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Transliteration

Excepting the common terms such as Islam or Muhammad (the Prophet), the transliteration of Arabic words, terms and names in this book basically follows the rules employed by the International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies. I apply this rule also to Malay-Indonesian persons, whose names are of Arabic origin, rather than using their popular Malay-Indonesian spelling. Thus I will use ‘Abd al-Ra’uf al-Sinkili’ rather than ‘Abdurreauf Singkel’ or other Malay-Indonesian variations of it. Non-Arabic Malay-Indonesian names will be retained in their original spelling.

All foreign words (or non-English words) are italicised through the text. Names of places that have been anglicised are used in their familiar form: thus I employ ‘Mecca’ instead of ‘Makkah’, or ‘Medina’ instead of ‘Madinah’.

Diacritic marks for Arabic words are used throughout the text, except for words used in their common English form, such as Islam, the Prophet Muhammad.

The plural of all Arabic and Malay-Indonesian words is formed simply by adding ‘s’ to their more familiar singular form: thus, ‘hadiths’ instead of ‘ahādīth’, or ‘ṣāriqahs’ instead of ‘ṣūrāq’ (or ‘ṣūrā’iq’ or ṣūrāqat—other Arabic plural forms).

All dates cited will include both the Muslim date or Anno Hijrah (AH), which is given first, followed by the Gregorian date or Christian/Common Era (CE) after an oblique stroke: thus 1068/1658, 1115/1693. This will allow readers unfamiliar or confused with the Hijrah calendar dates to readily know the equivalent Common Era dates. For the conversion of both dates, this book employs the table printed in J.L. Bacharach, A Middle East Studies Handbook (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1984).
Preface

For many of my friends, publication of this book is long overdue. While the Indonesian edition of the *Jaringan Ulama* (‘ulama’ networks) has been published in several editions by Mizan (Bandung) since 1994, followed by Arabic translation in 1997, the English version has been delayed for several years. Increased interest in the subject of ‘the transmission of Islamic learning’ from the Middle East to Indonesia or elsewhere in the Muslim world in the past several years has further enhanced the need for publication of this work.
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and Burhanuddin, have helped to edit and retype the manuscript. I owe them all a great debt.
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My greatest debt is of course to my family—my wife Ipah Farihah and our sons and daughter, Raushanfikr Usada Azra, Firman el- Amny Azra, M. Subhan Azra and Emily Sakina Azra who over the years have sustained my scholarly spirit with their love and understanding, especially when I have had to travel across the continents in the search for knowledge. May God bless all of them.

Azymardi Azra
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The transmission of Islamic renewal and reformism is a neglected area of Islamic studies. In contrast to the abundance of studies of the transmission of learning and ideas, for instance, from the Greeks to the Arabs and further to the Western world, there has not yet been any comprehensive study devoted to examining the transmission of religious ideas from centres of Islamic learning to other parts of the Muslim world. There are, of course, several studies on the transmission of hadiths (Prophetic tradition) from one generation of early Muslims to another by way of unbroken isnāds (chains of transmission).

The study of the transmission of Islamic renewalism and reformism, particularly on the eve of European expansion in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is important for several reasons. The Islamic socio-intellectual history of this period has been little studied; most attention has been given to Islamic political history. Given the decline of Muslim polities, this period has often been considered a dark age in Islamic history. In contrast to this widely held belief, it will be shown that the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries constituted one of the most dynamic periods in the socio-intellectual history of Islam.

The origins of Islamic dynamic impulses in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were networks of Muslim scholars (ʿulamāʾ), centred in Mecca and Medina. The central position of these two Holy Cities in Islam, especially in conjunction with the annual hajj pilgrimage, attracted a large number of scholars and students who produced a unique scholarly discourse there. These scholarly networks consisted of a significant number of leading ʿulamāʾ who came from different parts of the Muslim world; they thus brought together various traditions of Islamic learning to Mecca and Medina. There were conscious, if not concerted, efforts among these scholars to reform and revitalise the prevailing teachings of Islam; their central theme was the intellectual and socio-moral reconstruction of
Muslim societies. Because of the extensive connections of the networks, the spirit of reform and renewal soon found its expression in many parts of the Muslim world.

The transmission of Islamic renewalism and reformism in the scholarly networks involved very complex processes. There were highly intricate crisscrossings of scholars within the networks, by way of both their studies of Islamic sciences, particularly hadith, and their adherence to Islamic mystical brotherhood (tariqahs). An examination of this crisscrossing of the networks, and of works produced by scholars in the networks, throws much light on how Islamic renewalism and reformism were transmitted from centres of the networks to many parts of the Muslim world.

Understanding the processes of transmission becomes more important in connection with the course of Islam in the Malay-Indonesian world. As it is situated on the periphery of the Muslim world, there is a tendency among scholars to exclude the Malay-Indonesian world from any discussion of Islam. It is assumed that the region has no single stable core of Islamic tradition. Islam in the archipelago has long been regarded as not ‘real Islam’. It is considered distinct from Islam in the centres in the Middle East. We will not, of course, ignore local influences on Islam in the archipelago, but one should not assume that Malay-Indonesian Islamic tradition has little to do with Islam in the Middle East.

Similarly, it is incorrect to assume that the links between Malay-Indonesian Islam and Middle Eastern Islam have more political overtones than religious. The links, at least from the seventeenth century onwards, though marked by intense political relations between several Malay-Muslim kingdoms and the Ottoman Empire, were mostly religious in their nature. If these religious relationships later stimulated some kind of political ‘consciousness’ especially vis-à-vis European imperialism, it was simply a logical consequence of the impact of the rising ‘Islamic identity’ that resulted from such links.

Links between Muslims in the Malay-Indonesian world and the Middle East have existed since the earliest times of Islam in the archipelago, around the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Muslim merchants from Arabia, Persia and the Indian subcontinent frequented the harbour cities of the archipelago, where they engaged not only in trade but also in the transmission of Islam to the native population. Later penetration of Islam in the archipelago, however, was carried out less by Muslim traders than by wandering sufis and scholars who came in increasingly large numbers to the area from the thirteenth century onwards.

The prosperity of Malay-Indonesian Muslim states provided an opportunity for a certain segment of Malay-Indonesian Muslims to travel to the centres of Islamic learning in the Middle East. The Ottoman efforts to improve the security along hajj routes also encouraged Malay-Indonesian Muslims to make their pilgrimages to Mecca. As economic, diplomatic and religio-social relations between Malay-Indonesian and Middle Eastern
states developed in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it is probable that Malay-Indonesian pilgrims and students were able to pursue Islamic learning in a variety of places along the trade and hajj routes. This led to the rise of a non-Arab community in the Haramayn (Mecca and Medina), which was called ‘asḥāb al-Jāwīyīn’ (fellow Malay-Indonesians) by Meccans and Medinese. The term ‘Jāwīl’ (or Jāwah), though derived from the name Java, came to signify anyone from the Malay-Indonesian world.

The Jāwīl students in the Haramayn represented major lines of intellectual tradition among Malay-Indonesian Muslims. Examination of their history and the textual materials they produced and taught from will help to illuminate not only the nature of religious and intellectual relationships between Malay-Indonesian and Middle Eastern Muslims but also the contemporary development of Islam in the archipelago. Their lives and experience presented a vivid picture of the various networks that existed among them and Middle Eastern ‘ulamā’.

These scholarly networks involved a number of prominent Middle Eastern ‘ulamā’ teaching in Mecca and Medina. They constituted a cosmopolitan scholarly community linked together in a relatively solid fashion by way of their studies, particularly of ḥadīth, and their involvement in the šīfī ʿarqāh. Contacts and interactions between these scholars and students from distant places of the Muslim world resulted in further expansion of the international networks of the ‘ulamā’. There were several Malay-Indonesian students involved in such networks in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Having studied in the Haramayn with its leading scholars, most of them returned to the archipelago, and thus became essential transmitters of the Islamic tradition in the centres of Islamic learning in the Middle East to the Malay-Indonesian world.

The most salient feature of the intellectual tendencies that emerged from the scholarly networks was the harmony between shariʿah (Islamic legal doctrine) and taṣawwuf (Islamic mysticism). This has been called by many modern scholars ‘neo-Sufism’. Even though the reconciliation between shariʿah and taṣawwuf had been emphasised earlier by such scholars as al-Qushayrī and al-Ghazālī, it apparently gained its strongest momentum through these scholarly networks. Scholars in the networks were actively taught, and ardently believed that only by way of total commitment to the shariʿah could the extravagant features of earlier Sufism be controlled. The renewed commitment to shariʿah and taṣawwuf, in turn, led to a socio-moral reconstruction of Muslim societies.

Although all scholars in the networks shared a commitment to Islamic renewal and reform, there was no uniformity among them as to their method of achieving this aim. Most of them chose a peaceful and evolutionary approach, but some of them, prominent among these Ibn ʿAbd al-Wahhāb in Arabia, and ʿUthmān Ibn Fūṭi in West Africa, preferred a more radical and far-reaching reform, which in turn was adopted by some of the scholars in the archipelago.
Despite their differences, the networks of scholars in the Haramayn provided a basis for the renewalist drive within Muslim communities in the archipelago in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The exchange of ideas and the maintenance of lines of intellectual discourse during the period are crucial to the history of Islamic religious thought and to understanding the influence foreign Muslim ideas exerted on the outlook and daily lives of many Malay-Indonesians. The ferment of ideas arising from these intense relations and contacts through scholarly networks had a revitalising effect on the communal and personal lives of most Malay-Indonesian Muslims.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

As far as I am aware, no comprehensive work, historical or otherwise, has been done of networks of Middle Eastern and Malay-Indonesian ‘ulamā’.

Little attempt has been made to provide a critical analysis of the origins of Islamic reformism in the Malay-Indonesian world before the nineteenth and twentieth centuries through networks of the ‘ulamā’; and of how Islamic teachings were transmitted and how the transmission affected the course of Islam in the archipelago.

The works of Voll have discussed the existence of the international networks of the ‘ulamā’ centred in Mecca and Medina and their connections in other parts of the Muslim world. He deals mostly with the emergence of such networks among Middle Eastern and South Asian ‘ulamā’, and simply mentions in passing the involvement of such Malay-Indonesian ‘ulamā’ as ʿAbd al-Raʿuf al-Sinkilli and Muhammad Yusuf al-Maqassāri in the international scholarly networks in the seventeenth century.

Johns, on the other hand, in several studies discusses at length these relationships, particularly between al-Sinkilli and Ibrāhīm al-Kurānī. However, he has made no attempt to examine further networks of al-Sinkilli with other leading Haramayn scholars. The lack of studies dealing with networks of other Malay-Indonesian scholars is even more striking. Studies dealing with leading Malay-Indonesian ‘ulamā’ other than al-Sinkilli in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries fail to trace their linkages with Middle Eastern scholars in the period.

Furthermore, where the scholarly networks are actually mentioned, discussion centres on the ‘organisational’ aspect of the networks, namely, the nature of the relationships that existed between scholars in centres of Islamic learning in the Middle East and those coming from other parts of the Muslim world. No study has yet been done to examine the ‘intellectual content’ of the networks. This examination is crucial to determining the kinds of ideas and teachings transmitted through such scholarly networks.

This book will seek to answer the following questions: (i) How did the networks of Middle Eastern and Malay-Indonesian ‘ulamā’ come into being? What were the nature and characteristics of the networks? What were the teachings or intellectual tendencies developed in the networks?
(ii) What was the role of Malay-Indonesian ‘ulama’ in the transmission of the intellectual contents of the networks to the archipelago? What were the modes of transmission? (iii) What was the larger impact of the networks on the course of Islam in the Malay-Indonesian world?

In sum, this study attempts to elucidate a number of important subjects. It is the first comprehensive study of the global scholarly networks, with particular reference to Malay-Indonesian ‘ulama’ and their intellectual tendencies in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; the first treatment of the role of such networks in the transmission of Islamic renewal and reform to the archipelago; and a pioneering study of the origins of early Islamic renewal and reform in the Malay-Indonesian world.

SCOPE OF DISCUSSION

To present an accurate and comprehensive account of the scholarly networks and their role in the transmission of Islamic renewal and reform to the archipelago, this study is divided into seven chapters which, in turn, consist of several sections. Within each chapter, several topics will be explored and a conclusion drawn at the close of each section.

Chapter 1 examines the rise of the international scholarly networks in the Haramayn. The discussion centres first on how the political and economic situation affected pilgrimage and the world of learning in Mecca and Medina. Then follows an examination of a number of ‘ulama’ who constituted the core of scholarly networks in the seventeenth century; particular attention is given to the nature of their relationships in the networks.

Chapter 2 deals with a discussion of ‘neo-Sufism’ and of how its characteristics represented the intellectual contents and tendencies of the networks in the seventeenth century.

Chapters 3 to 5 are devoted to examining the careers and teachings of the leading precursors of Malay-Indonesian ‘ulama’ in seventeenth century scholarly networks, namely al-Raniri, al-Sinkilli and al-Maqassari. Special attention is given to their connections with leading scholars in the networks in the Middle East, and to how teachings spread in the archipelago related to Islamic renewalism and reformism in the centres.

Chapter 6 constitutes a final discussion of a number of Malay-Indonesian ‘ulama’ who were involved in the scholarly networks in the eighteenth century. The chapter begins with a discussion of the origins and date of Islamic renewalism in the archipelago. Discussion is then focused on the biographies of Malay-Indonesian ‘ulama’ and some of their teachers in the Haramayn and Cairo. The chapter continues with a discussion of their teachings and of how they translated Islamic reformism in the Malay-Indonesian world.

Finally, in chapter 7, we look forward to the nineteenth century and the networks in the face of the European challenge.
NOTES ON SOURCES

This study is the first to use Arabic sources extensively in any discussion relating to the history of Islam in the Malay-Indonesian world. The Arabic biographical dictionaries of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, most of which have by now been printed, are goldmines of information on teachers of the Malay-Indonesian students involved in the networks, and on scholarly discourse in the Middle East, particularly in the Haramayn and Cairo.

It is striking that most of these biographical dictionaries have not been utilised earlier for examining, for instance, the world of learning in the Haramayn. It is not surprising therefore that, unlike other centres of Islamic learning in the Middle East such as Baghdad, Cairo or even Nishapur, which have been studied a great deal, those of the Haramayn have only received scanty treatment. These biographical dictionaries have proven essential to an accurate account of the institutions of Islamic learning, such as the Holy Mosques, madrasahs and ribâts in the Haramayn.

Malay-Indonesian texts, either written by ‘ulama’ discussed in this study or by modern scholars, in many cases do provide the names of the teachers of Malay-Indonesian students in the Haramayn. Contemporaneous Arabic biographical dictionaries are used to trace not only the scholarly careers of these teachers but more importantly their connections with one another. By using these Arabic biographical dictionaries we are now on firm ground in speaking about the existence of the scholarly networks between Malay-Indonesian and Middle Eastern ‘ulamā’.

Furthermore, these biographical dictionaries in some instances show evidence of intense contacts between Malay-Indonesian students and their Middle Eastern teachers. The Fawa’id al-Irtihāl of al-Hamawi, for instance, provides vivid accounts of intellectual and religious confusion among Malay-Indonesian Muslims because of their misunderstanding of Islamic mysticism and of the reactions of such outstanding scholars as al-Kūrānī to this. Al-Muhībbi’s Khulāṣat al-Athar and al-Murādī’s Sīl al-Durar inform us of several leading Haramayn scholars who wrote special works to fulfil the requests of their Malay-Indonesian students.

Beginning in the eighteenth century, scholarly accounts of Malay-Indonesian scholars began to make their appearance in Arabic biographical dictionaries. The first, who was given a respected place in this genre of Arabic literature, is ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbānī, discussed in chapter 6. His Yemeni student, Wajīh al-Dīn al-Ahdal, includes the biography of al-Palimbānī in his al-Nafs al-Yamanī wa al-Rūḥ al-Rayḥānī. Later, al-Palimbānī’s biography is reproduced by al-Bayṯār in his Ḥīyat al-Bashar fī Tārīkh al-Qarn al-Thāliḥīth ‘Ashar.

Arabic biographical dictionaries are thus an indispensable source for the study of Malay-Indonesian ‘ulamā’ who studied or established their careers in the Haramayn. A cursory observation of Arabic biographical dictionaries
in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries gives even more striking evidence of the involvement of Malay-Indonesian scholars in the scholarly networks of this period. A substantial number of Malay-Indonesian ʿulamāʾ also make their appearance.
Networks of the ‘Ulamā’ in the Seventeenth Century Ḥaramayn

Mecca and Medina (the Haramayn, the two Harams, forbidden sanctuaries) occupy a special position in Islam and the life of Muslims. The twin Harams are the places where Islam was revealed to the Prophet Muhammad and initially developed. Mecca is the qiblah towards which the believers turn their faces in their ṣalāhs (prayers) and the holy city where they make the ḥajj pilgrimage. With all their religious importance, it is not surprising that some special qualities and merits (fadā’il) have been attributed to both Mecca and Medina.

The combination between the fadā’il of Mecca and Medina, and the injunction of the Qur’an and the hadith to the Muslims to search for knowledge (ṣalah al-’ilm), undoubtedly raised the value of the knowledge acquired in the two cities in the eyes of many believers. As a consequence, the scholars who taught and studied in the Haramayn enjoyed a more esteemed position in Muslim societies, particularly those of the Malay-Indonesian world, than their counterparts who underwent a similar experience in the other centres of Islamic learning.

Furthermore, with the coming and going of countless pilgrims every year, Mecca and Medina became the largest gathering point of Muslims from all over the globe, the intellectual hub of the Muslim world, where ‘ulamā’, šāfs, rulers, philosophers, poets and historians met and exchanged information. This is why scholars and students who taught and studied in Mecca and Medina were generally more cosmopolitan in their religious outlook than their counterparts in other Muslim cities. Such an experience for the seeker of ‘ilm (knowledge) in the Haramayn not only emphasised universal traits common to all Muslims but moulded them into a formulation for their self-definition vis-à-vis both the larger scholarly community of the Muslim world and their much smaller ones.

The emergence of networks of the ‘ulamā’, which included a substantial number of non-Middle Eastern scholars in Mecca and Medina, was not
independent of other developments in the Haramayn and the Muslim societies as a whole. Their rise can be attributed to several important factors which were not only religious but also economic, social and political, working at the regional level in a given Muslim society and at the level of the larger Muslim world.

For instance, contacts and relations between Malay-Indonesian Muslims and the Middle East began to gain momentum with the flowering of Muslim kingdoms in the archipelago in the late sixteenth century. The intensification of their participation in the trade of the Indian Ocean brought them into closer contact not only with Muslim traders but also with political authorities in the Middle East. The increasing presence of Europeans, particularly the Portuguese, was also an important factor that pushed their relations much further into the politico-diplomatic realm. The intensification of these relations contributed significantly to the growth of the Malay-Indonesian pilgrimage to the Haramayn, which in turn spurred the pilgrims' involvement in the scholarly networks.

The growth of the international networks of the 'ulamā́ in the Haramayn, particularly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, should therefore be viewed not only from a wider perspective but through the longer span of historical discourse between Muslim societies of both the Middle East and the Indian Ocean region.

SCHOLARLY DISCOURSES IN THE HARAMAYN: EARLY NETWORKS OF THE 'ULAMĀ́

The tradition of learning among the 'ulamā́ throughout Islamic history has been closely associated with religious and educational institutions such as mosques, madrasahs, ribāṭs, and even the houses of the teachers. This is particularly evident in the Haramayn, where the tradition of learning created a vast network of scholars, transcending geographical boundaries as well as differences in religious outlook. In this chapter we discuss how networks of the 'ulamā́ developed surrounding these institutions, and how leading scholars in the Haramayn, through their traditions of learning, created links that connected them with each other as well as with earlier and later scholars.

There is no doubt that the two great mosques in Mecca and Medina were the most important loci of scholars involved in the networks from the last decades of the fifteenth century onwards. Despite the fact that the number of madrasahs and ribāṭs continually increased after the first and second madrasahs in Mecca were built in 571/1175 and 579/1183 respectively, the Haram Mosques continued to be the most important centres for the process of learning. The madrasahs and ribāṭs by no means replaced the two great mosques so far as the process of learning was concerned. However, they became vital complements to the scholarly world in the Holy Land.

Before we go any further, it seems important to note that the madrasahs
were organised in a more formal way. They had their officially appointed heads of madrasahs, teachers, qādis (judges) and other functionaries. Furthermore, they each had their own curriculum, and even a certain quota of students, as well as an exact allocation of the time of study according to their madhhab. This is particularly true in the case of madrasahs, which consisted of four divisions of Sunni legal madhhab. The Madrasah al-Ghiyāthiyyah, for instance, had a quota of 20 students for each madhhab. The Shafi’i and Hanafi students had their classes in the morning, while the Maliki and Hanbali students had theirs in the afternoon.1 Similar arrangements applied at the Sulaymāniyyah madrasahs.2 It is also clear from our sources that these madrasahs were mainly devoted to teaching basic and intermediate levels of various Islamic disciplines. With all their formality, the madrasahs had few opportunities to bring their students to higher levels of Islamic learning.

However, such a disadvantage, which resulted from the nature of the Haramayn madrasahs, was soon filled by the halqahs, and more importantly by the two great mosques. Those who aspired to seek advanced learning, as a rule, joined the halqahs in the Harām Mosques, or the ribāts, and in many cases they also studied privately in teachers’ houses. As can be expected, there was little formality in such halqahs. Personal relationships were formed and became the ties that connected them to each other. Teachers were well acquainted personally with each of their students; they thus recognised the special needs and talents of each student, and they attempted to meet these special needs. The significance of this should not be underestimated; it is through these processes that the teachers issued ijazah (authority) to their students or appointed them the khalīfah (successor or deputy) of their tariqahs.

Al-Fāṣi relates many examples of teachers in the Harām Mosque in Mecca who were authorised to teach privately not only advanced students but also rulers and traders intending to pursue special Islamic disciplines. Among them was ‘Ali b. Ahmad al-Fuwwiyyī (d. 781/1389), who was authorised to teach a ruler of Shirāz, Shāh Shuja’ b. Muhammad al-Yazdī, about the hadith of the Prophet. So satisfied was he with the way al-Fuwwiyyī taught him that the ruler granted 200 mithqāl of gold, a portion of which was spent on building a ribāt.3 Similarly, when Bashir al-Jumdar al-Nāṣirī, a Mamlūk ruler in Egypt, wished to study various Islamic disciplines in Mecca, several qādis were assigned to teach him. The most important among them was Qādī al-Qudāḥ Muhammad Jamāl al-Dīn Zahirāh (d. 817/1414).4 Another scholar, Muḥammad Dīyā’ al-Dīn al-Hindi (d. 780/1378), and his son, Muhammad b. Dīyā’ al-Dīn al-Ṣāghānī (d. 825/1422), were also appointed to teach Hanbali fiqh to several members of the Egyptian Mamlūk ruling dynasty.5

Furthermore, scholars who taught in the Harām Mosques were often asked to answer questions coming from many parts of the Muslim world.
As a rule, they held special majlīs (sessions), discussing these matters. In many instances they issued written fatwās, but it was also not unusual for them to write special books, which attempted to answer the questions in detail. Al-Fāsī again relates the story of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Zahirah, one of his teachers, who received hundreds of questions from various parts of the Middle East. Such an important role played by the scholars in the Harām-Mosques vis-à-vis many believers becomes a distinctive feature in the later periods, when the scholarly networks increasingly gained momentum. As we shall see, several leading scholars in seventeenth century Haramayn wrote about, and discussed, certain religious issues that arose among Indian and Malay-Indonesian Muslims. For example, at the end of the seventeenth century the Chief Qādī of Mecca issued a fatwā on the deposition of Sulṭānah Kamālāt Shāh (of the Acehnese Sultanate) stating that, in his opinion, an Islamic kingdom could not be ruled by a woman.

One essential question to ask is how scholars who came from many different places in the Muslim world were able to get teaching positions in the Haramayn madrasahs and at the Harām Mosque of Mecca and the Prophet Mosque in Medina. In order to be allowed to teach, a teacher, either in the madrasah or at the Holy Mosques, was required to have ījāzah (authority), which established the academic credentials of the holder. The most important credential was the iṣnād, namely, the chain of authority that indicated the unbroken teacher-student link in the transmission of certain books or teachings. The ījāzah was issued by a recognised teacher to his students, generally after they studied with him. However, there were a few cases, as we see later, showing that the ījāzah might also be issued through relatively short meetings and even through correspondence with teachers.

The appointment of scholars to teaching positions at the Holy Mosques in Mecca and Medina was decided by a religious bureaucracy, which was responsible not only for administration of the Holy Mosques but also for religious life in the Haramayn as a whole. The highest official in the bureaucracy was the Qādī (judge), often called Qādī al-Qudāh (Chief Qādī), who was in charge of religious laws and of leadership of the four qādis—each of them representing a Sunnī legal school. It appears that prior to the Ottoman period, the Qādī al-Qudāh also held the office of Muftī. Next came the Shaykh al-Ḥaramayn, the two directors of the Harām Mosque in Mecca and Medina. In each city there was a Shaykh al-ʿUlamāʾ (chief of scholars), who oversaw all scholars.

We have no information as to when such a religious bureaucracy was instituted, but it is clear that it was already well established from at least the fifteenth century onwards. When the Ottomans rose to power in the Hijāz that structure was largely maintained. Although the holders of most of the posts needed to be confirmed by the Ottoman authorities, the Haramayn scholars were relatively free to choose those who would fill these positions. There was a tendency, however, for those positions to be dominated by scholars belonging to certain families.
This is demonstrated in the careers of many ‘ulamā’ in the Haramayn. For instance, Jamāl al-Dīn al-Zahirah, the Qāḍī of Qudāh, mentioned above, was succeeded to the position by his son Ahmad b. Muhammad al-Zahirah in the early fifteenth century. Similarly, the historian al-Fāsi—whose father, Ahmad (d. 819/1416), happened to be related by marriage to the Chief Qāḍī of Mecca, Muḥammad b. Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Nuwayrī—was appointed the Mālikī Qāḍī of Mecca in 807/1405 with a letter of investiture from al-Malik al-Nāṣir Faraj b. Barqūq, a Mamlūk ruler in Cairo. An important scholar in the networks, Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Rastūl al-Barzanjī, who migrated to the Haramayn in the second half of the seventeenth century, led scholars of the Barzanjī family to prominence in Mecca; three members of this family dominated the office of the Shāfi‘ī Muftī after 1269/1852. ‘Abd al-Hafīẓ al-‘Ajamī (or Ujaymi) became a mufti of Mecca after Hasan b. ‘Ali al-‘Ajamī, a prominent scholar in the networks, established the fame of the ‘Ajamī family towards the end of the seventeenth century.

It was the Shaykh al-‘Ulamā’, the Qāḍī al-Qudāh, Shaykh al-Ḥaramayn and four qādis of the four madhhabs who collectively made decisions on the appointment of scholars to teaching positions in the Ḥarām Mosques. Once or twice a year they sat together to examine candidates for future teachers. The candidates, as a rule, were longtime students of the mosques and were well acquainted with senior teachers. The examiners, in addition to checking the ijāzah of the candidates, posed a number of questions concerning various branches of Islamic discipline. If the candidates were able to answer all questions satisfactorily, they were issued ijāzah, or permission to teach in the Holy Mosques. The names of these new teachers were made public, and students were able to begin their studies with them.

Our sources make no mention of the number of teachers in the Ḥarām Mosques in the period under discussion. An Ottoman report for the year 1303/1884-5, however, mentioned that there were 270 teachers in that year. Snouck Hurgronje considers this number unreliable, ‘for many of those men are named professors because the Governor [Ottoman] wished to favor them with a salary from a fund destined for the advancement of science’. Thus, Snouck believes that the total number of actual teachers was only between 50 and 60. There is no way we can substantiate this number. However, I would suggest that the average number of teachers at any given time during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was between 100 and 200. If this number is added to teachers who taught only in the madrasahs and visiting teachers, then the total number of teachers in the Haramayn was clearly quite large.

PERSONAGE AND LINKAGES IN THE NETWORKS

There is little doubt that some of the scholars mentioned above, in one way or another, had connections with each other. What is important is that
several leading scholars of that period had links to the core of scholarly networks in the seventeenth century. We have noted that al-Fāṣi, for instance, was a student and good friend of Ibn Hājr al-‘Aṣqalānī and Shihāb al-Dīn al-Ramli, two great muḥaddiths who lived in Egypt. Similarly, al-Nahrawānī, a leading scholar in the sixteenth century Haramayn, had extensive connections not only with earlier scholars, such as Ibn Hājr al-‘Aṣqalānī, but also with those of the seventeenth century, such as Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī. Almost all scholars who constitute the core of seventeenth century networks of the ‘ulamā’ could trace their hadith isnād and tariqah silsilah to these scholars. The nature of their connections will become clearer as we proceed with this discussion.

The scholarly networks in the seventeenth century had cosmopolitan origins. There were at least two non-Ḥijāzī scholars who appear to have contributed largely to the growth of the networks in this century: the first was Indian by birth and Persian (Isfahān) by origin, Sayyid Ṣibghat Allāh b. Rūḥ Allāh Jamāl al-Barwājī (some spell it al-Barūjī or the modern Barauch in Gujarāt), and the second was an Egyptian named Ṭāhā b. ‘Ali b. ‘Abd al-Ṣuddūs al-Shinnāwī al-Miṣrī al-Madānī. Their relationship represents a good example of how scholarly interactions resulted both in exchanges of knowledge and in the transmission of the ‘little’ traditions of Islam from India and Egypt to the Haramayn (see Chart 1).

Sayyid Ṣibghat Allāh (d. in Medina 1015/1606) was undoubtedly a typical wandering scholar who ended up being a ‘grand immigrant’ in the Haramayn. Hailing from a Persian immigrant family in India, one of his famous Indian teachers was Wajīh al-Dīn al-Gujarātī (d. 997/1589), a leading Shāṭṭārīyyah master, who lived in Ahmadābād. For several years Ṣibghat Allāh, under the patronage of the local ruler, taught the Shāṭṭārīyyah doctrines in the town of his birth. In 999/1591 he travelled to Mecca in order to make the Ḥajj pilgrimage. After returning to India, he travelled to various places before staying in Ahmadnagar for one year. Later he moved to Bijapur, a strong şāfī centre in India, where he won the favour of Sulṭān Ibrāhīm ‘Adil Shah, who then made a special arrangement for him to travel back to the Haramayn in the royal ship during the Ḥajj season of 1005/1596.18

After performing the pilgrimage Ṣibghat Allāh decided to settle in Medina, where he built a house and a ṭabrī from the waqf and gifts he received from the Sulṭāns of Ahmadnagar, Bijapur, and Ottoman officials in Medina. Ṣibghat Allāh was generally known as a leading Shāṭṭārīyyah Shaykh; he was regarded as being responsible for introducing the Jawāhir-i Khamsah of the famous Shāṭṭārīyyah shaykh, Muhammad Ghauth al-Hindi (d. 970/1563), and other Shāṭṭārīyyah treatises to Haramayn scholars. However, he also initiated disciples into the Chishtiyyah, Suhrawardīyyah, Madārīyyah, Khalwāṭīyyah, Hama-dānīyyah, Naqshbandīyyah and Firdausīyyah orders. This is not surprising, as his teacher, Wajīh al-Dīn, had also been initiated into all
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Chart 1  The core of the seventeenth century networks

- Suhbat Allah d. 1015/1606
- Ahmad al-Shindawi d. 1028/1619
- Ahmad al-Qutabi d. 1071/1661
- 'Abd al-Qadir al-Tahari d. 1033/1624
- Ali al-Din al-Bibili d. 1077/1666
- Taki Ibn Ya'qub d. 1086/1676
- 'Ali Jamali al-Makki d. 1071/1661
- Ismail al-Maghrabi d. 1089/1679
- Zayn al-Tahari d. 1078/1667
- Hasan al-'Ajamili d. 1113/1701
- Abu 'Ali al-Razi al-Barzangi d. 1100/1692
- Ahmad al-Nahhili d. 1130/1718
- 'Abd Allah al-Basri d. 1134/1722
- Muhammad al-Maqashiri d. 1111/1699
- AbuTahir al-Kurani d. 1145/1732

Teacher-student
acquaintances
eight orders. In Medina, Şibghat Allâh was active in teaching at the Nabawi Mosque; he also wrote several works on Sufism, theology, and a commentary on the Bayâdî Qur’ânic exegesis.


Two prominent scholars responsible for the spread of Şibghat Allâh’s teachings in the Haramayn were Ahmed al-Shinnawi and Ahmed al-Qushâshi. Born in 975/1567 to a noted scholarly family in Egypt, Ahmed b. ‘Ali b. ‘Abd al-Qâdîs Abî al-Mawâhib al-Shinnawi acquired his early education in his own land. His grandfather, Muḥammad al-Shinnawi, a prominent sâfi shaykh, was a master of the famous Egyptian sâfi ‘Abd al-Wâhid al-Sha’râni. The latter, in turn, initiated Ahmed al-Shinnawi’s father, ‘Ali al-Shinnawi, into the Ahmadiyya tariqa. Even though Ahmed al-Shinnawi was from an early age exposed extensively to Sufism, he had an interest in studying ḥadîth. Among his teachers in ḥadîth were two leading Egyptian muhaddiths: the Shâfi’i mufît, Shams al-Dîn al-Ramlî (d. 1004/1596), and Muhammed b. Abî al-Ḥasan al-Bakrî, who was also known as a sâfi. Ahmed al-Shinnawi travelled to the Haramayn and took up residence in Medina, where he died in 1028/1619.

There can be no doubt that Ahmed al-Shinnawi attained fame in the City of the Prophet. He established a friendship and studied with Şibghat Allâh, who initiated him into the Shaṭṭâriyyah order. His erudition in the Shaṭṭâriyyah and other orders earned him the title of the al-Bâhir al-Tariqa (‘the dazzling light of the sîfs order’). With his expertise in ḥadîth and Sufism, he attracted numerous students to his ḥalqahs. Among his leading students were Sayyid Sâlim b. Ahmed Shaykhâni, Ahmed al-Qushâshi and Sayyid al-Jâlî Muhammad al-Ḫurâbî.

Ahmed al-Shinnawi’s scholarly connections through ḥadîth studies and tariqa were extensive. For instance, he had isnâds with earlier scholars and sîfs such as Muḥammad Zâhirâb al-Makî, Qâb al-Dîn al-Nârâwâlî, Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqâlânî, al-Suyûtî and Ibn al-‘Arâbî. He wrote several works dealing with theology and Sufism; al-Baghâdî and Brockelmann respectively list 16 and five of them. One of his works,
THE ORIGINS OF ISLAMIC REFORMISM IN SOUTHEAST ASIA


THE EXPANSION OF NETWORKS

How the scholarly networks in the Haramayn developed further can be seen in the experience of Ahmad al-Qushâshî. His career demonstrates how the web of scholars was becoming wider and more pregnant with intellectual exchange. Undoubtedly he was the most influential among the disciples of Sîbghat Allâh and Ahmad al-Shinnâwî. In the colophon of one of al-Qushâshî’s works, al-Simt al-Majîd,31 we are told about the career of this great scholar. The most complete biography of al-Qushâshî, however, is provided by Mustâfâ b. Fâth, Allâh al-Ḥamâwî al-Makki (d. 1124/1712), a leading mubahâdîn and historian in Mecca. Al-Ḥamâwî himself was a student of Ibrâhîm al-Kûrânî, the most prominent and influential disciple of al-Qushâshî.32 In his yet unpublished three-volume biographical dictionary entitled Fawâ’id al-İrîjâl wa Nata’îj al-Safar fi Akhbâr Ahl al-Qarn al-Ḥâdî ‘Ashar,33 al-Ḥamâwî devotes a long account (no fewer than 13 folios—26 pages) to the biography of al-Qushâshî, which is based mostly on the recollection of al-Kûrânî.34 Al-Kûrânî himself includes biographical notes of his great shaykh towards the end of his al-Umam li ‘Îqā‘ al-Ḥimam.35 Al-Ḥamâwî’s accounts were later condensed by al-Muḥâbbî in his Khulâsat al-Āthar fi ‘A‘yân al-Qarn al-Ḥâdî ‘Ashar.36

Ṣâfî al-Dîn Ahmad b. Muḥammad Yûnus al-Qushâshî al-Dâjûnî al-Madâni was born in Medina in 991/1538 of a Palestinian family, whose genealogy traced his ancestors back to Tamîm al-Dârî, a prominent Medinese companion of the Prophet. His grandfather, Yûnus al-Qushâshî, a ṣâfî, decided to take his family back to Medina from Dîjâna, a village near Jerusalem. In the City of the Prophet, Shaykh Yûnus, who had also been known as ‘Abd al-Nabî, earned his living by selling ḍâsh, second-hand goods, from which Ahmad got his first ḍâqî (surname or nickname). Our sources suggest that he took this lowly position in order to retain his anonymity as a great ṣâfî.37

Ahmad al-Qushâshî acquired his rudimentary religious knowledge according to the Mâlikî school of law from his father and Muḥammad b. ‘Îsâ al-Tîmilîmî, a renowned ʿâlim in Medina. In 1011/1602 his father took him on a trip to Yemen, where he studied with most of the ʿulamâ‘ with whom his father had studied, such as al-Amîn b. Ṣîdîqî al-Mawâhî, Sayyid Muḥammad Gharb, Ṭâhâ al-Ṣâḥîh al-Zâila‘î, Sayyid ‘Alî al-Qâbî and ‘Alî b. Muṭâyîr. They stayed in Yemen for some years before returning to Mecca, where he made the acquaintance of many of its leading scholars, such as Sayyid Abî al-Ghayth Shâjr and Sultân al-Majzûb. Although he spent the rest of his life in Medina, al-Qushâshî often visited Mecca, particularly during the pilgrimage seasons.38 It was in Medina that
Ahmad al-Qushâshî established his scholarly career. As al-Ḥamawi tells us, he associated himself with the city’s leading ‘ulamâ’, exchanging knowledge and information. Among them were Ahmad b. al- Faḍîl b. ‘Abd al-Nâﬁ’î, Wali ‘Umar b. al-Qârî Badr al-Dîn al-‘Adîlî, Shiḥâb al-Dîn al-Malkâ’î, Sayyid As‘âd al-Balkhî and, of particular importance, Ahmad al-Shînhâwî. Al-Shînhâwî not only taught him hadîth, fiqh, kalâm and other sciences related to Islamic law and theology, but also initiated him into and appointed him his khâlîfah of the Shaṭṭârîyyah tarîqah. The relationship between these two scholars went beyond the scholarly realm: al-Qushâshî married al-Shînhâwî’s daughter.

Despite their very close relationship, al-Qushâshî differed from al-Shînhâwî in that he maintained his adherence to the Mâlikî school of law; only after al-Shînhâwî’s death did he adopt the Shâﬁ’î madhhab, the legal school his father-in-law adhered to. In long accounts of al-Qushâshî’s change of madhhab, al-Ḥamawi reports that al-Qushâshî adopted the Shâﬁ’î madhhab after he got guidance from the Prophet Muhammad himself through his reading of the whole Qur’ân in one single night. Al-Qushâshî also gives several other valid reasons to change one’s madhhab,39 as we see later. It is evident that Ahmad al-Qushâshî was a scholar of extraordinary erudition and humility. This is confirmed, for instance, by Ayyûb al-Dimashqî al-Khalwâtî (994-1071/1586-1661), a great sîfî (who was, it is worth mentioning, a teacher of al-Maqassârî). Ayyûb al-Dimashqî points out that he had never met a scholar as learned as al-Qushâshî.40

Al-Qushâshî was also a prolific author. The number of his works is listed as 16 by al-Baghdâdî,41 as 19 by Brockelmann42 and more than 50 by other sources.43 These works deal with tâsawwäf, hadîth, fiqh, usûl fiqh, and tafsîr. Only al-Simât al-Majîd has been published thus far.

Although al-Qushâshî is generally known as a shaykh of the Shaṭṭârîyyah tarîqah, he was actually affiliated with almost a dozen other sîfî orders. It must be admitted, however, that he was particularly instrumental in the transmission of the Shaṭṭârîyyah tarîqah, through his students, to many different parts of the Muslim world. According to al-Ḥamawi, his principal disciples were no fewer than 100; they came from many regions (aqṭâr) of the world,44 and they constituted crucial links among scholars in the networks.45 The best known among his disciples were Ibrâhîm al-Kûrânî (1023-1101/1614-1690); ‘Abd Allâh b. Shaykh al-‘Aydarûs (1027-1073/1618-1662), a teacher of Bâ Shaybân, who was a teacher of al-Râ‘îrî;46 Hasan b. ‘Ali al-‘Ajamî (1049-1113/1639-1701);47 Sayyid al-‘Allâmâh al-Wâlî Barâkât al-Tûnisî; Sayyid ‘Abd al-Khâliq al-Hindî al-Lâhûrî (d.1059/1649);48 Sayyid ‘Abd al-Rahmân [al-Mahjûb] al-Maghribî al-Idrîsî (1023-1085/1614-1674);49 Isâ b. Muḥammad al-Maghribî al-Jâ‘fârî al-Makkî (1020-1080/1611-1669);50 Mînânî b. ‘Awd Bâ Mazrûţ; Sayyid ‘Abd Allâh Bâ Fâqîh, Sayyid ‘Ali al-Shaybânî al-Zabîdî (d. 1072/1662) and a number of other leading Yemeni scholars, especially...

Our scholarly networks gained strong impetus when Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, the most celebrated student of Ahmad al-Qushāshī, established his career in Medina after travelling in quest of Islamic sciences in various places in the Middle East. The fact that Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī occupied a position of extraordinary importance in the further development of the scholarly networks is shown by the large number of his students and his vast connections, but more importantly by his numerous works. He was the common starting point for the lines of linkage of many scholars in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Being a scholar of intellectual distinction, al-Kūrānī made a substantial contribution to the further growth of the intellectual currents developed by al-Shinnāwī and al-Qushāshī.

