

A Historic Perspective on the *Nabḍa*

John C. Wilkinson

1. The Ya'aruba Imamate

1.1 The Inherited Past

I need to state my initial position. As far as I am concerned, in so far as the term *nabḍa* represented a new awakening it started with the restoration of the Imamate in 1624 under Nāṣir b. Muṣṣab al-Ya'arubī, guided by his step-father Khamīs b. Sa'īd (b. 'Alī b. Mas'ūd) al-Shaqṣī (*nisba* of Mushāqīṣa). And as I shall show from a study of that great 'alim's *Minhaj al-ṭālibīn*, which had enormous influence on the leaders of the so-called *nabḍa*, it represented a reiteration of the fundamental principles of Ibādism and not a reform or reinterpretation of them. However, by emphasizing this continuity through the community's *āthār* (records) from its origins to his own time, the author does implicitly reject certain excesses that were developed by the 'ulamā' of the so-called Rustāq school in the centuries following the collapse of the 'First Imamate' in civil war.

The original *nabḍa* had occurred when the Ibādī bird (see the terminology in al-Kindī's *Muṣannaf*), whose egg was laid at Medina, hatched in Basra, and reached maturity (*nabḍa*) in Oman (with the establishment of the Imamate there). We know a reasonable amount about this early period down to the turn of the 6th/12th–7th/13th centuries, by which time the last claimant to what I label the Second Imamate, had been broken by the new force in the land, the Nabāhina. This Second Imamate was established early in the 5th/11th century under Imams from exclusively Yaḥmādī origins (which include the Kharūṣ) based in the Rustāq region, who justified their rights through an increasingly rigid interpretation of the thesis enunciated by Ibn Baraka and his pupil al-Bisyānī (mid 4th/10th century) that the deposing of al-Ṣalt b. Mālik al-Kharūṣī in 272/886 had been illegal; to the point that in 443/1052 the leading 'ulamā' of the so-called Rustāq school, issued a decree that all who disputed it or suspended judgment (*wuqūf*) were destined to hell-fire. At the same time, the tenets of Ibādism were likewise subject to an evermore-rigid interpretation that conformed

to the norms of Sunnī-Ash'arism. This culminated in the *Diyā'*, the great work of al-'Awtabī who effectively formalized Ibādism as a *madhhab*, further expounded as the only true *madhhab* of the 73 *firaq* in a work partly based on the *al-Mīlāl wa l-nihāl* model by al-Qalhātī.

So not only did the Rustāq school reject the moderating *wuqūf* that had allowed the election around 320/932 of a grandson of the last so-called Basran Imam at Nizwā recognized by all the 'ulamā', including Ibn Baraka, but also total rejection of 'aql (human reasoning) as a basis of legal opinion (*ra'y*): compare Ibn Baraka's condemnation of the *ṭarīqat al-'aql* with his contemporary and rival Abū Sa'īd al-Kudamī's *yukhraj ḥujja min al-ma'qūl*. That in turn called into question the 'ilm that was transmitted (*ḥamal*) from the founding Basran school, since it was tainted by traces of the Mu'tazilism that underpinned the Nizwan school's rationality. 'Ilm, like 'aql, al-'Awtabī decreed are human and not divine qualities. The hermeneutic link for interpreting the scriptures derives from divine guidance, 'illa, itself a *ma'nā*, an intrinsic quality of God's essence, an essentially Sunnī-Ash'arite argument. In other words 'illa replaced the notion of *iktisāb* (cf. *istiḥā'a*), the God-given acquisition of ability for man to distinguish between good and evil and so use 'aql as a source of interpretation.

It was this period between Ibn Baraka and al-'Awtabī's time I would argue, that saw the move away from the original essential Ibādī *tawḥīd*, reflecting its Muḥakkima origins: that the Qur'ān was the only font of the *dīn al-istiḥāma*. However, it must be emphasized, that founding principle did not intrinsically imply a fundamentalist elaboration of its content. On the contrary, most of the extremist interpretation stemmed from elaborations of *sunna* and associated *ḥadīth* which this revisionist Ibādī *madhhab* was now also beginning to adopt.

1.2 Attempts to Restore the Imamate (15th–16th Centuries)³

Of the following centuries we know increasingly little, until the start of the 15th when the Nizwans elected a Kindī as Imam (1406–30) and successfully defied Muẓaffar b. Sulaymān al-Nabhānī. Although Nizwā continued to be the seat of the Imams periodically elected, the real centre of the contemporary Ibādī 'ulamā' was at Bahlā', where in 885/1480–1 a Kharūṣī descendent of al-Ṣalt b. Mālik managed, not without opposition, to have himself elected under the name of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb. He finally managed to defeat the then Nabhānī *malik*, Sulaymān b. Sulaymān (b. Muẓaffar b. Sulaymān), who had recognized the authority of the Jubūr (Portuguese: Benjaber), rapidly expanding their power from Greater Bahrain towards Oman. Thereupon his *qāḍī* ordered the confiscation of the Nabhānī property, a judgment that was confirmed several times by subsequent 'ulamā' conclaves right up to the time of the Imamate of 'Azzān b. Qays (1868–71), who justified it as a precedent for confiscating the property of most of the Āl Bū Sa'īd.

But after the Kharūṣī's death the old disputes reopened and the three main fortified Jawf⁴ centres, Bahlā', Manah and Nizwā operated in quasi-independence, paying the Jabrī tribute when necessary. Weakened by this lack of cohesion, Sulaymān made a comeback, and drove the Banī al-Ṣalt (b. Mālik) and other 'ulamā' families, which included Mushāqīṣa, from Bahlā', the Kharūṣī returning to their *wādī* behind al-'Awābī and most of the Khalīlīs eventually to Bawshar. Nevertheless, these sporadic efforts to form Imamates and defy the Nabāhina endured in Nizwā until the mid-16th century when finally a push by the 'Late Nabāhina' *mulūk* in alliance with various intrusive tribes from Greater Bahrain, where the Jubūr power had by now been largely broken by the Portuguese, resulted in Sulaymān b. Muẓaffar (b. Sulṭān b. Muḥsin) al-Nabhānī establishing his authority over Nizwā and the Sharqīyya. But when he tried to take Bahlā', he was roundly defeated by a combine of the Banī Hina' of Sayfam, the 'Umayrī *malik* of Sumā'il (who was not unfavourable to the Ibādīs), the Jahāḍim of Samad al-Sha'n (then the main centre of the Sharqīyya), and one of the Jabrī *shaykhs*, now joined by the Ya'rubi *malik* of the all-important centre of Rustāq, which also commanded the Bāṭina coast (Ba'arab b. Sulṭān, great-grandfather of Nāṣir b. Murshid). This final collapse of Nabhānī authority somewhere around 1020/1611, coupled with the 'Umayrī *malik*'s withdrawal from the alliance, created a vacuum of power in the interior filled by competing *mulūk* and *amīrs* of both Omani and Bahraini origins, while the Portuguese, evicted from Hormuz in 1622,

reinforced their hold on the coast, including obtaining control of Sohar with the help of the Banī Hina' and 'Umayrī *malik* of Sumā'il. Only in Nizwā did the Ibādīs really continue to hold sway.

