

the JUH convened multiple anti-Pakistan groups (amongst them occupational groups such as the Bihārī weavers, from the province/state of Bihar) and regional Muslim parties (from the Frontier, Punjab, and Bengal) as well as the All India Muslim Majlis and the Independent Party to form the Muslim Parliamentary Board, with Madanī as chair. They contested the election of 1945–6 but to no avail. Madanī, as representative of the board, along with other nationalist Muslims, participated in the failed “Cabinet Mission” deliberations of April 1946, questioning elections that had been based on a narrow franchise and that trafficked in religious fear. Chastened by the interwar creation of European protectorates, moreover, he feared great-power interventions in two weaker countries rather than one unified state.

Madanī stood for a more socially just society once an independent country curtailed the exploitation of the British and their privileged collaborators. He also, like Gandhi, envisioned a communitarian organisation of society, with the ‘ulamā’ as guides to the personal and ritual lives of Muslims. Such aspects of the JUH vision were very much products of their time, but the fundamental stance of its members was, as Peter Hardy has argued, of potentially greater relevance. They justified equal citizenship with non-Muslims from within the Islamic tradition, and they confirmed, against all talk of an Islamic state, the treatment of *sharī‘a* as an internal moral imperative. This was a lasting legacy for India and the wider Muslim community.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

WORKS BY SAYYID ḤUSAYN AḤMAD MADANĪ  
*Hamāwā Hindūstān awr us ke jadā‘il*, New Delhi  
 n.d.; *Intikhāb-i khatūbāt-i Jam‘at al-‘Ulamā’-i*

*Hind*, ed. Shajha‘ ‘Alī Sandilvī, Lucknow 1988; *Maktūbāt-i shaykh al-Islām*, ed. Najum al-Dīn Iṣlāhī, 4 vols., Deoband 1952–64; *Muttaḥida qawmiyyāt awr Islām*, Delhi 1973, trans. Mohammad Anwer Hussain and Hasan Imam, *Composite nationalism and Islam*, New Delhi 2005; *Naqsh-i ḥayāt*, 2 vols., Deoband 1953; Abū Salmān Shāhjahānpūrī (ed.), *Mawlānā Sayyid Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī kī siyāsī dayrī. Akhbār wa-ijfāk kī roshnī men*, 8 vols., Karachi 2002–11.

#### STUDIES

Venkat Dhulipala, *Creating a new Medina. State power, Islam, and the quest for Pakistan in late colonial North India*, Cambridge 2015; Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi, *The Deoband School and the demand for Pakistan*, Bombay 1963; Yohanan Friedmann, ‘The attitude of the Jamī‘yyat-i ‘Ulamā-i Hind to the Indian national movement and the establishment of Pakistan’, *Asian and African Studies* 7 (1971), 157–80; Peter Hardy, *Partners in freedom and true Muslims. The political thought of some Muslim scholars in British India, 1912–47*, Lund 1971; Barbara D. Metcalf, *Husain Ahmad Madani. The jihad for Islam and India’s freedom*, Oxford 2009; Ali Usman Qasimi and Megan Eaton Robb (eds.), *Muslims against the Muslim League. Critiques of Pakistan*, Cambridge 2017; Muhammad Qasim Zaman, *The ‘ulama’ in contemporary Islam. Custodians of change*, Princeton 2002.

BARBARA D. METCALF

## Maḥbūb b. al-Raḥīl, Abū Sufyān

**Abū Sufyān Maḥbūb b. al-Raḥīl** (or al-Ruḥayl) al-Qurayshī al-Makhzūmī al-‘Abdī was a Basran Ibādī jurist, theologian, and historian who became a leader of the Basran Ibādī community after the death of Wā‘il b. Ayyūb, in about 190/806. His dates are uncertain: Crone and Zimmerman (310–1) propose his birth before 140/757 and his death in about 210/825; equally uncertain are his tribal identifications as a Qurayshī (al-Sa‘dī, 8:303) or

an ‘Abdī (i.e., a member of the ‘Abd al-Qays) (al-Darjīnī, 2:278), both of which Wilkinson doubts (*Ibādism*, 164). When his mother re-married, he became a stepson of the Ibādī luminary al-Rabīʿ b. Ḥabīb (d. c.170/787). In his early life, Abū Sufyān collected stories about the formative period of Ibādism and the third- and fourth-generation Ibādīs of Basra, such as his adoptive grandfather al-Mulayḥ (d. late second/eighth century) and ‘Abd al-Malik al-Ṭawīl (d. late second/eighth to early third/ninth century) (al-Shammākhī, 1:222–3, 226). Later, as leader of the Basran Ibādī community, Abū Sufyān acted as arbiter between the Rustamid Imām ‘Abd al-Wahhāb b. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Rustam (r. 171–208/788–824) and Khalaf b. Samḥ (d. after 282/895), the founder of the Khalafiyya (a North African Ibādī schismatic group), arguing in a now-lost tract in favour of Imām ‘Abd al-Wahhāb and outlining the “errors” (*takḥīʿa*) of those who followed al-Khalaf (al-Darjīnī, 1:70). In about 200/816, according to Crone and Zimmerman (311), Abū Sufyān contested the ideas of Hārūn b. al-Yamān (d. first half of the third/ninth century) in two letters to the Ḥaḍramawtī and Omani Ibādīs, in which he criticised Ibn al-Yamān’s lenient (and quasi-Murjiʿī) stance on the question of suspending judgement (*wuqūf*) in matters of association (*walāya*, the attitude taken towards, and legal stipulations regarding, those who are held to be co-religionists) and dissociation (*barāʿa*, the attitude towards, and legal rules regarding, those who are not considered co-religionists), touching also on related matters, such as Ibn al-Yamān’s dismissal of the requirement to attend Friday prayers (Kāshif, 1:305ff., 323ff.; Wilkinson, *Ibādism*, 234).