By all accounts, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī was a great scholar. Al-Murādī calls him ‘a mountain among mountains of ‘ilm and a sea among seas of ‘irfān (spiritual knowledge).\(^{53}\) A prominent nineteenth century scholar, Abī Ṭāyīb Muhammad Shams al-Haqq al-‘Aẓīmābādī (born 1273/1857), a noted Indian muḥaddith, has singled out al-Kūrānī as the reformer (muḥaddith) of the eleventh century AH/seventeenth century CE.\(^{54}\) Discussing extensively the hadith which states that ‘God sends to this community (ummah) at the “head” [ru’a’s] of each century one who regenerates its religion for it’, al-‘Aẓīmābādī gives a list of Muslim scholars who have been considered as the muḥaddīds of Islamic beliefs and practices at the end of each hundred years of the Hijrah. It is important to note that for the ninth century AH/fifteenth century CE muḥaddith, al-‘Aẓīmābādī states a preference for Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī (d. 911/1505) over Zakariyyā al-Ansārī (d. 926/1520), who had been chosen by other scholars.\(^{55}\) Despite this difference in preferences, the two great muḥaddīths were recognised by the leading exponents of the networks as their intellectual and spiritual precursors.

As for the muḥaddīth of the tenth century AH/sixteenth century CE, al-‘Aẓīmābādī follows al-Muhībī,\(^{56}\) who chose Shams al-Dīn al-Rāmīlī, the great Egyptian muḥaddith, who was a teacher of Ahmad al-Shinnāwī. In the twelfth century AH/eighteenth century CE, according to al-‘Aẓīmābādī, there were two muḥaddīds: the first was the great lexicographer, theologian and historian Muṭṭād al-Zābīdī (d. 1205/1791), and the second was the West African muḥaddith who settled in Medina, Ṣā’līḥ b. Muhammad al-Fullānī (d. 1218/1803-1804). These two scholars were among the most prominent personages in the international networks of ‘ulamā’ in the eighteenth century.

Why is Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī chosen as the muḥaddīth of the eleventh century of the Islamic calendar? According to al-Kattānī, al-Kūrānī was a Shaykh al-Islam and a teacher of the scholarly world, who was a ‘proof of Sufism’ (ḥujjat al-sūfiyyah) and a reviver of the Sunnī mystical tradition. Furthermore, he was one of the scholars most responsible in Islamic history for...
spreading the science of hadith studies, hadith narration and its isnāds in the Muslim world. Al-Zarkali credits al-Kūrānī with being a leading mujtahid among the Shāfi‘īs and muhaddiths.

Būr b. Dīn Ibrāhīm b. Ḥasan b. Shīhāb al-Dīn al-Kūrānī al-Shabrazūrī al-Shahrānī al-Kurdi, later also al-Madani, was born in Shahrīn, a village in the mountainous region of Kurdistan close to the borders of Persia. Our sources provide no account of his background. Al-Kūrānī initially studied Arabic, kalām (‘theology’), manṭiq (logic) and philosophy and, curiously enough, also handasah (‘engineering’) in his own region (qurt). Thus, in his early studies, he had already explored various sophisticated subjects, but he seems to have had a special interest in languages. He pursued rather detailed studies of Arabic, such as ma‘āni and bayān and at the same time studied Persian and Turkish. He later concentrated on usūl fiqh, fiqh, hadith and tāṣawwuf, mainly under the guidance of al-Mulā Muhammad Sharif al-Kūrānī al-Siddiqī (d. 1078/1667).

After the death of his father, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī left for Mecca to perform the ḥajj pilgrimage. The younger brother who travelled with him became gravely ill, which instead caused him to go to Baghdad. He remained there for a year and a half and took this opportunity to advance his knowledge of Arabic and Persian as well as to observe more closely the practice of the Qādiriyah ṭarīqah. Al-Kūrānī met ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jayyānī in one of his dreams. He was going westward, and al-Kūrānī followed him to Damascus, where he lived for the next four years. During this period he became increasingly interested in mystical doctrines, particularly in that of Ibn ‘Arabi (562-638/1165-1240). His main teacher in Sufism was Muhammad b. Muḥammad al-‘Amiri al-Ghazī. But, as he told al-Ḥamawī, it was al-Qushāshī, whom he met later in Medina, who was mostly responsible for instilling understanding in him of the intricate mystico-philosophical doctrine of Ibn ‘Arabi.

Despite his growing fascination with Sufism, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī did not put aside his genuine interest in hadith. For that reason, he travelled to Egypt in 1061/1650, where he studied hadith with its great mubaddiths, such as Muḥammad ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Shams al-Dīn al-Bāblī al-Qāhirī al-Azhari (1000-1077/1592-1666), Ahmad Shīhāb al-Dīn al-Khaṭṭāf al-Ḥanafī al-Ḥanāfī al-Māshri (d. 1069/1659) and Shāykh Sūltān b. Ahmad b. Salāmāh b. Ismā‘īl al-Mazzāḥī al-Qāhirī al-Azhari (987-1075/1577-1644). As al-Kūrānī tells us in his al-Ummām li lqā‘ al-Himām, these scholars issued him ijāzahs to teach hadith, after he had studied with them not only the standard books on the subject, such as the Kutub al-Sittah (six canonical books of the Tradition of the Prophet), but also a great number of lesser-known hadith books. They connected him with many leading Egyptian isnāds, including Shams al-Dīn al-Ramlī and Zakāriyyā al-Anṣārī. It is important to note that al-Kūrānī was also linked to the Egyptian isnāds by way of al-Qushāshī, who received them from al-Shinnawi, who in turn got them from his teacher, Shams
al-Dīn al-Ramlī. In addition to hadith, he studied tafsīr (until 1087/1677) with the Azhar Imām, Nūr al-Dīn ‘Alī al-Shabrāmalīsī, and ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Shihādā al-Yamanī.66

In 1062/1651 Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī returned to Mecca and then proceeded to Medina, where he attended the ḥalqahs of al-Qushāshī and ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Abī Bakr al-Kūrānī, among others. He was also appointed by al-Qushāshī as his khalīfah in the Shaṭṭāriyyah order. Despite this, al-Kūrānī was better known as a shaykh of the Naqshbandiyyah order. Later he taught in the Nabawi Mosque at the site where Ṣīḥḥat Allāh, Ḥāmid al-Shinnāwī and Ḥāmid al-Balkhī had taught. Al-Kūrānī, as al-Ḥamawī tells us, devoted his ḥalqahs to teaching hadith, fiqh, tafsīr, and tasawwuf. The books he used in his ḥalqahs were, among others, the Kuttub al-Sittah, and standard works by such scholars as al-Suyūṭī, al-Ghazālī and Ibn ‘Arabī.67

Because of his intellectual distinction and personality, al-Kūrānī attracted scholars and students from distant parts of the Muslim world to attend his ḥalqahs or majlis to study and learn from him. As a friend and a teacher he was extraordinarily humble. He loved to intermingle with his students. Furthermore, instead of simply swamping them with all the necessary sciences, he preferred to discuss them. To be present in his majlis was like, as al-Ḥamawī puts it, being in ‘one of the gardens of paradise’ (rawdah min riyyād al-jannah).68

Our sources do not tell us the exact number of al-Kūrānī’s students. But al-Kattānī points out that practically all seekers after ‘ilm during his time in the Haramayn were his students. Therefore, his networks were enormously extensive.69 The best known among his disciples were Ibn ‘Abd al-Rasūl al-Barzanjī, Ḥāmid al-Nakhīlī (1044–1130/1639–1701),70 Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Ḥādī al-Sīnī or Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sīnī al-Kabīr (d. 1138/1726),71 ‘Abd Allāh b. Sa‘d Allāh al-Lāḥūrī (d. in Medina in 1083/1673),72 ‘Abd Allāh al-Baṣrī (1048–1134/1638–1722),73 Abū Ṭāhir b. Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī (1081–1145/1670–1732),74 ‘Alī al-Shaybānī al-Zabīdī (d. 1072/1662),75 Ishāq b. Muḥammad b. Ja‘mān al-Yamānī (d. 1096/1685),76 al-Sīnīlī (1024–1105/1615–93) and al-Maqṣāṣīrī (1037–1111/1627–99).

Al-Kūrānī wrote prolifically which added to his intellectual importance in the networks. He is said to have written at least 100 works;77 al-Baghdādī provides 49 titles,78 while Brockelmann lists 42 of them.79 Most of his texts deal with hadith, fiqh, tawḥīd (and kalām), tafsīr and tasawwuf. In addition, he wrote a number of works that were intended to be his reply or explanation of certain problems either directly posed to him or contained in particular writings of other scholars. Although many of his works are available in manuscript form, so far only two have been published.80

So far our discussion has centred on the networks in Medina. This does not mean that those of Mecca were not important. Before discussing the networks in Mecca, it should be remembered that even though all the great scholars mentioned earlier had settled and taught in Medina, they regularly visited Mecca. During these visits they made contact with other scholars
and taught students as well. We should not underestimate the significance of such contacts in the scholarly networks: they were an important means of exchanging information on various issues and, more importantly, of linking scholars. And for students like al-Sinkilli, contacts with a number of great 'ulamā’ in the networks significantly contributed to their learning. A great scholar of enormous importance in connecting scholars both in Mecca and Medina with Egyptian hadith scholarship was Muhammad b. ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Bābīlī al-Qāhirī al-Azhārī (d. 1077/1666). He was a disciple of Shams al-Dīn al-Ramlī, Abū Bakr al-Shinnāwī, and a number of other leading Egyptian scholars. Both Shams al-Dīn al-Ramlī and al-Bābīlī have been mentioned as teachers of Ahmad al-Shinnāwī and al-Kūrānī respectively. He was acclaimed as a superior isnād and as one of the most reliable memorisers of the hadiths (al-hāfīz). He was even compared to the hāfiz Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī. Murtadā al-Zabīdī, another hāfiz of hadiths, maintains that there were no other great hāfīzs except al-Bābīlī after the death of the hāfiz and historian al-Sakhāwī in 902/1497. As a testimony to al-Bābīlī’s eminent position in hadith studies, Murtadā al-Zabīdī wrote two works, entitled al-Murabbi al-Kamilī fī man rawā ‘an al-Bābīlī and al-Fājr al-Bābīlī fī Tarjamah al-Bābīlī.82

Hailed as a major muhaddith in the seventeenth century, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Bābīlī travelled to various cities in Arabia and thus had extensive networks of colleagues and disciples.83 Later, he mostly lived in his home town, Bābil, and held a teaching post in the Ṣalāḥiyyah Madrasah until his death. But he regularly visited the Haramayn, where he performed the hajj and stayed for a while to establish contact with prominent scholars there as well as to teach. The best known among his students were in Mecca, Ahmad al-Nakhli and Ḥasan al-‘Ajamī and, in Medina, al-Kūrānī. Al-Sinkilli tells us that he also came into contact with this eminent scholar. Al-Bābīlī was a very dedicated teacher, who preferred to meet students in person rather than by way of writing. Although he actually discouraged writing, he wrote a work entitled al-Iḥād wa Fadā’ ilih.84

Another great scholar who played a remarkable role in connecting the scholarly networks in Mecca, this time with the Indian tradition of Sufism, was Tāj al-Dīn b. Zakariyyah b. Sultān al-‘Uthmānī al-Naqshbandi al-Hindi (d. in Mecca in 1052/1642). He hailed from Sambhal, India, and immigrated to Mecca when he was unable to secure the position of highest-ranking master in the Indian Naqshbandiyyah order after the death of Muhammad Bāqī bi Allāh (971-1012/1563-1603).85

In Mecca, Tāj al-Dīn al-Hindi succeeded in initiating a number of prominent Haramayn scholars into the Naqshbandiyyah tariqah, the most prominent being Ahmad b. Ibrāhīm b. ‘Ālān (d. 1033/1624), a noted Meccan shīfī and muhaddith, and Ahmad al-Nakhli. These two disciples largely helped the Naqshbandiyyah become more commendable to the Arabs. Thanks to Ibn ‘Ālān’s prestige and influence in the Haramayn, Tāj al-Dīn al-Hindi’s translation of Persian Naqshbandiyyah texts into Arabic could win
a much wider audience. As for al-Nakhli, who was also known as a *muḥaddith*, such a connection helped not only to bring about the Naqshbandiyyah reorientation but to link the community of hadith scholars to the *ṣīfīs*. He had also *silsilah* of the Naqshbandiyyah and Shattārīyyah from Sayyid Mir Kalāl b. Māhmūd al-Bālkhī, connecting him to ʿṢughat Allāh.87

Scholars from the Maghrib region played a substantial role in the networks. Like the Egyptian scholars mentioned earlier, they were responsible for introducing the North African tradition of *ḥadīth* studies and thus for strengthening the intellectual trends of returning to a more *shariʿah*-oriented Islam. There were two prominent Maghribi scholars whose names have been mentioned in passing: ‘Īsā b. Muhammad al-Maghribi al-Jaʿfarī al-Thaʿālibī al-Maghribi (1020–80/1611–69), and Muhammad b. Sulaymān al-Raddānī al-Maghribi al-Makkī (1037–94/1626–83). By settling down in Mecca, they not only brought the North African tradition of *ḥadīth* scholarship to the Haramayn but also helped create more linkages among scholars from many regions of the Muslim world. Considering their important roles in the scholarly networks, we will now examine them briefly.

‘Īsā al-Maghribi, later also al-Makkī, traced his ancestors to Jaʿfar b. Abī Ṭalīb, a cousin of the Prophet Muhammad. He spent most of his early years studying with local ‘*ulamāʾ* in his home town in the al-Jazāʾir region.88 Of all branches of Islamic science, he was particularly interested in *fiqh* and *ḥadīth*. For this reason he first travelled to Algiers, where he studied *ḥadīth* and other Islamic religious sciences, mostly with its *Mufīṭ*, Saʿīd b. Ḥibrīm Qaddūrāh. After continuing his studies in Tunis and other places in this region, he went for a pilgrimage to Mecca in 1062/1652. After the pilgrimage he extended his sojourn for one year at the Dāwūdiyyah *ribāṭ*, where he taught *ḥadīth* and *fiqh*. Again he went travelling, this time to Cairo, where he attended *halqahs* of great Egyptian ‘*ulamāʾ*’ such as Qādī Ahmad al-Shihāb al-Khaṭāfī, Sūṭūn al-Mazzāhī and Nur ‘All al-Shabrāmalīsī—all of whom were also teachers of al-Kūrānī.

Having gained from these *ijāzah* to teach and to relate *ḥadīth*, ‘Īsā al-Maghribi returned to Mecca. In the Holy City he exchanged knowledge and studied with prominent Haramayn scholars, such as Tāj al-Dīn b. Yaʿqūb al-Mālikī al-Makki (d. 1066/1656),89 Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn al-Ṭabarī (1002–78/1594–1667),90 ‘Abd al-Azīz al-Zamzamī (997–1072/1589–1662)91 and ‘All al-Jamāl al-Makki (1002–72/1594–1661).92 All of these scholars also authorised him to *ḥadīths* through their *iṣnāds*, which mostly began with ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Bābīlī.

The significance of ‘Īsā al-Maghribi in the scholarly communities of the Haramayn cannot be overestimated. He was acclaimed as one of the most prominent Mālikī legal scholars in his time. In the Holy Cities he was known by the honorary title ‘Imām al-Haramayn’. He taught at the Holy Mosques in Mecca and Medina. As al-Qannūjī tells us, he attracted many Haramayn students to attend his *halqahs*. Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, Hasan
al-’Ajami and Ahmad al-Nakhli were among his best-known students. Al-Sinkilli, as we will see later, also established contact with ‘Isa al-Maghribi while he was studying in Mecca. At a certain period every year, ‘Isa al-Maghribi taught in Medina, where he had a warm friendship with Ahmad al-Qushashi.93

All biographers of ‘Isa al-Maghribi are in accord that he was of great importance in connecting the tradition of hadith studies in the Maghrib region and Egypt with that of the Haramayn. The scope of his narration (riwaqah) was wide; as al-Kattani puts it, ‘nobody was more learned than he in these matters during his time’. Because of his extensive travels, Murtad’al-Zabidi believes that al-Maghribi was a ‘musnad al-dunyá’ (hadith narrator for the world).94 These claims find their support in one of al-Maghribi’s own works, entitled Kanz al-Riwaqat al-Majmu’a fi Durar al-Majaz wa Yawâqit al-Masmh. This work consists of two volumes and, as its title indicates, is indeed of the hadith narration. In it, al-Maghribi lists his hadith teachers, and more importantly draws a picture of their complex connections with one another. In addition, he provides the titles of the books that were produced by scholars involved in these hadith networks.95 The Kanz al-Riwaqat, therefore, is an important work which sheds more light on the role of hadith narration in the growth of the scholarly networks.

In terms of his educational background our next scholar, Muhammad b. Sulaymân al-Raddani al-Maghribi, was not so very different from his countryman, ‘Isa al-Maghribi. But in contrast to ‘Isa al-Maghribi, who preferred to lead a quiet life, Sulaymân al-Maghribi was an outspoken scholar; he had a strong tendency to exercise his religious influence in the political realm. As al-Siba’i points out, he was the only scholar in Mecca who dared to speak out against the abuse of power among the ruling Sharifian family, with their continuous struggles among themselves. He also attempted to bring about radical changes in the religious life of the Holy City. His close relations with the Ottoman ruling elite gave him additional weight in launching his reforms in Mecca.96

After studying in his home region, Sulaymân al-Maghribi travelled to al-Jazair and Egypt, where he learned from leading ‘ulamâ’, such as Shaykh al-Islami Sa’id b. Ibrâhim Qaddurah, Ahmad al-Khafäji, ‘Alâ’ al-Din al-Babili and Shaykh Sulîm al-Mazzahi. These same men, as mentioned earlier, were also the teachers of Ibrâhim al-Kûrani and ‘Isa al-Maghribi. In 1079/1668 Sulaymân al-Maghribi travelled to the Haramayn, where he remained for two years. After long travels to Istanbul and other cities in Turkey, Syria, Palestine and Lebanon, he finally returned to Mecca. There he built what was known as the Ibn Sulaymân ribât. However, he did not confine his activities to scholarly and religious matters: he was also occupied with public affairs, which led to open conflicts with the Sharifs of Mecca.97 As a result, he was expelled from
Mecca and died in Damascus. We return to Sulaymān al-Maghribī’s activism in the next section.

In addition to his activism, Sulaymān al-Maghribī was known as a distinguished muḥaddith with strong links to superior isnāds in hadith narration. Among his works, two were devoted to hadith studies: Jam‘ al-Fawā’id fi al-Hadith, and Silat al-Khalaf bi Mawsūl al-Salaf. In these works the author described, among other things, his connections with a number of earlier prominent muḥaddiths, such as Ibn Hajar, and the hadith books he studied. The biographical accounts of Sulaymān al-Maghribi do not explicitly mention the names of his students in the Haramayn. However, according to al-Muhibbi (1061-1111/1651-99), the author of Khulāṣat al-Āthar, who was himself a student of Sulaymān al-Maghribi, the latter had numerous students in the Haramayn, including Ahmad al-Nakhlī and Ḥasan al-ʿAjamī. And, as al-Kattānī shows us, Sulaymān al-Maghribi had vast connections by way of hadith studies with his contemporaries and later scholars in the networks.

So far, we have seen that many leading scholars in the seventeenth century networks were ‘grand immigrants’. This does not mean that native scholars from the Haramayn did not play an important role in this cosmopolitan scholarly community. There were in fact a number of native scholars of Mecca and Medina who took part actively in the networks in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

One of the leading scholars of Meccan origin was Tāj al-Dīn b. Ahmad, better known as Ibn Yaʿqūb. He was born in Mecca, where he died in 1066/1656. He studied primarily in Mecca with its leading scholars, such as ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Ṭabārī, ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalik al-ʿAṣāmī and Khalīd al-Mālikī, who issued ijāzah for him to teach in the Harām Mosque. Ibn Yaʿqūb had close relationships with scholars involved in the networks, particularly with ʿIsā al-Maghribi. Similarly, his connections through hadith studies were extensive. Known as an expert on the shariʿah, kalām and tasawwuf, Ibn Yaʿqūb was later appointed to the office of the Qāḍī al-Quḍāḥ of Mecca. In addition to this position, he taught in several madrasahs in Mecca. He was a prolific writer on various topics from Arabic to Sufism. As we shall see, one of his works was devoted to answering religious questions from Malay-Indonesian Muslims.

Another important scholar of Meccan origin was Zayn al-ʿAbidin al-Ṭabārī (1002-78/1594-1667), a leading scholar of the Ṭabārī family in Mecca. This family traced their ancestors to ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib. Zayn al-ʿAbidin’s principal teacher was his own father, ‘Abd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad b. Yahyā al-Ṭabārī (976-1033/1568-1624). But it is clear that Zayn al-ʿAbidin was also involved in scholarly discourses with other prominent scholars in the Haramayn. By virtue of the scholarly reputation of his family, he was able not only to gain a great deal of benefit from many prominent scholars in the Haramayn but also to assert his own role and that of the Ṭabārī family in the networks. Being a muḥaddith of distinction in Mecca, Zayn al-ʿAbidin was a teacher of the next
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...generation of scholars, including Hasan al-‘Ajami, Aḥmad al-Nakhli, ‘ʿAbd Allāh al-Baṣrī and Ābū Tahir al-Kūrānī.102

It is worth noting that Zayn al-ʿĀbidin’s father, ‘ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Ṭabarī (976-1033/1568-1624), was also a major scholar: he was a muhaddith, whose isnāds included great traditionists like Shams al-Dīn al-Ramlī, Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī and Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī. He also inherited the Meccan scholarly tradition from the Zahrārah family, mentioned earlier. Thus, ‘ʿAbd al-Qādir was a scholar of special importance in connecting the scholarly networks of an earlier period with those under discussion here. ‘ʿAbd al-Qādir was also a historian of Mecca: several of his numerous works were devoted to exploring the history of Mecca.103

Another son of ‘ʿAbd al-Qādir, ‘Ali (d. 1070/1660), was also a noted scholar, especially in fiqh. With an expertise in this field he was often asked to give religious opinions (fatwās) on various matters. Like his brother, Zayn al-ʿĀbidin, in addition to studying with his father he gained a great deal of benefit from scholars in the Ḥaramayn. If Zayn al-ʿĀbidin inherited his father’s expertise in hadith, ‘Ali took over his father’s talent as an historian. Thus, ‘Ali wrote several works on the history of Mecca and its notables.104

As we shall see later, ‘Ali al-Ṭabarī was also one of al-Sinkīlī’s teachers.

It is obvious that the Tabarī family played a significant role in scholarly discourse in the Ḥaramayn. Al-Sībā‘ī points out that the three Tabarī scholars mentioned above revived the reputation of the Tabarī family as an old scholarly family in Mecca. A daughter of ‘ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Ṭabarī, named Sayyidah Muḥārakah, was also a noted scholar.105 The Tabarī family continued to maintain its eminence in subsequent periods. One such well-known later Tabarī scholar was Muḥammad b. al-Muhībb al-Ṭabarī (1100–73/1689–1760), a faqīh and an historian.106

The list of scholars involved in the networks in the second half of the seventeenth century is a very long one. For the purpose of our discussion, it suffices to say that all the scholars discussed above played major roles in the networks during the period. We will, however, mention other scholars of this generation whenever necessary throughout this discussion.

SCHOLARS AT THE TURN OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Most scholars of Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī’s generation died in the second half of the seventeenth century. But the chain of the networks continued with their students who, in turn, became crucial links to scholars into the eighteenth century. These students were generally at the peak of their scholarly careers at the turn of the seventeenth century or in the early decades of the eighteenth century. We now deal briefly with some of the most prominent among these scholars (see Chart 2).

There is no doubt that Hasan b. ‘Ali b. Muḥammad b. ‘Umar al-ʿAjami (some spell his name al-ʿUjaymi) al-Makkī, was one of these prominent scholars at the turn of the seventeenth century. He was also
Chart 2 The core of the eighteenth century networks
known as ‘Abū al-Asrār’ (‘father of spiritual mysteries’). Born in Mecca, Hasan al-‘Ajami hailed from a noted scholarly family in Egypt. His great grandfather, Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Majid al-‘Ajami (d. 822/1419), was a well-known scholar in Cairo. Hasan al-‘Ajami studied with virtually every leading scholar in the Haramayn. In addition to al-Qushâshi and al-Kūrâni, he studied with prominent scholars such as ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn al-Bâhâlî, ‘Abd al-Qâdir and Zayn al-‘Abidin al-Tabârî, ‘Isâ al-Maghribî, ‘Ali al-Shabrâmalî, Sa’îd al-Lâhûrî, ‘Abd al-Rahîm al-Khâsî and Ibrâhîm b. ‘Abd Allâh Ja’îmân. The last two, as we will see later, were also teachers of al-Sînîlî. It is certain that Hasan al-‘Ajami possessed a thorough knowledge of various branches of Islamic discipline. He was renowned as an outstanding faqîh, muhaddith, sâbî and historian. In hadîth studies, al-Kattânî regards him as one of the few scholars in his time blessed by God to be a ‘light-house of the hadîth’. He died in Ta‘if in 1113/1701-2.107

Hasan al-‘Ajami played an important role in connecting the scholarly networks in the seventeenth century with those of the eighteenth century, particularly by way of hadîth studies and tariqa silsilahs. He was a meeting point of various traditions of hadîth studies: Syria, Egypt, the Maghrib, the Hijâz, Yemen and the Indian subcontinent. It is not surprising, as al-Kattânî points out, that students in the Haramayn did not feel satisfied in their hadîth studies until they had met and received hadîths from him. They flocked to his halâqahs in proximity to the Gate of al-Wadâ and the Gate of Umm Hâni’ at the Harâm Mosque in Mecca.108 As a result, al-‘Ajami’s isnâds and narrations of hadîth were extensive.109

To demonstrate the importance of the connections in the tariqa, Hasan al-‘Ajami wrote a special work, entitled Risâlât al-‘Ajami fi al-Þurûq, which deals with the silsilahs of 40 tariqaqs that existed in the Muslim world up until his time.110 In this work, in addition to discussing special distinctions of the teachings of each tariqaq the author provides the silsilahs to shaykhs of the tariqaqs and the benefits of affiliating with them. This is one of the main reasons why al-‘Ajami was also known as ‘Abû al-Asrâr’. By virtue of his works, the Risâlât al-‘Ajami fi al-Þurûq together with the Ihdâ‘ al-Latâ‘if min Akhâbâr al-Þa‘îf, al-‘Ajami established himself as a historian in his own right.

Hasan al-‘Ajami’s best known disciples were, among others, Muhammad Hayyât al-Sindî (d. 1163/1653), Abû Tâhir b. Ibrâhîm al-Kûrâni (1081-1145/1670-1732), Tâj al-Dîn al-Qal‘î, Qâdî of Mecca,111 al-Maqassârî and the historian Fâth Allâh al-Hamîwî. Hasan al-‘Ajami built the reputation of the ‘Ajami as a noted scholarly family in Mecca. Among the most prominent members of the ‘Ajami family in later periods were ‘Abd al-Hafiż al-‘Ajami, Muftî of Mecca; Muhammad b. Hussayn al-‘Ajami; and Abû al-Fâth al-‘Ajami.112

The next scholar worth mentioning was Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Rasûl al-Barzanjî. Tracing his ancestors to ‘Ali b. Abî Tâlib, he was born in...
Shahrazūr, Kurdistan. He acquired his early education in his own region and later travelled to Iraq, Syria, the Haramayn and Egypt. His teachers in the Haramayn included al-Mulā Muhammad Sharīf al-Kūrānī, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, Ishāq b. Ja‘mān al-Zabīdī, ‘Īsā al-Maghribī and several other scholars. While he was in Egypt, al-Barzanjī studied with, among others, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Bābīlī, Nūr al-Dīn al-Shabrāmālī and Sūltān al-Mazzāhī.113

After studying in Egypt, al-Barzanjī returned to the Haramayn, and later settled in Medina, where he died. He was a noted muhaddith, faqīh and shaykh of the Qādiriyah order. He devoted his life to teaching and writing. He was a prolific writer: al-Baghdādī lists 52 of his works, two of which were devoted to refuting Ahmad Sirhindī’s claim to be the ‘renewer of the Second Millennium of Islam’. Al-Barzanjī’s connections in the networks were far-reaching.114 Al-Barzanjī was the earliest scholar of the Barzanjī family to settle down and become famous in the Haramayn. One of the most prominent scholars of the Barzanjī family in Medina after ‘Ābd al-Rasūl al-Barzanjī was Ja‘far b. Ḥasan b. ‘Ābd al-Ḵārim al-Barzanjī (1103-80/1690-1766), the Shāfi‘ī Muftī in Medina and author of the ‘Iqd al-Jawāhir, a famous text relating to the celebration of the birthday of the Prophet.115

‘Āḥmad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Ālī al-Nakhkhī al-Makkī was also evidently one of the most prominent scholars in the networks after the generation of ʿIbrāhīm al-Kūrānī. He was born and studied mostly in Mecca and became known as a muhaddith-sīḥīh.116 In his work entitled Buḥyvat al-Tālīhin li Bayān al-Maḥāqāqīn al-Mu’tamīn, al-Nakhkhī provides a complete list of his teachers, his isnāds in various branches of Islamic discipline, and his sīsilah in a number of tariqahs.

It is of particular importance that, in the Buḥyvat al-Tālīhin, al-Nakhkhī also gives an account of the learning at the Harām Mosque of Mecca. For instance, he tells us that he attended lectures held in the ḥalqahs in proximity to the Gate of Peace (Bāb al-Salām). Lectures were given by his teachers every day after the Ṣuḥūr (dawn), ‘Asr (afternoon), Maḥrīb (sunset) and ‘Iṣrā‘ (night) prayers. It was in the ḥalqahs that he received some of his ijzah in the exterior sciences—such as shari‘ah or fiqh—and was initiated into several tariqahs: the Shāhādīyyah, Nawāwīyyah, Qādirīyyah, Naqshbandīyyah, Shajā‘īyyah and Khāṭwātīyyah. And it was also in the Harām Mosques that he most of the time practised the dhikr of these tariqahs.117

Like al-‘Ajamī and al-Barzanjī, al-Nakhkhī studied with most of the leading Haramayn scholars of his time. The list of his masters includes ‘Ālā’ al-Dīn al-Bābīlī, al-Qushāshī, al-Kūrānī, Tāj al-Dīn al-Hindī, ‘Īsā al-Maghribī, Muḥammad ‘Ālī b. ‘Ālān al-Siddīqī, Zayn al-‘Ābidīn al-Taḥārī, ‘Ābd al-‘Aziz al-Zamzamī and ‘Ali al-Janāl al-Makki. Al-Nakhkhī also had numerous teachers from Egypt, the Maghribī region, Syria and Iraq. Thus, as Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī correctly puts it, al-Nakhkhī linked numerous scholars by way of his hadith studies.118 Likewise, his students came from various parts of the Muslim world and carried the networks even further.119

Another important scholar who belonged to the group discussed under
this heading was 'Abd Allāh b. Sālim b. Muḥammad b. Sālim b. 'Isā al-Baṣrī al-Makki. He was born and died in Mecca. As one can see in al-Baṣrī’s own work, Kitāb al-Imdād bi Ma’rifah ‘Ulūw al-Insānī, his education was thorough; he studied many sciences, including hadith, tafsīr, fiqh, the history of the Prophet (ṣiraḥ), Arabic and tāṣawwuf. In the Kitāb al-Imdād, he devotes long pages to providing the titles of hadith books he has studied, along with the īsnāds to each of them. He goes on to mention books in other fields. As for tāṣawwuf, he studied books written by such scholars as al-Ghazālī, al-Qushayrī, Ibn ‘Atī' Allāh and Ibn ‘Arabi.¹²⁰

Though al-Baṣrī was an expert in various branches of Islamic science, he was mainly known as a great muhaddith; he was called an Amīr al-Mu'minīn fī al-Ḥadīth (‘commander of the believers in the ḥadīth’). Al-Sibā’ī points out that al-Baṣrī was one of the greatest hadith teachers in the Harām Mosque in the early eighteenth century.¹²¹ Through the Kitāb al-Imdād he contributed significantly to hadith studies by providing the names of scholars who were included among the superior īsnāds. But like other scholars in the networks, al-Baṣrī was an eminent šāfi‘. He was a master of several ṭarīqahs, such as the Naqshbandiyyah, Shādhiliyyah and Nawawiyyah. Furthermore, he established the reputation of the Baṣrī family in the scholarly discourses in the Harāmayn.¹²²

Al-Baṣrī played an important role in connecting the earlier generation of seventeenth century scholars and later networks. This can be seen in the composition of his teachers and disciples. Besides Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, his principal teachers included such familiar names as ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Bābīlī, ‘Isā al-Ja’farī al-Maghribī, Sulaymān al-Maghribī and ‘Alī al-Ṭabarī. Among his disciples were ‘Alā’ al-Dīn b. ‘Abd al-Baqī al-Mizjājī al-Zabīdī, Abū Tāhir al-Kūrānī, Muḥammad Hayyāt al-Sindī and Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhāb, all of whom, as we will see shortly, were leading exponents of the networks in the eighteenth century.¹²³

The last scholar to be dealt with here is Abū Tāhir b. Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī (1081-1145/1670-1733). Abū Tāhir was born and died in Medina. It appears that he studied mostly in the Harāmayn. His principal teachers were his father, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, Sulaymān al-Maghribī, Ḥasan al-‘Ajamī, Ibn ‘Abd al-Rasūl al-Barzanjī, ‘Abd Allāh al-Baṣrī and Ahmad al-Nakhī. We have no detailed information on his studies with them, but there is no doubt that his religious learning was thorough.¹²⁴

Abū Tāhir was primarily known as a muhaddith, but he was also a faqīh and a šāfi‘ī. He was heir to much of his father’s expertise in ḥadīth studies. As a faqīh, he occupied the post of Shāfi‘ī Muftī of Medina for some time. He was a prolific writer as well. According to al-Kattānī, he wrote about a hundred treatises, the most important among them being Kanz al-‘Amal fī Sunan al-Aqywāl and Shurūṭ al-Fuṣūs li al-Shaykh al-Akbar. This last work was apparently intended to explicate the doctrine of Ibn ‘Arabi. It also reflects Abū Tāhir’s learning in the realm of philosophical mysticism. Abū
Tahir had wide connections in the networks, by way of both hadith isnads and tariqah silsilahs. Among his best-known students were Muhammad Hayyât al-Sindi, Shâh Wali Allâh and Sulaymân al-Kurdi, all of whom are examined in greater detail in chapter 2.125

THE NETWORKS: BASIC CHARACTERISTICS

After discussing a number of the most important 'ulamâ’ involved in the networks, it is useful to make some generalisations about the basic characteristics of the networks. The scholarly networks became increasingly extensive in the seventeenth century. It is clear that there had been some connections between earlier scholars and the ones who were involved in seventeenth century scholarly networks. However, networks that developed during the seventeenth century appear to have been much more complicated; the crisscrossing of linkages by way of both hadith studies and tariqah affiliations was enormously complex. Despite the historiographical problems one finds in sources of information on these scholars and their networks, their connections to one another can be traced down to our time.

The crisscrossing of scholars who were involved in the networks produced intertwined, international intellectual communities. Relations among them generally existed in conjunction with the quest for learning through religious educational institutions such as the mosques, madrasahs and ribâ’ís. The very basic linkages among them, therefore, were ‘academic’ in their nature. Their connections to each other, as a rule, took the form of teacher–student (or ‘vertical’) relationships. This academic linkage included other forms: teacher–teacher, which may also be termed ‘horizontal links’; and student–student relations, all of which could also crisscross each other. Such forms of linkages were not strictly or formally organised in any kind of hierarchical structure. The relatively high mobility of both teachers and students allowed the growth of vast networks of scholars transcending geographical boundaries, ethnic origins and religious leanings.

Even though the relationships among scholars probably seem quite informal, especially from the point of view of the modern academic world, their common interest in regenerating the ummah (Muslim ‘nation’) stimulated cooperation, which in turn resulted in closer interpersonal relationships. These close personal relationships were maintained in various ways after scholars or students in the networks returned to their own countries or travelled elsewhere after their sojourn in the Haramayn. The need to establish stronger ties with scholars in the centres was increasingly felt when the returning teachers and students faced problems in their homelands, thus needing the guidance of their former teachers and colleagues in the Haramayn. All this helps to explain the continuing scholarly connections in the networks.

Furthermore, as we have seen, two important vehicles in solidifying the
linkages of the networks were the hadith isnād and tariqah silsilah. Voll has pointed out that both played crucial roles in linking scholars involved in the networks centred in the Haramayn in the eighteenth century. My own research for the same period supports this conclusion.

The same was true of the seventeenth century scholarly networks. In this period, scholars of the networks brought together Egyptian and North African traditions of hadith studies, thus connecting them with those of the Haramayn, which had been known in the early period of Islam as the strongest centre of hadith scholarship. The scholars in the networks played a crucial role in reviving the position of Mecca and Medina as centres of hadith scholarship.

As for the tariqah silsilahs, traditionally they had been an important means of creating close linkages between scholars. Disciples of the mystical way, by definition, must succumb to their master’s will. This created a very strong bond between those who followed the tariqahs. Voll emphasises that this type of relationship ‘provided a more personal tie and a common set of affiliations that helped to give the informal groupings of scholars a greater sense of cohesion’.

The increasing importance of the esoteric way (haqiqah) in the Haramayn, introduced for instance by South Asian scholars, resulted in bringing together scholars, who had mainly been associated with the exoteric way (shari‘ah), in an even more personal way. The involvement of South Asian scholars in the networks certainly helped widen the reach of the networks. But, not less importantly, they expanded the realm of influence of tariqahs, in particular the Shattāriyyah and Naqshbandiyyah orders, previously mostly associated with the Indian subcontinent version of Sufism, which had been almost unknown in the Haramayn in earlier periods. But it must be kept in mind that by entering the realm of Mecca and Medina which now, once again, had become important centres of hadith scholarship, these tariqahs, as we elaborate in chapter 2, underwent a sort of reorientation. In short, they became more ‘shari‘ah-oriented tariqahs’.

One should also be aware that, despite their close relations, there was a great deal of diversity among scholars involved in the networks. They were different from each other in terms of not only their places of origin but also their madhhabs and tariqah affiliations. While a certain teacher might be a Ḥanafī in terms of his adherence to Islamic legal doctrine, his student might be a Shafi‘i. While a teacher might be a Shattāriyya Sufī, his student might follow the path of the Naqshbandiyyah. Despite all these differences, however, they shared a general tendency towards Islamic reformism. This is discussed in greater detail in chapter 2.
Reformism in the Networks

A number of studies have been conducted on intellectual trends developed through scholarship in particular periods of Islamic history. However, never before has a study been done which examines the intellectual trends that grew out of the numerous ‘ulama’ who were linked to each other in loose scholarly networks such as those under discussion. They were different from one another not only in terms of their geographical backgrounds, which had their own ‘little’ Islamic traditions, but more importantly in their intellectual preferences, as reflected by their legal (madhhab) and tariqah affiliations.

Furthermore, leading scholars in the networks, before settling down in the Haramayn or elsewhere, had been peripatetic scholars, travelling from one centre of Islamic learning to another, studying with and learning from various teachers who had their own personal traditions of religious scholarship. Thus, scholars were influenced not by one single teacher but by many; they were exposed to and absorbed various lines of thought and intellectual tendencies. Because of this, describing the contents of teachings developed and transmitted by the scholarly networks is not easy. At this stage we will attempt to draw the broad outlines of the intellectual trends of the networks; this will perhaps help us comprehend the nature and characteristics of these scholarly networks.

In a certain sense the Haramayn was a ‘melting pot’, where various ‘little’ traditions of Islam melded to form a ‘new synthesis’ which was strongly in favour of the ‘great’ tradition.¹ We have seen previously how scholars from the Indian subcontinent, for instance, carried their mystical traditions to the Haramayn, while those from Egypt and North Africa came with an inheritance of hadith scholarship. These traditions interacted with each other as well as with the tradition already established in the Haramayn itself.
It must be kept in mind at the outset that what we call a ‘new synthesis’ is not entirely a new development in the history of Islamic social and intellectual traditions. Even though it has some distinctive characteristics, compared with the previous tradition, in many respects it also contains elements of continuity with earlier traditions. The return to the Sunni orthodoxy that gained momentum after the twelfth century appears to reach its culmination in the period under discussion. This can be seen not only in the intellectual contents of the networks but also in their ‘organisational’ aspects, or more precisely the linkages among scholars. Thus, the revivalist spirit that inspired the establishment of madrasahs everywhere in the Middle East after the founding of the Niẓāmiyyah madrasah in 459/1066 continued to flourish in a variety of ways.

The salient feature of the scholarly networks is that the rapprochement between the shari‘ah-oriented ‘ulamā‘ (more specifically, the fuqahā‘) and the šī‘īs reached its climax. The long-standing conflict between these two groups of Muslim scholars appears to have greatly diminished; the rapprochement or reconciliation between them, which had been preached insistently by such scholars as al-Qushayri and al-Ghazālī several centuries earlier, became a common goal among our scholars. Most of them were ahl al-shari‘ah (fuqahā‘) and ahl al-haqqāqah (šī‘īs) at the same time; thus, they were learned not only in the intricacies of the shari‘ah but also in the haqqāqah (mystical or Divine Realities). However, we should be very careful not to conclude that they took this reconciliation for granted; instead, they continued to nurture it.