It is in this period of final chaos, al-Shaqṣī states, when property was plundered, *falajs* destroyed, settlements ruined, people slaughtered, religious books burnt with resulting loss of the *āthār*, that the *ẓulm* of the Bedouins prevailed alike in the mountains of Oman, its *wādīs*, its deserts, to the point that there was no distinction between *badw* and *ḥaḍar*.⁵ And he then goes on briefly to describe the final reaction which under his guidance united the Omanis under the Imam Nāṣir b. Murshid al-Yārubi who restored order, so that the people of Oman held to the *madhhab al-aṣl*, the *madhhab al-istiḳāma min ummat Muḥammad: wa l-ḥamdu li-llāh*.

1.3 al-Shaqṣī's Role

Unfortunately al-Shaqṣī says little about events, simply remarking that he could have written a large work on what happened, but it was known to many of his contemporaries. Fortunately, one of these, Ibn Qayṣar, did indeed record a biography of the Imam Nāṣir, so we only need to concentrate on trying to reconstruct some of al-Shaqṣī's own background.

After the 'ulamā' had been driven from Bahlā' by Sulaymān b. Sulaymān, the Mushāqīṣa settled alongside the Ambūsa'īd, a brother clan dominant in 'Aqr Nizwā, where the Imam's fort is situated. Both stemmed from the Banī Ziyād⁶, descendants of the early Banī Sāma (b. Lu'ay) Nizārī clans from whom came two of the original missionaries trained in Basra and whose members were effectively the 'Imam-makers' of the First Imamate, all of whose Imams were of Yamanī Azd origins, and all but one from Yaḥmad clans. As a result, in the so-called Yaman–Nizār civil war that followed al-Ṣalt's deposing, the Sāmī *shaykhs* were also leaders in opposition to the Yaḥmad tribes, and subsequently continued to resist their pretensions in the Second Imamate, all of whose Imams were Yaḥmadīs from the Rustāq–'Awābī area, and who justified their precedence in terms of Rustāq party dogma. A celebrated case is the Banī Ziyād's refusal to recognize Muḥammad b. Abī Ghassān al-Kharūṣī whose consequent siege of 'Aqr (ca. 509/1116) led to a celebrated exchange between the Kindī author of the *Muṣannaf* who defended the Imam's tactics and his teacher, Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ṣāliḥ (d. 546/1151, himself forebear of a long line of prominent 'ulamā').⁷

During that final period of disorder under the *mulūk* *abl al-jawf*, the final straw for the Ibādīs seems to have

been the appointment of the *abl al-da'wa* who introduced Islam in Oman. So the Imam recognized him and sent him to the interior where the Ya'aruba (of unknown origin) had emerged as the dominant centre. It is interesting to note that we do not know to what *firq* he belonged, but he has no hesitation in recognizing himself who brought the 'ilm to the interior. In fact he had a son who had died shortly after his appointment. His young widow (by the name of Nāṣir b. Murshid) married Sayf. When Nāṣir was appointed *malik* of Imam (1624–49) he was guided by the 'ulamā' to restore order back in the interior. The Imam who guided him in this was al-Shaqṣī who ensured that the Imam participated in the final stages of the Portuguese garrison's capture of the captured ships and converted to Islam. The war against the Portuguese was actively pursued as al-

1.4 The *Minhaj al-*

al-Shaqṣī's monument was not completed, or at least finished, until after his death. It is interesting to note that in writing with a general disregard for methodically to discuss the subject, compiling this vast collection of material had access to the originals of the Rustāq fort, of which the originals of the *Muṣannaf* were destroyed in a fire during the reign of the Ya'aruba Imam. The *Minhaj* however differs markedly from the *Muṣannaf* are largely compilations of material (the *āthār*), through and concise summaries of the material related with his own, but where necessary for the purposes of applications.

From the start, the underlines is that there is a great deal of 'ulamā' about fundamental principles, *risāla*, *aḥkām al-imān* etc. (vol. I, 503). Fig-

been the appointment by the Rustāqī *malik* of a *qāḍī* from the *ahl al-da'wa* who started trying to impose his form of Islam in Oman. So the Ambūsa'īdī '*ulamā'*' refused to recognize him and sent Khamīs b. Sa'īd al-Shaqṣī to Rustāq, where the Ya'aruba family (possibly a Nabhānī clan in origin) had emerged as the *mulūk* of this all-important centre. It is interesting to note that al-Shaqṣī says he does not know to what *firq al-dalla* this *qāḍī al-khilāf* belonged but he has no hesitation in implying that the new *qāḍī* who brought the '*ilm*' to the people of Rustāq was himself. In fact he had a stroke of luck. The then *malik* must have died shortly after his arrival, and al-Shaqṣī married his young widow (by whom he had seven sons), bringing up Nāṣir b. Murshid along with his cousin Sulṭān b. Sayf. When Nāṣir was about 20, he assumed the mantle of Imam (1624-49), proving himself an able tactician guided by the '*ulamā'*' of Nizwā.⁸ But after he had brought order back in the interior it seems to have been al-Shaqṣī who guided him in the first attacks on the Portuguese coastal strongholds and after Nāṣir died (leaving no son), al-Shaqṣī ensured Sulṭān b. Sayf was elected and himself participated in the final onslaught against the last major Portuguese garrison hold up in Muscat. With their captured ships and converted *renegados* the new Imam took the war against the Christians to sea where it was being actively pursued as al-Shaqṣī was writing.

1.4 The *Minhaj al-Ṭalibīn*

al-Shaqṣī's monumental *Minhaj* of 20 volumes was written, or at least finished, towards the end of his life. Starting with a general discourse on '*ilm*' the work proceeds methodically to discuss its various aspects. For help in compiling this vast exposé of the Ibāḍī creed, al-Shaqṣī had access to the incredibly important library in the Rustāq fort, of which 9,370 manuscripts, including the originals of the *Muṣannaf* and the *Bayān al-shar'* were destroyed in a fire during the civil war that marked the end of the Ya'aruba Imamate a century later. His own work, however differs markedly from the earlier *jawāmi'*, which are largely compilations of rulings by the early '*ulamā'*' (the *āthār*), through its admirably logical development and concise summaries of past rulings, sometimes elaborated with his own, but in which sources are only quoted where necessary for understanding basic principles and applications.