A treatise (*ʿahd*) addressed to the Ibādī rebel ‘Abdallāh b. Yaḥyā (known also as Ṭālib al-Ḥaqq, d. 131/748) (al-Darjīnī, 2:279ff.) is either misattributed to Abū Sufyān (Crone and Zimmerman, 312) or incorrectly dated (Van Ess, 2:224). It is reported that Abū Sufyān, like al-Rabīʿ b. Ḥabīb, went to Oman at the end of his life, though it is unknown whether he died there or in Basra. His progeny settled in Ṣuḥār, where his son Abū ‘Abdallāh Muḥammad b. Maḥbūb became a famous scholar and *qāḍī* (judge) from 249/863 until his death, in 260/873–4 (al-Salīmī, 1:152ff.).

Abū Sufyān’s most influential work was the now-lost *Kitāb Abī Sufyān* (“Book of Abū Sufyān”), which was probably commissioned by the Rustamid *imām* Aflaḥ b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (r. 208–56/823–72). Probably compiled by one of Abū Sufyān’s students, it was biographical in nature and concerned with creating a line of development from the original Khārījīs—who broke from ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib after the battle of Ṣiffīn (37/657)—to the Ibāḍiyya of Abū Sufyān’s day. Large parts of the *Kitāb Abī Sufyān* survive in the biographical works of the North African historians Abū Zakariyyāʾ (d. after 474/1081), al-Darjīnī (d. 670/1271–2), al-Shammākhī (d. 928/1522), and al-Barrādī (d. 810/1407–8). Moreover, the compiler of the *Kitāb Abī Sufyān* probably used an earlier source, also lost—an anecdotal and biographical treatment of the early Khārījīs by Abū Yazīd al-Khwārazmī (d. mid-second/eighth century) (Wilkinson, Ibādī *ḥadīth*, 251). Wilkinson has shown that the *Kitāb Abī Sufyān* was unknown in Oman before the sixth/twelfth century and then began to be incorporated only slowly into Omani Ibādī scholarship (Wilkinson, *Ibādism*, 164).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## SOURCES

Patricia Crone and Fritz Zimmerman, *The Epistle of Sālim Ibn Dhakwān*, Oxford 2000; Abū l-‘Abbās Aḥmad b. Sa‘īd al-Darjīmī, *Kūtab ṭabaqāt al-mashāyikh bi-l-maghrib*, 2 vols., Algiers and Constantine, n.d.; Sayyida Ismā‘īl Kāshif, *al-Siyar wa-l-jawābāt li-‘ulamā’ wa-a‘immat ‘Umān*, 2 vols., Muscat 1986; Jumayyil b. Khamīs al-Sa‘dī, *Qāmūs al-sharī‘a*, ed. ‘Abd al-Ḥafīz Shalabī, 19 vols., Muscat 1983; Nūr al-Dīn al-Sālimī, *Tuhfat al-‘ayān bi-sīrat ahl ‘Umān*, 2 vols. in 1, Muscat 1997; Aḥmad b. Sa‘īd al-Shammākhī, *Kūtab al-siyar*, ed. Muḥammad Ḥasan, 3 vols., Beirut 2009.

## STUDIES

van Ess, *TG*; John C. Wilkinson, *Ibāḍī ḥadīth. An essay in normalization*, *Der Islam* 62 (1985), 231–59; John C. Wilkinson, *Ibāḍism. Origins and early development in Oman*, Oxford 2010.

ADAM R. GAISER

## Malay and other languages of insular Southeast Asia

**Malay** is an Austronesian language spoken by most inhabitants **of insular Southeast Asia**. It is the national language of Indonesia, Malaysia, and Brunei and one of the national languages of Singapore. From the twentieth century on, it has been known officially and popularly as Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian language, Indonesian) and Bahasa Malaysia (Malaysian language, Malaysian). It is diglossic, with a formal and standard form of the language used in government and education and for all official matters, and various colloquial or informal varieties used in everyday life (Sneddon, Diglossia). Malay is not the first language of most of its speakers.

### 1. THE DISTRIBUTION OF MALAY

Malay has served for centuries as the lingua franca of insular Southeast Asia. Several local dialects exist across the region, and various other languages are closely related to Malay, including Minangkabau, Kerinci, Iban, and Kendayan. These languages and dialects together form the Malayic subgroup within the West Malayo-Polynesian branch of the Austronesian language family. Although there is agreement amongst historical linguists that Borneo, rather than the Malay peninsula or Sumatra, is the Malay homeland, diverse theories have been proposed on the early migrations of Malayic speakers and on the internal classification of their languages (Adelaar, Where does Malay come from?).

Malay has also spread beyond insular Southeast Asia, most notably to Thailand, Sri Lanka, South Africa, and the Netherlands. Patani Malay is spoken in the Malaysian state of Kelantan and in the four southernmost provinces of Thailand, where it is important as a language of Islamic instruction. In the history of Malay printing, the Mecca-based Patani scholar and publisher Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Zayn al-Faṭānī (d. 1908) favoured the publication of Meccan editions of works of Malay Muslim scholars from Patani, such as Dā‘ūd b. ‘Abdallāh al-Faṭānī (d. 1847) (Bradley). Sri Lankan Malay, which is spoken by descendants of immigrants from present-day Indonesia and Malaysia—mainly transported there as soldiers, exiles, convicts, and slaves by the Dutch and British colonial powers between 1650 and 1850—is a language in its own right, whose vocabulary is overwhelmingly Malay (Nordhoff, Grammar; Nordhoff, Genesis). Despite