The rapprochement between the shari‘ah and Sunnism and the enrolment of the ‘ulamā‘ in the harāʾeh resulted in the rise of ‘neo-Sufism’. There has been considerable discussion on the meaning and use of the term ‘neo-Sufism’, which was coined by the late Fazlur Rahman. According to Rahman, neo-Sufism is the reformed Sufism largely stripped of its ecstatic and metaphysical character and content, these being replaced by a content that was nothing other than the postulates of the orthodox religion. As he explained, this new ‘type’ of Sufism emphasises and renews the original moral factor and puritanical self-control in Sufism at the expense of the extravagant features of the popular unorthodox Sufism. Neo-Sufism brings to the centre of attention the moral reconstruction of Muslim society, as contrasted with the earlier Sufism, which had primarily stressed the individual and not society. As a consequence, Rahman concludes, the overall character of neo-Sufism is undoubtedly puritanical and activist. We will now see more clearly how neo-Sufism developed in the networks.

NEO-SUFISM AND HADĪTH STUDY

Fazlur Rahman maintains that the most important group of Muslim scholars responsible for helping to crystallise the rise of neo-Sufism were the ‘people of tradition’ (ahl al-hadith). He further argues that after the šī‘īt
movement captured much of the Muslim world emotionally, spiritually and intellectually during the sixth/twelfth and seventh/thirteenth centuries, the traditionists found it impossible to neglect the Sufi forces entirely. Therefore, as Rahman puts it:

they tried, in their methodology, to incorporate as much of the legacy as could be reconciled with orthodox Islam and could be made to yield a positive contribution towards it. First, the moral motive of Sufism was emphasised and some of its technique of dhikr or muraqabah, ‘spiritual concentration’, adopted. But the object and the content of this concentration were identified with the orthodox doctrine and the goal redefined as the strengthening of faith in dogmatic tenets and the moral purity of the spirit. This type of neo-Sufism tended to regenerate orthodox activism and reinculcate a positive attitude to this world.6

The Haramayn, from the early years of Islam, had been known as the main centre of the hadith. This is not hard to understand, as the Prophet, the source of the hadith, lived and initiated Islam there. Furthermore, two of the four major schools of Islamic law, the Mālikī and the Ḥanbalī, known as ahl al-hadith, had in fact initially developed and gained their stronghold in the Arabian Peninsula. It is true that the Mālikī madhhab, introduced by Mālik b. Anas (d. 179/795) in Medina, later became more dominant in North and West Africa and Upper Egypt, but the Ḥanbalīs also came to exercise a predominance in the Arabian Peninsula. Although the Ḥanbalīs are known for their strong reliance on hadith and their refusal of rational philosophy and speculative mysticism, many accepted Sufism as long as it was practised in accordance with the sharī‘ah. There is no evidence that such prominent Ḥanbalī scholars as Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728/1328) and Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawziyyah were opposed to all types of Sufism; what they fiercely attacked was unorthodox ecstatic and antinomian Sufism—that is, Sufism which regards itself free from injunction of sharī‘ah or fiqh. For this reason, Fazlur Rahman considers them pioneers of neo-Sufism.7

There was also reluctance to accept Sufism among the ahl al-hadith of the Mālikī madhhab in the North African region and Upper Egypt. The Maghrībi Mālikīs in particular were more puritanical and, in some cases, also aggressive. It is well known that the early Egyptian (Nubian) Sufi Dhu’l-Nūn al-Misrī (d. 245/859) was persecuted by the Egyptian Mālikī jurist ‘Abd Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Hakam;8 al-Ghazālī’s books were condemned and banned by the Mālikī fuqahā’ of Spain,9 and one of the fiercest attacks on Sufism in Egypt, particularly of the extravagant type, came from Ibn al-Hājj al-‘Abdārī, a leading Mālikī fuqahā in the fourteenth century.10

Again it is important to note that not all Mālikī scholars were hostile to Sufism. Some of them were even zealous Sufis. A good example of this is ‘Ali b. Maymūn (854–917/1450–1511), a noted Moroccan Mālikī, who was responsible for spreading a revivalist version of the Shadhiliyyah order in Syria. He regenerated the decadent Syrian Sufism by not allowing
his disciples to isolate themselves in khalwah (seclusion) at the khângâh.\textsuperscript{11} It appears that when scholarly contacts and linkages between the Maghribi Mâlikis and scholars of other maddâhib gained momentum after the sixteenth century, some began to soften their tone of opposition to Sufism and joined other scholars in preaching neo-Sufism.

Despite these exceptions among the Hanbali and Mâlikî muhaddîths, the majority did not make use of their expertise in hadîth for accelerating the reform of Sufism on any larger scale. These muhaddîths generally continued to concentrate their hadîth studies on maintaining, reorganising and interpreting the six canonical books of the hadîth in light of their maddâhib’s point of view. However, they increasingly established contacts and connections with scholars of the intellectual traditions. In this way they were exposed to other ‘little traditions’ of Islam. At the same time they played an important role in connecting scholars living in various regions of the Middle East through their hadîth scholarship.

This is particularly true among the leading Mâlikî muhaddîths, who lived mostly in Egypt and the North African region. As we will see shortly, they were among the scholars most responsible for transmitting hadîths, and thus for establishing crucial linkages between various traditions of hadîth scholarship in the Middle East. The material shows that most isnâds in the networks were transmitted through the major fifteenth and early sixteenth century muhaddîths in Egypt, namely Ibn Hajar al-Asqalâni (d. 853/1449),\textsuperscript{12} Jalâl al-Dîn al-Suyûtî\textsuperscript{13} and Zakariyyâ al-Ansârî,\textsuperscript{14} noted earlier. These prominent scholars in fact constituted a group of networks among themselves.\textsuperscript{15} They were considered the most superior hadîth isnâds, and therefore became the most sought-after isnâds by later scholars in the networks.\textsuperscript{16}

As a result of this development, beginning in the late sixteenth century, connections among scholars in the Hâramayn resulting from hadîth scholarship increasingly widened in scope. In addition to the Egyptian isnâds above, we find the isnâds of North Africa coming into the picture. The North African isnâds in many cases also had strong linkages with the Egyptian isnâds. Being possessors of superior isnâds, major muhaddîths from the two regions not only became crucial links among scholars but more importantly stimulated new intellectual trends in the networks. This is perhaps best illustrated by the experience of such prominent muhaddîths as ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn al-Bâbîlî, ‘Isâ al-Maghrîbi and Sulaymân al-Maghrîbi.

One of the most superior isnâds these three brought to the Hâramayn was that of Shams al-Dîn al-Ramli, the tenth century renewer of Islam, also known as the ‘little Shâfi’î’ (al-Shâfi’î al-Šaghîr).\textsuperscript{17} As a superior isnâd, Shams al-Dîn received hadîths from his father, Shihâb al-Dîn al-Ramli (d. 957/1550),\textsuperscript{18} who in turn received them directly from his renowned teacher, Zakariyyâ al-Ansârî. Although Shihâb al-Dîn al-Ramli was not as famous as al-Ansârî, he was undoubtedly one of the prominent Shâfi’î muhaddîths of his generation.

Even major scholars in the networks, who have been mainly identified as
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ṣāfī, such as al-Qushāshī, al-Kūrānī, al-Nākhli or ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṭāsrī, had in fact extensive linkages with the Egyptian and North African traditions of ḥadīth scholarship. There is no doubt that ḥadīth studies constituted the most important subject in these scholars’ learning. Al-Kūrānī, in his accounts of his ʿisnād in various Islamic disciplines, devotes more than 40 pages to disclosing his ḥadīth ʿisnād before going on to those in fiqh, shariʿah and ṭaṣawwuf. His ḥadīth ʿisnād mostly go back through al-Qushāshī to al-Shinnāwī and further to Egyptian ʿisnāds, or directly in ascending order from Shams al-Dīn al-Ramlī to Shihāb al-Ramlī to Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī to Ibn Ḥajar al-Asqalānī and so forth to Mālik.

But lbrāhīm al-Kūrānī also possessed a ḥadīth ʿisnād, beginning with ‘Abd Allāh al-Lahūrī (d. 1083/1672), who migrated from Lahore, India, to Medina. Al-Lahūrī, by way of this ʿisnād, connected him with Quth al-Dīn al-Nahrawānī. This ʿisnād also includes Ibn Ḥajar at its apex, and has names not in the Egyptian and North African ʿisnāds. By way of this ʿisnād, al-Kūrānī is directly connected to the Indian tradition of ḥadīth studies.

It is interesting to note that al-Kūrānī has also an interesting ḥadīth ʿisnād, which runs through ṣāfī Shaykhs that connect him to Ibn ‘Arabi. It went from al-Qushāshī, who received it from al-Shinnāwī, who took it from his father, ‘Alī b. ‘Abd al-Quddūs ‘Abbāsī al-Shinnāwī, who got it from his master, al-Sha’rānī, who got it from Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī, who got it from Abū al-Fath Muḥammad al-Marāghī, who got it from Sharaf al-Dīn b. lbrāhīm al-Jabarī al-Zabīdī from Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī al-Wānī, who got it from the great master Ibn ‘Arabi, who got it from ‘Abd al-Wahlāb b. ‘Alī al-Baghdādī, who got it from Abū al-Fath al-Karūkhī, who got it from Abū Ismā‘īl al-Anṣārī al-Harāwī, who finally got it from ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-Jarrāhī. This ʿisnād was inherited by al-Kūrānī’s disciples, such as ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṭāsrī. Al-Ṭāsrī tells us in his Kitāb al-Imdād bi Ma’rifah ‘Uluw al-ʿIsnād that he studied al-Tirmidhī’s Sunan and al-Nasā‘ī’s Sunan with al-Kūrānī on the authority of this ʿisnād.

The importance of stating lbrāhīm al-Kūrānī’s long ʿisnād above is that it will enable us to see how chains of transmission can increasingly become orthodox and, by extension, how Ibn ‘Arabi, often accused of being an ‘unorthodox’ ṣāfī, was a source of authority to scholars who were mostly known as muhaddiths.

On the above list of names, three are perhaps most important: Ibn ‘Arabi, Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī, and ‘Abd al-Wahlāb al-Sha’rānī. For some Muslims it may be a shock to learn that a major muhaddith such as al-Anṣārī possessed a ḥadīth ʿisnād that went back through Ibn ‘Arabi, who had been condemned by many other muhaddiths. It is important to note that, although Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī was widely known as a great muhaddith and chief qādī, he was in fact also a ṣāfī. He studied with and received ṭaṣawwuf from, among others, Muḥammad al-Ghamrī. Al-Anṣārī also wrote several treatises on Sufism, including a commentary on al-Qushayrī’s Risālat al-Ṭaṣawwuf, which is
known for its insistence on the conformity of Sufism to the shari‘ah. Therefore, it is not a mere historical coincidence that al-Anṣārī initiated the young al-Sha’rāni (d. 973/1565) into Islamic mysticism.23 The fruit of the master-disciple relation of this type of scholar was the emergence of al-Sha’rāni’s ‘neo-Sufism’ or, as Tringham24 calls it, the ‘middle course’, that is, a combination of tasawwuf and fiqh.

The connection between the leading Haramayn scholars and the neo-sūfī al-Sha’rāni was far from simply a chain in the transmission of particular hadiths or authority in studying hadith books. Instead, their linkages were crucial to the transmission of the doctrines of neo-Sufism. Ahmad al-Qushāshī, for instance, traces his teachings on the obligation of disciples of the tariqah to move (hijrah) from negligence and ignorance to enlightenment, to wage jihād against inward and outward enemies, and to persevere in facing hardships, or on the permissibility of women to be initiated into the mystical ways, to al-Sha’rāni. Al-Sha’rāni taught them to ‘Ali al-Shinnāwī, who taught them to his son, Ahmad al-Shinnāwī, who in turn taught them directly to al-Qushāshī. But it is important to note that al-Sha’rāni derived his teachings from the authority of al-Suyūṭī.25 Al-Qushāshī also attributes similar teachings to Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī from Ahmad al-Shinnāwī, who got them from Shams al-Dīn al-Ramlī, who received them by way of ‘general ijāzah’ (al-ijāzah al-‘āmmah) from al-Anṣārī.26

Similarly, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī had connections with al-Sha’rāni, which appear in more ways than simply by way of hadith isnād: he read al-Sha’rāni’s works with Ahmad al-Shinnāwī, who received them from his father, ‘Ali al-Shinnāwī, who acquired them directly from the author, al-Sha’rāni.27 Therefore, it is clear that al-Kūrānī was fully aware of al-Sha’rāni’s neo-Sufism.

Another example of the scholars in our networks who treated hadith scholarship with particular regard is Ahmad al-Nahlī. He presents his isnāds in the search of exoteric (zāhīr) and esoteric (bāṭīn) sciences in his Bughyat al-Tāliḥīn li Bayān al-Maṣḥā’ikh al-Muḥāqiqīn al-Muṭamīdīn.28 He possessed, for instance, an Egyptian hadith isnād which began directly from ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Bābīlī, who in turn connected him with Shams al-Dīn al-Ramlī, Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī and Ibn Hajar. He also acquired a North African and Egyptian isnād by way of ‘Īsā al-Maghribī as well as an Indian isnād that went back through Șīhḥat Allāh to al-Anṣārī. In addition to the ‘Kutub al-Sittah’, he studied numerous other hadith books, such as the al-Miwaṭṭā of Mālik b. Anas, al-Sunan al-Kubrā of al-Bayhaqī and al-Jāmi’ al-Ṣaghīr of al-Suyūṭī.29

The particular importance placed by these scholars on hadith reflects their conscious attempts to make the way of the Prophet, besides the Qur’ānic teachings, not only a source of law but also a boundless inspiration towards proper moral conduct. Therefore, as a rule, in their hadith studies they did not confine themselves to studying standard hadith books.
We have cited several books, outside the ‘Kutub al-Sittah’, studied by al-Nakhli. It is also clear from al-Kūrānî’s accounts that the six canonical hadith books constituted only a small portion of his hadith studies. Many lesser-known hadith books, such as the Musnad al-Dārīmī, Musnad al-Bāzır, Musnad al-Kisī and Musnad ‘Ālī al-Tamīmī al-Mawṣuli, in fact constituted a substantial portion of his hadith scholarship.30 There were indeed serious efforts on the part of our scholars to go beyond the traditional study of the ‘Kutub al-Sittah’.

Thus, these scholars did not view hadith studies in the traditional way that is, for the sake of the shari‘ah as such. Hadith studies were directed to achieving other, higher, pious purposes. Ahmad al-Nakhli, for example, believes that the hadith will lead to real intimacy with the Prophet, who was second only to God as the essence of faith.31 According to Ahmad al-Qushāshī, the Prophet was the most important figure for the tarīqah people, as he was the source of the shari‘ah after God himself.32 So attached were our scholars to the hadith that Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī asserts, ‘I have no doubt that it [hadith] will be everlasting on earth’.33

Our scholars were also aware of the fact that there were scholars who fabricated hadith in order to pursue their own ends in the name of the Prophet. For that reason, in their hadith studies, they preferred what these scholars called the ‘high isnāds’ or the superior isnāds (‘ulow al-isnād or al-isnād al-‘āli), namely, those consisting of scholars of renowned integrity. According to ‘Abd Allāh al-escort, a superior isnād for a scholar is much like a sharper sword for a fighter: it is a more effective tool. He gives another illustration: a scholar without the superior isnād is like a wood gatherer who comes in the night into a forest that has venomous snakes without light.34

Thus, a superior isnād is essential to scholars in the networks in order for them to be able to receive the true hadiths, not the fabricated ones. Al-Nakhli takes special note of those scholars who fabricated or adver- tently abused the hadiths by citing a tradition of the Prophet which states that whoever says something the Prophet does not say, then his seat in the hereafter will be of fire.35 In a different tone, al-Kūrānī appeals to his fellow sīfis to interpret the hadith only with sufficient knowledge and understanding of all teachings of Islam; to do otherwise would lead only to the elimination of funā˚ (‘annihilation’ or ‘passing away’ of physical consciousness), an important stage of the mystical journey.36

There is no doubt that the special emphasis placed by these scholars on hadith studies had considerable impact not only in linking the scholars together, as well as the various Islamic ‘little traditions’, but also in bringing changes in their view of Sufism, especially in its relation to the shari‘ah.
NEO-SUFISM AND THE SHARI’AH

The emphasis on the study of hadith or the way of the Prophet, the second source of Islamic law, led our scholars to a greater appreciation of the significance of the shari‘ah in Sufism. It is interesting to take Ahmad al-Qushâshî as an example in this respect. Al-Qushâshî was initiated by Ahmad al-Shinnâwî into the Shâfi‘iyyah order, often associated with Indian Sufism, which tended to transgress the rules of the shari‘ah—at least in the earlier growth of this order.

Ahmad al-Qushâshî played an important part in the reorientation of the Shâfi‘iyyah order by emphasising the importance of Islamic legal doctrines in the mystical way. In his opinion, both exoteric (legal/shari‘ah) and esoteric (mystical/haqiqah) aspects of Islam should be in harmony and not in conflict with each other. Citing the Mi‘nân [al-Kubrâ] of al-Sha‘rânî,37 he believes that there must be loyal adherence to the precepts of the shari‘ah on which the doctrine and practice of the haqiqah would be built. Therefore, all mystical aspirants must practise the whole doctrine of the shari‘ah before they can hope to gain God’s trust.38

Al-Qushâshî recognises certain differences between the two ‘ways’—indeed ‘way’ or ‘path’ is among the meanings of both shari‘ah and jari‘lah. He maintains that they originated from the same sources—namely, the Qur‘ân and the hadith. Basically, Muslims could attain certain stages of the haqiqah while ignoring doctrines of the shari‘ah laid down by the Qur‘ân and the hadith, but they could not ‘feel’ the real blessing of God. Therefore, the Sufi needs to travel the mystical path with the guidance of the shari‘ah. According to al-Hamawi, ‘When he [al-Qushâshî] speaks about the haqiqah, he always supports it with Qur‘ânic verses and the tradition of the Prophet’.39 Johns rightly concludes that, in contrast to a few other Sufis who devoted most of their exegetical skill to the Qur‘ân, al-Qushâshî always presented his views by citing both the Qur‘ân and the hadith.40

With a clear vision of the proper relation between the shari‘ah and Sufism, it is not surprising that al-Qushâshî was an ardent supporter of neo-Sufism. He holds that there would be no real maqâm nor ahwâl (stages of mystical progress) without having sufficient knowledge (‘ilm) and good deeds (‘amal) as taught by the Qur‘ân and the hadith. ‘Ilm alone is not enough; there simply would be no real mystical progress for those who did not fulfill the obligatory ‘ibâdah, such as prayers, fasting or alms, and other recommended actions.

Al-Qushâshî takes the Prophet Muhammad as the exemplary figure of the perfect man of Sufism. As a Sufi, the Prophet did not alienate himself from society; he not only asked people to enjoin good and prohibit evil but also intermingled with their brethren, and performed his ‘mundane’ duties. Al-Qushâshî, on the authority of the scholar and historian al-Sakhâwî, refutes the belief held in certain Sufi circles that the Prophet used to take from his companions what later became known among Sufis as ‘al-khîrqat
He simply could not accept the inclusion of the Prophet in specific jariqahs, which would have supported the often-heard claim that it was sanctioned by the Prophet himself.

Similarly, Ibrâhim al-Kûrâni emphasises the paramount importance of the shari‘ah without necessarily putting aside his attachment to Sufism. He argues that šấtîfis should not allow their views and actions to conflict with the shari‘ah and other religious duties. The ahl al-kashf, people of intuitive revelation, have their own understanding of the meanings of the Qur‘ân and the Prophetic hadîth. He reminds them, however, that each verse of the Qur‘ân or main (text) of the hadîth has not only esoteric (bấtîn) meanings—as understood by the ahl al-kashf—but also exoteric (zấhir) meanings. As a consequence, the šấtîfis must not put their understanding of the Qur‘ân in opposition to that of the ahl al-shari‘ah. He takes as an example the issue of fanâ’ (‘annihilation’) in the Qur‘ân (55: 25). He explains that, according to its exoteric meaning, fanâ’ is clearly not natural death (al-mawt al-ma’nawi), but esoterically it is a kind of ‘death’ (al-mawt al-tabi‘î).42

It is clear that for al-Kûrâni the reconciliation between the shari‘ah and Sufism is not to be taken lightly. In dealing with this matter, his argument is subtle and philosophical. This is not surprising because, as al-Hamawî tells us in detail, he was familiar with various kinds of intellectual discourses, ranging from Mu’tazilite and Ash’arite kalâm to Ibn ‘Arabi’s philosophical mysticism and the Greek philosophy of Plato and Aristotle.43 In this regard he was a scholar of distinctive stature in the networks. But it must be borne in mind that his tone was always conciliatory and all-embracing. Thus, in addition to emphasising total obedience to the shari‘ah, he makes appeals for the recognition of the kashf as a valid path to understanding the inner meaning of the Qur‘ân and the hadîth.

For common Muslims, the intricate realm of Islamic philosophical interpretation could lead them to confusion and even lead them astray. Many scholars in the networks realised this. They shared a sense of responsibility for preventing their fellows from being heretical through a misunderstanding of the mystical doctrines and practices of Islam. This concern is shown by some scholars in the networks not simply by issuing fatwâs but more importantly by devoting special works to the subject.

There are several outstanding examples of this. Prominent among them is Ibrâhim al-Kûrâni. He seems to have been very responsive to answering questions either directly or indirectly posed to him. At least nine out of his 49 works listed by al-Baghûdâdi were devoted to responding to a variety of difficult issues, ranging from the relation of Sufism to the shari‘ah and the question of whether man will be able to see God, to the issue of taqlid (blind imitation).44 His most important work of this type is Ithâf al-Dhâkî bi Sharh al-Tulûf fi al-Mursalah ilâ Râh al-Nabî, which has been cited several times earlier. Johns45 claims that it was al-Kûrâni’s most important single work.
Al-Kūrānī wrote the *Ithāf al-Dhakī* in response to Fadl Allāh al-Burhānāūrī’s *Tuhfat al-Mursalah ilā Rūḥ al-Nabī*. As Johns concludes, in this succinct work, complemented by its short commentary, *al-haqqāqi al-Mawṣūfah li al-Shari‘ah*, al-Burhānāūrī essentially attempts to restrain the extravagant type of Sufism by emphasising the essential elements of Islam, such as the absolute Being (*Wujūd*) of God and the importance of the shari‘ah. Apart from this, I would argue, the author’s basic concepts, such as the seven grades of being and his arguments to explain them, are absolutely philosophical. These in turn might or could obscure the real intention of the author, especially if the work was read by the *awwām* (common believers).

The *Tuhfat al-Mursalah* was written in 1000/1590, and in 1030/1619 or earlier it was already known in the Malay-Indonesian world. The effects of this book on Islam in the archipelago were recorded by al-Kūrānī and his disciple, al-Hamawi. The latter tells us that he first met and studied with al-Kūrānī in 1086/1675. The *Ithāf al-Dhakī* had obviously been completed before that year, for al-Hamawi read it together with other books, such as the *Sāhih al-Bukhārī* (and other ‘Kutub al-Sittah’), the *Jāmi‘ al-Saghīr* of al-Suyūṭī, the *Iḥyā‘ Ulūm al-Dīn* of al-Ghazālī and the *Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah* of Ibn ‘Arabī. In his account of Fadl Allāh al-Burhānāūrī, al-Hamawi relates that:

Our Shaykh al-Khātimat al-Muhāqqiqīn Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī told me, while we were reading the *Tuhfat al-Mursalah* with him, that some of our Jāwī companions (ba‘d aṣbāḥīnā al-Jāwīyīn) informed him that this treatise and matters it treats was popular and famous in their land and that it is read in their religious schools, and that youth study it as one of the minor treatises in their rudimentary studies.

Al-Kūrānī himself, in his introductory notes to the *Ithāf al-Dhakī*, provides further background to his writing of the commentary:

We have had reliable information from a group (jama‘ah) of the Jāwīyīn that there have spread among the population of the lands of Jāwāh some books on the *haqiqāt* [Divine Realities] and gnostic knowledge (*uṣūl al-asrār*) passed from hand to hand by those attributed with knowledge because of their study and the teaching of others, but who have no understanding of the *’ilm al-shari‘ah* of the Prophet [Muhammad], the Chosen, the Elect [by God], peace be upon him, nor the *’ilm al-haqqāqi* bestowed upon those who follow the path of God, the Exalted; those who are close to Him, those admirable ones, or those who have set their foot on any path of their paths founded on the *Kitāb* [Qur‘ān] and the Sunnah [Tradition] through perfect obedience both outwardly (*al-zāhir*) and inwardly (*al-hājin*), as is done by the devout and pure. This is the reason for the deviation of many of them [the Jāwīyīn] from the right path, for the rise of impure belief: in fact they have entered into the crooked camp of atheism (*al-zandaqah*) and heresy (*al-ilhād*).
It is mentioned [by the Jāwīyīn] to me that among the famous books was the compendium named al-Tuhfat al-Mursalah ilā [Rūḥ] al-Nabī, peace be upon him, written by the adept by God’s help, Shaykh Muhammad ibn Shaykh Fadl Allāh al-Burhānpūrī, may God the Almighty render him of service. More than one of them have repeatedly asked my poor self (al-faqrīr) to write a commentary on it to make clear of the questions [it discusses] to the principles of religion, confirmed by the Noble Book and the Sunnah of the Master of the apostles, peace be upon him.

While Drewes50 points out that al-Kūrānī wrote the work on the orders of al-Qushāshī, the accounts of both al-Kūrānī and al-Ḥamawī provide no evidence to substantiate his view. If it is true, the work must have been conceived before the death of al-Qushāshī in 1071/1660. Whether he wrote it after having been asked directly by his Jāwī students or whether it was recommended by al-Qushāshī, or both, what is important is that al-Kūrānī took the task very seriously. He made special prayers for guidance (iṣṭikhrāh) at the tomb of the Prophet in Medina, and he began the work only after he was sure that his prayers were answered and that it was appropriate for him to do the task51.

What follows in the Iḥyāʾ al-Dhikrī is a long presentation on the mystical interpretation of Islam based on the Qur’ān and the ḥadīth.

Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī seems not to have been satisfied with writing only a single work on the ‘al-Masā’il al-Jāwīyīyah’ (the questions of the Jāwī people). He wrote another work entitled al-Jawāḥī al-Ghārāwīyīyah ‘an al-Masā’il al-Jāwīyīyah al-Jāhriyīyah,52 in which he once again attempted to clear the matter up. It is unfortunate that we can find no trace of it; we hardly have any concept of it beyond what its title indicates.

The religious problems of the Jāwī evidently persisted for some time in al-Kūrānī’s circle. ‘Abd al-Shukūr al-Shāmī, very likely one of his students, wrote a work called Ziyādah min ‘lābārat al-Mutaqaddimīn min Ahl al-Jawī. This work, like the Tuhfat al-Mursalah, deals with the question of the Being and Unity of God.53 The name ‘Abd al-Shukūr occurs in one of al-Sīnākī’s silsilahs of the Shīʿa silsilah ʿarāqah. Al-Sīnākī, according to this silsilah, received the ʿarāqah from ‘Abd al-Shukūr, who took it from al-Kūrānī, who in turn received it from al-Qushāshī.54 Al-Kūrānī also wrote a work for ‘Abd al-Shukūr entitled Kashf al-Mastur fi Jawāb As‘ilah ‘Abd al-Shukur, which could indicate their close relationship55 (see chapter 4).

Despite controversy around the Tuhfat al-Mursalah, it was used as an important reference by virtually all major Malay-Indonesian scholars throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. From Shams al-Dīn al-Samatrānī (d. 1039/1630), al-Rāmīrī, al-Sīnākī56 and al-Maqqāsīrī57 to al-Palimbānī and Muhammad Nafis al-Banjārī, all referred to the Tuhfat al-Mursalah in their writings.

Another prominent scholar who wrote a work of this nature in order to meet the special religious needs of the Jāwī was Tāj al-Dīn b. Ahmad,
better known as Ibn Ya’qūb. He also devoted a special work to answering problems originating from the ‘Bilād al-Jāwāh’. The problem concerned the concept of the wahdāniyyah (Unity of God). The title of the work is al-Jādat al-Qawūmah ilā Taḥqīq Mas’ūlāt al-Wujūd wa Ta’alluq al-Qudrat al-Qadīmah fi al-Jawāb ‘an al-As’īlat al-Wāridah min [Bilād] Jāwāh. It is doubtful whether the work is available today, as I found no trace of this very important text on the intellectual relations between the Malay-Indonesian world and the Middle East. It seems probable that it was al-Sinkili, who asked Ibn al-Ya’qūb to write this work, as he was included among the scholars coming into contact with him in Mecca.

The fact that at least three works are devoted by leading Haramayn ‘ulamā‘ in the seventeenth century to what our sources call ‘al-Masā’il al-Jāwiyah’ indicates the nature of the relationships between the Jāwī students and scholars in Mecca and Medina. As we will see later, in the second half of the eighteenth century Sulaymān al-Kurdi, a leading Haramayn scholar who was also the teacher of a group of Malay-Indonesian students, wrote a work of the same nature, entitled al-Durrat al-Bahiyyah fi Jawāb al-As’īlat al-Jāwiyah. All of this indicates the existence of an intense intellectual discourse between Malay-Indonesian students and scholars in the centres of the Haramayn. It also shows us the concern among the Haramayn scholars about, and commitment to, intellectual reform among their fellow Muslims in the Malay-Indonesian world. They simply would not allow them to go astray because of any misunderstanding of the proper relationship between the shari‘ah and Sufism.

Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī was fully aware of this danger. He thus insists that those who aspire to follow the mystical path should prepare themselves for this journey by a correct understanding of the Qurʾān and the hadith and by total attachment both outwardly and inwardly to shari‘ah doctrines. To do otherwise, he believes, will only result in deviation from the right path and, worse still, to unbelief and heresy. Furthermore, as related by al-Hamawī, al-Kūrānī maintains that young students should initially be taught articles of faith, the exoteric meaning of the Qurʾān and the hadith, and the teachings and practices of the righteous predecessors (al-Aslāf al-Ṣāliḥin) before they are exposed to mystical doctrines by masters who are learned not only in Sufism but also in shari‘ah.

Ahmad al-Qushāshī’s daily practice also demonstrated his concern with common believers going astray because of their inability to comprehend the correct significance of the mystical way. Citing al-Kūrānī, al-Hamawī relates that al-Qushāshī usually would not allow his friends to read and discuss with him certain difficult and problematic passages of Ibn ‘Arabī’s al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah, except in a very restricted manner. He would discuss them only when uneducated people were not present, and then only in a special room with locked doors. Al-Qushāshī believed that great sūfis, such as al-Junayd, never discussed anything about the ḥaqāʾiq except with
select \( \text{(khawwās) } \) friends or disciples. He then goes on to cite some examples from the Prophet Muhammad, who never said anything that could lead to confusion among his companions, and who indeed made distinctions between the common believers (\( \text{al-āwwām} \)) and the select (\( \text{al-khawwās} \)).

**NEO-SUFISM AND ACTIVISM**

Another striking intellectual tendency characteristic of the networks is the emphasis on the use of reason and, by extension, on the exercise of individual judgment \( \text{(ijtihād)} \) in religious matters. There is no evidence, however, that they actually employed the familiar slogan ‘open the bāb al-ijtihād’ (‘the gate of individual judgment’), which has, since the early twentieth century, been declared by modern Muslim scholars.

Ahmad al-Qushāši is reported to have urged Muslims who possessed sufficient \( \text{'ilm} \) (knowledge) to understand both outward and inward meanings of the verses of the Qur’ān and the hadīth. He appealed to those who devoted themselves to religion \( \text{(faqāha fī al-Dīn)} \) to exercise \( \text{ijtihād} \). He takes Ibn ‘Arabī as an example of this. According to al-Qushāši, Ibn ‘Arabī made use of hadīth extensively in order to make his own \( \text{ijtihād} \). Although many traditionists opposed Ibn ‘Arabī’s judgment, al-Qushāši believes that he had brought all his learning together in his attempts to produce his own \( \text{ijtihād} \). Ibn ‘Arabī’s \( \text{ijtihād} \) essentially constituted a new interpretation of the mystical doctrine of Islam. Al-Qushāši then cites his own experience of having changed his \( \text{madhhab} \) from Mālikī to Shafi’i, after he exerted himself to produce his own \( \text{ijtihād} \). As for those who have little knowledge, al-Qushāši considers it better for them to take others’ \( \text{ijtihāds} \) and simply become \( \text{muqallids} \) (‘followers’).

Al-Qushāši places emphasis not only on the exercise of reason but also on activism. Time after time he urges Muslims to abandon their negligence and ignorance by searching for \( \text{'ilm} \), and by using their time to good purpose. He also insists that Muslims fully perform their worldly duties in order to support their lives by teaching, trading or farming. In his opinion, a real \( \text{sāfī} \) is not one who alienates himself from society but one who enjoys good and prohibits evil, and lends his helping hand to the oppressed, the sick and the poor. Furthermore, a real \( \text{sāfī} \) is one who can mutually cooperate \( \text{(ta‘āwuni)} \) with other Muslims for the betterment of society. These are some examples given of good deeds that should be done by those who aspire to be perfect men \( \text{(al-insān al-kāmil)} \) as ideally envisioned by Sufism.

In contrast to most \( \text{sāfīs} \), who would simply emphasise the total emotional commitment to God without the interference of reason, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, like Ahmad al-Qushāši, encourages Muslims to exercise their reason. Speaking in a more philosophical way, he promotes an intellectual understanding of God and His role as Creator and the relation of the Creator
to creation. In bringing up the issue of reason here, he evokes the classic heated discussion between the *mutakallimûn* (‘theologians’) and the *ahl al-hadîth* (‘traditionists’). It is beyond the scope of our discussion to dwell on the long analysis in his *Ittâf al-Dhaki* on such hotly debated topics as the Realities of God, the obscure meaning (*mutashâbîha*) of some verses of the Qur’ân and the nature of stages of mystical journeys.64 I do not feel, however, that by bringing back these issues he intends to reactivate controversies among scholars. Rather, as al-Hamawi tells us, all he wants to do is to promote mutual understanding among scholars by emphasising their points of agreement.65 After all, as al-Kûrânî reminds the Muslims, by citing al-Shâfi‘i, al-Ghazzâli and Ibn ‘Arabi, the power of reason is not without limit.66

It is worth noting, however, that not all scholars involved in the networks were ready to present long and complicated arguments to promote activism in their societies. An exception to this trend was Sulaymân al-Maghribi, who was indeed a ‘radical’ scholar. Although he was a *sâfî* himself, and founded the famous Ibn Sulaymân *ribât* in Mecca, he was opposed to the extravagant type of Sufism which permitted drum-beating and dancing in the *ribâts*, and to those *sâfs* who alienated themselves from mainstream society. In his opinion, this type of Sufism was not sanctioned by the Qur’ân and hadîth. Taking the law into his own hands, he expelled the *aṣhâb al-khalâwî* (secluded people) who had carried on those practices from those *ribâts* affiliated with the madrasahs of Qayt Bey and Shârâbiyyah in Mecca. In so doing, he made more room for resident students (*al-mujâwirûn*), who, he believed, better deserved them. Sulaymân al-Maghribi, who had endowed a number of madrasahs and ribâts in the Ḥaramayn, also challenged misappropriation of the *waqf* properties by the Sharifian family. These things brought him into open conflict with the Meccan Sharifs. After several failed attempts, they were finally able to expel him from Mecca in 1093/1682 with the reluctant help of the Ottoman authorities. A year later he died in Damascus.67

The reformism of the networks, as we have seen thus far, is clearly centred on the social, moral and intellectual reconstruction of Muslim society. Although we find little evidence to indicate that specific discussion occurred among scholars about the regression of Muslim society, they apparently realised that society needed to be revitalised. The most logical way to achieve that end, it seemed to them, was by engendering a more balanced comprehension of each of the aspects of Islam itself: emphasising all its teachings in a unified fashion, such as legal and mystical, intellectual and practical, and social and individual. Thus, none of our scholars rejected Sufism or dismissed the importance of the *shari‘ah*. Their stress is clearly reformist, purificationist and activist in tone. In short, they sought to bring about changes in their society by their own efforts rather than waiting for eschatological intervention. There is no evidence to suggest that there were any among the scholars who adhered to such ideas as millenarianism or Mahdism. In fact, they strongly rejected these views.
The best-known example of the rejection of millenarianism is the polemic concerning the claim among the Indian subcontinent scholars that ʿAbd al-Rasūl al-Barzanjī, devoted two works to the issue, entitled ʿAṣāb al-Hind li Istīṣaʿal Kufriyāt Ahmad al-Sirhindi, completed on 15 Rajab 1093/20 July 1682, and al-Nāshirat al-Nāṣirah li al-Fīrqa al-Fājiyraḥ, completed on 7 Muharram 1095/26 December 1683. Ḥasan al-ʿAjāmī wrote another work called al-ʿAṣāb al-Hind li Istīṣaʿal Kufriyāt Ahmad al-Sirhindi. It is reported that al-Kūrānī also wrote a treatise on the subject, but we cannot find any trace of it in various lists of his works. Meanwhile, al-Qushāshī is said to have written a treatise after he engaged in a long discussion with Adam Banūrī (d. 1053/1643), a leading follower of al-Sirhindi, who preached his master’s doctrine in the Ḥaramayn.

Al-Sirhindi claimed that his age was full of darkness. A thousand years after the death of the Prophet Muhammad, Islam had regressed; at the same time, infidelity and bidʿah (unwarranted innovations) held sway among the Muslims. He believed that he himself was a scholar of perfect knowledge, who was capable of fulfilling the task of the steadfast prophet to renew and revive Islam. Friedmann shows us that eschatological speculations are in the background of al-Sirhindi’s view of his times. His eschatology, however, does not anticipate the ultimate end of the world but rather the arrest of the process of decline at its nadir by means of tajdīd (renewal). By attributing the necessity of tajdīd to the period of 1000 years, he evidently adheres to the concept of millenarianism. The crux of the issue attacked by al-Barzanjī was the very concept of and belief in the second millennium. He poses the following rhetorical questions:

What is the meaning of the Renewer of the Second Millennium? Does a second millennium remain from the time allotted to this community so that he [al-Sirhindi] can be its renewer? Did the ‘ulamāʾ not agree unanimously and did al-hāfiz al-Suyūṭī not say in his epistle (called) al-Kashf [an Muğāwazah Hādhiḥu al-Unmārah al-ʿAṣīf] that not even five hundred years will elapse after the Millennium and that the Day of resurrection will take place four hundred old years after it.

Unlike the concept and belief in the centennial renewal of Islam widely accepted by Muslim scholars, al-Sirhindi’s views on the millennial renewal imply the abolition of Muhammad’s prophecy and of his law. This becomes clearer when he asserts that the Kaʾbah is superior to the Prophet; that the Prophet reached perfection only 1000 years after his death, the time when the haqqat-i muḥammadī was changing to haqqat-i ahmadī; and that he had a direct relationship with God without Muhammad’s prophetic medi-
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atation. With regard to these teachings, al-Barzanji, after mentioning al-Kūrānī, who discussed these issues in the light of the Qur’ān and the hadith, concludes that al-Sirhindī was an infidel. It is not very clear whether al-Kūrānī, who was known for his conciliatory nature, really shares al-Barzanji’s conclusion. Al-Qushāshī, however, supports al-Barzanji when he points out that it was infidelity to state that the reality of the Ka’bah was superior to the reality of the Prophet Muhammad.

NEO-SUFISM AND ORGANISATION OF THE TARĪQAH

What was the impact of all the above doctrinal changes in Sufism on the organisational aspect of the tarīqahs? In attempting to assess the organisation of the tarīqahs, we will take a comparative perspective. The most striking feature of the tarīqahs in the period under discussion is that they appear to have been loosely organised; there were no clear cut boundaries between the numerous tarīqahs in either their doctrines and practices (ritual and ceremonies) or their ‘membership’. Sufi shaykhs and murids (disciples) did not necessarily owe their loyalty to a single tarīqah; they could become masters and disciples of a number of tarīqahs. Furthermore, they could be affiliated not only with certain tarīqahs originating from or mostly developing in one particular area of the Muslim world but also with those coming from other regions. This fact undoubtedly explains further the cosmopolitanism of our scholars in the networks.

Ahmad al-Qushāshī is a good example to support this observation. As he tells us, he was affiliated with almost a dozen tarīqahs: the Shaṭṭāriyyah, Chishtiyyah, Firdawsīyyah, Kubrawiyyah all of which he received from Ahmad al-Shinnāwī or directly from Ṣibghat Allāh. He also took the Suhrawardiyyah order from Ṣibghat Allāh, and from al-Shinnāwī by way of a silsilah which included al-Sha’rānī. As for the Qādiriyyah tarīqah, he took it from his father, and al-Shinnāwī and Ṣibghat Allāh. He was also affiliated with the orders of Tayfūriyyah, Awwāsiyyah, Khalwatiyyah and Naqshbandiyah, all of which he received from al-Shinnāwī and Ṣibghat Allāh. Then he took the Bātinīyyah order through a silsilah which went back to Hasan al-Basri. Finally he received the Shādhiliyyah order and tarīqah of Ibn ‘Arabi from al-Shinnāwī by a silsilah which included al-Sha’rānī.