From the start, the essential feature the author underlines is that there had been no disputes amongst the '*ulamā'*' about fundamentals concerning *aṣl al-dīn*, *tawḥīd*, *risāla*, *aḥkām al-imāma*, *ru'ya*, *al-kbulūd*, *tashbīh*, *taḥdīd* etc. (vol. I, 503). Fighting and bloodshed (*'alā ghayr al-*

ṣiḥba wa l-bayān) arose entirely from the issue of whether the Imam al-Ṣalt b. Mālik al-Kharūṣī was deposed or resigned, and whether the key personalities involved were in *walāya* or *barā'a*, or whether judgment should be suspended (*wuqūf*) because the contemporary leading '*ulamā'*' disputed events and justifications. So the principal parties involved justified their own interests in terms of *walāya* and *barā'a* to the point that some even sought aid from the *sulṭān al-jawr*, the enemies of the *dīn al-muslimīn*. Only with the election of the Ruḥaylī, Abū l-Qāsim Sa'īd b. 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Maḥbūb was there general agreement on a new Imam and after his 'martyrdom' (328/939-40 trying to bring order in the Rustāq area), his successor Rāshid b. Walīd, until he weakened and the Imamate gave way to the *sulṭān al-jawr*. And all this, he says, was *min sabīl al-da'wa*, in other words claims to legitimacy, and not *sabīl al-tadayyun*, fundamental Islamic principles. In this way he avoids saying anything about the Second Imamate or the Rustāq party's growing extremism, and while he does mention some of the great scholars like the Kindī authors of the *Bayān al-shar'* and the *Muṣannaf*, he significantly fails to mention al-'Awtabī's name even though his list of worthies goes down to al-Qalhātī's time.

Likewise he says nothing specific of the Nabāhina period or the local attempts to restore Imamates in the Jawf. In this connection, it should be noted that while the Nabāhina are made the whipping boys for all Omani ills from the time when the 'Dark Ages' began with the fall of the Second Imamate, the reality is that there were many Nabhānī families, some of which remained staunch supporters of Ibāḍism. Indeed one of al-Shaqṣī's own teachers was probably the Nabhānī, al-Shaykh Mas'ūd b. Ramaḍān, the Ibāḍī *mufī* at Nizwā. Furthermore, it is also important to remember that during all this period, Ibāḍism never died out in Oman and we have the names of several families that produced prominent '*ulamā'*' and administered justice during these 'Dark Ages', notably the Ibn Maddād of 'Aqr Nizwā, the Awwād Mufarrij and the Banī Ziyād of Bahlā'.

All is regarded by al-Shaqṣī in terms of principle and derivative rulings. In the same way as there is no singling out of individuals or dynasties, so there is no mention of the Jubūr, nor of Hormuz's domination of the coast, nor of the rise of the Sunnī Ottoman Caliphate or the Shī'ī Safavid empire. Nor indeed the fact that for more than a century it had been a Christian power that had taken over from Oman's traditional Muslim enemies and upset the sort of status quo that had been established during some 800 years between the interior and the coast when under foreign Muslim control. All that he says is that in driving out the Christians from Muscat, capturing their ships and

enslaving prisoners, all had been done in complete compliance with rulings concerning *ghanīma* and *sibā*'.

al-Shaqṣī's approach to burying the ancient dispute that had almost destroyed Ibādism was in fact not entirely new. Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Maddād in the 16th century (in his *Jāmi*'i) had held that while the old books like the *Jawāmi*'i, the *Bayān al-shar*' and the *Muṣannaf* might be used, they must be verified for disputes concerning the *Kitāb Allāh*, the Prophet's *sunna* and the *ijmā*' of the Muslims of the period.⁹ And they must never be used for anything which disputed the *uṣūl*. If a *umma sawdā*' challenges the consensual view of the *ahl al-arḍ*' (i.e. Oman) based on these three criteria then it is in the right: in other words universally accepted Islamic practice overrides local legal traditions. But, Ibn Maddād hastens to add, if it disputes (Abū 'Abd Allāh) Muḥammad b. Maḥbūb (al-Ruḥaylī, d. 260/873) and Mūsā b. 'Alī (al-Sāmī, d. 230 or 231/844-5) then it is *kufr ni'ma*. In other words by specifying these two '*ulamā*', he reasserted that the principles of the Ibādī Imamate are sacred. This is endorsed by Ibn 'Ubaydān, the *qāḍī* of the Imam Bal'arab b. Sulṭān b. Sayf (r. 1680 until being deposed by his brother Sayf, d. in Jabrīn 1104/1692-3) who built and developed Jabrīn as a sort of university centre. In answer to those who held the old books should be held in *wuqūf* (specifically the *Bayān al-shar*', the *Muṣannaf*, the nine *Jawāmi*'i and their *Mukhtaṣar*, and al-'Awtabī's *Ḍiyā*'a) he too agrees that what they say should not be accepted without verification (*ṣiḥḥa*), since they were written against a background of disputes.¹⁰ But while reasserting that no judicial opinion may be given without knowledge of the Qur'ān, the *sunna* of the Prophet, and the *āthār a'immat al-'adl*, that is the pronouncements of the leading forebears of the Ibādī community that effectively formed its *ijmā*', he also emphasizes that all this material must be treated with intelligence, for the *sharī'a* cannot be understood without '*aql*. And he too disposes of the Rustāq party's extremism, but in a slightly different way from al-Shaqṣī. *Barā'a*, he states, divides into two forms, *sharī'a* (obligatory), and *ra'y* (opinion).

And if this reintroduction of the notion of '*aql* as a criterion might be considered wayward, it is implicitly endorsed by Naṣīr, the son of the proclaimed father of the *nabḥa* Abū Nabḥān (see below), who says that whilst Abū Sa'īd (al-Kudamī) was the greatest expert of all time in the '*ilm al-sharī'a*', his father was the most learned Ibādī expert in all religious matters. In other words common sense was being re-established as a criterion, at least in Ibādī Islam.

And it was needed in rebuilding the prosperity of Oman at home and abroad. Virtually everything we have from the voluminous *Jawābāt* of Ibn 'Ubaydān¹² con-

cerns very practical problems, particularly agriculture and trade. It was he who finally broke the constraints of redeveloping land that had been considered as misappropriated (*magḥṣūba*) or whose former owners could not be traced (the *ghawā'ib*) which had hitherto been largely sterilized through earlier interpretations of the relative law.¹³ Similarly such problems of commerce as: "If a merchant from Dhofar (then not part of Oman) comes to Muscat and dies leaving goods, what is the legal position of his estate there with regards to *zakāt* for his heirs?"

In conclusion I would assert that the Ya'aruba period laid the basis for those who are labelled as being leaders of the *nabḥa*. It was a period of immense scholarship and virtually all the material that subsists concerning early Omani history was saved through copies made in that period. This contemporary literature has been barely studied as far as I can make out. The real interest in it for me, as indeed Ibādism in general, lies in its practical aspects, its effectiveness as an administrative structure, its ability to incorporate the moderating characteristics of '*aql* and *baṣar* (perceptiveness). So just as the '*ulamā*' were able to adapt to the challenges of the Ya'aruba period, so did those of what is here being called the *nabḥa*. It was Abū Nabḥān who finally settled the debate about drinking coffee, which had hitherto been banned: his ruling is perhaps not entirely dissociated from the fact that Oman convoy carried the annual coffee fleet from Yemen to the Gulf at this time.¹⁴ Likewise Sa'īd b. Khalfān al-Khalīlī, whom there is a tendency to see as a hardliner, stretched the legal notion of *khiyār* on property in Oman and East Africa to the limits to serve as an instrument for collateral loans, without actually infringing the ban on usury, as Dr Bishara is telling us.¹⁵ But I recommend he also study the major work devoted entirely to that subject, the *Khizānat al-akbyār* by al-Shaqṣī's contemporary who was Naṣīr b. Murshid's *wālī* in the important centre of Samad al-Sha'n, 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad b. Ghassān (b. Muḥammad b. Ghassān b. Muḥammad b. 'Umar) al-Kharasīnī, al-Nizwī, the original of which, completed in Jumādā II 1045/1635 is in the MNHC library.¹⁶

2. The Āl Bū Sa'īd Period

2.1 The Hināwī-Ghāfirī Civil War

So we come to the tragic end of the Ya'aruba Imamate in a terrible civil war that polarized the Omanis into two great factions, Hināwī and Ghāfirī, the invasion and occupation of the coast by the Persians, and their eviction by Aḥmad b. Sa'īd the Ya'rubī governor of Sohar who killed the last Ya'rubī pretender and had himself elected

Imam at Nizwā by the

of the Ambūsa'īd of

There was how

Yaman-Nizār civil

years earlier; there

derpinning the two

the Ghāfirīs represe

the main line of Y

ants sought suppor

and foremost the B

constraint through

Banī Ruwāḥa likew

Sharqiyya Hināwī

the Ghāfirī *tamīma*

had himself elected

of Sayf b. Sulṭān II

tle in 1728). The res

universal support.¹⁷

Mombasa, supporte

nize him, while at h

many major forts. E

resided they held H

ers of opinion ther

of Rustāq. Further

was continuously b

Jabrī mother, Sulṭān

succeeded in taking

main ports for the

And in northern O

Āl 'Attāb (the desc

lished their own fi

conflict maneuvering a

of the Būsa'īdī dyn

confronted them, tr

amongst Aḥmad's d

But there were th

of events which prof

developed in the 19th

Sa'ūdī state which e

so-called Buraimi o

the Imam 'Azzān b.

al-Wahhāb from the

whom they take *tash*

other *da'wa* calling f

der their goods, and

Abū Nabḥān's son

was successful with

rance living in the

live the people of fa

al-faḍl).¹⁸ Need anyt

The second was t

the Omani navy and

particularly agriculture broke the constraints... considered as misapp... former owners could not... hitherto been largely... etations of the relative... commerce as: "If a mer... (part of Oman) comes to... what is the legal position... zakāt for his heirs?"... that the Ya'aruba period... labelled as being leaders... immense scholarship and... obsists concerning early... gh copies made in that... ture has been barely... The real interest in it for... lies in its practical as... ministrative structure, its... ating characteristics of... just as the 'ulamā' were... the Ya'aruba period, so... called the *nahda*. It was... the debate about drink... en banned: his ruling is... om the fact that Oman... lect from Yemen to the... d b. Khalfān al-Khalīlī, ... s a hardliner, stretched... erty in Oman and East... a instrument for collat... ing the ban on usury, ... I recommend he also... ntirely to that subject, ... qsi's contemporary who... he important centre of... Muhammad b. Ghassān... hammad b. 'Umar) al-... of which, completed in... HC library.¹⁶

War

the Ya'aruba Imamate... the Omanis into two... , the invasion and oc... ans, and their eviction... governor of Sohar who... and had himself elected

Imam at Nizwā by the Ghāfirī *shaykhs* under the guidance of the Ambūsa'īd of 'Aqr Nizwā (1167/1753-4, d. 1783).

There was however, a major difference from the Yaman-Nizār civil war that had torn Oman apart 800 years earlier; there was no ideological justification underpinning the two sides. At a risk of over-generalizing, the Ghāfirīs represented those who had done well out of the main line of Ya'rubi Imams whilst the rival claimants sought support from those who had lost out, first and foremost the Banī Hīnā' who had been held under constraint throughout the main Ya'aruba period, the Banī Ruwāḥa likewise for helping the Nabāhina, and the Sharqiyya Hīnāwīs who had been viciously suppressed by the Ghāfirī *tamīma* Muḥammad b. Nāṣir al-Ghāfirī who had himself elected in 1724 as Imam during the minority of Sayf b. Sulṭān II (he and the Hīnāwī leader died in battle in 1728). The result was that Aḥmad b. Sa'īd never had universal support.¹⁷ In East Africa, the Mazrū'ī *liwalis* of Mombasa, supported by the Mushāqīṣa refused to recognize him, while at home the Ya'aruba continued to occupy many major forts. Even in the Rustāq area where Aḥmad resided they held Ḥazm and Nakhl, while the real deciders of opinion there were again the Mushāqīṣa 'ulamā' of Rustāq. Furthermore, even in his own time Aḥmad was continuously being challenged by his two sons by a Jabrī mother, Sulṭān and Sayf, who tried and sometimes succeeded in taking control of Barkā' and Muscat, the main ports for the newly reestablished maritime trade. And in northern Oman, the Ghāfirī leaders, notably the Āl 'Attāb (the descendants of the Ghāfirī Imam), established their own fiefdoms and were in continuous conflict maneuvering against each other. So from the start of the Būsa'īdī dynasty's history, two major challenges confronted them, tribal disorder and internecine feuding amongst Aḥmad's descent.