Al-Qushāshī’s isnāds of these orders tell us how the Indian and North African traditions of Sufism had their meeting points initially in al-Shinnāwī and later in al-Qushāshī. They also indicate how Ibn ‘Arabi’s mystical tradition passed through generations down to the scholars in the networks. Similarly, al-Nakhšī received several ṣūfī orders from various traditions. He took the Naqshbandiyah order from Tāj al-Hindī and Mīr Kīlān, the Qādiriyyah order from Nī’mat Allāh al-Qādirī, the Shādhiliyyah order from ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Bābīlī, and the Khalwatiyyah order from Muhammad ‘Isā b. Kinān al-Hanbali.
Although affiliation with numerous tariqahs was widely practised, once a disciple declared his allegiance (bay’ah) to a certain Shaykh he was required to obey his orders. As al-Qushāshi maintains, allegiance to the shaykh would lead him to the real meaning of the mystical way. However, al-Qushāshi appears to have opposed the teachings of most tariqahs in earlier periods, which required disciples to behave vis-à-vis their masters as ‘a dead body in the hands of its washer’. He asked disciples to leave their masters and their tariqahs if they transgressed Islamic legal doctrines as laid down by the Qur’an and the hadith. This is because al-Qushāshi believes that the essence of joining the tariqah is entering the tariqah.

Thus, the rules of the shari‘ah become the norms for disciples wishing to be initiated into the tariqahs. Among the most important requirements for the acceptance of disciples is maturity (bulūgh), which makes them accountable for practising all the pillars of Islam; in short, a total obedience to the shari‘ah both outwardly and inwardly. With such stringent requirements, the membership of the tariqah becomes quite restricted. These restrictions go even further in the adoption of such divisions among disciples as ‘awwām (lay) and khawwās (elite). Both al-Qushāshi and al-Kūrānī believed that only the khawwās disciples could be taught the real substance of the mystical ways. Exposing all secrets of the tariqah doctrines to the ‘awwām would result only in religio-intellectual confusion and heresy. All these restrictions make it clear that the tariqah organisation was intended more as a vehicle for intensifying religious beliefs and devotional practices than for recruiting mass followings.

Although membership in the tariqahs was quite restricted, disciples in the Haramayn were far from homogeneous. In contrast to, for instance, the disciples of Muhammad al-Shinnāwī—a master of al-Sha’rānī—who were mostly fellahs, the Haramayn sūfīs and disciples were heterogeneous in many respects. The Haramayn sūfīs geographically came from various parts of the Muslim world; religiously they adhered to different madhhab; and socially they occupied various positions in society, from teachers and traders to rulers. The heterogeneity in the membership of the tariqahs in the Haramayn undoubtedly comes from the existence of cosmopolitanism in the area. Partly also because of their cosmopolitanism, the succession in the Haramayn tariqahs is ascriptive rather than descriptive. There was a tendency among certain orders in Egypt in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries to make the post of sūfī shaykh a hereditary position. However, the Haramayn sūfī shaykhs, as a rule, designated their best disciples to lead their tariqahs. We have numerous examples of this. Ahmad al-Shinnāwī designated al-Qushāshi his successor in several tariqahs. The latter, in turn, appointed al-Kūrānī to succeed him as the Shaṭṭāriyyah shaykh. Al-Qushāshi also appointed al-Sinkī as his Shatṭāriyyah khalīfah for one of its branches in the Malay-Indonesian world. It is not very clear whether this pattern of succession in the Haramayn tariqahs was in one way or
another influenced by al-Sha’râni’s opposition to the principle of automatic hereditary succession among his fellow Egyptian şâﬁ şaykhs.86 Furthermore, the Haramayn şâﬁ şaykhs appear to have been free from the image of ‘holy men’ that we often find in the accounts of earlier tariqahs.87 The image of the wandering dervish is almost entirely absent in the accounts of the Haramayn şâﬁs. This is related to the special emphasis put by scholars involved in the networks on the importance of the shari’ah in the tariqah practices and of following the example of the Prophet Muhammad. They generally believe that the real şâﬁ is not the one who distinguishes himself from the rest of society by wearing distinctive clothes.

In this respect, according to al-Qushâshî, the real şâﬁ is the one who dresses well in accordance with the rules of the shari’ah. The clothes a şâﬁ wears should be clean, for cleanliness reflects the purity of the soul.88 As for al-Kûrâni, al-Qânnûjî vividly narrates that despite his reputation as a great scholar and şâﬁ, he wore only the clothes of ordinary people, disregarding the style of dress of certain ‘ulamâ’ who lengthened their sleeves and enlarged their turbans in order to command people’s respect, or of some şâﬁs who wore dervish clothes to raise their aura of sanctity.89

Another important organisational aspect of the tariqahs concerns their centre of activities. If most tariqahs in other parts of the Muslim world carried out their activities mainly in the ribâts, khânjâhs or zawiyyahs, the Haramayn şâﬁs were centred in the Holy Mosques, teachers’ houses and ribâts. However, the Haram Mosque in Mecca and the Nabawî Mosque were the most important centres of devotional and learning activities. Most of our şâﬁ scholars studied and later taught as well as practised their Sufistic rituals there. The accounts of Aḥmad al-Nakhli, cited earlier, demonstrate this.

Furthermore, those scholars who had settled in the Haramayn had their own houses, which sometimes also had large libraries.90 Thus, the şâﬁ şaykhs, in most cases, did not live in the ribâts but in their own houses, where they also held learning sessions.91 This significantly reduced the tendency among the şâﬁ şaykhs to style themselves in a more dervish fashion if they lived in the ribâts. The ribâts were, of course, also important centres of learning and devotional activities for the Haramayn şâﬁs. But they were occupied mainly by disciples, who stayed there temporarily until they returned to their homelands or travelled elsewhere. These ribâts were usually led by an appointed head who was an administrator rather than a şâﬁ şaykh.92

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

It is important to keep in mind that with the emergence of neo-Sufism the old paradigm of Sufism did not completely disappear. Extravagant Sufism was still practised by some people in Mecca, as we have seen in the
experience of Sulaymān al-Maghribī. In spite of this, there is no evidence that our scholars attempted to remove all aspects of the earlier tradition of the ḥarīṣah. Therefore, it is appropriate to describe this phenomenon as one of continuity and change. While the scholars in the networks substantially reduced the extravagant and ecstatic features of earlier Sufism and emphasised loyal adherence to the shari‘ah, at the same time they maintained their doctrinal links with, for instance, Ibn ‘Arabī. However, in maintaining their connection with Ibn ‘Arabī they tended to disengage themselves from some points of his controversial doctrines.

Johns has pointed out that Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī was one of the last great exponents of the school of Ibn ‘Arabī, so far as his philosophical and theological ideas are concerned. But we should be careful not to conclude that his thought was dominated by Ibn ‘Arabī’s teachings. It is true that, in his Ikhāf al-Dhākī, he often cites Ibn ‘Arabī, but at the same time he puts forward his own arguments by citing al-Ghazālī, al-Qushayrī and even Ibn Taymiyyah. Furthermore, he studied not only Ibn ‘Arabī’s philosophical doctrines but also his legal teachings. As he tells us, he learned this often neglected aspect of Ibn ‘Arabī’s teachings not from a sūfī but from a prominent Meccan scholar, Zayn al-‘Abīdīn al-Ṭabarī, who was known as a muḥaddith.

The same is true of Aḥmad al-Nakhli. In the same vein he expresses a great appreciation of al-Ghazālī and Ibn ‘Arabī. He tells us that he studied al-Ghazālī’s ʿIyā‘ ʿUlām al-Dīn with Sayyid Aḥmad al-Ḥusnī al-Maghribī al-Mālikī, better known as al-Mahjūb, who later issued him an ijāzah to teach al-Ghazālī’s teachings. But from the same teacher he studied the rules of fasting in a chapter of Ibn ‘Arabī’s al-Futūḥat al-Makkiyyah. In another passage he relates that he studied the ʿIyā‘ ʿUlām al-Dīn with al-Kūrānī, who told him that this book was very popular in his homeland, Kurdistan. Interestingly enough, al-Nakhli also learned the ʿIyā‘ ʿUlām al-Dīn from al-Qushshāʿī, who studied it with Aḥmad al-Shinnāwī, who received it by way of an isnād which included al-Shaʿrānī, Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī and Ibn ‘Arabī.

With this evidence it is clear that there was a conscious effort among scholars in the networks to reconcile different streams of thought that had often been seen as in conflict with each other by scholars before them. There seems to have been no bias against scholars who had been the subject of controversies, such as al-Ghazālī or Ibn ‘Arabī. On the contrary, scholars in the networks studied them in order to understand their teachings and later attempted to reconcile them. An example of this had been set earlier by the neo-sūfī al-Shaʿrānī, who sought to reconcile doctrines of the speculative theologians (ahl al-fikr) and the mystics (ahl al-kashf) by taking care not to associate himself entirely with Ibn ‘Arabī, despite his admiration for him, and linking himself to famous fiqahā‘ and muḥaddithīn.

Although such a scholar in the networks as Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī was by nature a conciliator, who preferred to reconcile two opposing points of
view rather than choose one or the other of them, he was bitterly criticised by a number of scholars, such as the Algerian Ibn al-Tayyib and Yahyā al-Shāwī. Ibn al-Tayyib writes a short biography of al-Kūrānī in the *Nashr al-Mathānī*. In this work, Ibn al-Tayyib recognises al-Kūrānī’s high reputation. Despite this, he attacks him on various issues: that he was in favour of the Qadariyya interpretation of the ability of created power to be responsible for the acts of human beings; that he leaned to the Mu’tazilite point of view by writing a treatise on the material character of non-being; that he accepted the historicity of the report that the Prophet Muhammad had uttered the so-called ‘Satanic verses’, allegedly interpolated into the Qur’ān (53:21); and that he wrote a treatise on the faith of Pharaoh according to Ibn ‘Arabī’s philosophical framework. Meanwhile al-Shāwī (fl. 1096/1685), in his work entitled *al-Nabl al-Raqiq fi Hulqūm al-Sabb al-Zindiq*, goes even further by accusing al-Kūrānī of atheism and demanding his death. Al-Shāwī’s accusation, in turn, was answered by al-Barzanjī, in his work *al-‘Iqāb al-Hāwi ‘alā al-Tha’lab al-‘Āwī wa al-Nushshāb al-Kawī li al-Ashâ al-Ghawī wa al-Shīhāb al-Shawī li al-A‘hwāl al-Shawī*.

The fact that Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī was attacked on such a wide range of issues is, as Johns points out, an index of his learning. He had sufficient status in various Islamic disciplines to provoke disagreements. He was a master of various disciplines of Islam, and on the basis of his learning made his own *iḥtīāds*. Eclectic and original, he was the kind of scholar about whom others must have divided views and who thus exercises a creative role among his contemporaries. To sum up, these attacks on al-Kūrānī indicate the dynamics of intellectual discourse in the networks, which continued to gain momentum in the succeeding periods.
Seventeenth Century Malay-Indonesian Networks I: Nūr al-Dīn al-Rānīrī

Two of the three major chains of networks in the Malay-Indonesian world, those stemming from al-Rānīrī and al-Sinkīlī, flourished in the Sultanate of Aceh, while the originator of the other, al-Maqassārī, was born in Sulawesi (Celebes) and established his career in Banten, West Java. In this chapter we will deal with al-Rānīrī (d. 1068/1658), discussing particularly his role in transmitting the reformism of the networks to this part of the Muslim world.

The importance of Aceh or North Sumatra as a whole in the early history of Islam in the region is unquestionable. However, in order to understand the proper socio-historical context of al-Rānīrī’s reforms specifically, it is appropriate to give a brief account of the dominant Muslim intellectual discourse in Aceh prior to al-Rānīrī’s time. This in turn leads us to two major scholars, Ḥamzah al-Fansūrī and Shams al-Dīn al-Samatrānī, who played a crucial role in shaping the religious thought and practice of the Malay-Indonesian Muslims in the first half of the seventeenth century.

Despite their prominence, many things about the life of Ḥamzah and Shams al-Dīn are still obscure. There is still disagreement on the birthplace of Ḥamzah al-Fansūrī as well as his life span, as his dates of birth and death are unknown. However, there is evidence that he lived and flourished in the period preceding and during the reign of Sultān ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Ri’āyat Shāh (r. 997–1011/1589–1602); it has been suggested that he died before 1016/1607. Apart from this it is clear that Ḥamzah was a Malay of Fansūrī, an old centre of Islamic learning in southwest Aceh.

Ḥamzah was obviously a great scholar. He is reported to have travelled to the Middle East, visiting some important centres of Islamic learning, including Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem and Baghdad, where he was initiated into the Qādiriyah ṭarīqah. He also travelled to Pahang, Kedah and Java, where he preached his teachings. Ḥamzah mastered Arabic, Persian and possibly also Urdu. He was a prolific writer, producing not only religious
treatises but also prose works laden with mystical ideas. In view of his works, he is regarded both as one of the most important early Malay-Indonesian šāfs and a prominent precursor of the Malay literary tradition.

The nature of Ḥamzah al-Fanṣūrī’s relationship with Shams al-Dīn (d. 1040/1630) is not very clear either. Most scholars are of the opinion that they were friends. This may imply a sort of teacher–disciple relationship, as suggested by Hasjmi and Abdullah; both assert that Shams al-Dīn was a disciple of Ḥamzah. Whatever the case, Shams al-Dīn and Ḥamzah certainly met. Sir James Lancaster, the British special envoy to Aceh in 1011/1602, tells us that he negotiated a treaty of peace and friendship between England and Aceh with two notables appointed by Sulṭān ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Ri’āyat Shāh to discuss this matter on his behalf:

The one of these noblemen was the chiefe bishope of the realme, a man of great estimation with the King and all the people; and so he well deserved, for he was a man very wise and temperate. The other was one of the most ancient nobilitie, a man of very good gravitie but not so fit to enter into these conferences as the bishop was. And all the Conferences passed in the Arabicke tongue, which both the bishop and the other nobleman well understood.

Schrieke and Hasjmi maintain that the ‘chiefe bishope’ was Ḥamzah al-Fanṣūrī, as he, by that time, had gained prominence. Van Nieuwenhuijze and Iskandar, on the other hand, are of the opinion that the ‘chiefe bishope’ was Shams al-Dīn. The first opinion seems to be more plausible, as Shams al-Dīn during this time was in the middle of his career; it was only under the next Sulṭān, namely Iskandar Muda (r. 1015–1046/1607–1636), that he became ‘chiefe bishope’. Like Ḥamzah, Shams al-Dīn was a prolific writer and a master of several languages. He wrote in both Malay and Arabic, and most of his works deal with kalām and Sufism. But, unlike Ḥamzah, he never wrote any mystical poetry.

Ḥamzah and Shams al-Dīn have been categorised as belonging to the same stream of religious thought. We are not going to describe in detail their thoughts, but the two were the leading proponents of the wahdat al-wujūd philosophical interpretation of Sufism. Both were deeply influenced in particular by Ibn ‘Arabī and al-Jilī, and strictly followed their elaborate system of wujūdiyyah. For instance, they explain the universe in terms of a series of neo-Platonic emanations and consider each of the emanations an aspect of God himself. These are the very concepts that led their opponents, prominent among them al-Rāʾīṣī, to accuse them of being pantheists and, therefore, of having gone astray.

So far as this accusation is concerned, scholars are divided into two groups. Winstedt, Johns, Van Nieuwenhuijze and Baried maintain that the teachings and doctrine of Ḥamzah and Shams al-Dīn are ‘heretical’ or ‘heterodox’. Therefore, they were ‘heretics’ or ‘heterodox’ mystics as opposed to the ‘orthodox’ šāfs such as al-Rāʾīṣī and al-Sīnkīlī. On the other
hand, al-Attas maintains that the teachings of Ḥamzah, Shams al-Din and al-Rānīrī are essentially the same; one cannot categorise the first two as heretics. Al-Attas, in turn, accuses al-Rānīrī of distorting the thought of Ḥamzah al-Fanṣūrī and Shams al-Din and of conducting a ‘smear campaign’ against them. Al-Attas, however, seems to change his assessment of al-Rānīrī in his later book, in which he praises al-Rānīrī as ‘a man gifted with wisdom and adorned with authentic knowledge’, who succeeded in making clear the false doctrines of wujūdiyyah scholars, whom he calls the ‘pseudo-ṣāfīs’.

In any case, the period before the coming of al-Rānīrī in 1047/1637 was the time during which mystical Islam, particularly that of the wujūdiyyah, held sway not only in Aceh but in many parts of the archipelago. Although there were attempts to apply the precepts of the shari‘ah, the mystical doctrine and practices, the salient feature of Malay-Indonesian Islam from the earliest period, continued to enjoy supremacy. Ḥamzah and Shams al-Din’s writings give further impetus to this tendency. With their position as Shaykh al-Islām of the Acehnese Sultanate, they were able to exercise considerable influence. All the sources, local and foreign, are in agreement that the two scholars dominated the religious and intellectual life of the Malay-Indonesian Muslims before the rise of al-Rānīrī.

AL-RĀNĪRĪ’S BIOGRAPHY AND NETWORKS

A good number of studies have been devoted to al-Rānīrī. However, they mostly deal with his thought; very little attention is paid to the wider context of his scholarly milieu and to his role in Islamic discourse in the Malay-Indonesian world. There is no single study devoted to assessing the religious changes he brought about in the Malay-Indonesian world. Therefore, al-Rānīrī is mostly considered a ṣāfī rather than a renewer (mujaddid). In fact, he was obviously one of the most important early mujaddidīs in the archipelago.

Nūr al-Din Muhammad b. ‘Ali b. Hasanji al-Ḥamid (or al-Humayd) al-Shāfī‘ī al-Aslāḥī al-Yarūsī al-Rānīrī was born in Rānīrī (modern Randir), an old harbour on the Gujarat coast. Despite his birthplace, al-Rānīrī is generally regarded as a Malay-Indonesian ‘ālim rather than Indian or Arab one. His birth date is unknown, but it was probably towards the end of the sixteenth century. It has been suggested that his mother was a Malay, but his father was of Ḥadrami immigrants with a long tradition of migrating to South and Southeast Asia. Most of these South Arabian people settled in the harbour towns on the coast of the Indian Ocean and of the Malay-Indonesian archipelago. His ancestors probably belonged to the al-Ḥamid family of the Zuhra, one of the 10 clans of the Quraysh. Among the prominent members of the Zuhra clan was ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Awf, a close companion of the Prophet. But it is also possible that al-Rānīrī’s ancestors were of the Ḥumayd family, often associated with Abū Bakr ‘Abd
Allāh b. Zuhayr al-Asadi al-Humaydi (d. 219/834), known as one of the prominent native scholars of Mecca. Al-Humaydi was among the most famous disciples of al-Shāfi‘ī. He was also the Mufti of Mecca and a leading traditionist (muḥaddith) in the Ḥijār.26

In the first half of the sixteenth century, Rānīr was an important and busy harbour that attracted Arabs, Persians, Turks and Malays to trade or settle there. In 1040/1530, the Portuguese attacked and colonised it. As a result, Rānīr experienced a severe blow and was replaced in eminence by Surat. Although Rānīr has since that time been under Portuguese rule, most immigrants appear to have continued to live there. However, they maintained their contacts with Ḥaramayn, Yemen and the Malay-Indonesian world. Scholars, in fact, travelled back and forth to these places, contributing significantly to the maintenance of close contacts and relations among these Muslim societies. Furthermore, the Ḥadramīs generally sent their children and youth to their ancestral home and to the Haramayn to pursue their religious studies. When they completed their studies, most of them returned to their birthplaces or travelled elsewhere in the Muslim world.

This pattern of life among Ḥadrami immigrants can be observed clearly in the experience of al-Rānīr’s own uncle. In his Bustān al-Salāṭin fi Dhikr al-Awwalin wa al-Ākhirin,23 he tells us that his paternal uncle, Muhammad Jilānī b. Hasan Muhammad al-Ḥumaydi, came from Gujarat to Aceh between 988/1580 and 991/1583, where he taught fiqh, usūl al-fiqh, ethics and logic (mantiq) and rhetoric. However, people were more interested in studying mysticism (taṣawwuf) and theology (kalām). As al-Rānīr further relates, his uncle was no expert in mysticism and was therefore not prepared to meet the people’s demand to learn about it. Muhammad Jilānī then decided to cancel his teaching, and went to Mecca instead to pursue more advanced studies in mysticism and other related subjects. Having mastered these, he returned to Aceh during the reign of Sultān ‘Ala’ al-Dīn Rī’āyat Shāh (r. 997–1011/1589–1602) to teach people in the subjects they wanted to study. It appears that he succeeded to some extent in unraveling the intricacies of mysticism and kalām, especially of the nature of the archetypes (al-dī’ān al-thābitah).

The account shows us how a Ḥadrami teacher from Gujarat played an important role in the development of Islam in Aceh. The events surrounding him indicate intense contacts and relations among Muslim scholars and communities in various parts of the Muslim world. As al-Rānīr relates, the interest of the Acehnese Muslims in mysticism was generated by a deadlock in public discussion and debates between two scholars, coming from Mecca to Aceh in 947/1540, on mystical and philosophical matters, in particular concerning the permanent archetypes.
the fixed essences, or the permanent archetypes. It seems that in addition to teaching fiqh, Ibn Ḥajar discusses matters contained in his book that were very difficult for the common people to grasp. The other scholar was Muhammad al-Yamani, an expert in fiqh and usul al-fiqh as well as in ṭalām al-hadīth and sciences related to the Qurān. Both scholars were later involved in a heated discussion on these topics, but neither gained the upper hand by satisfactorily explaining these complicated matters, leaving the audience in confusion and with an abiding intellectual curiosity. To make the situation even worse, both Shaykhs left Aceh. And people had to wait for the coming of Al-Rānīrī’s uncle to attempt a conclusion.

Al-Rānīrī followed in the footsteps of his uncle and many other Ḥadrami scholars. He acquired his early education in Rānīr, and later continued his study in the Ḥadramawt region. We have no information on the time he spent there, or on the teachers with whom he studied. It is not very clear either whether or not he returned to his home town when he left Ḥadramawt. But, most probably, he went directly to the Ḥaramayn, as, according to al-Ḥasani, he was in Mecca and Medina in 1030/1620 or 1031/1621, when he performed the ḥajj pilgrimage.39 And it is very likely that he also came into contact with the Jāwī students and pilgrims there before returning to Gujarat.40

Al-Rānīrī’s most prominent teacher in India was Abū Ḥafs ‘Umar b. ‘Abd Allāh Bā Shaybān al-Tarīmī al-Ḥadramī (d. 1066/1656), who was also known in the Gujarat region as Sayyīd ‘Umar al-Aydarūs.35 There is no information on his dates of birth or death, but he was born in the Gujarat region. Bā Shaybān was, like al-Rānīrī, of Ḥadrami origin, more precisely of the Aydarūsiyyah of Tarīm, one of the most important centres of Islamic learning in South Arabia. According to al-Rānīrī, it was Bā Shaybān who initiated him into the Rifā‘iyyah order, an old Arab tarīqah.31 He appointed al-Rānīrī his khalīfah of the tarīqah and was therefore responsible for spreading it in the Malay-Indonesian world.33 But the Rifā‘iyyah was not the only order al-Rānīrī was affiliated with. He also had chains of initiation of the Aydarūsiyyah44 and Qādirīyyah orders.

Bā Shaybān first studied in his land of birth but later travelled to Tarīm, where he studied with such well-known ṭulāmā’ as ‘Abd Allāh b. Shaykh al-Aydarūs (d. 1073/1662), a disciple of Aḥmad al-Qushāshī, and ‘Abd al-Azīz al-Zamzamī, and his son, Zayn al-‘Ābidin; Qādī ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Shīhāb al-Dīn al-Saqqāf (945–1014/1538–1605);46 Abū Bakr b. Shīhāb (d. 1061/1651);47 and his two brothers, Muḥammad al-Ḥāḍī and Aḥmad Shīhāb al-Dīn. After several years in Tarīm, Bā Shaybān continued his studies in Mecca and Medina for four years, studying with and taking tarīqahs from many Ḥaramayn ṭulāmā’. Prominent among these were Sayyīd ‘Umar b. ‘Abd Allāh al-Rahīm al-Basrī (d. 1037/1638), Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm b. ‘Alā‘ (d. 1033/1624)49 and ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Khaṭīb al-Sharbañyī (d. 1014/1605).40 All these scholars and their connections, as their biographies inform us, were involved in the networks in the
seventeenth century and, through others in addition to Bā Shaybān, also had connections with the archipelago.


The importance of mentioning these major scholars of the Aydarūsīyyah order family is to put al-Rānīrī and his renewal in the proper context, for it is certain that the ‘Ayarūsīyyah order played an important role in channelling religious ideas from the Middle East to India and further to the Malay-Indonesian world. Al-Muhībī, for instance, lists no fewer than 30 prominent scholars of the ‘Ayarūsīyyah order family, who were centred in Tarīm. Many of them travelled back and forth from Tarīm to the Ḥārāmayn to India and the archipelago throughout the tenth-eleventh/sixteenth-seventeenth centuries. Bā Shaybān was one of the crucial links, connecting various traditions of Islamic learning. By way of his main disciples, like al-Rānīrī and al-Maqqāṣārī, he transmitted religious ideas from Tarīm and the Ḥārāmayn to India and the Malay-Indonesian world (see Chart 3). Bā Shaybān lived mainly in Bilgram, one of the leading centres of Islamic learning and Sufism in India. There he enjoyed the patronage of Sūltān ʿĀdil Shāh (r. 1037–68/1626–1656) of the Bahmānī Sultanate. Later he moved to Burhānpūr, where he produced several books, but he died in Bilgram.

Having studied Islamic sciences and been appointed as a khalīfah of both the ‘Ayarūsīyyah order and Rifāʿīyyah orders, the time had come for al-Rānīrī to begin his career. Some of his works indicate that he was well acquainted...
with the Malay world even before coming to the archipelago. It appears that he acquired information on it from his involvement in the community in Mecca. But there is little doubt that his uncle, Muḥammad Jālānī, who used to travel back and forth to Aceh, provided him with much information on Malay cultural and religious tradition.

Al-Rānīrī was certainly the most prominent predecessor of the ‘Ayyarṣiyyah scholars in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago. We have mentioned that ’Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muṣṭafā al-‘Ayyarṣūs (d. 1194/1780 in Egypt), a teacher of Muḥammad al-Zahīdī, also travelled to the Malay-Indonesian world. But unlike al-Rānīrī, who left a substantial impact on the archipelago, Muṣṭafā al-‘Ayyarṣūs apparently only passed through it in his travels to many parts of the Muslim world. However, it is not impossible that he came into contact and established networks with Ḥusayn b. Abū Bakr al-‘Ayyarṣūs (d. in 1213/1798 in Batavia, now Jakarta), another leading scholar and sāfi of the ‘Ayyarṣūs family in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago.48

There is no information as to when al-Rānīrī travelled for the first time to, and lived in, the Malay world. But it is likely that, during the period between his completion of the pilgrimage in 1029/1621 and 1047/1637, he lived for some time in the archipelago, probably in Aceh or Pahang in the Malay Peninsula or both. His sudden rise to the office of Shaykh al-Islām of the Sultanate of Aceh in 1047/1637 indicates that he had been known

---

Chart 3: Al-Rānīrī’s networks

---
before among the Malay rulers or circles, especially those of the Pahang Sultanate. The son of Sultan Ahmad of Pahang was seven years of age when he was taken to Aceh by Sultan Iskandar Muda, who later married him to his daughter and treated him as his own son;\(^\text{59}\) he was later known as Iskandar Thâni. Thus, when he succeeded his father-in-law to the throne of the Acehnese Sultanate, al-Rânírî was not new to the Sultan circle. It is hard to believe that al-Rânírî could win the patronage of the Sultan and the office of Shaykh al-Islâm as soon as he arrived in Aceh without having been in close contact beforehand.

If al-Rânírî had already been in the archipelago before 1047/1637, why then did he not establish himself in Aceh? To answer this question one should consider the political and religious situation in Aceh during the reign of Sultan Iskandar Muda (r. 1015–1046/1607–1636). In this period it was Shams al-Dîn al-Samatrâni who occupied the office of Shaykh al-Islâm. Under the patronage of Iskandar Muda, the doctrines of wujûdiyyah preached by Hamzah al-Fansûrî and Shams al-Dîn enjoyed their heyday. Therefore, the time was not yet ripe for al-Rânírî to challenge the established political and religious order; he had to wait until the situation became more favourable to him.

When Shams al-Dîn and Iskandar Muda successively died, al-Rânírî came to Aceh, precisely on 6 Muharram 1047/31 May 1637.\(^\text{50}\) He was soon appointed Shaykh al-Islâm, one of the highest posts in the Sultanate below the Sultan himself, becoming perhaps even more influential than the other two highest officials, the Qâdî Malik al-‘Âdîl and the Orang Kaya Maharaja Srimaharaja. The Dutch trade representatives to Aceh called him ‘the Moorish Bishop’.\(^\text{51}\) He was, of course, responsible for religious matters, but Dutch records make it clear that he also played an important role in economic and political affairs. So when the Gujarat traders once again tried to dominate trade in Aceh, the Dutch fiercely protested, but to no avail. It is only through al-Rânírî’s goodwill and mediation that Sultanânah Şâfiyyât al-Dîn (1051–86/1641–75), the widow of Iskandar Thâni, withdrew policies favourable to the Gujarat traders and detrimental to the Dutch.\(^\text{52}\)

Gaining a firm foothold in the court of the Acehnese Sultan, al-Rânírî began to launch Islamic renewal in Aceh. In his view, Islam in this region had been corrupted by misunderstanding of the šâﬁ doctrine. Al-Rânírî lived for seven years in Aceh as an ‘âlim, mufti and prolific writer, spending much of his energy in refuting the doctrines of wujûdiyyah. He even went so far as to issue a fatwâ, which led to a kind of heresy-hunting: killing those who refused to dismantle their beliefs and practices, and reducing to ashes all of their books. He succeeded in retaining the favour of the court until 1054/1644, when he abruptly left Aceh for his town of birth, Rânír. This is recorded by one of his disciples in the colophon of al-Rânírî’s work, Jawâhir al-‘Ulûm fi Kashf al-Ma’lûm;\(^\text{53}\)
And when he has thus far completed this work it came about by [God’s] decree that he was prevented [from completing it altogether], whereat he set out for his native town of /G52/G8C/G6E/GA5/G72/.

This short passage provides no clear explanation as to why /G61/G6C/G2D/G52/G8C/G6E/GA5/G72/GA5’s sudden return to /G52/G8C/G6E/GA5/G72/ led Daudy54 to speculate that /G61/G6C/G2D/G52/G8C/G6E/GA5/G72/GA5’s abrupt departure had something to do with his dislike of the policies of Sultánah Safiyyat al-Din, designed to persecute people who refused to be ruled by a woman. These people believed that, according to the local tradition as well as the shari’ah, it was inappropriate for a woman to be the ruler. As a result, there was opposition to her rule; and al-Rānīrī’s departure represented such an opposition. This explanation does not seem plausible. One may expect some kind of opposition or resistance from a more shari’ah-oriented Muslim society to the rule of a woman; however, as far as al-Rānīrī’s departure is concerned, it is unlikely that his return to his native town was caused by his alleged dislike of rule by a woman who had shown favour to him. In fact, many of his works were written to satisfy the command of the Sultánah, including those written in the last minutes before his departure.

The enigma of al-Rānīrī’s sudden departure was solved when Ito published a short but very important article,55 based on the diary of the /G6F/G70/G70/G65/G72/G6B/G6F/G6F/G70/G6D/G61/G6E/G20/ ('higher trader') Peter Sourij, who in 1053/1643 was sent by the VOC (Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie) as a trade commissioner to Jambi and Aceh. In an entry of his diary for 8 August 1643, Sourij reports that the coming of a ‘Moorish Bishop’ from Surat, India, to Aceh gave rise to endless debates between him and al-Rānīrī, for the latter had branded the newcomer’s doctrines as ‘heretical’. The debates put the Sultánah in an awkward and difficult situation. She had up to then shared the views of al-Rānīrī, but the newcomer’s teachings soon gained momentum.

Two weeks later Sourij provides us with more background information. In the entry of 22 August, he again reports the continuing debates between the two ‘ulamā’, now in the presence of the chairman of the Joint Councilors of the Sultanate or Orang Kayu Maharajalela. More importantly, Sourij informs us that the new person was Sayf al-Rijāl, a Minangkabau, who used to study in Aceh with a certain Shaykh Maldin (Jamāl al-Dīn?). The latter was banished from Aceh after the coming of al-Rānīrī because of his allegedly unorthodox views. Sayf al-Rijāl soon won the hearts of many Acehnese through his erudition and piety. He even made his entire house and adjoining lands into a pious foundation. Al-Rānīrī himself gives a vivid account of the whole situation:

Then came Sayf al-Rijāl, and he held debates with us over the matters which had been discussed before. We ask: ‘How could you approve of the people who assert that wa Allāh bi Allāh tā Allāh, man is Allāh and Allāh is man
[sic]’ He [Sayf al-Rijāl] answers: ‘This is my belief and that of the people of Mecca and Medina.’ Then his words prevail, and many people return to this wrong belief.56

It is clear that the bitter debates between al-Rānīrī and Sayf al-Rijāl became a divisive political issue. The Orang Kayu failed to settle the issue, so the Joint Councillors of the Sultanate and the bentarānas (ministers) had to meet again and again to resolve the controversy. But they too failed. The only thing they could do was to recommend that the case be settled by Sulṭānah Ṣafiyyah al-Din, who wisely refused to do so, for she acknowledged not having knowledge on religious matters. So she left the case in the hands of the aleebalangs (adat functionaries).

With the Sulṭānah’s refusal to use her authority to end the bitter disagreement between the two scholars, some kind of religious and political confusion soon prevailed among the population. So confused had the situation been that Sourij complained about the delay in his business. Finally, Sayf al-Rijāl gained the upper hand. Sourij, in his notes for 27 August 1643, writes that Sayf al-Rijāl was finally summoned to the court by the Sulṭānah herself, during which time he received honourable treatment. With this, the door was shut to al-Rānīrī, and he was forced to leave the arena.

There is no further information on Sayf al-Rijāl, who won the struggle. But what is clear is that he represents a strong counter-attack against al-Rānīrī, who for about seven years persecuted the followers of Hamzah
al-Fanṣūrī and Shams al-Dīn. Another important point to note is the international nature of the success of Sayf al-Riṣāl. In order to win the struggle, he travelled a long way to Surat, studying. We do not know with whom he studied there. When he returned, he possessed enough distinction to enable him to challenge al-Rānīrī and not easily be defeated by him in their bitter debates.

Al-Rānīrī returned to his native town in 1054/1644–45, as was mentioned in the colophon of his Jawāhir al-ʿUlam ʾī Kashf al-Maʿlūm. He spent the remaining 14 years of his life in Rānīrī. Although he was now far from Aceh or the archipelago, he maintained his concern for Muslims in the ‘lands below the wind’. Al-Hasani relates that after returning to his native town al-Rānīrī wrote at least three works, dealing with the matters he used to encounter in Aceh. One of the works was written as his answer to questions put forward by the Bantenese Abū al-Mafākhir ‘Abd al-Qādīr al-ʿAli. Al-Rānīrī died on Saturday, 22 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1068/21 September 1658.

AL-RĀNĪRĪ’S WORKS AND RENEWAL

Al-Rānīrī was a prolific and erudite writer. According to various sources he wrote no fewer than 29 works. But not all were written during his seven-year sojourn in Aceh. For instance, one of his most studied works, the Sirāt al-Mustaqim, was prepared at least partly before he came to Aceh. His works mainly deal with taṣawwūf, kalām, fiqh, ḥadīth, history and comparative religion.

As he wrote much on kalām and taṣawwūf, apparently al-Rānīrī considers one of the basic questions among Malay-Indonesia Muslims to be their ʿaqāʾid (fundamentals of belief). Therefore, he attempts to make clear, among other things, the relation between the Realities of God and the universe and man. He delineates the Ashʿarī doctrine of difference (mukhlāfah) between God and the universe, the origin of the world in time (iḥdāʾih), and God’s absolute transcendence vis-à-vis man. With his loyal adherence to the Ashʿarīyyah it is not hard to understand why he was so bitter towards Hamzah al-Fanṣūrī and Shams al-Dīn, both of whom maintained the immanence of God in His creation.

As far as al-Rānīrī’s Sufism is concerned, although he is generally known as belonging to the Rifʿīyyah order, he was also affiliated with the ‘Aydārūsiyyah and Qādiriyyah orders. His affiliation, particularly with the ‘Aydārūsiyyah tariqah, appears to have been crucial in developing his radical tendencies. Eaton has shown us that the ‘Aydārūsiyyah, with its strong Arabian roots, is one of the most important reformist tariqahs in the Indian subcontinent. It strongly emphasises the harmony between the mystical way and total obedience to the sharīʿah. It is also noted for its non-ascetic and activist attitude.
With these characteristics, the 'Aydarūsiyyah is clearly a ṭarīqah of neo-
ṣāfī type. The prominent ṣāfī scholars of the 'Aydarūsiyyah attempted to impart
in India not only the teachings of a more shari'ah-oriented Islam but also certain symbols of Arab culture. 'Abd Allāh b. Shaykh al-'Aydārūs (d. 1041/1631), for instance, went so far with his reform as to 'convert'
Sulfān Ibrāhīm II ('Ādīl Shāh) from Shi'ism to Sunnī Islam. Although the Sultān was tolerant of the Shi'is, he had never been a Shi'i himself.
'Abd Allāh also persistently attempted to persuade the Sultān to wear Arab
clothing.

Joining in the general tendency in these networks, al-Rānīrī insisted on
the importance of the shari'ah in mystical practices by writing the Širāt al-
Mustaṣqīm in Malay.60 In this work he explicates the basic but fundamental
duties of each Muslim in his life. Using the familiar outline of any fiqh
book, he goes on in detail to explain various matters concerning ablution
(wuḍū'), prayers (ṣalāt), 'alms' (zakāh), fasting (ṣawm), pilgrimage (hajj),
sacrifice (qurban) and the like. Although the book would seem to be a
simple exposition of basic fiqh rules, one should not underestimate its
importance to Malay-Indonesian Muslims during the time when an extravagant
Sufism was prevalent.

Most of the al-Rānīrī works are polemical, and to some extent apologetical.
But this should not conceal the important fact that he always makes
good use of standard books and leading authorities. He was certainly an
avid reader. On kalām and tasawwuf he eloquently quotes al-Ghazālī, Ibn
'Arabi, al-Qunawā, al-Qāshānī, al-Firuzābādī, al-Jilī, 'Abd al-Rāhmān
al-Jāmi, Faḍl Allāh al-Burhānīrī and other leading scholars.62 As for his
fiqh, he based himself on the standard Shāfī'i books, including Minhāj
al-Tālibīn of al-Nawawī, Fath al-Wadhāb bi Shahr Minhāj al-Tullāb of
Zakariyya al-Ansāri, Hidāyat al-Muḥtār Sharḥ al-Mukhtāṣār of Ibn Hajar,
Kitāb al-Anwār of al-Ārdābīlī or Nihāyat al-Muḥtāj (īlā Sharḥ al-Minḥāj-
—of al-Nawawī) of Shams al-Dīn al-Rāmī.63 Considering al-Rānīrī's
works and their sources, it is clear that he was more than simply a zealous
Shaykh al-Islām, using his religious and political influence to persecute
wujūdīyyah followers. He was a man of erudition and argument, exploring
the intricacies of the mystical doctrines in order to put those he regarded as
having gone astray on the right track.

In his polemical works, al-Rānīrī vigorously charges wujūdīyyah follow-
ers with heresy and even with polytheism. Thus, as a consequence, they
could be condemned to death if they refused to repent.64 Furthermore, he
challenges protagonists of the wujūdīyyah doctrine to debate the matter.
Al-Rānīrī tells us that debates were held at the court of the Sultanate in
the presence of the Sultān or Sultānah. In some instances the debates were
fierce and lasted for several days. However, they obviously failed to settle
the differences. Sultān Iskandar Thānī repeatedly ordered the wujūdīyyah
followers to change their minds and repent to God for their misbelief, but
this was also fruitless. Finally, the Sultan had them all killed and their books burned in front of the Banda Aceh grand mosque, Bayt al-Rahmān. Al-Rānīrī tells us vividly:

Again they say: ‘al-‘ālam huwa Allāh, huwa al-‘ālam—the universe is God and He is the universe. After that the King orders them to repent for their wrong belief. He appeals several times, yet they are not willing [to change their mind]; they even fight the messengers of the King. Finally, the King gives orders to kill them all and to gather and burn their books in the field at the front of the Mosque Bayt al-Rahmān.

Scholars have tried to explain why al-Rānīrī used his position as the Emir of the Sultanate to issue a fatwā declaring the wujūdiyyah people unbelievers (kāfirāt). Daudy, for instance, asserts that al-Rānīrī’s uncompromising personality has something closely to do with his past experience of living in the hostile Hindu environment of India. The long-standing social and religious conflicts between the Muslim minority and the Hindu majority created little tolerance within segments of both societies; and al-Rānīrī was a product of such a society.

Looking at al-Rānīrī’s case in this rather wider perspective, this kind of interpretation has its own validity. However, I would argue that al-Rānīrī’s uncompromising personality is to a great extent related to the reformism in the networks. In other words, as Drewes correctly points out, al-Rānīrī’s radical opposition to Hamzah al-Fansūrī and Shams al-Din al-Samatrānī, together with his followers, was not an isolated case of ‘orthodox reaction’ to unorthodox mysticism. Al-Rānīrī’s sojourn in Aceh occurs during the period in which the doctrines of wujūdiyyah met serious theological opposition or were reinterpreted by many scholars in the centres, in a stricter way in light of the sharī‘ah. In this sense, al-Rānīrī’s attitude is a good example of how the reformism of the networks was translated into renewalism in the Malay-Indonesian world.