But there were three new factors affecting the course of events which profoundly influenced the way the *nahda* developed in the 19th century. The first was the Wahhābī-Sa'ūdī state which established, off and on, a base in the so-called Buraimi oasis until finally driven out in 1868 by the Imam 'Azzān b. Qays. "A new religion taken by 'Abd al-Wahhāb from the Ḥanbalites and the Azāriqa... from whom they take *tasbrik abl al-qibla*... and we know of no other *da'wa* calling for Muslims to kill each other... plunder their goods, and enslave their women and children", Abū Nabḥān's son Nāṣir (1778-1847) declared, adding it was successful with the Bedouin (*a'rāb*), people of ignorance living in the desert outside the settlements where live the people of favour (*fi l-qufār dūn abl al-buldān min al-faql*).¹⁸ Need anything more be said?

The second was the rapidly accelerating importance of the Omani navy and overseas trade, which by the end of

the 18th century had renewed the dominance achieved in the Ya'rubi period, and in conjunction with the Sultan of Mysore and others had established factories extending from the Red Sea to Pegu (Burma). But increasingly these were being incorporated into a wider world-wide trading pattern, notably through the East India Company's interest in India following the defeat of Tipu Sahib at Seringapatam (1799), the French in the Mascarene Islands, and Portugal's empire in Africa and Brazil. Britain's intervention took a new turn in the Napoleonic Wars from which it emerged triumphant, developing at the same time a zeal in the newly founded anti-slavery movements, increasingly supported by Christian missionaries of various kinds. The main effects initially became marked in Oman's overseas empire on the Swahili coast, where Sayyid Sa'īd b. Sulṭān (r. 1806-56) consolidated his hold after dealing with the Mazrū'īs of Mombasa (1837) and finally moved to Zanzibar, from which Omani pioneers had already developed the ivory front as far as the Upper Congo. Thus started the absentee rule that was to characterize so much of the Būsa'īdī Sultanate, and led them increasingly to turn to Britain to defend their regime against their alienated subjects. Shortly after Sa'īd's death the Indian mutiny put an end to the East India Company, and its domain became incorporated into a wider imperial polity, which finally led Britain into a confrontation with other putative European colonial powers in the 'Scramble for Africa'.

The third feature was that Britain's hold of trade was indirect. It was the Indian merchants (notably the Hindu Banians) who farmed the Sultan's customs, who financed the ivory expeditions into central Africa, who advanced the funds for the rapidly expanding pearl industry in the Gulf and the date trade of Oman, and acted as the bankers and intermediaries for the clove and sugar plantations and copra trade of Zanzibar, Pemba, and the Swahili coast.—So much for the background to the *nahda*.

2.2 The Kharūṣ

Enter Abū Nabḥān Ja'īd b. Khamīs al-Kharūṣī (1734- ca. 1822). This is the first time the Kharūṣ feature in events since the demise of their controversial Imam 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb at the end of the 15th century and the eviction from Bahlā' of the Banī l-Ṣalt by Sulaymān b. Sulaymān al-Nabḥānī. They simply do not play any significant role in the Ya'aruba Imamate, probably for two reasons. The Ya'aruba had no intention of being challenged by the old Yaḥmadī confederation of the Rustāq region, while the Ibādī 'ulamā' who backed them had no love for the Kharūṣ: as we have seen, al-Shaqṣī implicitly condemns

the Imams of the Second Imamate through claiming a false legitimacy based on extreme Rustāq school dogma (whence the name of the school). On the other hand, every one of the Kharūṣī figures who feature in the new *nabḥa* stem from lineages of that First Imamate: Abū Nabḥān from Khalīl b. Shādhān b. al-Ṣalt; the Khalīlīs from the same line descending through Khalīl b. ‘Abd Allāh under whom the Imamate was finally overthrown by the Nabāhina; and the Imam Sālim b. Rāshid (r. 1913–20) from ‘Azzān b. Tamīm, that is the Imam appointed by the Mūsā b. Mūsā l-Sāmī faction which deposed al-Ṣalt (not of itself a recommendation for the Rustāq party, but nevertheless a family closely associated with Kharūṣī clan interests in ‘Awābī and the tribal *dār* behind).

It is only at the very end of the Ya‘āruba period that the Kharūṣ appear when they feature backing Bal‘arab b. Ḥīmyar b. (Sulṭān b. Sayf) al-Ya‘rubī who tried to make a come back with their support until killed by Aḥmad b. Sa‘īd. Perhaps in this lies the antipathy of Abū Nabḥān for Aḥmad and his refusal to recognize his Imamate. In any case his strictures on the legitimacy of his election¹⁹ is belied both by the fact that he was only a boy when those events occurred, while those who elected him were the Ambūsa‘īd and the man who made the *khuṭba* was his teacher, a Kindī who had travelled widely in India and the Ottoman Empire.²⁰ Furthermore, Aḥmad was acknowledged as a hero in the war against the Persian occupation and his renown such that a large number of the Maghribī Ibādīs wrote him a long epistle describing our *sayyid* the Imam Aḥmad b. Sa‘īd al-Būsa‘īdī and his two sons Hilāl and Sa‘īd²¹ as our hope for establishing the true *dīn* against the *abl al-khilāf* etc.²² Abū Nabḥān only in fact comes to the fore in the Imamate of Aḥmad’s successor, his son Sa‘īd whom he actually seems to have proclaimed.²³ It was this Imam Sa‘īd’s inability and reluctance to get involved in the aggravation between the Kinda and Banī Riyām at Nizwā, where he had already had an unfortunate experience when appointed by his father as governor there, that led Abū Nabḥān to do a *khurūj* and take possession of the fort at ‘Aqr. The above description of Abū Nabḥān’s Kharūṣī background is in no way meant to belittle his immense learning and merits in intervening for the good in the current unsettled situation in Oman which led to his being dubbed *Abū l-Nabḥa*, but it does once again illustrate how politics, tribal ambitions, and religion are intimately entwined in Oman. The same is evident in the story of Sa‘īd b. Khalfān al-Khalīlī (?1820–1871), who was largely responsible for winning support to elect the Būsa‘īdī ‘Azzān b. Qays of Rustāq as a *ḍa‘īf* Imam (1868–71) and whose own grandson, Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh became Imam of Oman (1920–54).