The persecution against wujūdiyyah followers left an everlasting mark on the intellectual life of Islam in the archipelago. It gave rise to a reassessment among the ‘ulama‘, in particular al-Sīnā‘ī, of such concepts as ‘Muslim’, ‘kāfir’ (unbeliever), tasāmuh (religious tolerance), and the like, all of which will be discussed further. More importantly, al-Rānīrī’s fatwā of takfīr and the killing of wujūdiyyah Muslims reached the Haramayn, where an anonymous manuscript written in 1086/1675 tells us that it was the writer’s answer to questions coming from an island of the Jāwah region (min ba‘d jazā‘ir Jāwah). The problem put forward was that an ‘ālim coming from ‘above the wind’ accused a wujūdiyyah šāfi‘ of being a kāfir. The case was brought to the attention of the Sultan. The ‘ālim strongly demanded that he repent, but he refused. The šāfi‘ maintained that he could not repent as his argument was not understood. But nobody took his words seriously; and finally the Sultan issued an order to kill him, together with
all the people who followed his teachings. All of them were put into the fire. Was it permissible to do that?

The author of the treatise explains the danger of arguing with people who cannot comprehend the matter. However, the šāfi‘ī’s statements that he was not properly understood were indications of his following certain intricate interpretations of a particular religious doctrine that he himself was not able to explicate to the ‘ālim, who labelled him unbeliever. Whatever the case, the treatise’s writer argues that it was terribly wrong to kill him and his followers. He further elaborates that the accusation was obviously based on a literal understanding of wujūdiyyah doctrine; yet this attitude was not permissible in Islam. He goes on to quote the Prophet that any statement of Muslims could not be considered wrong as long as others were able to interpret it in any other way.

It comes as no surprise that the writer was Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī. The ‘ālim from ‘above the wind’ was obviously al-Rānīrī; the Sulṭān was Iskandar Thānī; and the one who transmitted the problem to the Haramayn was al-Sinkillī. As we describe in greater detail in chapter 4, al-Sinkillī apparently could not accept the way al-Rānīrī launched his reform. Therefore, without any hesitation he brought the matter to his teacher’s attention across the Indian Ocean in Medina. And finally he received the teacher’s response. This event tells us how the intellectual and religious networks of teacher–disciple played their role in the historical course of Islam in this part of the Muslim world.

AL-RĀNĪRĪ’S ROLE IN MALAY-INDONESIAN ISLAM

Al-Rānīrī was primarily a šāfī‘ī, a theologian and a faqīh (jurist). But he was also a man of letters, a preacher and a politician. His multifaceted personality could lead to misunderstanding, particularly if one viewed only a certain aspect of his thought. As a result, until now he has often been considered more as a šāfī‘ī who was probably occupied only with mystical practices, whereas he was in fact also a faqīh, whose main concern was the practical application of the very basic rules and regulations of the shari‘ah. Therefore, to understand him entirely one should take into consideration all aspects of his thought, personality and activity.

Although al-Rānīrī’s sojourn in the archipelago was relatively short (for seven years only, 1047–1054/1637–1644), he had a significant role in the development of Islam in the Malay-Indonesian world. He played a key role in bringing the great tradition of Islam to the region, reducing substantially the tendency to uncontrolled intrusion of local tradition on Islam. Without underestimating the role of the earlier carriers of Islam from the Middle East or elsewhere, one can say that al-Rānīrī had a much stronger network of the ‘uṣūl, connecting the Islamic tradition in the Middle East with that of the archipelago. He was indeed one of the most important transmitters of Islamic reformism and renewals to this part of the Muslim world.
We do not know much about al-Rānîrī’s network of disciples, but there is little doubt that his most prominent disciple in the archipelago was al-Maqassārī. The latter, in a work entitled Sāfinat al-Najāh, gives his sīsilah of the Qādiriyah tariqah from al-Rānîrī. Al-Maqassārī explicitly states that al-Rānîrī was his shaykh and teacher (gurū). Despite this evidence, there are problems concerning the date and place they met (which are discussed in chapter 5). We have no names for the disciples of al-Rānîrī, except al-Maqassārī. After returning to Rānîrī, he apparently devoted himself to teaching and writing; he even ordered his disciples to complete his Jawāhir al-‘Ulam fī Kashf al-Ma‘lūm, but he mentioned no names for these disciples.

Despite the obscurity surrounding the identity of his disciples, al-Rānîrī’s role in the transmission of reformism through his works is undeniable. His habit of citing numerous well-known authorities and standard works to support his arguments throughout his writings was a crucial means of their transmission. In so doing, he introduced these authorities to the Muslims in the archipelago. Furthermore, by introducing into and disseminating in the archipelago the interpretation of Islam held by the mainstream of ‘ulama’ and šīfi’s in the centres of Islam, he stimulated a strong impetus for renewal among Malay-Indonesian Muslims. Al-Rānîrī’s mastery of Arabic, Persian, Urdu, Malay and Acehnese was of great importance to him in building his scholarly reputation.

With his polemical works against what he regarded as the ‘heretical’ wujūdiyyah, al-Rānîrī was the first in the archipelago to clarify the distinction between the true and the false interpretation and understanding of šīfi doctrines and practices. There were, of course, attempts by such scholars as Faḍl Allāh al-Burhānpūrī to clarify this distinction. But al-Burhānpūrī failed to achieve the intended aim. On the contrary, his work led to religious confusion among Malay-Indonesian Muslims, so that Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī felt it necessary to write a commentary on it, as mentioned earlier. Further attempts were also carried out by Hamzah al-Fānsūrī and Shams al-Dīn. But, as al-Attas points out, their works again failed to draw a clear distinction, particularly between God and the universe, or relations between God and Creation. Al-Rānîrī therefore paved the way towards the rise of neo-Sufism in the archipelago.

A further consequence of his clarification of the types of Sufism was the intensification of the Islamisation process in the Malay-Indonesian world. The process was pushed further by al-Rānîrī’s writings on the shari‘ah and fiqh, particularly by his Širāt al-Mustaqīm. Al-Rānîrī was the first ‘ālim in the archipelago ever to take the initiative to write a sort of standard manual for people’s basic religious duties. Even though the precepts of shari‘ah and fiqh had to an extent been known and practised by some Malay-Indonesian Muslims, there was no single work in Malay to which to refer. Therefore, it is not hard to understand why the work became very popular and seems to be still in use to this day in certain parts
of the Malay-Indonesian world, particularly in Southern Thailand and the Malay Peninsula.77

Al-Rānīrī’s concern about the application of the detailed rules of the fiqh led him to extract sections of his Ṣirāt al-Mustaqīm and issue them as separate works. The most famous among these extracts are Ka‘fīyāt al-Ṣalāh and Bāb al-Nikāh; the latter together with the Ṣirāt al-Mustaqīm were sent by al-Rānīrī himself to Kedah in about 1050/1640. This appears to be of particular importance in furthering the Islamisation of Kedah.78 For that reason it has been claimed that his contribution to the process of Islamisation of Kedah was of equal magnitude to that of the first preachers who directly brought Islam to the people of Kedah.79

The role of al-Rānīrī in the intensification of the process of Islamisation is also clear in the political field. During his sojourn in Aceh, in his position as the Shaykh al-Islām of the Sultanate, among his duties was that of counselling the newly enthroned Sultan Iskandar Thānī in various matters, either religious or political. In his Bustān al-Salātīn, he tells us how he counselled the Sultan in his function as a ruler and khalīfah (representative) of God on earth. Quoting various verses of the Qur’ān (e.g. 4:59; 6:165; 38:26), he makes clear to the Sultan his responsibility for and duty towards his people; protecting the weak and providing goodness to the people make him protected and blessed by God. Probably because of his counsel, Sultan Iskandar Thānī abolished un-Islamic punishments for criminals, such as the ‘immersing into hot oil’ (mencelup minyak) and ‘licking the burning steel’ (menjilat besi).80 The Sultan also prohibited his subjects from discussing the issues surrounding God’s Being with reason.81

According to al-Rānīrī, the application of the shari‘ah could not be intensified without a deeper knowledge of the tradition (ḥadīth) of the Prophet. Therefore, he compiled in his Hidāyāt al-Ḥabīb fi al-Targhib wa al-Tarhib some traditions of the Prophet which he translated from Arabic into Malay so that the Muslim population would be able to understand them correctly. In this concise compendium, he interpolates ḥadīths with citations of the Qur’ānic verses in order to support the arguments attached to the ḥadīths. This work was the pioneer in the field in the archipelago and introduced the importance of ḥadīth in the life of Muslims.

Apart from clarifying the distinction between unorthodox and orthodox Sufism and emphasising the importance of the shari‘ah, al-Rānīrī took on the arduous task of making Muslims understand correctly the articles of belief (al-‘aqā‘id). It is true that one of the standard works of the ‘Ash‘arīs, the Mukhtāṣar al-‘Aqā‘id by Najm al-Dīn al-Nasafi, was already in use among certain circles of Malay-Indonesian Muslims. However, this is not a simple text: in addition to the subject being difficult to comprehend, its Arabic was hard for the Malays in general to understand. Realising the need for this kind of text, al-Rānīrī prepared its Malay translation or a partial translation, called Durrat al-Farā‘id bi Sharh
He does not in fact simply translate it; he adds some commentary, so that it is easier for his Malay readers to understand.

Al-Rānīrī played a crucial role, not only in clarifying to the Malay-Indonesian Muslims the very basis of Islamic beliefs and practices but in revealing the truth of Islam in a comparative perspective with other religions. He was the first 'ālim ever in the Malay world to write a work on comparative religion, called Tībiyān fi Ma‘rīfat al-Adyān, as well as substantial passages touching on the same subject in his other works. The Tībiyān, which has been discussed by scholars, was apparently planned according to the Kitāb al-Mīlal wa al-Nīhal, the well-known work on comparative religion by al-Shahrastānī. But for much of its contents al-Rānīrī depends on Abū Shahūr al-Salīmī’s Kitāb al-Tamhid. In the first part of the Tībiyān he begins his discussion with non-scriptural religions, to conclude with the scriptural religions of Christianity and Judaism. The second part deals with Islam, including the 72 Muslim splinter groups considered heretical or outside the true Sunnī tradition. As one might expect, he includes the followers of Shī‘a and Shams al-Dīn among these ‘heretics’.

The influence of al-Rānīrī in the field of history was no less profound. Again, he was the first writer in Malay to present history in a universal context, and to initiate a new form of Malay historical writing. His history books, collectively called the Bustān al-Salāṭīn, are his most voluminous work, reflecting the author’s special interest in the field. These seven books show us how he successfully made use of several traditions of the historiography of Islam and introduced them to Malay audiences. The first two books present the history of the world, mostly from a theological point of view. While the first book is written following the pattern of al-Kīsā’ī’s Qīsas al-Anbiyā’, dealing with the creation of the Pen, the Tablet, the Light of Muhammad and the like, the second book is planned according to al-Ṭabarī’s Tarīkh al-Rusul wa al-Mulūk. Thus, he begins with the history of the Persian, Greek and Arabian people in the pre-Islamic period, followed by an annalistic history of Islam until the year of the execution of al-Ḥallāj in 309/921. The second book later goes on to describe the history of the kings of India and the Malay-Indonesian world. The remaining five books of the Bustān al-Salāṭīn follow the pattern of al-Ghazālī’s Nashahat al-Mulūk, and therefore were intended to be guiding books for the court families.

The Bustān al-Salāṭīn is one of the most important early Malay-Indonesian histories. It has been an indispensable source for the reconstruction of the early history of Islam in the Malay-Indonesian world. Its significance becomes enormous in view of the fact that the history of Islam in the region is mostly written on the basis of Western sources. Al-Rānīrī’s acquaintance with the history of the archipelago is clearly extraordinary. It seems that one of his major sources for the Bustān al-Salāṭīn was the Sejarah Melayu.
In fact, he was apparently an expert in the detailed description of the *Sejarah Melayu*, because he probably was well acquainted with its author, Tun Seri Lanang. He was also familiar with the genealogy of the Sultans of Pahang.86

Not least important is al-Râniří’s role in stimulating further development of the Malay language as the lingua franca of the Malay-Indonesian world. He is even acclaimed as one of the first *pujanggas* (men of letters) of Malay. Although al-Râniří was not a native speaker of Malay, his mastery of the language was undisputed. A. Teeuw, a Dutch scholar who was one of the prominent experts in the Malay-Indonesian language, maintains that his classical Malay indicates none of the awkwardness often found in classical Malay before the seventeenth century.87 Thus, works in Malay are also considered literary works, and contributed substantially to the development of Malay as a language of learning.
We have seen how al-Rānīrī sparked the momentum for renewal in the Malay-Indonesian world. Although the reform he launched underwent a significant political setback with his fall, there is no doubt that al-Rānīrī had an irreversible impact. Before long the renewal again gained a crucial stimulus in al-Sinkīlī (1024–1105/1615–93), one of the most important early mujaddids in the archipelago. We have already established that al-Rānīrī in one way or another had connections with the core of networks in the Ḥaramayn. Al-Sinkīlī surpassed al-Rānīrī in this respect. He possessed direct and undisputed links with the major scholars of the networks. For the first time we find, in al-Sinkīlī, a clear picture of intellectual and spiritual genealogies, putting Islam in the Malay-Indonesian world on the map of the global transmission of Islamic reformism.

Al-Sinkīlī has been the subject of several important studies. However, these mainly concentrate on his teachings. Some of them do mention in passing his teachers in the Middle East, but no attempt has been made to trace further his intricate intellectual connections with the cosmopolitan scholarly networks centred in Mecca and Medina. There is no study either that seeks to examine how his involvement in the networks influenced his thought and intellectual disposition. Furthermore, no critical study has been done to assess his role in stimulating Islamic renewal in the Malay-Indonesian world. An attempt will be made in this chapter to deal with all these questions. In that way we shall be able to gain a better understanding not only of his position in the historical course of Islam in the archipelago but also of the interplay between Islam in the Malay-Indonesian world and Islam in the Middle East.

AL-SINKĪLĪ’S EARLY LIFE

‘Abd al-Ra’ūf b. ‘Ali al-Jāwī al-Fanṣūrī al-Sinkīlī, as his name indicates, was a Malay of Fanṣūr, Sinkil (modern Singkel), on the southwestern
coastal region of Aceh. His birth date is unknown, but Rinkes, after calculating backwards from the date of his return from the Middle East to Aceh, suggests that he was born around 1024/1615. This date has been accepted by most scholars of al-Sinkilli. We do not have very reliable accounts of his familial background. According to Hasjmi, ancestors of al-Sinkilli came from Persia to the Sultanate of Samudra-Pasai at the end of the thirteenth century. They later settled in Fanșūr (Barus), an important old harbour on the coast of western Sumatra. He further argues that al-Sinkilli’s father was the older brother of Hamzah al-Fansūrī. We are not sure whether al-Sinkilli was really a nephew of Hamzah, as there is no other source to corroborate it. It appears that he did have some familial relationship with him, for in some of his extant works al-Sinkilli’s name is followed by the statement: ‘who is of the tribe of Ḥamzah Fansūrī’ (‘yang berbangsa Ḥamzah Fansūrī’). Dally, on the other hand, maintains that al-Sinkilli’s father, Shaykh ‘Ali [al-Fansūrī], was an Arab preacher who, after marrying a local woman of Fanșūr, took up residence in Singkel, where their child, ‘Abd al-Ra’ūf, was born. There is of course the possibility that al-Sinkilli’s father was non-Malay, as we know that Samudra-Pasai and Fanșūr had been frequented by Arab, Persian, Indian, Chinese and Jewish traders from at least the ninth century. But as far as the accounts of al-Sinkilli’s father are concerned, there is no other source to substantiate them.

It appears that al-Sinkilli acquired his early education in his native village, Singkel, mainly from his father, a supposed ‘alim, who, Hasjmi believes, also founded a madrasah that attracted students from various places in the Acehnese Sultanate. It is also very likely that he continued his studies in Fanșūr, as it, as Drakard points out, was an important Islamic centre and a point of contact between Malays and Muslims from western and southern Asia. According to Hasjmi, al-Sinkilli later travelled to Banda Aceh, the capital of the Acehnese Sultanate, to study with, among others, Ḥamzah al-Fansūrī and Shams al-Din al-Samatrānī. It is clear that al-Sinkilli could not have met Hamzah, as the latter died around 1016/1607, at which time al-Sinkilli was not even born. However, we cannot rule out the possibility of al-Sinkilli’s studying with Shams al-Din. If we assume that he studied with Shams al-Din (d. 1040/1630) in his final years, al-Sinkilli must have been in his teens at that time. Despite these problematic accounts, there is no doubt that in the period before al-Sinkilli departed for Arabia, around 1052/1642, Aceh was marked by controversies and struggles between the followers of the wuṭūḍiyyah doctrine and al-Rānīrī, as discussed in chapter 3. There is no indication whatsoever that al-Sinkilli met and had personal contact with al-Rānīrī, who was in Aceh in the period 1047/1637 to 1054/1644–45. However, he must have been aware of the teaching of Hamzah al-Fansūrī and Shams al-Din as well as of al-Rānīrī’s persecution of their followers. Al-Sinkilli, as we will see later, apparently attempted to disengage himself from the controversies.
Even though the spirit of al-Sinkilli’s writings shows that he differs from Hamzah and Shams al-Din, we find no evidence in his teachings that explicitly opposes their teaching. He also has the same attitude towards al-Raniri. Only implicitly does he criticise the way al-Raniri carried out his renewal; he has no dispute with his teachings in general.

AL-SINKILI’S ARABIAN NETWORKS

Although al-Sinkilli’s early years were obscure, we are fortunate that he has left us a biographical codicil of his studies in Arabia. In the codicil attached to the colophon of one of his works, ‘Umdat al-Muhtajin ila Suluk Maslak al-Mufidin,’ he provides us with information on the ṭarīqaḥs he was affiliated with, the places where he studied, the teachers from whom he learned, and the scholars he met. Although the account is rather concise, nonetheless gives us a good picture of how a Malay-Indonesian ṣāḥib travelled in search of iḥlām (religious knowledge). It discloses not only the crisscrossing of our scholarly networks but also the process of transmission of Islamic learning among Muslim scholars.
Al-Sinkili most probably left Aceh for Arabia in 1052/1642.  He lists 19 teachers from whom he learned various branches of Islamic discipline, and 27 other ‘ulama’ with whom he had personal contacts and relations. We are not going to give accounts of all his teachers; we will examine only the most prominent among them. Al-Sinkili studied in a number of places, scattered along the hajj routes, from Duhâ (Doha) in the Persian Gulf region, Yemen, Jeddah, finally to Mecca and Medina (see Map 2). Thus he began his studies in Duhâ, Qatar, where he studied with ‘Abd al-Qâdir al-Mawrî, but it appears that he stayed there for only a short time.

Leaving Duhâ, al-Sinkili continued his studies in Yemen, chiefly in Bayt al-Faqîh [ibn ‘Ujayl] and Zabid, although he also had several teachers in Mawza’, Mukhâ, al-Luhayyah, Hudaydah and Tâ’izz. Bayt al-Faqîh and Zabid were certainly the most important centres of Islamic learning in this region. In Bayt al-Faqîh he studied mostly with scholars of the Ja’mân family, such as Ibrâhîm b. Muḥammad b. Ja’mân, Ibrâhîm b. ‘Abd Allâh b. Ja’mân and Qâdî Ishâq b. Muḥammad b. Ja’mân. In addition, he established relations with Faqîh al-Ṭayyib b. Abî al-Qâsim b. Ja’mân, the Mufti of Bayt al-Faqîh, and another Faqîh, Muḥammad b. Ja’mân. The Ja’mân, an eminent sīfî-‘ulamâ’ family in Yemen or, as al-Muhîbî puts it, ‘a prop of the people of Yemen’, initially lived in Zabid before finally moving to Bayt al-Faqîh. Several of the Ja’mân scholars, mentioned earlier, were students of Ahmad al-Qushâshî and Ibrâhîm al-Kurâni.

Among al-Sinkili’s teachers from the Ja’mân family, the most important was Ibrâhîm b. ‘Abd Allâh Ibn Ja’mân (d. 1083/1672). Mostly known as a muhaddith and faqiḥ, he appears to have studied largely in the Yemen region before settling down in Bayt al-Faqîh. He was a prolific author of fatwâs and, therefore, one of the most sought-after scholars in the area. He also had connections with leading ‘ulama’ in the networks. al-Sinkili relates that he spent most of his time with Ibrâhîm b. ‘Abd Allâh Ja’mân studying what he calls ‘ilm al-zâhir (exoteric sciences), such as fiqîh, hadîth and other related subjects. It was ‘with his blessing that this faqiḥ, poor [al-Sinkîlî] was able to continue his studies under the feet [tapâk] of the enlightened wâli (saint) who was the authority and Quṭ of his time; that is, Shaykh Ahmad al-Qushâshî in the City of the Prophet, peace be upon him’.

Ja’mān, who introduced him to al-Qushâshī, it is not unlikely that Ishâq b. Ja’mān also recommended him to study with al-Qushâshī as well as with al-Kurānī.

The network of al-Sinkî’s clearly becomes more complex on the continuation of his studies in Zabîd. Among his teachers in Zabîd were ‘Ābd al-Raḥîm b. al-Siddîq al-Khâsh;21 Amin b. al-Ṣiddîq al-Mizjâjî, who was also a teacher of Muḥammad al-Qushâshî;22 and ‘Ābd Allâh b. Muhammad al-’Adani, whom al-Sinkî calls the best reciter of the Qur’ān in the region. He also came into contact with prominent Zabîdī or Yemeni scholars such as ‘Ābd al-Fattâh al-Khâsh, the Muftî of Zabîd; Sayyid al-Tâhîr b. al-Husayn al-Ahdâl; Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Bâqi’ al-Mizjâjî, a celebrated Naqshbandî shaykh (d. 1074/1664),23 who was also a teacher of al-Maqassârî; Qâdí Muḥammad b. Abî Bakr b. Muṭâyir (d. 1086/1675);24 and Ahmad Abû al-’Abbâs b. al-Muṭâyir (d. 1075/1664).25 Most of these scholars, especially of the Ahdal and Mizjâjî families, as we have shown, played an important role in linking scholars in the networks.

Al-Sinkî does not inform us as to when he left Yemen. Following the pilgrimage route we now find him in Jeddah, where he studied with its Muftî, ‘Ābd al-Qâdir al-Barkhâlî.26 He then continued his travels to Mecca, where he studied with Bâdîr al-Dîn al-Lahûrî and ‘Ābd Allâh al-Lahûrî. Al-Sinkî’s most important teacher in Mecca was ‘Āli b. ‘Ābd al-Qâdir al-Tâbâri. Al-Sinkî was introduced to ‘Āli al-Tâbâri by one of his teachers in Zabîd, ‘Āli b. Muḥammad al-Dayba’, a muḥaddith who had close relationships with the Tâbâri family and other Ḥaramayn leading scholars.27 ‘Āli al-Tâbâri, like his brother Zayn al-’Abbîdîn,28 was a leading Meccan faqîh. ‘Āli, or the Tâbâri family, had extensive networks with other Yemeni scholars, especially of the Ja’mān family, who may also have recommended al-Sinkî to study with ‘Āli al-Tâbârî and other prominent Ḥaramayn scholars.29

In addition to studying with scholars whom he mentioned specifically as his teachers, al-Sinkî established contacts and relations with other prominent scholars in Mecca, both resident and visiting. He does not specify the nature of his relations with them, but there is little doubt that he gained great advantages from them. They can be assumed, at least, to have inspired him and brought him a much wider intellectual perspective. Most of these scholars are familiar names in the networks: they include ‘Isâ al-Maghrîbî, ‘Ābd al-’Azîz al-Zamzamî, Tâj al-Dîn Ibn Ya’qûb, ‘Alâ’ al-Dîn al-Bâbîlî, Zayn al-’Abbîdîn al-Tâbâri, ‘Āli Jamâl al-Makkî and ‘Ābd Allâh b. Sa’îd Bâ Qâshîr al-Makkî (1003–1076/1595–1665).30

The last leg of al-Sinkî’s long journey in his search of knowledge was Medina. It was in the City of the Prophet that he felt satisfied that he had completed his studies. He studied in Medina with Ahmâd al-Qushâshî until the latter’s death in 1071/1660, and with his khalîfah, Ibrâhîm al-Kurânî. With al-Qushâshî, al-Sinkî learned what he calls the ‘interior’ sciences
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('ilm al-bātīn); that is, tawwuf and other related sciences. As a sign of his completion of studying the mystical way, al-Qushāshī appointed him his Shayṭāriyyah and Qādiriyyah khalīfah. Al-Sinkīlī’s relationship with al-Qushāshī was apparently very cordial. An account of the Shayṭāriyyah sīsilah in West Sumatra tells us that al-Sinkīlī studied with and served al-Qushāshī for several years. One day the teacher ordered him to return to Jāwah, for he considered that al-Sinkīlī possessed sufficient knowledge to enable him to carry out further Islamisation in his homeland. Having heard the order, al-Sinkīlī burst into tears, as he felt the need to learn more. As a result, al-Qushāshī changed his mind and allowed him to stay with him as long as he wished.31

Intellectually, al-Sinkīlī’s largest debt was to Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī. This is obvious not only in his thought, reflected in his writings, but also in his personal demeanour, as we will elaborate shortly. In his accounts, al-Sinkīlī makes it clear that it was with al-Kūrānī that he completed his education after the death of al-Qushāshī.32 He had no ṭariqah sīsilah with al-Kūrānī; therefore, what he learned from him apparently were sciences, promoting an intellectual understanding of Islam rather than a spiritual or mystical one. In other words, for al-Sinkīlī, al-Qushāshī was a spiritual and mystical master, while al-Kūrānī was an intellectual one.

There is no doubt that al-Sinkīlī’s personal relationship with al-Kūrānī was very close. We have mentioned earlier that Ibrāhīm wrote his masterpiece, the Iḥāf al-Dhāki, on the request of his unnamed ʿaṣḥāb al-Jāwiyīn. Considering their close intellectual and personal ties, it is no surprise that Johns33 suggests that it was al-Sinkīlī who asked al-Kūrānī to write it. This suggestion becomes more plausible if one takes into account the fact that al-Sinkīlī, after returning to Aceh, asked al-Kūrānī’s opinion on the way al-Rāniī launched his reform in Aceh. Furthermore, it was apparently not the only question sent across the Indian Ocean by al-Sinkīlī to al-Kūrānī. In the concluding notes to his Lubb al-Kashf wa al-Bayān li mā yarāhu al-Muhtadar bi al-Iyān, which deals with the best type of dhikr for the dying, he writes:

Let it be known, my disciples, that after I wrote this treatise, I sent a letter to the City of the Prophet, to our enlightened Shaykh in the science of Realities (‘ilm al-haqqā’iq) and in the science of secret details of things (‘ilm al-daqaqīq), i.e., Shaykh Mawlā Ibrāhīm [al-Kūrānī], asking [his opinion] about all matters described in the beginning of this treatise whether it is correct in the opinion of the [leading] āiftā, and whether this matter on the best dhikr is discussed in hadīth books or in any [other] books. After a while, his treatise entitled Kīf al-Munṭazar was sent by [our] Shaykh, in which he answers all the questions.34

Although al-Sinkīlī obviously spent most of his time in Medina studying with al-Qushāshī and al-Kūrānī, he also established contacts and scholarly relations with several other leading scholars there (see Chart 4). He
Chart 4 Al-Sinkilli's partial networks
includes in his list\textsuperscript{35} such scholars as Mullā Muhammad Sharīf al-Kūrānī; Ibn ‘Abd al-Rasūl al-Barzanjī; Ibrāhīm b. ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Khiyari al-Madani (1037–83/1638–72), a student of ‘Alā‘ al-Dīn al-Bābīlī, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī and ‘Isā al-Maghribī;\textsuperscript{36} and ‘Alī al- Başīr al-Mālikī al-Madani (d. 1106/1694), a muḥaddith.\textsuperscript{37}

Al-Sinkīlī notes that he spent 19 years in Arabia. The fact that most of his teachers and acquaintances are recorded in Arabic biographical dictionaries indicates the incontestable prominence of al-Sinkīlī’s intellectual milieu. Coming from a fringe region of the Muslim world, he entered the core of the scholarly networks and won the favour of the major scholars in the Haramayn. His education was undeniably complete from shari‘ah, fiqh, hadith and other related exoteric disciplines to kalām, and tasawwuf or esoteric sciences. His career and works after his return to the archipelago were the history of his conscious efforts to implant firmly the idea of harmony between shari‘ah and tasawwuf.

Like many other scholars in the networks, al-Sinkīlī appears to have begun his teaching career in the Haramayn. This is no surprise, as by the time he came to Mecca and Medina he already possessed sufficient knowledge to be transmitted to his fellow Malay-Indonesian Muslims. It appears that al-Sinkīlī also initiated Jāwī disciples into the Shaṭṭārīyyah jāriqah. But there were also Shaṭṭārīyyah sīhilahs in Java which went straight back to Aḥmad al-Qushāshī, instead of by way of al-Sinkīlī. Snouck Hurgronje\textsuperscript{38} maintains that al-Qushāshī appointed his Malay-Indonesian Khalilahs during the pilgrimage. If we accept this, then we can believe that al-Sinkīlī played a crucial role in introducing them to al-Qushāshī.

**AL-SINKĪLĪ’S TEACHINGS AND RENEWAL**

Al-Sinkīlī supplies no date for his return to his homeland. However, he indicates that he returned not long after the death of al-Qushāshī, and after al-Kūrānī issued him an iḥām to transmit what he had received from him. Therefore, most scholars of al-Sinkīlī are in accord that he returned to Aceh about 1072/1661.\textsuperscript{39} It is useful to recall that Sultānah Safiyyat al-Dīn, who had patronised al-Rānīrī for about two and a half years before turning to Sayf al-Rijāl, still occupied the throne of the Acehnese Sultanate. We do not know for sure whether Sayf al-Rijāl, powerful exponent of the wujūdiyyah type of Sufism, was still alive nor how far the doctrine could be revived by him.

In any case, the arrival of al-Sinkīlī from Arabia naturally created curiosity, particularly among court circles. Before long al-Sinkīlī was attended by a court official, Kātib Seri Raja b. Ḥamzah al-Āshī, who put unspecified religious questions to him. Voorhoeve\textsuperscript{40} points out that al-Āshī’s office was ‘Reurenkon Kaṭiboy Mulo’; that is, the Secret Secretary of the Sultānah. Therefore, Voorhoeve believes that al-Āshī was assigned by the Sultānah
to assess al-Sinkil’s religious views. It is clear that al-Sinkil passed the ‘examination’, as he soon won the favour of the court. He was appointed by the Sulṭānah to the office of the Qāḍī Ṭālib al-‘Ādil or Mufīṭ who was responsible for administering religious affairs.

Before we proceed with al-Sinkil’s teachings and his renewal, it is appropriate to discuss briefly the political developments in the Acehnese Sultanate during his career. The most striking feature of the period was that the Sultanate was ruled by four successive Sultānahs, well until the close of the seventeenth century. We already know that the first Sultānah was Ṣafiyīyat al-Dīn, who succeeded her husband, Iskandar Thānī, in 1051/1641. Under her long rule until 1086/1675, the Sultanate’s authority substantially dwindled; much territory under its control in the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra soon broke away.41 In addition to its political decline, the Sultanate under Ṣafiyīyat al-Dīn was marked by religious turmoil.

The next Sultānah, Nūr al-‘Ālam Naqīyyat al-Dīn, after reigning for only three years (1086–88/1675–8), was succeeded by Zakkīyāt al-Dīn (1088–98/1678–88). Despite the Acehnese political troubles, the Sultanate was still apparently a respected Muslim political entity in the region. Thus in 1096/1683 Sultānah Zakkīyāt al-Dīn received a delegation from the Sharīf of Mecca. The delegation was initially dispatched by the Sharīf Barakat to meet the Moghul Sultān Aurangzēb, who reportedly refused to entertain them. As a result, the delegation came to Aceh instead, bringing letters and gifts for the Sultānah. Feeling very pleased, she asked them to stay for a while in the capital city, while preparing gifts for the Sharīf of Mecca. It is reported that the Acehnese sent gifts and ṣadaqaḥ (charitable gifts), consisting of, among other things, a statue made of gold taken from the ruins of the palace and the Bayt al-Rahmān Mosque, which had both been destroyed by fire during the period of Sultānah Naqīyyat al-Dīn.42

It is clear that al-Sinkil was involved in events surrounding the delegation. However, we have no information on his exact role in entertaining the envoys of the Sharīf of Mecca. The delegation finally returned to Mecca, bringing numerous gifts to be presented not only to the Sharīf of Mecca, and the Prophet Mosque in Medina, but also to the poor population in the Haramayn. There was dispute among the sons of the deceased Sharīf Barakat concerning the distribution of the gifts. The events surrounding the delegation, the coming of the gifts from ‘Bandār Ḥisb’ (Banda Aceh) and the dispute among members of the Sharīfian family are not ignored by Arab historians. Based on a chronicle written about 1700, Ahmad Dāhlān, an eminent scholar and historian of Mecca, gave a detailed account of the events.43

The coming of the delegation from Mecca was to a certain extent a boost to the prestige of the Sultānah. But it was also taken as a good opportunity for some Acehnese to ask for an opinion on the question of whether it was permissible according to Islamic law for a woman to be a ruler.44 The
question had long been an unsolved problem among the Acehnese. Al-Sinkīlī himself appears to have failed to answer it explicitly. In his fiqh work Mir‘āt al-Tullāb, he does not address the issue directly. Discussing the requirements for the ḥākim (judge—by extension, the ruler), al-Sinkīlī seems deliberately to provide no Malay translation for the word dhakar (male). He could possibly be accused of compromising his intellectual integrity, not only by accepting the rule of a woman but also by not addressing the issue more properly. On the other hand, this case could be a further indication of his personal tolerance, a trait al-Sinkīlī certainly possessed.

Similarly, the Meccan delegation gave no answer to the matter but apparently brought the question to the attention of the Haramayn ‘ulamā’. The answer finally came from Mecca to the Acehnese court during the reign of Sultānah Kamālat al-Dīn (1098–1109/1688–99). The Chief Muftī of Mecca reportedly sent a fatwā, declaring that it ran contrary to shari‘ah for an Islamic kingdom to be ruled by a woman. As a result, Kamālat al-Dīn was deposed from the throne, and ‘Umar b. Qādī al-Malik al-‘Ādil Ibrāhīm was installed as Sultān Badr al-‘Ālam Sharīf Hāshim Bā al-‘Alawi al-Husaynī, establishing the ‘Arab Jamāl al-Layl dynasty in Aceh.

Thus, in his entire career in Aceh, al-Sinkīlī was patronised by the Sultānahs. He wrote about 22 works, dealing with fiqh, tafsīr, kalām, and taṣawwuf. He wrote in both Malay and Arabic. He appears to have preferred to write in Arabic rather in Malay, acknowledging that his Malay was not very good because of his long sojourn in Arabia. Therefore, he was helped by two teachers of the Malay language to write his works in Sumatran Malay or, as he puts it: ‘in the ḥisn al-Jāwiyyat al-Sumatra’īyyah.’ Throughout his writings al-Sinkīlī, much like Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, demonstrates that his main concern is the reconciliation between the shari‘ah and taṣawwuf, or in his own terms, between the zāhīr and bāṭin sciences.

The major work of al-Sinkīlī in fiqh is Mir‘āt al-Tullāb fi Tashīl Ma‘rifat al-Al-Akhām al-Shar‘īyyah li al-Malik al-Wahlāh. Written on the request of Sultānah Saфиyyat al-Dīn, it was completed in 1074/1663. Unlike the Širāt al-Musta‘qim of al-Rā‘ūrī, which deals solely with ‘ibādat (devotional services), the Mir‘āt al-Tullāb sets out the ma‘āmalat aspect of fiqh, including the political, social, economic and religious life of the Muslims. Covering so many topics, it is a substantial work in the field. Its main source was the Fath al-Wahlāh of Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī, a major predecessor in the networks discussed earlier. But al-Sinkīlī also derives materials from such standard books as: Fath al-Jawwād and Taḥfīt al-Muḥtāj, both of Ibn Ḥajar al-Ḥaytāmī (d. 973/1565); Nihāyat al-Muḥtāj of Shams al-Dīn al-Rā‘ūrī; Tafsīr al-Baydā‘wī of Ibn ‘Umar al-Baydā‘wī (d. 685/1286); and Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim of al-Nawawī (d. 676/1277). With these sources al-Sinkīlī makes clear his intellectual connections with the networks.

Al-Sinkīlī was the first scholar in the Malay-Indonesian world who
wrote on the fiqh mu‘amalat. By way of the Miṣr‘āt al-Ṭallāb he shows his fellow Muslims that Islamic legal doctrines are not confined to purely devotional services (‘ibādat) but include all aspects of their daily life. The Miṣr‘āt al-Ṭallāb is no longer used in the archipelago today, although in the past the work was widely circulated. Hooker has pointed out that the Līwūrān, ‘Selections’, used by the Muslims of Maguindanao, the Philippines, since the middle of the nineteenth century, made the Miṣr‘āt al-Ṭallāb one of its main references. Another work of al-Sinkīlī in fiqh, Kitāb al-Fārā‘īd, presumably taken from the Miṣr‘āt al-Ṭallāb, was apparently used by some Malay-Indonesian Muslims until more recent times.

The significance of al-Sinkīlī to the development of Islam in the archipelago is irrefutable in the field of Qur’ānic commentary (tafsīr). He was the first ‘ālim ever in this part of the Muslim world to take on the enormous task of preparing tafsīr of the whole Qur’ān in Malay. A number of studies have discovered that before him there was only a fragment of commentary on sūrah 18 (al-Kahf). That work, supposedly written during the period of Hamzah al-Fansūrī or Shams al-Dīn al-Samatrānī, follows the tradition of al-Khāzīn’s commentary. But the style of translation and interpretation was different from that of Hamzah or Shams al-Dīn who, as a rule, interpreted passages of Qur’ānic verses cited in their works in a mystical sense.

Although al-Sinkīlī gives no date for the completion of his acclaimed tafsīr work, entitled Tarjumān al-Mustafādī, there is no doubt that he wrote it during his long career in Aceh. Hasjmi maintains that it was written in India, when he allegedly travelled there. This is a wild supposition, as there is no indication whatsoever that al-Sinkīlī ever set foot in India. Furthermore, it would have been impossible for him to undertake such a huge work while travelling. The patronage he enjoyed from the Acehnese rulers makes it more plausible that he wrote the work in Aceh.

Being the earliest tafsīr, it is not surprising that his work was widely circulated in the Malay-Indonesian world. Editions are found to be among the Malay community as far away as South Africa. Of various MSS available in many collections, Riddell has established that the earliest extant copy of the Tarjumān al-Mustafādī dates back to the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. More importantly, the Tarjumān al-Mustafādī lithograph and printed editions were published not only in Singapore, Penang, Jakarta and Bombay but also in the Middle East. It was published in Istanbul by the Maṭba‘ah al-‘Uthmāniyyah as early as 1302/1884 (and in 1324/1906); and later also in Cairo (by Sulaymān al-Marāghi) and Mecca (by al-Amiriyyah). The fact that the Tarjumān al-Mustafādī was published in the Middle East at various times reflects the importance of the work as well as the intellectual stature of al-Sinkīlī. Its latest edition was published in Jakarta as recently as 1981. This indicates that the work is still in use among Malay-Indonesian Muslims today.
The tafsîr has long been regarded as simply a translation into Malay of the Anwâr al-Tanzîl of Baydâwî. Snouck Hurgonje,58 apparently without having studied the work in greater detail, concludes in his typically cynical way that it was merely a bad rendering of al-Baydâwî’s commentary. With this conclusion Snouck was responsible for leading astray two other Dutch scholars, Rinkes and Voorhoeve. Rinkes, a student of Snouck, creates additional errors by stating that al-Sînkî’s works, in addition to the Tarjumân al-Mustafa’d, include a translation of the Baydâwî Tafsîr and a translation of a section of the Jalâlâyn Tafsîr.59 Voorhoeve, after following Snouck and Rinkes, finally changed his conclusion by stating that the sources of the Tarjumân al-Mustafa’d were various Arabic exegetical works.50

Riddell and Harun,61 in their studies, have shown convincingly that the work is a rendering of the Jalâlâyn Tafsîr. Only in rare instances did al-Sînkî make use of the commentaries of al-Baydawî and al-Khâzîn (d. 41/1340). This identification is important, not only for disclosing the line of transmission from the centres, but for showing the approach al-Sînkî used in transmitting what he received from his teachers in the networks to his Malay-Indonesian audience.

The Jalâlâyn Tafsîr, it is worth noting, was written by the two Jalâlîs; that is, Jalâl al-Dîn al-Mahlîlî (d. 864/1459) and Jalâl al-Dîn al-Suyâtî (d. 911/1505), a major figure to whom most of our leading scholars in the networks traced their intellectual and spiritual genealogies. Al-Sînkî’s selection of this tafsîr as the major source of his own commentary, therefore, must be because he possessed isnâds connecting him to Jalâl al-Dîn al-Suyûtî through both al-Qushâshî and al-Kûrânî. Having had ijâzahs to transmit from al-Kûrânî all the sciences he received through successive chains of transmission, which included al-Suyûtî, al-Sînkî could be expected to prefer the Jalâlâyn Tafsîr to other commentaries of the Qur’an. This argument becomes more plausible when we take into account the fact that al-Sînkî also took the Fath al-Wahhâb of Zakariyyâ al-Ansârî as the main source for his Mîrât al-Ṭullâb. His tendency to rely heavily on the works by scholars in the networks is also clear in his works on kalâm and tâṣawwuf.

Furthermore, as Johns argues,62 although the Jalâlâyn Tafsîr was often considered as contributing little to the development of the tradition of Qur’ânic commentary, it is a masterly, lucid and succinct exegesis of the Qur’an. Furthermore, it provides asbâb al-nuzûl (the backgrounds to revelation) of the verses, which are very helpful for a fuller comprehension of the commentary. With these characteristics, the Jalâlâyn is a good introductory text for novices in the science of tafsîr among the Malay-Indonesian Muslims. In rendering the Jalâlâyn into Malay, al-Sînkî makes it simple or comprehensible to his fellow Malays in general. As a rule, he translates the Jalâlâyn word for word, and restrains himself from giving his own additions. Furthermore, he leaves out the Arabic grammatical explanations and long commentaries that might distract the attention of
his audience. Thus, it is clear that his intention is that the *Tarjumān al-Mustafāfid* should be easily understood by his readers and, as a consequence, become a practical guide for life.

One can hardly overestimate the role of the *Tarjumān al-Mustafāfid* in the history of Islam in the archipelago. Johns\(^63\) maintains that ‘it is in more than one way a landmark in the history of Islamic learning in Malay’. It has contributed significantly to the study of Qur’anic commentary in the archipelago. It lays the foundation for a bridge between *tarjumah* (translation) and *tafsīr*,\(^64\) and thus stimulates further study on the *tafsīr* works in Arabic. For almost three centuries it was the only full rendering of the Qur’ān in Malay; only in the past 30 years have new commentaries in Malay-Indonesian made their appearance, but without necessarily detracting from the *Tarjumān al-Mustafāfid*. Therefore, this work continues to play an important role in promoting a better understanding of the teachings of Islam.

We need no long argument to prove that al-Sinkīlī inherits the tendency from the scholarly networks of emphasising the importance of the *hadith*. He wrote two works in this field. The first was a commentary on the *Arba‘īn Ḥadīth* of al-Nawawi, written at the request of Sultānah Zakiyyat al-Dīn.\(^65\) The second was *al-Mawā‘īz al-Bāḍī‘ah*, a collection of *ḥadīth quḍāt*—that is, God’s revelation communicated to the believers by the Prophet’s own words. Again, al-Sinkīlī’s selection of these works reflects his genuine concern for his fellow Muslims at the grassroots level; all he wants is to lead them to a better understanding of the teachings of Islam. It is worth noting that the Forty Ḥadīth of al-Nawawi, a small collection of *ḥadīths* concerning the basic and practical duties of Muslims, is clearly intended for a general audience rather than specialists pursuing religious studies.

Al-Sinkīlī’s collection of the *ḥadīth quḍāt* possesses a similar nature. It delineates 50 teachings (*pengajaran*) concerning God and His relation to creation, hell and paradise, and the proper ways for the individual to achieve God’s favour. Al-Sinkīlī particularly emphasises the need for each Muslim to find harmony between knowledge (*‘ilm*) and good deeds (*‘amal*); knowledge alone will not make a better Muslim: he must do good deeds as well. He thus appeals to Muslim activism.\(^66\) The *Mawā‘īz al-Bāḍī‘ah* was published in Mecca in 1310/1892 (fourth or fifth edition).\(^67\) It was also reissued in Penang in 1369/1949, and it is still used by Muslims in the archipelago.\(^68\) With these works, al-Sinkīlī set an example for later Malay scholars to undertake works on small collections of the *ḥadīth*, as since the nineteenth century such works have been very popular in the archipelago.\(^69\)

Al-Sinkīlī writes not only for common Muslims (*al-‘awwām*) on the *zāhir* sciences but also for the elite (*al-khawwās*) on topics related to the *bātin* sciences, such as *kalām* and *tasawwuф*. He wrote several works dealing with these topics.\(^70\) But the works are still not sufficiently studied, and, as Johns\(^71\) lamented more than three decades ago, there is a lack of
interest among scholars in exploring them. The works of Hamzah al-Faṣūrī and Shams al-Dīn al-Samatrānī, however, whom Johns calls ‘the foremost exponents of heterodox pantheistic mysticism’, have been published. Al-Sinkillī’s orthodoxy, he laments further, appeals less to the imagination of scholars than heresy.72

To begin our discussion of his mystical teachings, al-Sinkillī, in his Kīfāyat al-Muhtajīn ilā Mashrab al-Muwahhidīn al-Qā’ilīn bi Wahdat al-Wujūd,73 insists on the transcendence of God over His creation. He refuses to adhere to the notion of the wujūdīyyah, which emphasises the immanence of God in His creation. This teaching reminds us of the doctrines developed by the leading scholars discussed earlier. Al-Sinkillī argues that before God created the universe (al-‘ālam) He always thought of Himself, which resulted in the creation of the Nūr Muhammad (the Light that is Muhammad). It is from the Nūr Muhammad that God created permanent archetypes (al-a’yan al-thābitah), namely, the potential universe, which became the source of the exterior archetypes (al-a’yan al-khārijīyyah), the creation in its concrete form. Al-Sinkillī concludes that although the a’yan al-khārijīyyah are the emanation of the Absolute Being, they are distinct from God Himself: it is like a hand and its shadow. Although the hand can hardly be separated from its shadow, the latter is not identical to the former. With this explanation, al-Sinkillī establishes the transcendence of God over His creation.

The same argument is presented in his short treatise entitled Daqā‘iq al-Hurūf. The work is a commentary on the so-called ‘two pantheistic verses’ of Ibn ‘Arabī.74 There is no need to dwell on al-Sinkillī’s discussion of the verses, as Johns has shown us that al-Sinkillī knowledgeably interprets them in an orthodox sense,75 proving that God and the universe are not identical. Although al-Sinkillī also makes use of the quasi neo-Platonic emanation system, also closely associated with the pantheism of Shams al-Dīn, he carefully distances himself from an unorthodox interpretation.76 Johns concludes:

He [al-Sinkillī] affirms at once the intuition of the mystics and the rights of orthodoxy, recognising the incapacity of human words to express adequately the dependence of the world upon God and its existence through Him, and the unspeakable reality of the Divine transcendence.77

Al-Sinkillī’s interpretation is clearly reminiscent of Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, who emphasises the importance of intuition (kashf) in the mystical way, while recognising the limit of reason in understanding the Realities of God. Al-Sinkillī expresses his intellectual links with al-Kūrānī in a more than implicit way. In discussing the Unity of God in the Daqā‘iq al-Hurūf,78 he relies heavily on al-Kūrānī’s concepts of Tawḥīd al-Ulāhīyyah (Divine Unity), Tawḥīd al-Af‘āl (Unity of God’s Act), Tawḥīd al-Ṣifāt (Unity of Attributes), Tawḥīd al-Wujūd (Unity of Being), Tawḥīd al-Dhāt (Unity of Essence) and Tawḥīd al-Haqiqi (Unity of Absolute Reality).79
Like Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, al-Sinkīlī proposes that the most effective way to feel and grasp the Unity God is by performing ‘ibādat, particularly dhikr (‘remembrance’ of God), both silently (sirr) and vocally (jaahr). According to al-Sinkīlī, the aim of the dhikr more specifically is to achieve al-mawt al-ikhtiyārī (‘voluntary death’), or what is called by al-Kūrānī al-mawt al-ma’nāwī (‘ideal death’), as opposed to al-mawt al-jabī’ (natural death).

In his detailed method of dhikr, however, al-Sinkīlī largely follows that of Ahmad al-Qushāšī, as described in his work al-Simt al-Majīd. He also follows al-Qushāšī’s teachings on the obligation of disciples towards their master, as he shows in his two treatises called respectively Risalah Adab Murid akan Syaikh and Risālah Mukhtasarah fi Bayān Shurūt al-Shaykh wa al-Murid.

Having discussed al-Sinkīlī’s teachings, it is clear that he transmitted the doctrines and tendencies in the scholarly networks in order to renew the Islamic tradition in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago. The most salient feature of his teachings indicates that what he transmitted is neo-Sufism: his works make it clear that taṣawwuf should go hand in hand with the shari’ah. Only with total obedience to the shari’ah can aspirants of mystical ways gain the true experience of the haqiqah (realities).

It is important to keep in mind, however, that al-Sinkīlī’s approach to renewal was different from that of al-Rānīrī: he was a mujaddid of an evolutionary type, not a radical. Therefore, like Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, he preferred to reconcile opposing views rather than to take sides. Even though he was against the doctrines of wujūdīyyah, only implicitly does he make clear his views. Similarly, he shows his dislike for the radical approach of al-Rānīrī’s renewal quite simply and not explicitly. Again, without mentioning al-Rānīrī’s name, he wisely reminds Muslims in the Dāqīq al-Harīf of the danger of accusing others of unbelieving by citing a hadith of the Prophet, stating ‘let no man accuse another of leading a sinful life or of infidelity, for the accusation will turn back if it is false’.

Considering al-Sinkīlī’s gentleness and tolerance, Johns rightly concludes that he was a mirror image of his teacher, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī.

AL-SINKILĪ’S MALAY-INDONESIAN NETWORKS

The Acehnese have long been proud of their country; they have always called their country, with pride, ‘Serambi Mekkah’, or the front yard or gate to the Holy Land, not only because of its crucial role in Islamic learning but also for its position as the most important transit point for the Malay-Indonesian pilgrims in their journey to and from the Haramayn. Aceh’s special position was among the main reasons why works of scholars like Hamzah al-Fansūrī, Shams al-Dīn al-Samatrānī, al-Rānīrī and al-Sinkīlī became widely circulated in the archipelago. The fact that all these scholars lived in Aceh, together with extensive relations and contacts between the Acehnese and foreign Muslim scholars, contributed substantially to the
establishment of the identity of the Acehnese as one of the most ardent Muslim ethnic groups in the archipelago.

Al-Sinkilli appears to have begun teaching while he was in the Haramayn, but we have no information on his disciples there. It is only after he returned to Aceh that we are able to trace his Malay-Indonesian network of disciples. These disciples, in turn, were responsible for spreading al-Sinkilli’s teachings and ‘tariqahs, particularly the Shaṭṭāriyyah order, in many parts of the archipelago.

There is no doubt that the type of the Shaṭṭāriyyah order, so often associated with the Indian type of Sufism, that was implanted by al-Sinkilli in the archipelago was the one that had been reformed by such leading scholars in our networks as Sharaf al-Dīn al-Shināwī and Ahmad al-Qushāḥī. Archer, in his classical study, calls the Shaṭṭāriyyah introduced by al-Sinkilli the ‘orthodox way’. Although in his sittihā al-Sinkilli refers to the ‘tariqah as the Shaṭṭāriyyah, he also calls it the ‘Qushāshīyyah’ ‘tariqah’. The Shaṭṭāriyyah ‘tariqah was also known as the ‘Ishqiyyah in Iran and as the Bistāniyyah in Ottoman Turkey, but is not generally known as the Qushāshīyyah. The Qushāshīyyah ‘tariqah was another name for the reformed Shaṭṭāriyyah and became a unique Malay-Indonesian phenomenon. This can be taken as an indication of al-Sinkilli’s attempts to disengage his ‘tariqah from the early Shaṭṭāriyyah. The Qushāshīyyah ‘tariqah was and can still be found in certain parts of the archipelago.

The most celebrated of al-Sinkilli’s disciples in Sumatra was Burhān al-Dīn, better known as the Tuanku of Ulakan, a village on the coast of the Minangkabau region (now West Sumatra). Local accounts of the development of Islam in Minangkabau relate that Burhān al-Dīn (1056–1104/1646–92) studied with al-Sinkilli for several years before returning to his home region. Burhān al-Dīn was, of course, not the first scholar to introduce Islam to the Minangkabau area, but he undoubtedly played a crucial role in the intensification of Islamisation among its population.

Soon after his return, Burhān al-Dīn established his Shaṭṭāriyyah surau, a ‘ribaṭ-type educational institution, in Ulakan. Before long it gained fame as the sole religious authority in Minangkabau. The Ulakan surau attracted numerous students from throughout the region; they specialised in various branches of Islamic discipline, and in turn established their own suraus when they returned to their home villages. By the fourth quarter of the eighteenth century several leading students of Burhān al-Dīn began in earnest to launch their reforms, which reached a climax at the turn of the century.

Another eminent student of al-Sinkilli was ʿAbd al-Muhīy of West Java. It is through the latter’s efforts that the Shaṭṭāriyyah gained a large following in Java. Although our sources provide no date of birth, they are in accord in reporting that ʿAbd al-Muhīy studied with al-Sinkilli in Aceh before embarking on a pilgrimage to Mecca. He was reported also to have travelled to Baghdad in order to visit the tomb of ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Jaylānī.
Returning from the *hajj* pilgrimage, on the request of the local leader he settled in Karang, Pamijahan, West Java, where he played a substantial role in converting people from animistic beliefs to Islam. ‘Abd al-Muhàyî was also very active in preaching the Ṣaḥāriyyah *tariqah*, for many *sililahs* of the order in Java and the Malay Peninsula went through him which he received directly from al-Sînkî.55

Al-Sînkî also had a prominent student in the Malay Peninsula: he was ‘Abd al-Mâlîk b. ‘Abd Allâh (1089–1149/1678–1736), better known as Tok Pulau Manis, of Trengganu. Abdullah points out that ‘Abd al-Mâlîk studied with al-Sînkî in Aceh, and later continued his studies in the Haramayn. According to local tradition, he studied there also with Ibrâhîm al-Kûrânî. But this is hardly plausible, because at the time of the latter’s death (1101/1690) ‘Abd al-Mâlîk had not even been born. At best, he may have met with al-Kûrânî’s students. Apart from this problematic account, ‘Abd al-Mâlîk was obviously a scholar of some distinction. His works deal mainly with the *sharî‘ah* or *fiqh*; he was also very active in teaching.96

The closest disciple of al-Sînkî, without doubt, was Dâwûd al-Jâwî al-Fànṣûrî b. Ismâ‘îl b. Âghâ Muṣṭafâ b. Âghâ ‘Ali al-Rûmî. The importance of citing his long full name is to indicate that he was most likely of Turkish origin. His father was probably one of the Turkish mercenaries who came in large numbers to assist the Acehnese Sultanate in their contest with the Portuguese in the early sixteenth century. The attribution al-Jâwî indicates that his mother was probably a Malay, or that he was born in the archipelago. Despite the obscurity surrounding his origin, Dâwûd al-Jâwî al-Rûmî was the most favoured student of al-Sînkî. There is a strong indication in the colophon of al-Sînkî’s *Târîjûnân al-Mustâfîd* that he was ordered by the teacher to make some addition to the *tafsîr*. And there is also a suggestion that he did so under the supervision of al-Sînkî himself before the latter’s death.97 Hasjmi98 maintains that Dâwûd al-Jâwî al-Rûmî was the main *khâlîfah* of al-Sînkî. Together with his master, he founded a *dayâh*, a traditional Acehnese Islamic educational institution, in Banda Aceh. He was also reported to have written several works.

Al-Sînkî died around 1105/1693 and was buried near the *kuala*, or the mouth, of the Aceh River. The site also became the graveyard for his wives, Dâwûd al-Rûmî and other disciples. It is after the site of his tomb that al-Sînkî later came to be known as the Shaykh of *Kuala*. Al-Sînkî’s tomb has become the most important place of religious visitation (*ziyârah*) in Aceh until the present time.99

It is important to note that al-Sînkî was also associated with al-Maqqassârî. They were in fact friends, studying together with, among others, al-Qushâshî and al-Kûrânî. It is to al-Maqqassârî that we now turn.
Seventeenth Century Malay-Indonesian Networks III: Muḥammad Yūsuf al-Maqassārī

Our discussion of the Malay-Indonesian connection of the networks of ‘ulamā’ up to now has centred mainly on Aceh. The third figure of Islamic renewal in the archipelago, Muhammad Yūsuf al-Maqassārī (1037–1111/1627–99), brings our discussion into a vast region, from South Sulawesi (Celebes) and West Java to Arabia, Srilanka and South Africa. In order to get a better grasp of al-Maqassārī’s role in Islamic development in these places, we must also deal in passing with the religious and intellectual life of the Muslims in these respective areas.

There have been a number of studies devoted to al-Maqassārī, in both Indonesia and South Africa.1 But most of them centre only on his career in the archipelago or when he was in exile in South Africa; very little attention has been given to his scholarly connections within the international networks of ‘ulamā’. This fails not only to trace the origins of al-Maqassārī’s teachings but also to recognise his role as one of the early transmitters of Islamic reformism to the region where he lived.

FROM SULAWESI TO BANTEN AND ARABIA

Muḥammad Yūsuf b. ‘Abd Allāh Abū al-Maḥāsin al-Tāj al-Khalwātī al-Maqassārī, also known in Sulawesi as ‘Tuanta Salamaka ri Gowa’ (Our Gracious Master from Gowa), according to the Annals of Gowa, was born in 1037/1627.2 Despite myth and legends concerning the parents and events surrounding the birth of al-Maqassārī, probably fabricated after his death, his family was among those which had been fully Islamised.

As a result, from his early years of life, prior to his departure to Arabia, al-Maqassārī was educated according to Islamic tradition. He initially learned to read the Qur’ān with a local teacher named Daeng ri Tasammang. Later he studied Arabic, fiqh, tawḥīd and taṣawwuf with Sayyid Bā
'Alwî b. ‘Abd Allâh al-‘Allâmah al-Ţahir, an Arab preacher who lived in Bontoala at that time. When he was 15 years of age he continued his studies in Cikoang, where he studied with Jalâl al-Dîn al-Aydid, a peripatetic teacher who was reported to have come from Aceh to Kutai, Kalimantan, before finally settling down in Cikoang.¹

The accounts of al-Maqqâsârî’s initial religious education again emphasise the nature of Islamic development in Sulawesi, as in many parts of the archipelago, namely, that wandering scholars, many of them sâifs, played a crucial role in converting and teaching the native population. However, they came to Sulawesi much later than to the western part of the archipelago; only after the second half of the sixteenth century do we find evidence of their presence in the region. It was in the early seventeenth century that these peripatetic teachers, from Aceh, Minangkabau, South Kalimantan (Borneo), Java, the Malay Peninsula and the Middle East, succeeded in converting large numbers of the population of Sulawesi. They had much greater success after the local rulers embraced Islam.⁴

Thus, in the period of al-Maqqâsârî’s birth, Islam was gaining firmer roots in South Sulawesi. By the third decade of the seventeenth century the newly Islamised rulers made their attempts to translate some doctrines of the shari‘ah into the political organisation of their kingdoms. Religious posts such as imâm (prayer leader), khatîb (reciter of the Friday sermon) and qâdî (judge) were created, and their holders became included among the nobility.⁵ With the creation of these offices, many wandering scholars were encouraged to stay. Al-Maqqâsârî was able to acquire a rudimentary Islamic education in his own region. However, it is important to note that doctrines of Islamic law were adopted only to a limited degree, especially those concerning familial matters, which were incorporated in local customs variously called pangaderreng or panguadakkang.

Returning from Cikoang, al-Maqqâsârî married a daughter of the Sulûn of Gowa, ‘Âlî al-Dîn, also known locally as Mangarangi Daeng Maura-biya (r. 1001–46/1591–1636). Al-Maqqâsârî had apparently long cherished an ambition to pursue further studies in the Middle East; it can be expected that his teachers of Arab origin gave him a further incentive towards Islamic learning there. Al-Maqqâsârî left Makassar for Arabia in the month of Rajab 1054/September 1644.⁶ Makassar, it is worth noting, was an important harbour in the eastern part of the archipelago, and from the second half of the fifteenth century it had been frequented by Malay-Indonesian and foreign traders. It had links, in the interinsular trading networks, with Banten and other harbours on northern Java as well as with Malacca and Aceh. Al-Maqqâsârî took advantage of the trading networks. He boarded a Malay ship, and we soon find him in Banten.⁷

The Sultanate of Banten (Bantam) was one of the most important Muslim kingdoms on Java. When al-Maqqâsârî arrived in Banten, the reigning ruler was Abû al-Mafâkhîr ‘Abd al-Qâdir (r. 1037–63/1626–51),
who was granted the title of Sultàn by the Sharîf of Mecca in 1048/1638. He evidently had a special interest in religious matters; he sent inquiries about religious matters not only to al-Râînî but also to scholars in the Haramayn, which resulted in special works written by those scholars, answering his questions.\(^8\) As a result, Banten became known as one of the most important Islamic centres on Java, and it is highly probable that al-Maqassârî also studied there. Not least importantly, he was able to establish close personal relations with the elite of the Bantenese Sultanate, especially with the Crown Prince, Pangeran Surya, who would succeed his father, Abû al-Mafâkhîr, as Sultàn with the official name ‘Abd al-Fattâh, better known as Sultàn Ageng Tirtayasa.

Following the route of the interinsular trade, al-Maqassârî departed for Aceh. It is reported\(^9\) that while he was in Banten he had already heard about al-Râînî and intended to study with him. Meanwhile, al-Râînî had left Aceh for his home of birth, Râînî, in 1054/1644. As al-Maqassârî departed from Makassar in the same year, it is unlikely that they met in Aceh. However, al-Maqassârî, in his work "Safinat al-Najâh, before giving his complete silsilah of the Qâdiriyah tarîqah, has the following to say:

As for the chains of initiation of the khulîfah al-Qâdiriyah, I take it from my Shaykh and prop (sandaran), the learned and prominent, the wise and inimitable, who possesses the sciences of shari‘ah and haqiqah, exploring ma‘rîfah and tarîqah, my master and teacher (guru), Shaykh Nur al-Dîn b. Ḥâsanî b. Muḥammad Ḥumayd al-Qurayshî al-Râînî; may God purify his spirit and illuminate his tomb.\(^10\)

Considering this account, it is likely that al-Maqassârî followed al-Râînî to India, where, as al-Attas points out, he studied also with ‘Umar b. ‘Abd Allâh Bâ Shaybân, al-Râînî’s teacher.\(^11\) If this is so, he must have been introduced to Bâ Shaybân by al-Râînî; and they must have met only in the Gujarat region as, so far as we are aware, Bâ Shaybân never travelled to the Malay-Indonesian world.

In all probability it is from the Gujarat coast that al-Maqassârî continued his travels to the Middle East. His first destination was the Yemen, where he studied mostly in Zabîd, with Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Bâqî al-Naṣqîbhânî, Sayyid ‘Alî al-Zabîdî and Muḥammad b. al-Wâjjî al-Sa’dî al-Yamânî.\(^12\)

We have mentioned earlier that Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Bâqî al-Mizjâjî al-Naṣqîbhânî (d. 1074/1664), probably the most important scholar of the Mizjâjî family in the seventeenth century, was one of the scholars al-Sinkîlî came into contact with in the Yemen. ‘Abd al-Bâqî was in fact the predecessor of the Mizjâjî scholars, who played an increasingly important role in the expansion of the networks to many parts of the Muslim world.

Volli\(^13\) has suggested that by the beginning of the eighteenth century the Mizjâjhîs had been identified with the Naṣqîbhânîyâh order. The association certainly began with ‘Abd al-Bâqî, for, as al-Muḥîbbi points out,\(^14\)
he was initiated into the order by Tāj al-Dīn al-Hindī, the leading shaykh of the Naqshbandiyyah in Mecca. Al-Maqaṣṣārī tells us that he took the Naqshbandiyyah tariqah from ‘Abd al-Baqī. He does not make mention of other sciences he learned from ‘Abd al-Baqī; therefore, we can assume that al-Maqaṣṣārī primarily studied tasawwuf with him.

The second major teacher of al-Maqaṣṣārī in Yemen was simply named Sayyid ‘Alī al-Zabīdī or ‘Alī b. Abī Bakr b. Muṭāyr, according to al-Maqaṣṣārī’s silsilah of the Bā ‘Alwiyyah tariqah. It is difficult to identify this scholar in Arabic sources, because his is a very common name. But his identification with Zabīd helps us in some way. Al-Muḥibbī mentions two ‘Alīs, one of whom could be a teacher of al-Maqaṣṣārī, because of his connection not only with al-Sinkīl but also with the larger networks; he is ‘Alī bin Muhammad b. al-Shaybānī al-Zabīdī, as described later.

To take al-Maqaṣṣārī’s silsilah of the Bā ‘Alwiyyah into account, it is possible that Sayyid ‘Alī was ‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr b. Muṭāyr, who died in Zabīd in 1084/1673. The Muṭāyr scholars had played some role in the networks; two of the Muṭāyr scholars, have already been mentioned namely, Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr and Abū al-‘Abbās, in connection with al-Sinkīlī. ‘Alī b. Muṭāyr [al-Zabīdī] was known as a šīfi and muḥaddith. Al-Muḥibbī, however, simply mentions that ‘Alī adhered to the tariqah of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā’ah (the people of the Sunnah and community, or the mainstream of the Sunni); no explicit mention is made of the Bā ‘Alwiyyah tariqah, although the order can surely be included among the tariqahs with which the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā’ah was affiliated.

It is also possible that Sayyid ‘Alī was actually ‘Alī b. Muḥammad b. al-Shaybānī al-Zabīdī (d. 1072/1661). Al-Muḥibbī, citing Muṣṭafā b. Fāṭḥ Allāh al-Hamāwī, his colleague, tells us that ‘Alī al-Zabīdī was a great muḥaddith of Yemen and the leader of men of learning in Zabīd. He initially studied in his home town with Muḥammad b. al-Ṣaddiq al-Khaṭṭūs al-Zabīdī or Ishaq Ibn Ja’mān—both mentioned earlier in connection with al-Sinkīlī. ‘Alī continued his studies in the Haramayn, receiving tariqahs from Abūl-Qasim al-Qushāshī. He was also active in teaching ḥadīth; among those who studied ḥadīth with him were Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, Ibn ‘Abd al-Rasūl al-Barzanji and Ḥasan al-Ajamī. He died in Zabīd. ‘Alī al-Zabīdī’s connections with these scholars, who were teachers of Jāwīdī students, including al-Maqaṣṣārī himself, made it possible for ‘Alī to come into contact with and teach al-Maqaṣṣārī. We cannot go further, as there is no indication that he was a shaykh of the Bā ‘Alwiyyah tariqah.

Al-Maqaṣṣārī does not inform us of the date of his sojourn in Yemen, but it probably took several years before he continued his travels to the heart of the networks in the Haramayn. His period of study in Mecca and Medina coincided with that of al-Sinkīlī. Therefore, it can be expected that al-Maqaṣṣārī studied with scholars who were also the teachers of al-Sinkīlī. The most important among his teachers in the Haramayn were familiar
names in the networks, such as Aḥmad al-Qushāšī, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī and Ḥasan al-ʿAjamī.29

Al-Maqassārī’s relationship with al-Kūrānī was apparently close. It is known that he was entrusted by al-Kūrānī to copy al-Durrat al-Fākhīrah and Risālah fi al-Wujūd, both works of Nūr al-Dīn al-Īmām (d. 898/1492), and a commentary on the first work by ‘ʿAbd al-Ghaftūr al-Lārī (d. 912/1506). Al-

Kūrānī himself later wrote a commentary on al-Durrat al-Fākhīrah called al-Tahyīrāt al-Bāhirāt li Ṭabāḥīth al-Durrat al-Fākhīrah.20 All of these works attempt to reconcile opposing positions between the Muslim theologians and philosophers on several philosophical issues concerning God. It has been suggested that al-Maqassārī studied these three works under al-Kūrānī when he was copying them.21

Unlike al-Sinkīlī, al-Maqassārī does not specify the religious sciences he studied with the above scholars. He mentions them primarily in connection with his teachings and ṭarīqah silsīlahs or in notes towards the end of some of his works. Considering their scholarly discourse and the kind of teachings he attributed to them, it is fair to assume that, in addition to ṭasawwūf, al-Maqassārī studied ḥadīth, taṣfīr, fiqh and other branches of Islamic science with them.

Aside from the above scholars, al-Maqassārī mentions his other teachers in the Ḥaramayn: Muḥammad al-Maẓrūʿ [al-Madānī], ‘ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Lahūrī and Muḥammad Murāz al-Shāmī.22 While I have failed to identify the first scholar, the second was very likely ‘ʿAbd al-Karīm al-

Hindī al-Lahūrī, who settled in the Ḥaramayn and flourished in the eleventh/seventeenth century. He appears also to have been involved in the networks; he was an acquaintance of ‘ʿAbd Allāh al-Baṣrī, Aḥmad al-

Nakhīlī, Tāj al-Dīn al-Qāʿī and Abū Ṭāḥīr al-Kūrānī.23 We may expect that through ‘ʿAbd al-Karīm for Muḥammad al-Lahūrī, al-Maqassārī learned much about the Indian tradition of Islamic learning.

As for Muḥammad Murūz al-Shāmī, he was most probably Muḥammad Mirza b. Muḥammad al-Dīmāshqī. This is based on the fact that the copyists of al-Maqassārī’s works obviously misspelled the names of several of his teachers. They, for instance, wrote ‘Muḥammad al-Zujājī al-Naqshbandī’ instead of Muḥammad [b. ‘ʿAbd al-Baqī] al-Mīzjājī al-Naqshbandī, or ‘Muḥammad Bāqī Allāh al-Lahūrī’ instead of ‘ʿAbd al-

Karīm al-Lahūrī or Muḥammad b. ‘ʿAbd al-Baqī al-Naqshbandī.24

We have other reasons to identify Muḥammad Mirza as a teacher of al-Maqassārī. First of all, he was a student of Tāj al-Dīn al-Hindī al-Naqshbandī. Like Muḥammad b. ‘ʿAbd al-Baqī al-Mīzjājī, Muḥammad Mirza was initiated by Tāj al-Dīn into the Naqshbandiyah order in Mecca; they may be expected to have been friends. As al-Maqassārī had received the order earlier from ‘ʿAbd al-Baqī, it is possible that he later recommended al-Maqassārī to study with Muḥammad Mirza when he left Yemen for the Ḥaramayn. Muḥammad Mirza migrated from Damascus and lived in Medina for 40 years before he finally moved to Mecca, where he died in 1066/1656, after only two
years there. Muhammad Mirza, mainly known as a ṣūfī, attempted to reinterpret Ibn ‘Arabi’s doctrines in terms that people could comprehend.25

Unlike al-Sinkil, who returned directly to the Malay-Indonesian world after studying in the Haramayn, al-Maqqassârî travelled to Damascus, another important centre of Islamic learning in the Middle East. It appears that Muhammad Mirza recommended that al-Maqqassârî study there. But it is also possible that Ahmad al-Qushâshî encouraged him to go to Damascus and study with one of its leading scholars, Ayyûb b. Ahmad b. Ayyûb al-Dimashqî al-Khalwâtî (994–1071/1586–1661). As we have already noted, al-Qushâshî was a close friend of Ayyûb al-Khalwâtî (see Chart 5).

Ayyûb al-Khalwâtî was born and died in Damascus. He was a renowned ṣūfî and muhaddith of Syria. His education included both exoteric sciences, such as hadîth, tafsîr and fiqh, as well as esoteric sciences like taṣawwuf and kalâm. Both al-Hamawi and Al-Muhîbî call him ‘al-ulustâdî al-akbar’ (great teacher), and they claim that nobody else in Damascus was as learned as he was during his time. Sulṭân Ibráhim, the ruler of Syria, often consulted him in matters relating to Islamic law and mysticism.26

Ayyûb al-Khalwâtî was also a prolific writer. His writings mainly deal with taṣawwuf, kalâm, hadîth and Khalwatiyyah rituals. He attempted to give a new interpretation of Ibn ‘Arabi’s doctrines, particularly concerning the concept of al-Insân al-Kâmîl (‘perfect man’ or ‘universal man’), in light of the sharî’ah. Ayyûb al-Khalwâtî also had extensive networks by way of hadîth studies. His scholarly reputation made his halqahs popular with students from various parts of the Muslim world, such as the Maghribi region, Arabia, and South and Southeast Asia.

Al-Maqqassârî does not tell us when the period of his study with Ayyûb al-Khalwâtî took place, but al-Maqqassârî evidently accompanied him for some time. After exhibiting his talent for absorbing the exoteric and esoteric sciences, he was able to win the favour of Ayyûb al-Khalwâtî. The latter awarded him the title of ‘al-Tâj al-Khalwâtî’ (the Crown of the Khalwâtî). Al-Maqqassârî highly praises Ayyûb al-Khalwâtî in his works and mentions him in his sîsilah of the Khalwatiyyah ṣariqah.27 The way al-Maqqassârî refers to Ayyûb al-Khalwâtî could lead one to assume that this Damascene scholar was simply a great ṣūfî, but in fact he was also a leading expert in Islamic law.

After studying in Damascus, al-Maqqassârî is said to have continued his travels to Istanbul.28 Traditional accounts of al-Maqqassârî’s life that circulate in South Sulawesi tell the story of his journey in the ‘Negeri Rum’ (Turkey), but we have no other sources to corroborate them.29

According to Gowa sources, while he was in Mecca al-Maqqassârî had begun to teach. As one might expect, most of his students were of Malay-Indonesian origin, both from the hâji pilgrims and the Jâwâh community in the Haramayn. Among his students in Mecca was ‘Abd al-Bashîr al-Darîr al-Rapanî (from Rappang, South Sulawesi), who later was responsible for spreading the Naqîshbandiyyah and Khalwatiyyah orders in South
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Sulawesi. Furthermore, al-Maqassar is reported to have married the daughter of a Shafi’i Imam in Mecca, but his wife died when she gave birth to a child, and al-Maqassar remarried a woman of Sulawesi origin in Jeddah before he finally returned to the archipelago.31

FROM BANTEN TO SRILANKA AND SOUTH AFRICA

It is not very clear when Al-Maqassar returned to the archipelago. Hamid and Van Bruinessen respectively claim that he returned in 1075/1664 and 1083/1672,32 but we are not able to substantiate this, for other sources do not supply us with the date of al-Maqassar’s return. However, if these dates are correct, it means that he spent between 20 and 28 years traveling in search for knowledge. There are also conflicting accounts of whether al-Maqassar returned directly to his homeland, Gowa, or went via Banten.

Hamka,33 Amansyah,34 Mattulada35 and Pelras36 all maintain that al-Maqassar initially returned to South Sulawesi before he proceeded to Banten. Hamid,37 Labbakang38 and Dangor,39 on the other hand, believe that al-Maqassar settled in Banten when he returned to the archipelago and never came back to Gowa. We will discuss these two conflicting accounts and attempt to determine which one is the more plausible.

According to the first opinion, when al-Maqassar returned from Arabia to Gowa, South Sulawesi, he found that Islamic precepts were not being practised by the Muslim population; remnants of contra-Islamic local beliefs continued to hold sway. Although the ruler and nobility had long declared themselves Muslims, they were reluctant to apply the doctrine of Islamic law in their realms. They were unwilling or unable to prohibit gambling, cock-fighting, arrack drinking, opium smoking and the like. They in fact promoted superstitious practices such as giving offerings to the spirit of the ancestors in the hope that the latter would bring them prosperity.

Having witnessed such a sorry state of religious life, al-Maqassar appealed to the Gowa ruler and notables to abolish all such practices and to implement Islamic law. However, the ruler insisted on maintaining the status quo; abolishing gambling and opium smoking, for instance, would have meant reducing financial gains.40 As a result, al-Maqassar departed to Banten, where he established his career. He left behind him, however, several outstanding disciples, such as Nur al-Din b. ‘Abd al-Fattah, ‘Abd al-Bashtir al-Darir and ‘Abd al-Qadir Karaeng Jeno.

It is apparent that the account of al-Maqassar’s return to Gowa is based on Hamka’s article, one of the earliest writings on al-Maqassar in the Indonesian language. The problem with Hamka’s article is that it relies heavily on an oral tradition that has passed through many generations. It is difficult to sift fact from myth in such oral histories, and we have no written sources to substantiate them.
The spread of al-Maqassārī’s teachings and works in South Sulawesi did not necessarily require al-Maqassārī’s physical presence in the region. All of his students are reported to have studied with him either in the Haramayn or in Banten. Furthermore, from the middle of the seventeenth century, Muslims from South Sulawesi came to Banten in large numbers. They also played an important role in spreading al-Maqassārī’s teachings and works when they returned to their own regions.41

It is more plausible, therefore, that al-Maqassārī returned to Banten rather than to Gowa. He may have planned to stay there temporarily on his way back to his homeland, but later developments made him change his mind. After several months in Banten he married the daughter of Sultān Ageng Tirtayasa.42 It is worth remembering that al-Maqassārī and the Sultān had been friends before the former left for Arabia. Thus, when al-Maqassārī returned with scholarly credentials and prestige, Sultān Ageng attempted to keep him in Banten by any means, including marriage.

Sultān Ageng Tirtayasa (r. 1053–96/1651–83) was undoubtedly the last great ruler of the Bantenese Sultanate. Under his rule the Sultanate reached its golden age. Its port became an important centre of international trade in the archipelago. The Bantenese traded with traders from England, Denmark, China, Indo-China, India, Persia, the Philippines and Japan. The ships of the Sultanate sailed the archipelago, representing the last powerful trading power of the Malay-Indonesian kingdoms.43

Sultān Ageng was a fervent enemy of the Dutch; his accession to the throne resumed the long-standing conflicts between the Bantenese and the Dutch, who had fought wars in 1028/1619 and 1043–9/1633–9. Peace settlements achieved after the wars could not hold for very long. Sultān Ageng’s fleet, modelled after those of the Europeans, attacked the Dutch posts in Sumatra. He made Banten a safe haven for fighters from elsewhere in the archipelago in wars against the Dutch, as well as for fugitives from Dutch prisons.44 For the Dutch, who now fortified themselves in Batavia, Sultān Ageng was a major stumbling block in their territorial expansion in the archipelago.

Sultān Ageng Tirtayasa, like his father, Sultān Abū al-Mafākhir ‘Abd al-Qādir, had a special interest in religion. The political and diplomatic relations with the Muslim rulers, particularly with the Sharifs of Mecca, that had been established by his father continued to flourish. Contemporaneous Dutch sources also note that Sultān Ageng was able to establish relations with Surat and other Muslim kingdoms on the coastal region of the Indian subcontinent.

Moreover, he sent his son, ‘Abd al-Qahhār, on a diplomatic mission to Istanbul; this was in conjunction with the latter’s hājj pilgrimages to Mecca, which were undertaken respectively from 1080/1669 to 1082/1671 and from 1085/1674 to 1087/1676. During the time of Sultān Ageng, scholars and students from various parts of the Muslim world
continued to come to Banten. Sultan Ageng himself, most of the time, was accompanied by these Muslim scholars. Thus, he was able to maintain the reputation of Banten as an important centre of Islamic learning in the archipelago.

The political and religious situation in the Bantenese Sultanate was clearly favourable for al-Maqassar to remain there. His marriage to the daughter of the Sultan created a stronger bond with the Sultanate. He rose to one of the highest positions among the court elite, and became the most influential member of the Sultan’s Advisory Board. He was called *opper-priester* or *hoogepriester* (highest priest) by Dutch sources, and played an important role not only in religious matters but also in political ones.

The news about al-Maqassar’s presence in Banten soon reached South Sulawesi. The Sultan of Gowa dispatched a delegation to Banten in order to induce him to return to his homeland. The Sultan requested that al-Maqassar teach the royal family about Islam and thus accelerate the process of Islamisation in the region. Al-Maqassar, however, declined the invitation. Our sources cite him as stating that he would not return to Gowa until his erudition in Islamic reached perfection. He instead sent home his student ‘Abd al-Bashir al-Darir, who had apparently followed him from Mecca to Banten. Al-Maqassar appointed al-Darir (‘the blind’) his *khalifah* of the Khalwatiyyah and Naqshbandiyyah orders.

Thus, while in Banten, although al-Maqassar was increasingly pulled into the political arena he continued to teach students in the capital city of Banten as well as to write. Later, when al-Maqassar was involved in wars against the Dutch, he was reported to have retreated to the village of Karang, and had some connections with a man named by Dutch sources as ‘Hadjee Karang’. Karang was the home of ‘Abd al-Muhyi, a disciple of al-Sinkil, and he was certainly the ‘Hadjee Karang.’ ‘Abd al-Muhyi took the opportunity of his meeting with al-Maqassar to study with him, asking his commentary on certain verses of the Qur’an that dealt with mystical doctrines. ‘Abd al-Muhyi also asked al-Maqassar to transmit to him the *silsilah* of the Khalwatiyyah and Naqshbandiyyah orders.

Included among the most prominent students of al-Maqassar was the heir to the Sultanate, ‘Abd al-Qahhar. There is little doubt that al-Maqassar recommended that he travel to Istanbul after performing his pilgrimage in Mecca. Al-Maqassar’s wide contacts in the Middle East and his possible visit to Istanbul helped pave the way for the Crown Prince to carry out his diplomatic mission. We have no further information on the mission. What is clear is that when the heir Prince returned from the Middle East to Banten with the new title of Sultan Haji, he soon appealed to the Bantenese to wear clothes of Arab style.

‘Abd al-Qahhar’s insistence on Arab dress is reported by Sasmita to have been the initial reason for the rifts between him and his father, Sultan Ageng. But it appears that the fundamental cause of conflict was the
decision of Sultan Ageng to appoint his other son, Pangeran Purbaya, to succeed him to the throne while 'Abd al-Qahhār was on his pilgrimage.\(^5\)

This decision was apparently prompted by 'Abd al-Qahhār’s predilection for the Dutch, in contrast to Sultan Ageng’s decidedly anti-Netherlands disposition. Sultan Ageng attempted to reach some reconciliation with 'Abd al-Qahhār; the latter was restored to his original position as heir, and was assigned to rule the Sultanate from the capital city, Banten, while the old Sultan moved to Tirtayasa. These policies proved to be a great blow to the old Sultan, for 'Abd al-Qahhār now used his position to embrace the Dutch even more closely.

Meanwhile, Sultan Ageng had reasserted his rule over the Cirebon Sultanate, and warned the Dutch resident in Batavia in the presence of the English, French and Danish residents that he would consider every act of hostility or interference by the Dutch East Indies Company (VOC) in the affairs of Cirebon as a *casus belli* for him.\(^5\) 'Abd al-Qahhār did not share his father’s views. He made it clear that he took the side of the Dutch. Probably with the connivance of the Dutch, 'Abd al-Qahhār declared the abdication of his father from the throne in 1091/1680, and claimed it for himself. Sultan Haji soon dismissed supporters of Sultan Ageng from their official positions, and sent envoys to Batavia to negotiate a peace treaty with the Dutch.