2.3 The *Nabḥa* and Modernity

So I could go on developing aspects of all these themes almost *ad infinitum*. But there is one in particular I have not even touched on, the development of a sort of neo-Ibādism at the turn of the 19th–20th century. I have attempted briefly to describe its characteristics in *The Imamate Tradition*²⁴ but it is too large a subject to develop here and it is one that will be broached by others in this volume better able than me to analyze it. I would simply like to point out that it raised a vital internal debate which was reflected in Oman’s subsequent history; the issue of adapting to the new technology, Western education and administration, along with other expressions of ‘modernity’ introduced by ‘colonial’ regimes, as too the need of Islam in general and of the Ottoman Caliphate in particular to modernize and reform the institutions of government to survive as a political force.

With regards to the Ibādīs, these issues were most to the fore in North Africa where the French and Italians, along with the British in Egypt not only jostled each other, but also challenged the legitimacy of the Ottoman Empire. They also presented themselves in the multi-cultural environment of East Africa, affecting Oman directly with the tripartite division of the Omani Sultan’s mainland territory between the French, British, and Germans and the direct occupation of Zanzibar as a British Protectorate (1890). In Oman itself, the British also had a free hand following the *entente cordiale* with France, but chose to continue maintaining its limited imperial interests indirectly through manipulating the Sultan Fayṣal b. Turkī (r. 1888–1913). However, although the division of the Omani empire into Zanzibar and Omani Sultanates by the Canning Award of 1861 had some effect on the traditional migratory and economic links between the two regions, it had in no way severed them and the ‘*ulamā*’ of Zanzibar still tended to look to Oman for guidance. Thus came into existence a debate between those in Zanzibar favoring a degree of ‘progressist’ acceptance of the contemporary world, and the ‘*ulamā*’ of Oman, whose hopes of reinstating an Imamate government had foundered with the death of Ṣāliḥ b. ‘Alī l-Ḥārithī in 1896 and the power struggle within the ‘Azzān b. Qays b. al-Imām Aḥmad’s line from which potential candidates had hitherto been considered.

The new figure to emerge as leader of the Ibādī opposition to Fayṣal was ‘Abd Allāh b. Ḥumayd al-Sālimī (1868–1914). As his exchanges with the Zanzibaris show,²⁵ al-Sālimī chose the reactionary path of a puritanical adherence to Islamic values and a total rejection of any compromise whatever with those of the Western world: the Zanzibaris had brought on themselves God’s punishment

by their own transgr... attempts to have hi... succeeded in uniting... thereby obliging the... port of the Sultan ho... ment of sorts betwe... was finally brokered... determined to keep... no attempt was mad... tive sphere or intro... for their people, as t... Nafūsa, Sulaymān al... obliged to find refug... India Office who we... backwater to its own...

But in the new p... post-colonial world... in command of the... sion was inevitable. F... after Sultan Qabūs b... *nabḥa* is one that is... material progress as... ical vision. So I will... Ibādism is no abstrac... pragmatically and in... allows it to show tol... Muslims alike, all th... and sense of justice... been established hav... history. So the quest... ible with those of an...

by their own transgressions. Finally in 1913, after several attempts to have him assassinated had failed, al-Sālimī succeeded in uniting the Omanis behind a Kharūṣī Imam, thereby obliging the British to come to the military support of the Sultan holding out in Muscat. After an agreement of sorts between the two claimants to sovereignty was finally brokered by the British in 1920 both parties determined to keep the outside world at bay. Absolutely no attempt was made by either to modernize its respective sphere or introduce even a modicum of health care for their people, as the great Ibādī leader from the Jabal Nafūsa, Sulaymān al-Bārūnī (1870-1940), discovered when obliged to find refuge in Oman. All of which suited the India Office who were more than satisfied to leave this backwater to its own devices with minimum cost.

But in the new political and economic order of the post-colonial world, these three players were no longer in command of the Omani political game and an explosion was inevitable. Finally a new order started to develop after Sultan Qābūs b. Sa'īd took power (1970). This new *nahḍa* is one that is based essentially on much-needed material progress as well as on a unifying socio-political vision. So I will leave you with one final thought. Ibādism is no abstract school. Rather it has had to evolve pragmatically and in the process develop a flexibility that allows it to show tolerance to others, Muslims and non-Muslims alike, all the while adhering to a strict morality and sense of justice. The principles on which these have been established have remained unaltered throughout its history. So the question that arises is: are these compatible with those of an increasingly complex modern world?

Notes

- 1 I have used the Maktabat Masqat 2006 edition (10 vols). According to the editor, the title *Minhaj al-talibin*... was attributed by 'Abd al-'Aziz b. Ibrāhīm al-Thamīnī who wrote a *Mukhtaṣar* (abridgement) of the work. al-Thamīnī (1130/1718–1223/1808), who was the pupil of the Maghribi *Abū l-Nabḍa*, 'Ammī Yahyā (d. 1226/1811; he left no written works) was the author of the great Maghribi *nabḍa* compilation, the *K. al-Nīl*..., one of whose famous pupils, Ibrāhīm b. Yūsuf Aṭṭayyish came to Oman from the Mzab via Egypt and on his return taught his younger brother, the 'Pole of the Religion' (*Quṭb al-Dīn*) Muḥammad b. Yūsuf (1820–1914), who wrote, *inter alia*, a *sharḥ* of the *K. al-Nīl*, and in his later years was a contemporary of the Omani 'Light of the Religion' (*Nūr al-Dīn*), 'Abd Allāh b. Ḥumayd al-Sālimī (1868–1914). And it was his nephew Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm Aṭṭayyish who eventually edited and published al-Sālimī's famous history of the Imamate, the *Tuḥfāt al-'ayān*... (finished January 1913, three months before he brought about the re-establishment of the Imamate under his son-in-law Sālim b. Rāshid al-Kharūṣī). Interaction between Oman and the Maghrib was also encouraged by the printing of works from both regions at the press established in Zanzibar by Sultan Barghash b. Sa'īd (r. 1870–88) and the Bārūnī press of the great Tripolitanian Ibādī, Sulaymān Pāshā l-Bārūnī (1870–1940).
- 2 Wilkinson 2010: 223 for Ḥajjīb al-Tā'ī's use of the term.
- 3 The following is largely based on Wilkinson 1987: 212–18 where the main sources may be found, but I have modified my account of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb's Imamate in the light of Dr 'Abdullah Abu 'Ezzah's excellent 1995 study which throws considerable new light from a study of Sulaymān b. Sulaymān's own poetry.
- 4 That is the region of central Oman on the inner side of the mountains. The opposite side, sometimes described as the Ghadaḥf, focuses on the Rustāq–'Awābī area.
- 5 For the *badw-ḥaḍar* divide in Oman see Wilkinson 1987: 94.
- 6 The eponym was Ziyād b. Aḥmad of Bahlā.
- 7 Details in Wilkinson 1987: 125–6; id. 2010: 358–9.
- 8 There is some correspondence between Nāṣir and Sulṭān b. Sayf b. Mālik whom he appointed *wālī* of the troublesome centre of Bahlā' (see Anon [Ms]: 249 ff.) In this he says he is *qatīl al-'ilm* and how he had particularly sought the counsel of Mas'ūd b. Ramaḍān and Ṣāliḥ b. Sa'īd. But with regard to the refractory Banī Hina', his main adviser was Mas'ūd b. Ḥāshim who referred to the precedent of 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb's confiscating Nabāhina property. It was the consequent constraints placed on the Banī Hina' that led to their becoming the main protagonists against the Sulṭān b. Sayf line in the civil war that brought the collapse of the Ya'aruba Imamate.
- 9 See Ibn Maddād [Ms]: 3.
- 10 Abū Nabḥān's grandson, Yahyā b. Khalfān, told the German Orientalist E. Sachau (Sachau 1898) that the basic texts used by the *qāḍīs* were the *Bayān al-sbar'*, the *Muṣannaf* and Abū Sa'īd al-Kudāmī's *K. al-Istiḳāma* and *Mu'tabar* from the old books, along with more modern compilations like Jumayyil b. Khamīs al-Sa'īd's *Qāmūs al-sbarī'a* (written over twenty years, 1260/1844–1280/1863) which the Barghash press started printing, the *Jawābat* of Sa'īd b. Khalfān al-Khalīlī, and works by members of the Ṣā'ighī family of Manāḥ, notably Sālim b. Sa'īd b. 'Alī, the leading *'ālim* in the time of Imam Sa'īd b. al-Imām Aḥmad b. Sa'īd, and who probably drew much from (his uncle) Jum'ā b. 'Alī's 14 volume compilation, *Jawbar al-athar* which predates 1778/1765.
- 11 It was also the favourite work of the powerful *shaykh al-'allama* Mājīd b. Khamīs al-'Abri (ca. 1836/8–1927) who was prominent in the Imamates of three *nabḍa* Imams, 'Azzān b. Qays (1868–71), Sālim b. Rāshid al-Kharūṣī (1913–20) and Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh al-Khalīlī (1920–54). He was also a teacher of al-Sālimī and it was during a dispute with him over the legality of sequestering *waqf* left for visiting graves and reading the Qur'ān for the dead in order to raise funds for the hard-pressed Imamate that al-Sālimī was killed as his camel passed under a bough on his way to al-Ḥamrā' to settle the issue. Likewise, he had prevented 'Azzān and his main sponsor Sa'īd b. Khalfān al-Khalīlī from collecting *zakāt* early for similar reasons.
- 12 There are six Mss of (Muḥammad b. 'Abd Allāh b. Jum'ā) Ibn 'Ubaydān in MNHC, of which the unbound Ms in an envelope No. 3609 dated 1216 H is particularly interesting.
- 13 See appendix on Ibādī land laws in Wilkinson 1977: 258–65.
- 14 Wilkinson 1987: 5.
- 15 See Bishara 2014.
- 16 A *stra* by another member of the family who lived about a generation on, Sa'īd b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad al-Khurāsīnī l-Nizwī, was, along with the *Minhaj*, the source for al-Sa'īd's section on past worthies down to al-Qalhātī time in volume VIII of his *Qāmūs al-sbarī'a* (for this Khurāsīnī's biography see vol. VIII, 310 of the first ten volumes published by the Barghash press between 1297–99 H). The author presented a complete copy of the Ms to Muḥammad b. Yūsuf Aṭṭayyish which I saw at Beni Isguen.
- 17 His main support came from the Sharqiyya Hināwīs and the Jabrī *shaykh* in the Sumā'il Gap. It was Sayyid Sa'īd b. Sulṭān's alienation of the Sharqiyya confederation, under their great *tamīma* of the first half of the century 'Isā b. Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥārithī (who was succeeded about the middle of the century by his great-grandson Ṣāliḥ b. 'Alī b. Nāṣir al-Ḥārithī, d. 1896) that swung the Hināwīs behind the Imamate cause, as too the tyranny of the Ghāfirī Jabrī leader in the Sumā'il Gap, Muḥammad b. Nāṣir, who was an important supporter of Sayyid Sa'īd. This brought the Banī Ruwāḥa with whom the Khalīlīs were building influence into the Ibādī alliance. The choice for a potential Imam perforce lay in the 'Azzān b. Qays b. al-Imām Aḥmad line based on the stronghold of Rustāq which also dominated much of the Bāṭina coast and with it the major grouping known as the Al Sa'īd under the leadership of the Khamīs clan. At one stage under Ḥamad b. Khamīs, brother and teacher of Jumayyil who wrote the *Qāmūs al-sbarī'a* they actually did a *khurāj* in their own right based on the principle of 40 declaring themselves *shurāt*. It was the leading *'ālim* on the Bāṭina, Muḥammad b. Sulayyīm al-Gharībī who rallied local support for 'Azzān there, the whole thing being coordinated by Mājīd b. Khamīs al-'Abri who settled in Qays's entourage in 1854.
- 18 For the incomplete Ms in MNHC replying to questions the Christians might ask about Ibādism, see Wilkinson 1987: 370. The fact that Nāṣir says that after the collapse of the Wahhābī state those who had been converted changed to Sunnism indicates he was writing in the period between the capture of Fayṣal b. Turkī by the Egyptian general Khurshīd Pāshā (1838) and his escape from Egypt and subsequent reoccupation of Buraimi in 1845. I suspect the *stra* was addressed to Capt. (later Col.) Atkins Hamerton, the first East India Company Consul who was also the first European to visit Buraimi (in 1840 because of Egyptian ambitions in the Gulf area following Fayṣal's capture). Hamerton subsequently moved to Zanzibar where Sayyid Sa'īd b. Sulṭān resided, keeping Nāṣir in his entourage to make sure he did not cause trouble back in Oman.
- 19 See Sālimī 1380/1961, II: 169.
- 20 For Abū Nabḥān's strictures see Wilkinson 1987: 171–2. See also further for biographies Ibn Ruzayq [Ms]: folios 255v ff. and 275r–279v.
- 21 Hilāl had considerable support but went virtually blind and died at Diu seeking a cure. So it was Sa'īd who succeeded.
- 22 Anon [Ms] has a list of those writings (Shammākhī's, Bārūnī's etc.). As well as the Imam and his two sons in the right fight (*kifāyat*), Abū Sulaymān (Muḥammad b. 'Amīr) al-Ma'walī is also addressed

and the Ms contains a
For al-Ma'walī's other v
Wilkinson 1987: 370.
23 Sālimī 1380/1961, II: 173
24 Wilkinson 1987: 243–5.
25 See Ghazal 2015: 236–5

Bibliography

Cited Works

Abu 'Ezzah 1995

Abu 'Ezzah, 'A.: Imam 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb of Oman and Banū Ġabr of al-Ḥasā. In: *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies* 25 (1995) 1-13.