Sultan Ageng refused his forced abdication; he gathered his army in Tirtayasa, and civil war appeared inevitable. Being caught in this difficult situation, al-Maqassārī, together with Pangeran Purbaya, chose to take the side of Sultan Ageng. The war finally broke out in the last days of 1092/early 1682, when Sultan Ageng’s forces besieged Sultan Haji in the capital, Banten. Realising that his position was precarious, Sultan Haji appealed for support from Batavia. In return for Dutch help in keeping him on the throne, he promised to cede all trade benefits to the VOC.

The Dutch immediately seized this long-awaited opportunity. Reinforcements under Captain François Tack were sent from Batavia so that Sultan Haji could escape from being humiliated by Sultan Ageng’s army. Fresh from victories in South Sulawesi, Cirebon and Mataram, the Dutch army was able to inflict reverses on Sultan Ageng’s forces. On 29 December 1682, Dutch troops attacked Tirtayasa, but Sultan Ageng, al-Maqassārī and Pangeran Purbaya escaped the siege and took refuge in the southern mountains of West Java. Persistently pursued by forces of the Dutch and Sultan Haji, Sultan Ageng was finally captured in 1096/1683 and was exiled to Batavia, where he died in 1103/1692.\(^5\)

The capture of Sultan Ageng, however, did not put an end to the war. His force was now led by al-Maqassārī. Conducting a guerilla warfare, al-Maqassārī’s forces of 4000 men, consisting of the Bantenese, Makassarese/Buginese and Javanese, proved difficult to subdue. This attests to al-Maqassārī’s dauntless courage and bravery, and to his firm determination
to fight the enemy. After failing to capture al-Maqassārī on the battlefield, the
Dutch finally employed the trickery that they were so often to use in their
territorial expansion in the archipelago. According to one version from Dutch
accounts, Van Happel, the commander of the Dutch troops, wearing Arab
garb and disguised as a Muslim, was able to infiltrate al-Maqassārī’s fortifi-
cation, finally capturing him on 14 December 1683.57 Another version of the
capture is that Van Happel came to al-Maqassārī’s hiding place with the
latter’s daughter, promising him the pardon of the Dutch if he surrendered.
Persuaded by the promise, which was never honoured by the Dutch, al-
Maqassārī and his forces joined Van Happel and followed him to Cirebon,
where he was officially declared a prisoner of war and taken to Batavia. At
the same time, his followers of South Sulawesi origin were sent back to their
homeland.58
With the capture of al-Maqassārī, the Banten wars practically ended. The
news of al-Maqassārī’s detention spread through Batavia; he was hailed as
a great hero in the struggle against the Dutch expansionism. He was highly
venerated: even his *seph* (chewed betelnut) was picked up by his follow-
ers when he spat it out, and was preserved as a relic.59 It is not hard to
understand, then, the Dutch fear that the Muslims would rise up to free him.
In September 1684 they exiled him to Srilanka, together with two wives,
several children, 12 disciples and a number of maids.60
Despite the fact that al-Maqassārī stayed in Srilanka for almost a decade,
studies of the Malay-Indonesian Muslim community on that island fail to
disclose his presence and role in the development of Islam there.61 This is
unfortunate, as when he was in Srilanka al-Maqassārī produced a sub-
stantial number of works, some of which bear the title of *Saylāniyyah*
(or Sailan = Ceylon) or are mentioned explicitly to have been written
in ‘‘Saratānib’’ (mediaeval Arabic term for Srilanka).62 Furthermore,
al-Maqassārī appears to have left some descendants in Srilanka who
possess manuscripts that could be a starting point for future research.63
Such manuscripts would certainly be useful for complementing both
Indonesian accounts and Dutch records of al-Maqassārī’s life in Srilanka.

It is worth noting that outside the archipelago, Srilanka, ruled by the
Dutch in the period between 1050/1640 and 1211/1796, was the second
centre for banishment after the Cape of Good Hope for Malay-Indonesian
exiles. Due to its proximity to the archipelago, Srilanka had been preferred
by the Dutch to the Cape of Good Hope, which seems to have been reserved
for more dangerous exiles. The Dutch apparently began to transport a
substantial number of Malay-Indonesian exiles to Srilanka as soon as they
established their rule there.64 We know very little about the life of exiles
prior to the seventeenth century, but there is no doubt that al-Maqassārī was
the most prominent Malay-Indonesian figure ever banished by the Dutch to
Srilanka.

In a sense, al-Maqassārī’s banishment to Srilanka was a blessing in
disguise. While he was in Banten he experienced political turbulence, but
he never abandoned his scholarly concerns; he was even able during this period to produce several works. Now in Srilanka he had the opportunity to return entirely to the scholarly world. In the introduction to his *Safīnat al-Najāh*, al-Maqassārī in retrospect expected that by the grace of God he would inherit the wisdom of Adam, the prophet, who was, in the Muslim belief, discharged on Srilanka after his fall from Heaven.65 So al-Maqqāsārī devoted himself primarily to writing.

We can fairly safely assume that al-Maqassārī played an important role in nurturing the hitherto small and inchoate Malay Muslim community on the island. Al-Maqassārī himself expressly mentioned that he wrote his works in Srilanka to satisfy the requests of his friends, disciples and fellow Muslims there.66 He also established contact with other scholars there. Among the Muslim scholars of Indian origin who became his friends were Sîdî Matîlaya, Âbî al-Mâ`ânî Ibrâhîm Minâhân and `Abd al-Ṣiddîq b. Muhammad Şâdiq.

The fact that his *Safīnat al-Najāh* was written on the request of Ibrâhîm Minâhân was an indication that Minâhân and his fellow Indian scholars were well aware of al-Maqqāsārī’s erudition. It is possible that through these scholars the Moghul ruler Aurângzâb (1071–1119/1659–1707) learned about the banishment of al-Maqassārī to Srilanka. The Şultan reportedly warned the Dutch authorities there to pay attention to the wellbeing of al-Maqassārī.67

Thus, the banishment had failed to cut al-Maqassārī off from outside contacts. No less important than al-Maqqasārī’s relations with the Indian scholars were his contacts with Malay-Indonesian pilgrims, who made Srilanka their transit point on their way to and from Mecca and Medina, or with Muslim traders who came there for business. That the contacts between al-Maqqasārī and the pilgrims existed becomes obvious from an explicit mention in one of his works that he wrote it for his friends the *sâs*.68

It was these *ḥâjîs* who brought al-Maqqasārī’s works, written in Srilanka, to the archipelago so that we are able to read them today. They in turn brought works written by Malay-Indonesian scholars to Srilanka. The religious works found among the Malays on this island include these of al-Râ Çünkü, al-Sînkîlî and al-Maqassārī himself.69

Considering the existence of such extensive relations, the Dutch were right in assuming that al-Maqqasārī still exerted a considerable influence on the Malay-Indonesian Muslims. They were suspicious that through those pilgrims al-Maqqassārī had established networks, consisting of various Muslim rulers in the archipelago, who would wage concerted and large-scale wars against the Dutch. Fearing further political and religious repercussions from al-Maqqasārī’s relations with his countrymen, the Dutch authorities decided in 1106/1693 to send al-Maqassārī even farther away, to exile in South Africa. He was already 68 years old when once again he was forced to embark on *‘De Voetboog’*, which would take him to the Cape of Good Hope.70
Among the Malays, the Cape of Good Hope was the most notorious place of banishment. Since colonisation by the Dutch in 1652, a number of eminent Malay-Indonesian figures, considered by the Dutch to be the most dangerous, had been exiled there. But, as in Sri Lanka, not all Malay-Indonesians brought to the Cape of Good Hope were exiles; some of them were slaves who were used for work on Dutch farms in the region.71

Prior to the coming of al-Maqassāri, both the early exiles and slaves constituted the nucleus of a small Muslim group known as the Cape Malays.

All writers on South African Islam are in accord that al-Maqassāri was the most important Malay-Indonesian exile ever banished to South Africa.72 Al-Maqassāri arrived in the Cape of the Good Hope on 2 April 1694. Most of his retinue of 49 people were those who had followed him earlier to Sri Lanka. Two months later the Dutch authorities took him and his retinue to live in Zandvliet, a farm village at the mouth of the Eerste River, so that he, as Jeffreys points out, ‘would not be in touch with any adherents of the old regime’.73 Bearing historical connections to al-Maqassāri and his followers, this locality today is known as Macassar, and its coastal area is called Macassar beach.

Generally, al-Maqassāri received good treatment and due respect from the Dutch authorities in the Cape. Governor Simon van der Stel and later his son, Willem Adriaan, befriended him.74 Despite this, they must have been aware that al-Maqassāri could give them problems. Therefore, the Dutch attempted to isolate him and his followers from other Malay-Indonesian exiles who had arrived before them. But their attempts apparently failed. He once again became the rallying point for the Malay-Indonesians, not to rise up against the Dutch but to intensify their Islamic beliefs and practices. Al-Maqassāri and his 12 disciples, now called imāms, together with other exiles, carried out teaching sessions and religious services secretly in their lodges.75 With such activities, al-Maqassāri was able not only to preserve the Islamic belief of his fellow exiles but to gain numerous new converts.76

Al-Maqassāri appears to have devoted most of his time to proselytising activities; there is no evidence that he also spent his time on writing, for none among his known works contains any indication whatsoever that it was written in South Africa. This suggests that al-Maqassāri considered direct propagation through teaching to be of the utmost importance to his Malay-Indonesian community. In short, the maintenance of Islamic belief was his primary concern.

This is no surprise, as the Dutch not only prohibited Muslims from openly holding religious services but, worse still, ordered the Christianisation of all Muslim slaves in the Cape.77 The Dutch evangelist scholar Zwemer even regrets the failure of Petrus Kalden, first minister of the Old Dutch Church at Cape Town, to convert al-Maqassāri to Christianity, despite the fact that the latter lived on land belonging to the minister. Zwemer bluntly points out that a great opportunity was lost by Kalden.78

Al-Maqassāri has been hailed by historians of South African Islam as the
founder of Islam in the region. The term ‘founder’ could be misleading: Islam, or a Malay-Indonesian Muslim community, had clearly existed in the Cape before he arrived there. Therefore, I would suggest that he is more appropriately called the ‘reviver’ or ‘revitaliser’ of Islam in South Africa. His determination to preserve the belief of his fellow Muslims was one of the crucial factors contributing to the survival and further development of Islam in the region.

Furthermore, as Zwemer points out, there were three orders that existed among Muslims in South Africa: the Qadiryyah, Shatariyyah, and Rifaiyyah. It is highly likely that al-Maqqasiri was responsible for introducing these orders there, for he was a khalifah of all of them. As early as 1186/1772, Thurnberg observed a ritual among the Malays that clearly constituted dhikr, and in the 1860s Mayson gives us vivid accounts of the well-known practices among the Rifaiyyah followers of being invulnerable to fire and weapons.

Al-Maqqasiri, as Colvin in his Romance of the Empire asserts, could not but have longed for the palms and spices of his native land, which he was fated never again to see. Colvin may be right, but al-Maqqasiri himself never made clear his sense of being an old exile under his long-contested enemy. It is clear that his relatives in Gowa had never lost hope for his freedom. As early as 1103/1689, when al-Maqqasiri was still in Srilanka, the Sultan of Gowa, ‘Abd al-Jalil (r. 1088–1121/1677–1709), and all the important local notables came to meet the Dutch Governor in Makassar, asking for the return of al-Maqqasiri to his homeland. They brought with them 2000 rijksdaalders, which had been donated by both notables and commoners to make possible his return. Although the Governor agreed to meet the request, Batavia annulled his decision. ‘Abd al-Jalil asked the Dutch to return al-Maqqasiri repeatedly until 1110/1698, when the Dutch Council in Batavia issued a definite refusal to consider any such request, obviously fearing political repercussions from his return.

Al-Maqqasiri died at the Cape on 22 Dh al-Qa’dah 1111/22 May 1699, and was buried in Faure, on the sandhills of False Bay, not far from the farm of Zandvliet. His tomb later came to be known as the ‘Karamat’ Shaykh Yusuf (lit. ‘miracle’). Between 1321/1903 and 1333/1913 the grave of al-Maqqasiri was restored by Haji Sulaymân Shâh Muhammad, a rich Cape Muslim of Indian origin. A splendid domed mausoleum was erected over al-Maqqasiri’s grave, which later was complemented by other buildings, including tombs of four of his disciples. The ‘karamat’ of al-Maqqasiri is one of the most beautiful and the most important tomb buildings in the Cape Peninsula. It became a central point of the Malay-Indonesian community and the most important place of Muslim religious visitation (ziyarah) at the Cape; or, as Du Plessis puts it, ‘the tomb has become the Mecca of the South, where thousands of pilgrims pay their respects annually to the memory of a noble exile’.
The death of al-Maqassārī was a relief for the Cape Dutch authorities, both politically and financially. On 1 July 1699, they reported his death to Batavia; they asked Batavia to lift the financial burden, incurred by the Cape authorities, for the upkeep of al-Maqassārī and his retinue. As a result, the Council of Batavia decided in October 1699 to grant permission to al-Maqassārī’s survivors and followers to return to the archipelago, should they want to; most of them chose to return, and they departed on board the ships ‘De Liefde’ and ‘De Spiegel’ in 1116/1704.87

In the meantime, the news of al-Maqassārī’s death had reached South Sulawesi. Once again the Sultan of Gowa requested the return of al-Maqassārī—now, of course, only his remains. Finally, the remains allegedly belonging to al-Maqassārī arrived in Gowa on 5 April 1705, and were reburied the following day in Lakiung. 88 Like his tomb in Faure, this tomb of al-Maqassārī soon became one of the most important places of religious visitation in South Sulawesi.89

The fact that al-Maqassārī has two tombs has led to some speculation. De Haan believes that the Dutch sent the actual remains of al-Maqassārī to Gowa; therefore, his tomb in Faure is empty.90 The Muslims in the Cape, on the other hand, believe that only the remains of a single finger of al-Maqassārī were taken to his homeland.91 This speculation appears to contain some truth if one considers a legend in Gowa about the body of al-Maqassārī they reburied. According to the legend, initially only a handful of dust, which was probably the remains of his finger, was brought from the Cape. The dust, however, kept growing until it took the shape of the full body of al-Maqassārī when it reached Gowa.92

AL-MAQASSĀRĪ’S NEO-SUFISM

Al-Maqassārī was primarily a sūfī. His life experience makes it clear that his Sufism did not keep him away from worldly affairs. Unlike earlier sūfīs who exhibited strong tendencies to shun worldly life, the whole expression of al-Maqassārī’s teachings and practices shows a full range of activism.

Like al-Rānīrī and al-Sinkilī in the Sultanate of Aceh, al-Maqassārī played an important role in Bantenese politics. Not only that he stepped up to the forefront of the wars against the Dutch after the capture of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa. However, like most scholars in the international networks of scholars in the seventeenth century, al-Maqassārī did not employ the tarīqah organisation to mobilise the masses, especially for the purposes of war.

Al-Maqassārī wrote his works in perfect Arabic; his long sojourn in the Middle East had enabled him to write in that language. Almost all his known works deal with taṣawwuf, particularly in its relations with kalām. Like al-Rānīrī and al-Sinkilī, al-Maqassārī in developing his teachings often cites such scholars and sūfīs as al-Ghazālī, Junayd al-Baghdādī, Ibn ‘Arabi, al-Jīlī, Ibn ‘Atā’ Allāh and other authorities.
A central concept of al-Maqassārī’s ṭaṣawwuf is the purification of belief ('aqīdah) in the Unity of God (tawḥīd). This is his attempt to explain the transcendence of God over his creation. Such, of course, is a central theme developed by other scholars in the networks. Citing Sūrat al-Ikhlas (the Qur'ān, chapter 112) and another verse of the Qur'ān that states that nothing can be compared with Him (42:11), al-Maqassārī maintains that the Unity of God (tawḥīd) is infinite and absolute.93 Tawḥīd is the essential component in Islam; one who does not believe in tawḥīd is an unbeliever (kāfir). He further compares the immaculate tawḥīd with a leafy tree: gnostic knowledge (ma‘rifah) is its branches and leaves, and devotional services ('ibādāt) are its fruits. One who has no ma‘rifah is ignorant (jāhi‘), and one who does not practise 'ibādāt is sinful (fāsiq).94

Despite his insistence on the transcendence of God, al-Maqassārī believes that God is all-encompassing (al-iḥṣā‘ah) and omnipresent (al-ma‘ā‘iyah) over His creation.95 But he takes great care not to associate himself with the doctrine of pantheism by maintaining that although God is present or expresses Himself in His creation, it does not necessarily mean that the creation is God himself; all creation is simply allegorical being (al-mawjūd al-majāżī), not the Real Being (al-mawjūd al-haqiqī).96 Thus, like al-Sinkīlī he believes that the creation is only a shadow of God, not God Himself. According to al-Maqassārī, the ‘expression’ of God in His creations is not the ‘physical’ presence of God in them.

With the concept of al-iḥṣā‘ah and al-ma‘ā‘iyah, God descends (tanazzul) while man ascends (taraqqi), a spiritual process that brings the two closer. It is important to note that according to al-Maqassārī the process will not take its form in the ultimate unity between man and God: while the two may be closely associated, in the final analysis man is man and God is God. With this, al-Maqassārī rejects the concept of wahdat al-wujūd ('Unity of Being', or ontological monism) and al-hulūl ('Divine Incarnation'). In his opinion, God is simply incomparable to anything (layṣa ka mitihih shay, Qur'ān 42:11). Instead he adopts the concept of wahdat al-shuhūd ('Unity of Consciousness', or phenomenological monism).97 Thus, while he carefully disengages himself from the controversial doctrine of wahdat al-wujūd of Ibn 'Arabi and of al-ḥulūl of Mansūr al-Ḥallūjī, al-Maqassārī adopts the doctrine of wahdat al-shuhūd, developed mainly by Ahmad al-Sirhindī (971–1034/1564–1624); later, this doctrine was also adopted by Shah Wali Allah (1114–76/1702–1762).

A salient feature of al-Maqassārī’s theology of God’s Unity is that he attempts to reconcile all Attributes or Qualities of God. According to Islamic belief, God possesses Attributes which may seem to be conflicting one with another. God is, for instance, believed to be the First (al-Awвал) and the Last (al-Ākhir); the Exterior (al-Zāhir) and the Interior (al-Bā‘īn); the One who gives guidance (al-Ḥādi‘), but also the One who allows humans to go astray (al-Mudīl). According to al-Maqassārī, all these seemingly conflicting Attributes of God should be understood in accordance with the Unity of
God Himself. Emphasising only certain Attributes while ignoring the others will lead to wrong belief and practices. The Realities of God are the Unity of pairs of conflicting Attributes, and none will be able to comprehend their secret but those who have been granted knowledge by God Himself.98

As far as al-Maqassārī’s theology is concerned, he adheres strictly to the Ash’āri doctrines. He thus stresses total commitment to all six articles of belief—that is, belief in the One God, the Angels, the Revelation, the Prophets, the Day of Judgment and the Will of God. Furthermore, in connection with impeccable belief in these articles of faith, he appeals to his fellow Muslims to accept the ambiguous meanings of some verses of the Qur’ān, or al-āyāt al-mutashābīhāt.99 Looking for or questioning the real meanings of such verses is simply an indication of not totally believing in God; only with the acceptance of the verses as such will a traveller on God’s path be able to gain the blessing of God.100

It is well known that the theology of al-Asḥārī emphasises human predestination vis-à-vis the Will of God. Al-Maqassārī basically accepts this notion. For instance, he repeatedly asks Muslims to sincerely embrace their fate and the divine decree (al-Qaḍā wa al-Qadar), either good or bad.101 He insists, however, that men must not simply surrender to them. Of particular importance, men cannot blame God for their bad deeds, for they should not simply accept them as their fate. Instead, they must make ceaseless attempts to avoid sinful behaviour and improve humanity by thinking about the creation and doing good deeds.

In this way, al-Maqassārī believes, men will be able to create a better life in this world and the next. More importantly, they will open the way to attaining the highest stage, called al-‘ubūdīyyah al-mutlaqah (unrestricted adoration). The one who succeeds in achieving this stage reaches the centre of his being, and is accordingly called the Universal Man (al-Insān al-Kāmil).102 According to al-Maqassārī, by achieving the stage of Universal Man a slave strips his allegorical being (al-mawjūd al-majāţī) and gets into his real ‘nothingness’, non-existence (‘udum al-haqqī). His nothingness is taken by God as a mirror (mir‘ah) of Himself. God further reveals (tajallī) Himself in the slave. In other words, the slave who is absorbed (fanā‘) in the existence of God is able to recognise the secrets of his Master—that is, God. He then sees through His Sight, hears with His Hearing, reaches with His Hands, walks with His Feet, speaks with His Word and thinks with His Mind.103

Al-Maqassārī’s notion of the Universal Man reminds us of the similar doctrine elaborated by al-Jīlī. The latter says:

If the servant is lifted higher and God fortifies him and conforms him, after his extinction (fanā‘), in the state of subsistence (baq‘ā), God will reply Himself to whoever invokes this servant.

When God reveals Himself to His servant in one of his Qualities, the servant soars in the sphere of this Quality until he has reached the limit by way
of integration (al-ijmāl), not by distinctive knowledge, for those who realise the Divine Qualities do not have distinctive knowledge except by virtue of integration. If the servant soars in the sphere of a Quality, and he realises it entirely by (spiritual) integration, he is seated on the throne of this Quality, so that he assimilates it into himself and becomes its subject; from then on, he encounters another Quality, and so on until he realises all the Divine Qualities.

To some, God reveals Himself in the Quality of the Sight (al-baṣar). For, revealing Himself first by the total intellectual vision which penetrates everything, God will reveal Himself more particularly in the Quality of Sight, so that the sight of the servant will become the organ of his knowledge.104

Again, al-Maqassārī takes pains not to be trapped in the long and heated controversy concerning the concept of Unity of Being between the servant and God. He maintains that even though the servant is able to enter the existence of God, he nevertheless remains a human being, whereas God remains God.

Like most other ṣaḥīfs, al-Maqassārī clearly holds a positive view of humankind as a whole. In his opinion, every person has an innate disposition to believe in God, and those who are closest to Him are the ones who are able to nurture that disposition in the right way.105 Therefore, he appeals to his fellow believers not to scold or look down on those who do not believe in God and who live a sinful life; the faithful simply must have a good opinion (husn al-zann) of the unbelievers. Citing Abū Madyān al-Tilimsānī, he reminds them that the flaws of the unbelievers may be better than the pitfalls of the faithful.106 With such a view it is not surprising that nowhere in his works does al-Maqassārī accuse the Dutch, who inflicted great misery on his life.

In accordance with their degree of belief in God, al-Maqassārī classifies the believers into four categories. The first, those who simply utter the statement of faith (shahādah) without really believing, are called the hypocrites (al-munaﬁq). The second group is the people who do not only utter the shahādah but also implant it deep in their souls; this group is called the common faithful (al-mu‘min al-awwām). The third category is the group of faithful who fully realise the inward and outward implication of their statement of faith in their life; they are called the people of the elite (ahl al-khawwās). The last group is the highest category of the faithful, who come out of the third group by intensifying their shahādah, mainly by practising taṣawwuf, in order to get closer to God; they are accordingly called the select of the elite (khāṣṣ al-khawwās).107

Al-Maqassārī clearly reserves the taṣawwuf for the select of the elite. Like other scholars in the networks, his taṣawwuf is the one that has been classified as neo-Sufism; he calls his taṣawwuf by the name the ‘tariqat al-Muhammadiyah’ or ‘tariqat al-Aḥmadiyyah’, which is familiar among scholars in the networks. This very name implicitly conveys their aim to return to the way of the Prophet Muhammad. Al-Maqassārī believes
the ‘tarīqat al-Muḥammadiyyah’ constitutes the right path (Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm). Throughout his writings he makes it clear that the mystical way can be trod only through a total commitment, both outwardly and inwardly, to the legal doctrine of Islam as well as to the way of the Prophet. He maintains that committing oneself simply to the practices while ignoring Islamic legal precepts is better than practicing tasawwuf while ignoring Islamic legal precepts. He even goes so far as to classify as fāsiq (freethinker) and muḥdid (heretic) those who believe that they will be able to get closer to God without practising such rituals as prayer and fasting.

It appears that al-Maqassārī was rather overzealous in his reconciliation between the exoteric and esoteric aspects of Islam. In this regard, he repeatedly narrates statements of unnamed authorities who assert that those who stick only to the shari‘ah without the haqiqah are fāsiq (sinful), and those who practise tasawwuf while ignoring shari‘ah are zindiq. The best that can be done is to harmonise the two. As al-Maqassārī puts it: ‘Let it be known, my fellows, exoteric devotion without esoteric one is like a body without a soul, whereas esoteric occupation without exoteric devotion is like a soul without a body’. Finally he cites a hadith of the Prophet which states that the Prophet was sent by God in order to bring to the people both the shari‘ah and haqiqah.

Al-Maqassārī insists that every aspirant in the path of God should practise all the precepts of the shari‘ah before he enters tasawwuf. He then lists the ways to get closer to God. First is the way of the akhyār (best people), that is by performing numerous prayers, reading the Qur‘ān and ḥadīth, striving in the way of God (al-īḥād fī sabīl Allāh) and other exoteric devotion. The second is the way of the people of mujāhādāt al-shaqa‘ (those who strive against hardship), by way of rigorous training to get rid of bad habits and to purify the mind and soul. The last is the way of the people of dhikr (ahl al-dhikr), who love God both outwardly and inwardly; they take very special care of the two kinds of devotion.

Al-Maqassārī, however, discourages the traveller on God’s path (sālik) from treading his own way in seeking after truth; it will only lead him astray, for Satan will become his master. Therefore, he should look for a trusted and experienced ṣāḥīf master, even if he, as a consequence, must travel to distant places, leaving his family and homeland behind. But there is no other way; only with the guidance of a trusted ṣāḥīf master (shaykh) will he be able to get to God; for the master will show him the correct and surest way to achieve spiritual progress. More than that, ṣāḥīf shaykhs are successors of the Prophet; they are his representatives (khalīfah) both outwardly and inwardly.

With such an important position reserved by al-Maqassārī for the ṣāḥīf shaykh, he differentiates himself from most scholars in the networks. Unlike Ahmad al-Qushāshī, who encourages a sālik to leave his master if the latter disobeys the shari‘ah, al-Maqassārī adheres to the earlier notion
of the position of the šāfiʿ master vis-à-vis his disciples. Thus, for al-Maqassārī, once a šālik pledges his allegiance (bay'ah) to a certain šāfiʿ master, he must totally obey him, even if the shaykh does something that does not necessarily lead to a closer communion with God. In accordance with the traditional way, he should behave like a dead body in the hands of those who clean it. To support this view, al-Maqassārī cites Ibn ʿArabi, who maintains that a šālik must obey his master, even though he may observe that the shaykh does something that runs contrary to the precepts of the shariʿah. The reason for this is that the shaykh is not infallible: even some prophets made mistakes.118 However, when the shaykh makes mistakes by transgressing certain rules of the shariʿah, al-Maqassārī reminds the disciple to keep up his good deeds and not to follow his master’s transgression.119

Al-Maqassārī discusses at length some specific religious devotional services and the steps towards spiritual progress that should be undertaken by the travellers in God’s path. He puts a special emphasis on dhikr. His dhikr was mainly the vocal one (jahrg), as taught by both Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī and Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Baqī al-Naṣḥī.120 In accordance with his concept of the purification of faith, in al-Maqassārī’s opinion the essence of the dhikr is the full recognition of the Unity of God. On the preliminary level (al-mubtadī’), the one who performs dhikr confirms that in his faith nothing should be worshipped but God. On the intermediate level (al-mutawassīf), he recognises that he seeks and loves nothing but God. On the final level (al-muntahī), he fully believes that there is no other being but God.121

Although al-Maqassārī’s teachings are apparently confined to the taṣawwuf, this does not conceal his main concern; that is, the renewal of Muslim belief and practice in the archipelago by way of the implementation of a more shariʿah-oriented Sufism. Of the various ṭariqahs al-Maqassārī was affiliated with, it was the Khalwatiyyah—later known as the Khalwatiyyah Yūsuf—that found fertile ground, especially in the South Sulawesi region. If the people of South Sulawesi, and also of West Java, have been counted generally as among the most fervent Muslims in the archipelago, one can hardly underestimate the role of al-Maqassārī in developing that identity.
So far we have attempted to give a comprehensive account of the transmission of reformist ideas from the centres of scholarly networks in the Middle East by three of the most important scholars of the Malay-Indonesian world in the seventeenth century, al-Râni, al-Sinkil and al-Maqqassâri. The career and teachings of these scholars clearly show us that Islamic developments in the archipelago were to an extent influenced by those in the Middle East. Thanks to al-Râni, al-Sinkil and Al-Maqqassâri, the reformist tendencies of the scholarly networks found their rapid translation in the archipelago.

Despite differences among modern scholars over the definition and boundaries of the terms ‘reform’ and ‘renewal’, it is clear that not all of the Malay-Indonesian scholars proposed radical doctrinal changes of Islam that can be categorised as reform. Their endeavours are more appropriately called renewal (taṣawwuf) than reform. Their central theme is a return to an orthodoxy that finds its most salient feature in the harmony between shari‘ah and taṣawwuf. With this, these mujaddids contributed substantially to the strengthening of the Islamic identity of their societies. The immediate result of this process was the intensification of Islamisation in the archipelago.

I have argued that Islamic renewal began in the Malay-Indonesian world as early as the seventeenth century, rather than at the beginning of the nineteenth century or the early twentieth century, as maintained by some scholars. Hamka and Federspiel, for instance, believe that Islamic reform or renewal began in the archipelago only with the rise of the Padri Movement in West Sumatra at the beginning of the nineteenth century.1 Although Geertz recognises that what he calls ‘a more precisian Islam’ (or ‘scripturalist Islam’) was introduced to the archipelago before the nineteenth century, he is of the opinion that it gained momentum only after the early nineteenth century with the rise, for instance in West Sumatra, of what he termed ‘a band of religious zealots, outraged by the heterodoxy
of local customs. In this reference to the Padri Movement, Geertz clearly views Islamic reforms very simplistically.

The Padri Movement, as we will discuss briefly later, in fact originated from the scholarly networks. The birth and growth of this movement reflect a complicated process of the transmission of reformist ideas, including a ‘tug of war’ between the forces of reformism and local factors such as adat (custom). The Padri Movement is an excellent example of how reformism generated by the networks found one of its extreme manifestations in the archipelago.

Deliar Noer, on the other hand, maintains that Islamic reformism started only in the early twentieth century. Noer overemphasises Islamic reformism in the period he discusses, concluding without hesitation that Indonesian Islam before the twentieth century was dominated by taṣawwuf and was thus no more than a hybrid of Islamic mysticism and remnants of local Hindu-Buddhist beliefs. He does mention the influences that had come from Mecca since the eighteenth century, but by using Snouck Hurgronje’s framework Noer views this influence mostly in political terms, or more precisely as pan-Islamism.

As we will see shortly, this view can no longer be maintained, because there is no evidence in the eighteenth century, among scholars in the centres of the Haramayn or among our Malay-Indonesian scholars, that points to any attempt to forge a feeling of pan-Islamism in the archipelago. What they transmitted to this part of the Muslim world was for the most part, indeed, reformist or renewalist religious ideas rather than political ones.

Our three mujaddids did not explicitly declare that they were launching reform, nor did they employ the organisation of the tariqahs in order to pursue their ends, but the central theme of their teaching leaves no doubt about their commitment to renewalism. It is important to note that reformism or renewal is not an overnight process. Therefore, although by the second half of the seventeenth century reformist ideas had been introduced to the archipelago, they took root only slowly and sporadically. There is no doubt, however, that the momentum of renewalism sparked by al-Rānīrī, al-Sinkīlī and al-Maqqāsārī was irreversible. Thus, as Federspiel rightly points out, over the past four centuries Islam in Indonesia has slowly altered its form: ‘the heterodox religious trends of the early period have slowed in momentum, and more orthodox Islamic practices and patterns have slowly gained in importance’.4

Federspiel recognises that contacts between the Malay-Indonesian world, by way of Jāwī students and pilgrims, and the Middle East greatly contributed to the rise of Islamic renewalism in the region. Again, however, like Hamka, he simply points to the famous example of the Padri Movement, which gained crucial stimulus from the return of three ḥājiṣ from Mecca in the early nineteenth century. But as we have already noted, and will discuss further later, the origins of the Padri Movement can be traced back to al-Sinkīlī and to reformist movements in the centres of the networks in Mecca and Medina.
In the final analysis, the roots of Islamic renewal in the Malay-Indonesian world are to be found in the teachings of al-Rânírî, al-Sînkîlî and al-Maqqassârî. Like reformism in the Haramayn, the renewal is genuine and born as an internal response to prevailing religious conditions among Muslims themselves. But from the eighteenth century outside factors, especially increasing colonial encroachment, also contributed to the acceleration of Islamic renewal and reform in the archipelago.

‘ULAMÂ’ IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY NETWORKS

If al-Rânírî, al-Sînkîlî and al-Maqqassârî have commanded much attention from scholars, the ‘ulamâ‘ in the eighteenth century have been less studied. Furthermore, the few sources available, mainly in Malay and Indonesian, simply narrate biographies, without critical examination of their positions vis-à-vis Islamic developments in the Malay-Indonesian world or their relationship to the teachings introduced by al-Rânírî, al-Sînkîlî and al-Maqqassârî. No attempt has been made to trace their connections with the scholarly networks of the larger Muslim world, which should give us a better picture of the continuing religious and intellectual relations between the archipelago and the Middle East.

The ‘ulamâ‘ involved in the eighteenth century scholarly networks indeed had traceable connections with earlier networks. While they did not have direct teacher-student connections with al-Rânírî, al-Sînkîlî and al-Maqqassârî, their teachers in Mecca and Medina were among the prominent figures of the networks in their period and had direct connections with earlier scholars to whom the three predecessors had also been linked. Malay-Indonesian scholars in the eighteenth century, moreover, were well aware of the teachings of their three precursors, and they established intellectual connections with them by making reference to their works.

In chapter 5 we have seen how, through al-Maqqassârî and his disciples, the regions of South Sulawesi and West Java, following Aceh, came into the picture of Islamic learning in the archipelago in the seventeenth century. In the eighteenth century, South Sumatra, South Kalimantan (Borneo) and the Patani region in the northern part of the Malay Peninsula came to prominence. Therefore, I would argue that the birthplaces and ethnic origins of Malay-Indonesian scholars in a way reflect the historical course of Islam in the archipelago through centuries. This points to the fact that appreciation of the importance of Islamic learning as well as the need for renewal and reform began to gain ground among various ethnic groups in the archipelago. These scholars, having acquired substantive credentials in Islamic learning, in turn stimulated further intensification of Islamisation, particularly among their respective ethnic groups. In the eighteenth century such developments continued, so as to become one of the most distinctive features in the transmission of Islam in the archipelago.
There were several major Indonesian-Malay 'ulamā' who came from various regions and ethnic groups in the archipelago in the eighteenth to the early nineteenth centuries. A prominent group came from the Palembang region of South Sumatra. The most important among them were Shihāb al-Dīn b. 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad, Kemas Fākh r al-Dīn, 'Abd al-Šamād al-Palimbānī, Kemas Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir and Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn b. Shihāb al-Dīn. Then came Muḥammad Arshād al-Banjārī and Muḥammad Naṣīf al-Banjārī from South Kalimantan; 'Abd al-Wāḥḥāb al-BUGIS from Sulawesi; 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Batūsīrī al-Maṣrī from Batavia and Dāwūd b. 'Abd Allāh al-Fiṣṣānī from the Patani region (South Thailand). Although information on several of these scholars is sketchy, their careers and teachings make it clear that they were involved both socially and intellectually in the networks. Taken together, they constituted the most important scholars of the archipelago in the eighteenth century.

AL-PALIMBĀNĪ AND OTHER PALEMBANG SCHOLARS

The fact that there were several scholars of the Palembang region who rose to prominence in the period under discussion is an interesting example of the relations between Middle Eastern Muslims and the growth of Islamic learning in the archipelago.

Arab migrants, particularly from the Hadramawt, began to come to Palembang in increasing numbers from the seventeenth century. Al-Palimbānī’s father, although he stayed in Palembang for only a relatively short time, was among the Arab sayyids who came to this region in the early seventeenth century. By the middle of the eighteenth century, some Arab scholars had gained prominent positions in the court of the Palembang Sultanate. In 1168/1754–5 a certain Sayyid al-'Aydarūs was reported to have married Sulṭān Muḥammad’s sister, and several unnamed sayyids came to control the religious hierarchy in the Sultanate: they became ‘senior priests’, and one of the sayyids was called ‘Tuan Besar’ (great lord).

These Arabs clearly played an important role in the growth of the tradition of Islamic learning in the region. They stimulated and encouraged the Sulṭāns of Palembang to pay special attention to religious matters, but apparently did not go much further. They did not take any initiative, for instance, to establish religious educational institutions at the popular level, for there is no evidence that such institutions as madrasah or pesantren existed during this period. Instead, they concentrated on the court, and apparently contributed to the rise of the court as the centre of learning. As a result, the court of Palembang become the centre for an extensive collection of religious works by local scholars. This further indicates the importance of the court in the scholarly discourse in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago.

Most of the Palembang scholars, such as Shihāb al-Dīn, Kemas Fākh r al-Dīn, Muḥammad Muḥyī al-Dīn and Kemas Muḥammad, are known mostly from their works, preserved initially in the court of the Palembang
Sultanate before being taken by the Dutch and the British. Drewes has correctly concluded that they lived throughout the second half of the seventeenth and the early eighteenth centuries. There is insufficient information on their lives, although it is known that Kemas Fakhr al-Din (1133–77/1719–63) travelled to India and spent a good deal of his life in Arabia, most probably in Mecca or Medina, where he wrote his works.9 Most of the works of these scholars deal with mysticism and theology and are based largely on the teachings of al-Junayd, al-Qushayri and al-Ghazâli. They clearly embraced teachings belonging to neo-Sufism.10

Without doubt, the most prominent among these Palembang scholars was ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbâni. He was also the most influential, especially through his works, which were widely circulated in the archipelago. We have a rather complete account of his life and career, unlike his fellow Palembang scholars, so that we are able to reconstruct his biography. So far, accounts of al-Palimbâni’s life are based on the scattered information he supplied in his works, which have been supplemented by Malay accounts and Dutch sources. However, there is ample information on him in Arabic biographical dictionaries, which throw some light on this major Malay-Indonesian scholar. This is an important finding, for never before had accounts of a Malay-Indonesian scholar been given in Arabic biographical dictionaries. This also indicates that al-Palimbâni enjoyed a respected career in the Middle East.

According to Malay sources the full name of al-Palimbâni was ‘Abd al-Šamad b. ‘Abd Allâh al-Jâwi al-Palimbâni, but Arabic sources call him Sayyid ‘Abd al-Šamad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Jâwi.11 We have every reason to believe that ‘Abd al-Šamad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Jâwi was indeed ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbâni. As we will show in this chapter, the picture of the career of ‘Abd al-Šamad b. ‘Abd al-Rahmân al-Jâwi in Arabic sources almost entirely describes that of ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbâni given by other sources.

Of all the available sources, only the Târîkh Salâsîlah Negeri Kedah supplies the date of al-Palimbâni’s birth and death. According to this work, al-Palimbâni was born about 1116/1704 in Palembang to a sayyid father and a Palembang woman. This, therefore, corroborates the Arabic sources, which mention that al-Palimbâni was a sayyid. Al-Palimbâni’s father is said to have come from Sana’a, Yemen, and travelled widely in India and Java before taking up residence in Kedah, where he was appointed Qâdi. About 1112/1700 he went to Palembang, where he married a local woman and returned to Kedah with his new born son, al-Palimbâni. It is believed that al-Palimbâni acquired his early education in Kedah and Patani, probably in a pondok (local traditional Islam educational institution), about which more follows. Later, his father dispatched him to study in Arabia.12 We have no information on when he left the archipelago.

Although we cannot resolve the conflicting dates surrounding his life, all sources are in accord that al-Palimbâni’s life span was from the first decade
well into the late eighteenth century. Al-Bayṭār points out al-Palimbānī died after 1200/1785. But most probably he died in 1203/1789, the date of completion of his final and most acclaimed work, the Sayr al-Sallikīn. When he completed this work he would have been 85 years old. In the Tārīkh Salāsīlah Negeri Kedah, it is reported that he was killed in the war against the Thais in 1244/1828. It is difficult to accept this account, as there is no evidence in other sources to indicate that al-Palimbānī ever returned to the archipelago. Furthermore, he would then have been about 124 years old—too old to go to the battlefield. Although al-Bayṭār does not mention the place where al-Palimbānī died, there is a strong suggestion that he died in Arabia.

Al-Palimbānī almost certainly established his career in the Haramayn and never returned to the archipelago. He nevertheless maintained a deep concern for Islam and Muslims in the Malay-Indonesian world. In the Haramayn, al-Palimbānī was involved in the Jāwī community and was a fellow student of Muḥammad Arshad al-Banjārī, ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Bugis, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Batāwī and Dāwūd al-_FILENAME_1. His involvement in the Jāwī community kept him fully aware of the religious and political developments in the archipelago.

Al-Palimbānī and his group all had the same teachers. The most famous among them were Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Sammānī, Muḥammad b. Sulaymān al-Kurdi and ʿAbd al-Munʿim al-Damanhūrī. Al-Bayṭār, in addition to mentioning Muḥammad [b. Sulaymān] al-Kurdi, lists other teachers of al-Palimbānī: they were Ibrāhīm al-Raʾīs, Muḥammad Murād, Muḥammad al-Jawharī and ʿAṭāʾ Allāh al-Maṣrī. Some of these scholars were also teachers of the four friends of al-Palimbānī.