Anon [Ms]

Composite Anon Ms 2424 in MNHC (details Wilkinson 1987: 367; this Ms also includes the letter of the Imam Naṣir b. Murshid to his cousin mentioned in note 8).

Bishara 2014

Bishara, F.A.: Paper Routes: Inscribing Islamic Law across the Nineteenth-Century Western Indian Ocean. In: *Law and History Review* 32,4 (2014) 797-820.

Ghazal 2015

Ghazal, A.N.: Omani Fatwas and Zanzibari Cosmopolitanism: Modernity and Religious Authority in the Indian Ocean. In: *The Muslim World* 105 (2015) 236-50.

Ibn Maddād [Ms]

Ibn Maddād, Abū Bakr Aḥmad b. Maddād: *Jāmi'*. MNHC Ms (of 138h?) entitled by the copier K. *Khizānat al-'ibād. Jawābāt min Abi l-Umma... Aḥmad b. Maddād.*

Ibn Ruzayq [Ms]

Ibn Ruzayq, Ḥumayd b. Muḥammad: *al-Ṣaḥīfa l-Qaḥṭāniyya*. Ms of 1269/1852, Rhodes House Oxford, Mss Afr.S.3.

Sachau 1898

Sachau, E.: Das Gutachten eines muhammedanischen Juristen über die muhammedanischen Rechtsverhältnisse in Ostafrika. In: *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen* 1,3 (1898) 1-8.

Sālimī 1380/1961

al-Sālimī, 'Abd Allāh b. Ḥumayd: *Tuḥfat al-a'yān bi sirat abl 'Umān*. Cairo 1380/1961.

Shaqṣī 2006

al-Shaqṣī l-Rustāqī, Khamīs b. Sa'īd: *Minhaj al-ṭālibin wa balāgh al-rāghibin*. 10 vols., Muscat 2006.

Wilkinson 1977

Wilkinson, J.C.: *Water and Tribal Settlement in South-East Arabia: A Study of the Aflāj of Oman*. Oxford 1977.

and the Ms contains a *qasida* of his concerning these Maghribis.

For al-Ma'wali's other works see under his bibliography in

Wilkinson 1987: 370.

23 Sālimī 1380/1961, II: 173.

24 Wilkinson 1987: 243-5.

25 See Ghazal 2015: 236-50.

ality of sequestering *waqf* left
an for the dead in order to
te that al-Sālimī was killed as
way to al-Ḥamrā' to settle the
n and his main sponsor Sa'īd
ḥakāt early for similar reasons.
Abd Allāh b. Jum'a) Ibn
ound Ms in an envelope No.
esting.
lkinson 1977: 258-65.

y who lived about a generation
Khurāsīnī l-Nizwī, was, along
r's section on past worthies
I of his *Qāmūs al-sharī'a* (for
, 310 of the first ten volumes
en 1297-99 H). The author
Muḥammad b. Yūsuf

qīyya Hinawīs and the Jabri
d Sa'īd b. Sulṭān's alienation
their great *tamīma* of the
Ḥārithī (who was succeeded
great-grandson Sāliḥ b. 'Alī
g the Hinawīs behind the
he Ghāfirī Jabri leader in the
o was an important sup-
e Banī Ruwāḥa with whom
to the Ibādī alliance. The
y in the 'Azzān b. Qays b.
nghold of Ruṣṭāq which also
d with it the major grouping
hip of the Khamīs clan. At
rcher and teacher of Jumayyil
ctually did a *kburūj* in their
declaring themselves *shurāt*.
Muḥammad b. Sulayyim al-
azzān there, the whole thing
al-'Abri who settled in Qays's

ying to questions the
ee Wilkinson 1987: 370. The
ose of the Wahhābi state
l to Sunnism indicates he was
l to Sunnism indicates he was
ure of Fayṣal b. Turkī by the
) and his escape from Egypt
ni in 1845. I suspect the *ṣira*
ins Hamerton, the first East
he first European to visit
mbitions in the Gulf area fol-
osequently moved to Zanzibar
reeping Naṣir in his entourage
back in Oman.

nson 1987: 171-2. See also fur-
folios 255v ff. and 275r-279v.
at virtually blind and died at
t succeeded.
(Shammākhi's, Bārūnī's etc.).
in the right fight (*kiḥfāyat*),
al-Ma'wali is also addressed

Wilkinson 1987

Wilkinson, J.C.: *The Imamate Tradition of Oman*.
Cambridge 1987.

Wilkinson 2010

Wilkinson, J.C.: *Ibâdism: Origins and Early Development
in Oman*. Oxford 2010.

The

At the end of the 19th century, the reformers of educational, social and political life in Istanbul, Beirut, Zanzibar and elsewhere were using the term *nahḍa* to describe their activities. They were responding to the challenges posed by modernity beyond inertia and inactivity, and the creation of new models of society. The desired changes could be summarized as: Renewal of the state; Reform of the law; and Renewal of education (*fiqh*); and Renewal of educational structures. The renewal of the state, the reform of the law, and the renewal of education, earlier than that, namely the reform of the state. It quickly became clear that cultural reform were also necessary.

But religious reform was also necessary for three reasons. First, the reformers were among the followers of the *Salaf*, and in addition that the majority of the reformers were its guiding principles. They were not to abandon. This made the reformers (creative intellectual effort) to accommodate with the reformers the resistance that tradition posed in the face of Western modernity. The reformers to religious reform was a necessary and appropriate strategy; they just needed the "opening of the gates" of the reformers' backing of age-old and traditional values to be identified in the eyes of the reformers; thus for example, the reformers' attack on the Faith of the reformers that surrounded the *fiqh* of the reformers. The third obstacle, the reformers' was that the reformers' change, except the change of the reformers' religious traditions, and the reformers' the Book and the *sunna* of the reformers' creative effort or *ijtihad*.