It is important to examine briefly the biographies of these last four teachers, as they further show us the connections al-Palimbānī and his fellow Malay-Indonesians had with the extensive scholarly networks.

[Abū al-Fawz] Ibrāhīm [b. Muḥammad] al-Raʾīs [al-Zamzamī al-Makki] (1110–94/1698–1780) was evidently another important scholar from the Zamzamī family. As al-Jabartī points out, Ibrāhīm al-Zamzamī al-Raʾīs was well versed in various religious sciences; one of his special subjects was ʾilm al-falak (astronomy). Among his teachers were ʿAbd Allāh al-Baṣrī, Ibn al-Ṭayyib, Ahmad al-Jawhari, ʿAṭāʾ Allāh al-Maṣrī and Ṣālim al-Jabartī, the father of the historian al-Jabartī; he took the Khalwatīyyah order from Muṣṭafā al-Bakrī and the Naqshbandiyyah from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-ʾAyarūsī. No less importantly, he was a student of Muṭṭādā al-Zabiḍī and Ṣālim al-Fullānī, both major figures of the scholarly networks in the eighteenth century. Ibrāhīm al-Raʾīs was also closely connected with Muṣṭafā al-ʾAyarūsī and with scholars of the Aḥdāl and Mizjājī families, including the father of Sulaymān al-Aḥdāl, one of al-Palimbānī’s students.
As for Muhammad Murād, there is strong evidence that he was Muhammad Khalīl b. ‘Ali b. Muhammad b. Murād al-Ḥusaynī (1173–1206/1759–91). My research on Muhammad Murād in several biographical dictionaries of the period points to Muhammad Khalīl al-Murādī. Better known as al-Murādī, primarily for his four-volume biographical dictionary Silk al-Durar, he was a contemporary of al-Palimbānī. Al-Jabarti, his good friend, points out that al-Murādī mainly lived in Damascus but travelled extensively, including to the Haramayn, in order to collect information on the scholars he would write about in his biographical dictionary. In the course of his travels, al-Murādī not only advanced his knowledge but taught students as well. Therefore, it is highly probable that al-Palimbānī took the opportunity of al-Murādī’s visits to the Haramayn to study with him.

Although al-Murādī was renowned mostly as a historian, al-Jabarti reports that he was a ‘prop of the shari‘ah’ and a ‘house of knowledge’ in Syria during his time, who had mastered both exterior and interior sciences to the fullest extent. As al-Baghdādī also tells us, he was the Mufti of the Ḥanafi school of law in Damascus, and a Naqshbandi shaykh. He had wide connections with such major scholars in the networks as Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī, not only because he had met them in the course of collecting biographical data but more importantly because of ḥadīth scholarship; his was considered a ‘superior’ isnād in ḥadīth studies.

The next teacher of al-Palimbānī, Muḥammad b. Ahmad al-Jawhari [al-Misrī], was the son of a leading Egyptian muhaddith, Ahmad b. al-Ḥasan b. ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Yūsuf al-Karīmī al-Khalīdī al-Jawhari al-Azhari (1096–1181/1685–1767). Muhammad al-Jawhari (1132–86/1720–72), like his father, Ahmad al-Jawhari, was known mainly as a traditionalist. Although he lived mostly in Egypt, Muhammad al-Jawhari often travelled to the Haramayn, where besides performing pilgrimages he taught students. In addition to receiving ḥadīth from his father, he possessed isnāds through his father which connected him with such scholars as ‘Abd Allāh al-Baṣrī and Ahmad al-Nakhli. Therefore, he was among the most sought-after isnāds in the networks during this period. He had also extensive networks through ḥadīth studies down to more recent times.

The last scholar in the list of al-Palimbānī’s teachers was ‘Aṭī Allāh b. Ahmad al-Azhari al-Maṣrī al-Makki, mentioned earlier as a teacher of Ibrāhīm al-Ra‘īs. ‘Aṭī Allāh was a renowned muhaddith and a colleague of Muhammad al-Sammānī, Muḥammad al-Jawhari and Murtaḍā al-Zabīdī. Al-Zabīdī even lists ‘Aṭī Allāh as one of his numerous teachers. It appears that after completing his education at the Azhar, later in his life ‘Aṭī Allāh migrated to Mecca or, in al-Kattāni’s terms, he was ‘naẓīl al-Haramayn’, where he was very active in teaching. Among his students were Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sindī al-Ṣaghīr and Ṣāliḥ al-Fullānī, and a number of Yemeni scholars. Like Muḥammad al-Jawhari, ‘Aṭī Allāh is considered a superior isnād in ḥadīth studies.
Thus, as al-Sinkili earlier, al-Palimbānī reaped great profit from visiting scholars in the Haramayn, especially during the pilgrimage season. On visiting scholar from whom al-Palimbānī gained great benefit was Ahmad al-Damanhūrī. The latter, whose biography has been provided by Zabīdī, lived mostly in Cairo, though he often travelled to the Haramayn. Based on notes he took when he attended lectures given by al-Damanhūrī in Mecca, al-Palimbānī was able to write one of his earliest works, entitled Zuhrat al-Muridī Bayān Kalimat al-Tawḥīd. The work, in Malay, deals with logic (mantiq) and theology (uṣūl al-din), and it was written at the request of one of his friends, obviously a Malay, in order to better understand al-Damanhūrī’s lectures. 37

Considering the status of the scholars he studied with, it is certain that al-Palimbānī’s education was a thorough one; he studied hadith, fiqh, shari‘ah, tafsīr, kalām and taṣawwuf. Al-Palimbānī had a strong disposition towards mysticism, and it is evident that he studied taṣawwuf mostly with al-Sammānī, from whom he also took both tariqahs of Khalwatiyyah and Sammāniyyah. 38 Abdullah39 believes that al-Palimbānī studied with al-Sammānī for five years in Medina. During the course of his studies with al-Sammānī, he was entrusted to teach some of al-Sammānī’s students of Arab origin. So far as his adherence to tariqah is concerned, al-Palimbānī was deeply influenced by al-Sammānī. Conversely, it is through al-Palimbānī that the Sammāniyyah tariqah found fertile ground not only in the Palembang region but in other parts of the archipelago; al-Sammānī and the Sammāniyyah tariqah became principal subjects in the writings of later Palembang scholars.

Al-Palimbānī never returned to the archipelago. He devoted his time in the Haramayn to writing and teaching. Al-Bayūrī reports that in 1201/1787 he travelled to Zabīd, where he taught students, particularly of the Ahḍal and al-Mīzjāli families. 40 This report is in accord with Abdullah’s accounts of al-Palimbānī’s travels to Zabīd and his meetings with local scholars and students. 41 One of his students in Zabīd was Wajīh al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. Sulaymān b. Yaḥyā b. ‘Umar al-Ahdal (1179–1255/1765–1839), a muḥaddith who later occupied the post of Muftī of Zabīd. Wajīh al-Dīn al-Ahdal evidently considered al-Palimbānī one of his most important teachers, as he included his biography in his dictionary, al-Nafs al-Yamānī wa al-Rūḥ al-Rayḥānī. 42

According to al-Kattānī, Wajīh al-Dīn al-Ahdal in his biographical dictionary put al-Palimbānī into his third category (al-tabaqat al-thāliḥah); that is, major scholars who visited Zabīd and spent their time there primarily as teachers. 43 It is interesting to note that, in addition to studying with al-Palimbānī, Wajīh al-Dīn learned from such scholars as Ahmad b. Ḥasan al-Muqrī al-Zabīdī, Amr Allāh b. ‘Abd al-Khāliq b. Muḥammad al-Bāqī al-Mīzjālī, Sulaymān al-Kurdi, ‘Abd al-Rahmān Mustafa al-‘Aydarūs and Murtadā al-Zabīdī. 44 Thus, through Wajīh al-Dīn al-Ahdal, al-Palimbānī was connected to a much wider network of scholars.
Because of his scholarly connections, al-Palimbānī was, without doubt, the most prominent Malay-Indonesian scholar in the eighteenth century networks. However, his importance in light of Islamic development in the archipelago lies not only in his involvement in the scholarly networks but more importantly in his writings, which were widely read in the Malay-Indonesian world, particularly in the ‘ulamā’ circles, in the pesantren, pondok and other Islamic educational institutions. In his works al-Palimbānī disseminated the teachings of neo-shīfs, but he also appealed to his fellow Muslims to launch a jihād against Europeans, particularly the Dutch, who had intensified their attempts to subdue Muslim political entities in the archipelago.

AL-BANJĀRĪ

With Muhammad Arshad al-Banjārī we now come to South Kalimantan (Borneo), a region where the development of Islam is still insufficiently studied. As elsewhere in the archipelago, studies of Islam in South Kalimantan have so far mainly concentrated on the questions of when, how and whence Islam came to this region; there is almost no discussion of the growth of Islamic institutions and the tradition of learning among its Muslim population. With regard to this, the importance of Muhammad Arshad lies not simply in his involvement in the scholarly networks but also in the fact that he was the first scholar to establish new Islamic institutions as well as to introduce new religious ideas to South Kalimantan.

Islam came to South Kalimantan at a much later period than, for instance, North Sumatra or Aceh. It is assumed that there had been some Muslims in the coastal region since the early sixteenth century, but Islam gained momentum only after the Demak Sultanate’s troops in Java came to Banjarmasin to assist Pangeran Samudra in his struggles with the court elite of the Daha Kingdom. On his victory, Pangeran Samudra converted to Islam around 936/1526 and was installed as the first Sulṭān of the Banjar Sultanate. He was given the name of Sulṭān Surian Shāh or Surian Allāh by an Arab teacher.45

With the establishment of the Sultanate of Banjar, Islam appears to have been officially regarded as the religion of the state, although Muslims constituted a minority of the population. Adherents to Islam, by and large, were confined to the Malay population; Islam only very slowly made inroads among the tribal population, commonly called the Dayaks.46 Even among Malay Muslims, the adherence to Islam was evidently nominal and did not go beyond the utterance of the confession of faith. Under successive Sulṭāns down to the period of al-Banjārī, it is evident that there was no substantial attempt made by the rulers to advance Islamic life. However, they did adopt the Arabic script for the Sultanate’s correspondence with other Malay-Indonesian rulers, the Dutch and the British. There are also accounts of attempts by wandering scholars to further Islamisation in the region, but apparently they made little progress.47
A substantial drive for further Islamisation was launched by Muhammad Arshad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Banjārī (1122–1227/1710–1812), one of the best-known scholars of Kalimantan. Born in Martapura, South Kalimantan, Muhammad Arshad acquired a rudimentary religious education in his own village, apparently from his father and local teachers, for there is no evidence that surau or pesantren existed during this period in the region. When he was seven years old he is reported to have been able to read the Qurʾān perfectly. He became famous for this, which led Sulṭān Tahlīl Allāh (1112–58/1700–45) to take him and his family to live in the court of the Sultanate. Later the Sulṭān married him to a woman, but almost immediately he sent Muḥammad Arshad to the Ḥaramayn in order to pursue further studies at the Sultanate’s expense. The Sulṭān seems to have financed him generously; Muḥammad Arshad was even able to buy a house in the Shamiyyah quarter of Mecca, which is still maintained by the Banjar immigrants even today.

As we noted earlier, Muḥammad Arshad studied with al-Palimbānī and several other Malay-Indonesian students. However, while al-Palimbānī had a good number of teachers, Muḥammad Arshad’s known teachers included only al-Sammānī, al-Damanhūrī, Sulaymān al-Kūrdī and ʿAtāʾ Allāh al-Masrī. It is possible that he studied with other teachers, especially with Ibrāhīm al-Raʾis al-Zamzamī, from whom Muḥammad Arshad most likely studied ʿilm al-falak (astronomy), a field in which he was a leading authority among Malay-Indonesian scholars.

With regard to his works and activities after his return to the archipelago, one might assume that Muḥammad Arshad was simply an expert in fiqh or sharʿīh, especially due to the fact that his best-known text, entitled Sabil al-Muhtadīn, is a fiqh book. But this does not necessarily mean that he was not learned in Sufism; it is known that he also wrote a work entitled Kanz al-Muʿrīfah, dealing with taṣawwuf. Thus Muḥammad Arshad was well versed in the exterior (al-zāhir) and interior (al-bāṭīn) sciences or, as Steenbrink writes, he was an expert in fiqh as well as in taṣawwuf. Muḥammad Arshad received the Sammānīyah tarīqah from al-Sammānī, and he is considered the scholar most responsible for the spread of the Sammānīyah tarīqah in Kalimantan.

Muḥammad Arshad studied for about 30 years in Mecca and five years in Medina before returning to the archipelago. Several years before his return it is said that he began to teach students in the Ḥarām Mosque of Mecca. However, Muḥammad Arshad felt that he did not yet have sufficient knowledge. Together with al-Palimbānī, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Batāwī and ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Bugisī, he asked permission of their teacher, ʿAtāʾ Allāh al-Masrī, to advance their education in Cairo. While appreciating their good intention, ʿAtāʾ Allāh suggested that it would be much better for them to return to the archipelago, as he believed they already possessed more than sufficient knowledge to be effective as teachers in their homeland. They decided to travel to Cairo anyway, but simply for a visit, ...
It was probably a sign of their connection with ‘Aṭā’ Allāh and their visit to Cairo that one of Muḥammad Arshad’s friends, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Batāwī, added the *luqāb* (surname) of ‘al-Maṣrī’ to his name.

Like other Malay-Indonesian scholars, Muḥammad Arshad maintained constant contact and communication with his homeland while he was in the Ḥaramayn, so that he was well informed about the developments of Islam there. In this connection he is reported to have asked the opinion of his teacher, Sulaymān al-Kurdi, about the religious policies of the Sūltān of Banjar. The Sūltān, he had heard, imposed heavy fines on his Muslim subjects for failing to perform the *Jumā‘ah* (Friday) prayer. Muḥammad Arshad also asked Sulaymān al-Kurdi to explain the differences between *zakāh* (obligatory *‘alms’) and tax, for the Banjar Sūltān had required the population to pay tax instead of *zakāh*. It is unfortunate that we have no information on Sulaymān al-Kurdi’s responses to these questions, but this account reflects the genuine concern on the part of Muḥammad Arshad about the correct application of the *shari‘ah*.

Muḥammad Arshad, together with ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Batāwī al-Maṣrī and ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bugisī, returned to the archipelago in 1186/1773. Before he proceeded to Banjarmasin, at the request of al-Batāwī, Muḥammad Arshad stayed in Batavia for two months. Although in Batavia for a relatively short time, he was able to launch an important reform for the Batavian Muslims. He corrected the *qiblah* (the direction Muslims face when performing prayers towards the Ka‘bah in Mecca) of several mosques in Batavia. According to his calculation, the *qiblah* of mosques in Jembatan Lima and Pekojan, Batavia, were not directed correctly at the Ka‘bah, and therefore had to be changed. This created controversy among Muslim leaders in Batavia, and as a result the Dutch Governor summoned Muḥammad Arshad to explain the matter. The Governor, impressed by Muḥammad Arshad’s mathematical calculations, happily presented him with several gifts. Later, the correction of the direction of the *qiblah* was proposed by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Batāwī in Palembang when he travelled there around 1800; this incited heated discussion as well.

The reformist impulse in Muḥammad Arshad’s personality to introduce new religious ideas and institutions is obvious after his return to Martapura, South Kalimantan. One of the first things he did after his arrival was to establish an Islamic educational institution, which was crucial to the education of Muslims in advancing their understanding of Islamic teachings and practices. To that end Muḥammad Arshad asked Sūltān Tahmīd Allāh II (r. 1187–1223/1773–1808) to grant him a large plot of wasteland outside the capital of the Sultanate. He and ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bugisī, who was now married to Muḥammad Arshad’s daughter, built a centre for Islamic education, which was similar in characteristics to the *sura‘* in West Sumatra or *pesantren* in Java. Like many *sura‘*s and *pesantrens*, Muḥammad Arshad’s centre of learning consisted of lecture halls, students’ hostels, teachers’
houses and libraries. This centre was economically self-sufficient, as Muhammad Arshad together with other teachers and students transformed nearby lands into productive rice fields and vegetable gardens. Before long, the centre had established itself as the most important locus for the training of students, who later became leading scholars in Kalimantan society.

Muhammad Arshad took another important step in intensifying Islamisation in his region by reforming the administration of justice in the Sultanate of Banjar. In addition to making Islamic legal doctrines the most important reference in criminal courts, Muhammad Arshad, with the support of the Sultan, established separate Islamic courts to deal with more purely civil legal matters. He also initiated the establishment of the office of Mufti, who was responsible for issuing fatwas on religious and social matters. With these initiatives, Muhammad Arshad managed to put Islamic law into effect in the realm of the Sultanate of Banjar.

Another important Kalimantan scholar is Muhammad Nafis b. Idris b. Husayn al-Banjarī. Although we do not have much information on his life, there is no doubt that he was second only to Muhammad Arshad in terms of the influence he exerted on the Kalimantan Muslims, especially in the field of taṣawwuf. If Muhammad Arshad was known primarily as an expert in shari‘ah, Muhammad Nafis was famous as a šafi‘ scholar by virtue of his well-known work, al-Durr al-Nafis fi Bayān Wahdat al-Af‘al al-Asmā‘ wa al-Šifā‘a‘ wa al-Dhāt al-Taqdis, which circulated widely in the archipelago. This work was printed several times in Cairo by Dār al-Ṭabar ‘ah (as recently as 1347/1928) and by Muṣṭafā al-Ḥalabi (1362/1943), in Mecca by Māṭba‘at al-Kārim al-Islāmiyyah (1323/1905), and in various places in the archipelago.

Muhammad Nafis was born in 1148/1735 in Martapura into the Banjar royal family. Thus, he lived in the same period as Muhammad Arshad. There is no evidence of the date of his death, although it is known that he died and was buried in Kelua, a village about 125 kilometres from Banjarmasin. His early education is not known, but he was most probably taught the basic principles of Islam in his own region. Later, we find him studying in Mecca, as he writes in his introductory notes to his al-Durr al-Nafis:

‘...he who writes this epistle... that is Muhammad Nafis b. Idris b. al-Husayn, who was born in Banjar and lives in Mecca.’

There is no hard evidence that he studied together with al-Palimbān, Muhammad Arshad or their colleagues, but it is highly probable that his period of study in the Haramayn coincided with that of al-Palimbān and others. I would suggest that they studied together at one time or another, particularly if we consider the following list of Muhammad Nafis’ teachers.

Abdullah mentions that Muhammad Nafis studied with a number of scholars in the Haramayn, the most famous of whom were al-Sammān, Muhammad al-Jawhari, ‘Abd Allâh b. Ḥijāzī al-Shaqqāwī, Muhammad Siddiq b. ‘Umar Khān and ‘Abd al-Rahmān b. ‘Abd al-Azīz al-Maghribī. Muhammad Siddiq b. ‘Umar Khān was a student of al-Sammān and ‘Abd
al-Azīz al-Maghribī, and was apparently a close friend of al-Palimbānī. The latter even includes the titles of several works of Muhammad Ṣiddīq in the list of works that he recommends to be read by aspirants of the ṣāḥīf path.61

We have already mentioned both al-Sammānī and Muhammad al-Jawhari, who were among the teachers of al-Palimbānī and his fellows. The fact that Muhammad Nafis studied with al-Sammānī, al-Jawhari and Muhammad Ṣiddīq indicates that he was indeed a fellow student of al-Palimbānī, Muhammad Arshad and their other Malay-Indonesian counterparts.

As for ‘Abd Allāh b. Hijāzī [b. Ibrāhīm] al-Sharqāwī al-Azhari (1150–1227/1737–1812), he was Shaykh al-Islām and Shaykh of the Azhar from 1207/1794. Al-Sharqāwī was two years younger than Muhammad Nafis. As al-Sharqāwī mostly lived in Cairo, it is very likely that Muhammad Nafis studied with him during his frequent visits to the Haramayn.63 We are not so certain whether al-Palimbānī, Muhammad Arshad, ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Batāwī and ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Bugis also studied with al-Sharqāwī. But, as we will see shortly, al-Sharqāwī had another important Malay-Indonesian student, namely Dāwūd al-Fāṭānī.

Al-Sharqāwī, it is worth mentioning briefly, was himself a student of important scholars in the networks, including Aḥmad al-Damāhūrī, Māḥmūd al-Kurdi and Aḥmad al-Jawhari. Māḥmūd al-Kurdi appointed him as the khālīfah of the Khalwātīyyah ṣāriqah in Cairo. Al-Sharqāwī then established himself among reformists of the order. He was well versed in various branches of Islamic discipline, although he was mainly known as a leading expert in the sharī‘ah and ḥadīth. Like most scholars in the networks, he emphasised the importance of ḥadīth, in terms of its position not only as the second source of Islamic legal doctrines but also as the indispensable source of proper moral conduct.64 Therefore, in addition to being a reformist, and a ṣāḥīf with numerous khālīfahs, al-Sharqāwī was among the most respected ḥudūdās in the networks.65 It is important to note in passing that Muhammad Māḥfūz al-Tarmisī (from Termas, East Java—1285–1338/1842–1920), an important Malay-Indonesian ḥadīth scholar who lived and died in Mecca, traced his ḥudūdās to al-Sharqāwī, among others.66 Having studied with al-Sharqāwī as well as with al-Sammānī and Muhammad al-Jawhari, Muhammad Nafis clearly had strong links with the networks in the period under discussion.

Muhammad Nafis al-Bānjārī, like all Malay-Indonesian scholars, followed the Shāfī’ī school of law and Ash’arī theological doctrines. He was affiliated with several ṣāriqahs: Qādiriyyah, Shaṭṭārīyyah, Sammānīyyah, Naqshbandiyyah and Khalwātīyyah.67 Muhammad Nafis was an expert in kalām and taṣawwuf. His Durr al-Nafīs, while stressing the absolute transcendence and Unity of God, refused the notion of the Ḥabarīyyah, who maintained fatalistic determinism as opposed to free will (Qadarīyyah). In Muhammad Nafis’ opinion, Muslims must strive to achieve a better life by doing good deeds and avoiding evil.68 Thus,
Muhammad Nafis was clearly a proponent of activism, one of the basic characteristics of neo-Sufism discussed earlier. With its strong emphasis on Muslim activism, it is no surprise that his book was banned by the Dutch, who feared that it would incite people to launch a jihād.69

There is no information on when Muhammad Nafis al-Banjārī returned to the archipelago. It appears that he proceeded straight to South Kalimantan. Like Muhammad Arshad, who was the pioneer of the Islamic educational institution, Muhammad Nafis devoted himself to the pioneering work of propagating Islam in the interior of the South Kalimantan region. He was indeed a typical wandering sūfī teacher and played a crucial role in expanding Islam in Kalimantan.70

DĀWŪD B. ‘ABD ALLĀH AND THE RISE OF PATANI SCHOLARSHIP

To conclude this chapter, we will examine the Patani scholars who by the end of the eighteenth century increasingly came into the picture of Islamic learning in the archipelago. With the rise of Patani scholars, we can observe not only the proliferation of the tradition of Islamic learning but also the further dissemination of renewal and reformism in the Malay-Indonesian world.

The conversion of the Patani region in South Thailand to Islam took place from roughly the twelfth to the fifteenth century. The Patani Sultanate was a populous and prosperous Muslim kingdom in the Malay Peninsula until it fell under Thai control in 1202/1786. Its harbour was also an important centre of trade for Asian and European traders.71

There have been numerous studies on Patani Muslim separatism after World War II but little attention has been paid to the growth of Islamic tradition and institutions among the Patani Muslims in the earlier period.72

Despite Patani’s political weakness as a border state, wandering teachers, mainly sūfīs, continually frequented the Patani region. The Hikayat Patani reports the coming of scholars such as Shaykh Gombak and his student ‘Abd al-Mu’min from Minangkabau,73 and Shaykh Faqīh Safī al-Dīn from Pasai in the second half of the sixteenth century. They played a crucial role in the religious life of the Sultanate. Safī al-Dīn, for instance, urged the construction of a royal mosque and later became adviser to Sultan Muzaffar Shâh on religious matters.74 Again, in the middle of the seventeenth century, a number of scholars came to Patani: Sayyid ‘Abd Allâh from Jerusalem via Trengganu, Hājī ‘Abd al-Rahmān from Java, Faqīh ‘Abd al-Manân, a Minangkabau from Kedah, and Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir from Pasai.75 They are reported to have carried out concerted efforts to spread the hukum Allah (shari‘ah) into Patani.76

An important point conveyed by these accounts is that the Patani Muslims were not isolated among their fellow Muslims in the archipelago. With the coming of scholars to their region, Patani Muslims were
made aware of developments in religious ideas and institutions in other parts of the Malay-Indonesian world. It is highly plausible that it was such scholars who stimulated the establishment of the traditional Islamic educational institution known in Patani as pondok. Furthermore, it is suggested that the pondok system, which also developed in other parts of the Malay Peninsula, originated from Patani. Al-Palimbâni, as mentioned earlier, is said to have had his early education in Patani, probably in the pondoks there, but little is known about them in the period before the nineteenth century. Matheson and Hooker point out that the pondoks in Patani were very prestigious and that their more advanced students were welcomed as teachers elsewhere. I would argue, however, that this was true only in the nineteenth century, when native Patani scholars increasingly came onto the scene and contributed significantly to the growth of the pondoks.

Shaghir Abdullah, a grandson of Ahmad Zayn al-`Abidin al-Fatâni, a leading Patani scholar, lists Muhammad Tâhir b. `Ali al-Fatâni (914–78/1508–78), the author of the famous Tadhkîrât al-Mawdûdât, as among the earliest and most famous scholars of Patani. This is incorrect, as Muhammad Tâhir also had a laqab (nickname) of al-Hindi (from India), to be exact, from Patan in the Gujarat region. If this claim were true, Muhammad Tâhir al-Fatâni would have been the earliest Malay scholar involved in the scholarly networks of the Haramayn; that is, a century ahead of al-Râ`î, al-Sînkîlî and al-Maqassârî.

The best-known Patani scholar was Dâwûd b. `Abd Allâh b. Idrîs al-Fatâni; but he was neither the earliest nor the only scholar from this region involved in the networks. At least from Dâwûd al-Fatâni’s silsilah of the Sammâniyyah ta`riqah we know that he received the order not directly from Muhammad al-Sammâni but by way of two other Patani scholars, namely `Ali b. Ishâq al-Fatâni and Muhammad Šâlih b. `Abd al-Ra`îmân al-Fatâni. They probably came to the Haramayn earlier than Dâwûd al-Fatâni, but Abdullah suggests that the three were contemporaries, with Dâwûd al-Fatâni the youngest among them.

Thanks to research done by Abdullah, published in his Seyîkh Daud bin Abdullah al-Fatâni, we know more about Dâwûd al-Fatâni’s life and career. According to Abdullah, records kept by families related to Dâwûd al-Fatâni give the date of birth of this great scholar differently; that is, 1724, 1153/1740 and 1183/1769. He died in Mecca, and one of the records gives his date of death as 1265/1847. There is no way we can be certain which of the dates is the correct one. But because of his studying with the teachers listed below, I think al-Fatâni was most probably born in 1153/1740; he is reported to have studied with al-Barrawi (d. 1182/1768), as will be seen shortly. Furthermore, his earliest dated work was completed in Mecca in 1224/1809, when he was 69 years old and had established himself as a learned scholar. The date of his last work is 1259/1843. This means that he lived a relatively long life. The height of
his career was certainly in the early decades of the nineteenth century—
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al-Sammānī, Dāwūd al-Faṭānī must have reached the Haramayn in the second half of the 1760s, or when he was in his late 20s.

‘Isā b. Ahmad [b. ‘Isā b. Muḥammad al-Zubayrī al-Shāfi‘ī al-Qāhirī al-Azharī], better known as al-Barrāwī, was a muḥaddith and faqīh who had a special expertise in legal hadiths and in the comparative study of schools of Islamic law.⁹⁵ He lived mainly in Cairo, where he died in 1182/1768. He was also a frequent visitor to the Haramayn, performing pilgrimage and involving himself in scholarly activities. He received hadith through isnāds which included ‘Abd Allāh al-Baṣrī. Al-Barrāwī was also a teacher of Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Shanwānī.⁹⁶ Al-Shanwānī, as we will see shortly, was also a teacher of Dāwūd al-Faṭānī. Al-Faṭānī mostly studied usūl al-Dīn (lit. ‘roots of religion’) with al-Barrāwī. He possessed an isnād in this science, which ran from al-Barrāwī to include such major network scholars as ‘Abd Allāh al-Baṣrī, ‘Alā’ al-Dīn al-Bābīlī, Shams al-Dīn al-Rāmī and Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī.⁹⁷ Considering the fact that al-Faṭānī wrote a number of works on fiqh, it is highly probable that he also learned this science mostly from al-Barrāwī.

More than any other Malay scholar who preceded him, al-Faṭānī had many teachers either of Egyptian origin or with a strong Egyptian connection. As there is no evidence that al-Faṭānī ever travelled to Cairo, he must have studied with them during their visits to the Haramayn. In addition to studying with al-Barrāwī, al-Faṭānī continued his studies with al-Sharqāwī,⁹⁸ the Shaykh of Azhar and celebrated Khalwatiyyah reformist mentioned earlier as a teacher of Muḥammad Nafīs. As al-Sharqāwī was an expert in hadith, sharī‘ah, kalām and tasawwuf, it is probable that al-Faṭānī also learned these sciences from him.

The next teacher Dāwūd al-Faṭānī studied with was the successor of al-Sharqāwī as the Shaykh of al-Azhar. He was Muḥammad b. ‘Alī al-Shanwānī (d. 1233/1818), better known simply as Al-Shanwānī, who was elected President of the Azhar University on al-Sharqāwī’s death.⁹⁹ During his youth, Al-Shanwānī studied with most of the leading scholars of Egypt, including Muḥammad al-Dāmanī, al-Barrāwī, al-Sharqāwī and Muḥammad al-Zabīdī. He was an outstanding scholar of hadith, fiqh, tafsīr and kalām. Although he taught mostly in Cairo, he had a number of students in Mecca, who studied with him during his visits there.¹⁰⁰ With Al-Shanwānī, al-Faṭānī advanced his studies in fiqh and kalām.

In addition to studying with the scholars mentioned above, al-Faṭānī learned from Muḥammad As‘ad, Muḥammad al-Marzūqī and ʿIrāhīm al-Ra‘īs al-Zamzamī al-Makkī.¹⁰¹ The latter, as we have seen, was also a teacher of al-Palīmbānī. Dāwūd al-Faṭānī studied various branches of Islamic discipline with ʿIrāhīm al-Ra‘īs as well as receiving the Shādhaliyyah ṭarīqah from him. It is interesting that ʿIrāhīm al-Ra‘īs is in turn took this ṭarīqah from ʿAlī ʿAlī al-Fulānī, who got it from his teacher, Ibn Sinnah.¹⁰² ‘Muḥammad As‘ad’ was most probably Muḥammad As‘ad al-Hanafī al-Makkī, a muḥaddith who is said to have been very proud of having a
that went back to 'Abd Allāh al-Baṣrī. Interestingly enough, al-Faṭānī did not take the isnād but instead took the Shafā‘iyyah ṭarīqah from Muḥammad As‘ad al-Makkī, who took it from Muḥammad Sa‘īd b. Ṭāhir, who took it from his father, Abū Ṭāhir, who in turn took it from his father, Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī, who took it from Aḥmad al-Qushā‘ī, who took it from Aḥmad al-Shinnāwī, who took it from Ṣibghat Allāh. This silsilah is different from that of al-Sinkīlī, who received the ṭarīqah not from al-Kūrānī but from al-Qushā‘ī.

We do not have much information on ‘Aḥmad al-Marzūqī’, the last in the list of al-Faṭānī’s teachers. This scholar very likely was Aḥmad al-Marzūqī al-Mālikī, a student of Al-Shanwānī. Aḥmad al-Marzūqī was known as a muḥaddith who taught mostly in Mecca. Both Muḥammad As‘ad al-Hanafī and Aḥmad al-Marzūqī al-Mālikī were al-Faṭānī’s teachers of non-Shāfī‘ī madhhabs. This indicates that the differences among scholars in their adherence to schools of Islamic law, as in the previous century, were not barriers in the networks of ‘ulamā‘ in the eighteenth century.

Considering all the teachers he studied with and the sciences he got from them, it is clear that Dāwūd al-Faṭānī’s education was complete and comprehensive. He possessed more than sufficient knowledge to earn him fame as a major Malay-Indonesian scholar in the period of transition between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Al-Faṭānī seems never to have returned to Patani or elsewhere in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago. Instead he devoted himself to teaching and writing in the Haramayn until he died in Ta‘īf. His numerous Malay-Indonesian students came from all over the archipelago. He has been claimed as a pivotal figure in the history of Islam in Patani.

There can be no question that al-Faṭānī was one of the most prolific among Malay-Indonesian scholars. He wrote at least 57 works, dealing with almost all branches of the Islamic disciplines. The works themselves, however, some printed in various places in the Middle East and the Malay-Indonesian world, have not been sufficiently studied.

The careers of Malay-Indonesian scholars in the eighteenth century, from al-Palimbānī to al-Faṭānī, have shown us that the networks among Middle Eastern and Malay-Indonesian scholars continued to gain momentum. More importantly, these indicate the incessant transmission of reformism from the centres of learning in the Middle East to various parts of the archipelago. The wide circulation of the writings of these Malay-Indonesian scholars pushed Islamic reformism in this part of the Muslim world even further.
Renewal in the Network:
The European Challenge

We have seen how 'Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbânî, Muḥammad Arshad al-Banjârî, Muḥammad Naṣr al-Banjârî, Dâwûd al-Ḍâfînî and other scholars in the eighteenth century had definite connections with a number of important scholars in the centres of networks in the Ḥaramayn and in Cairo. Not only were they the crucial channels of transmission of Islamic reformism from the Middle East to the archipelago, they also served as connections for later Malay-Indonesian scholars, who came in ever-increasing numbers to the Ḥaramayn. Their links with Ḥâfîz students in the nineteenth century, which involved a number of leading scholars in the Ḥaramayn, created similarly complex webs of scholarly networks.¹

The connections of al-Palimbânî and his group with earlier scholars were more than simply student–teacher relations; throughout their writings they showed their intellectual lineage to earlier major scholars by giving their works as major sources of their thought. It is no surprise to find that they developed equally reformist teachings.

Al-Palimbânî and his fellow Malay-Indonesian scholars also played an important role in preserving the morale of their fellow Muslims in facing the continuing encroachment of European colonial powers. This period marked a painful transition in the history of Malay-Indonesian Muslims: one after another, the Malay Muslim kingdoms fell into the hands of foreign powers.

These encounters with European powers added a new dimension to the development of Islam in the archipelago. We should not, of course, overemphasise the European factor, but there is little doubt that it contributed to the growing concern among our Malay-Indonesian scholars about the future of Islam in this region. This concern is, in turn, reflected in their writings. We will first attempt to discuss their teachings, particularly in relation to the intellectual currents in the wider networks. Then we will assess their impact on Islamic development in the archipelago. Lastly
we will examine their response to the intensification of the European attempts to incorporate the Malay-Indonesian world into their realm.

**SHARĪ’AH AND TAṢAWWUF: RECONCILING AL-GHAZĀLĪ WITH IBN ‘ARABI**

In previous chapters we have examined the central theme of al-Rā’i, al-Sinkīl and al-Maqāṣārī, which was the harmony between the legal and mystical aspects of Islam. This harmony also became the central theme in the writings of al-Palimbarī and his group. Throughout their writings, they were eager to reconcile Ibn ‘Arabi’s philosophical mysticism and al-Ghazālī’s taṣawwuf. At the same time, the importance of the shari’ah was repeatedly emphasised.

This tendency in the development of Islamic thought is best seen in Palembang. As Drewes has shown, local religious literature in this region at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century did not include works of Hamzah al-Fansūrī or Shams al-Dīn al-Samatrānī, nor any writings that had been considered ‘unorthodox’ or that even contained some ‘heterodox’ teachings. On the other hand, works of al-Rā’i and al-Sinkīl circulated widely. Prominent Palembang scholars such as Shihāb al-Dīn b. ‘Abd Allāh Muhammad preached neo-Sufism as taught by al-Junayd, al-Qushayrī and al-Ghazālī. Shihāb al-Dīn even went so far as to condemn the reading of works on the martabat tujuh (seven grades of being). He opposed this doctrine, it appears, simply because he feared that it would lead his fellow Muslims astray. He assumed they would misunderstand it because of their lack of solid grounding in Islamic knowledge, particularly of the shari’ah. As we will see, most Malay-Indonesian scholars in the period, from al-Palimbarī to al-Fatānī, in fact adopted the very same concept of the seven grades of being.

Of all the Malay-Indonesian scholars in the eighteenth century, it was Muhammad Arshad al-Banjārī and Dāwūd al-Fatānī who fostered the entrenchment of the shari’ah in the archipelago. We have seen how Muhammad Arshad played a crucial role in the establishment in the Banjar Sultanate of the administration of justice in accordance with Islamic law. His role in the spread of Islamic legal doctrines in the archipelago, however, was far greater through his works on fiqh, which were widely circulated in the archipelago.

Muhammad Arshad’s principal work was the Sabīl al-Muḥtadin li al-Tafaqqūḥ ʿilā Amr al-Dīn. Without doubt it is one of the major works on fiqh in Malay after the completion of the Šīrāt al-Mustaqīm of al-Rā’i and the Miḥrāt al-Tūllāb of al-Sinkīl. As Muhammad Arshad states in his introductory notes, he began to write the Sabīl al-Muḥtadin in 1193/1779 at the request of Sultan Taḥmīd Allāh. It was completed in 1195/1781. The work is in two volumes, consisting of some 500 pages. It deals with detailed rules
of the 'ibādah (ritual) aspect of fiqh. It is basically an elaboration, or to some extent a revision, of al-Rānīrī's Širāž al-Mustaqīm, which used many Acehnese words hardly understood by Malay-Indonesians in other areas of the archipelago.5

The Sabīl al-Muhtadin, printed several times in Mecca, Cairo, Istanbul and various places in the archipelago, was highly popular in the Malay-Indonesian world, and is still used in many parts of the region. Later, descendants of Muhammad Arshad composed a collection of his teachings on the fundamentals of belief ('aqā'id) and fiqh, entitled Perukunan Besar al-Rānīrī or Perukunan Melayu. The work enjoyed similar success and was subsequently translated into other languages of the archipelago, such as Javanese and Sundanese.6 The popularity of Muḥammad Arshad’s writings indicates that works explicating Islamic legal precepts were needed by Malay-Indonesian Muslims as practical guides in their daily life. It attests to the fact that Muslims in the archipelago also exhibited a deep interest in the legal aspect of Islam. They were not solely interested in Islamic mysticism, as had been supposed by some scholars.7

The main sources of the Sabīl al-Muhtadin are Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī’s Sharḥ Minhāj al-Ṭullāb, Shams al-Dīn al-Rāmīlī’s Nihāyat al-Muḥtāj [ilā Sharḥ Minhāj of al-Nawawī], Ibn Hajr al-Haytamī’s Tuhfat [al-Muḥtāj li Sharḥ al-Minhāj], and Khāṭib al-Sharbatīnī’s Muḥni al-Muḥtāj.8 Both al-Rānīrī and al-Sinkīlī also made extensive use of these sources. Al-Rānīrī’s Širāž al-Mustaqīm, which was printed in the margin of Sabīl al-Muhtadin, was Muḥammad Arshad’s starting point; he then made the works of the scholars mentioned above his major references. Muhammad Arshad thereby strengthened his intellectual connections with some important scholars in the networks. Because of its popularity, the Sabīl al-Muhtadin played an important role in establishing the dominance of the above works as standard references of the Shāfī’ī school of law in the archipelago.

A substantial contribution to the further spread of Islamic legal doctrines was made by Dāwūd al-Ṣafāṭī, the most prolific among the Malay-Indonesian scholars in the eighteenth century. He is the best example of a scholar successful in his attempts to reconcile the legal and mystical aspects of Islam. We discuss Dāwūd al-Ṣafāṭī’s main works on taṣawwuf later, focusing our attention now on those works dealing with various aspects of the shari‘ah or fiqh. The most important among them are the Bugḥyat al-Ṭullāb li Murīd Ma‘rīṭat al-Abkām bi al-Ṣawāb, which discusses religious observances (fiqh al-‘ibādah), and Furū‘ al-Masā‘il wa Uṣūl al-Wasā‘il, which deals with rules and guidelines in daily life. Smaller epistles then follow, such as the Jami‘ al-Fawā‘id, on various obligations of a Muslim towards his fellows and others; Hidāyat al-Muṭa‘allim wa ‘Umādat al-Mu‘allim, on fiqh in general; Munyat al-Muṣallī, on prayer (ṣalāt); Nahj al-Rāghibin fi Sabīl al-Muttaqīn, on commercial transactions; Ghāyat al-Taqrīb, on inheritance (farā‘id); Iḍāḥ al-Bāḥ li Murīd al-Nikāh
bi al-Șawāb, on matters relating to marriage and divorce; and a number of other shorter writings on particular sections of fiqh.9

Coming out of the same intellectual milieu, it is hardly surprising that al-Fatānī also derived most of his teachings from the important scholars referred to earlier. His major sources for Bughyat al-Tallāb are, among others, the Minhāj al-Talibīn of al-Nawawī, Fath al-Walhāb of Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī, Tuḥfat al-Muḥtāj of Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytāmī, and Nihāyati al-Muḥtāj of Shams al-Dīn al-Ramlī. Al-Fatānī’s Bughyat al-Tallāb consists of two volumes of 244 and 236 pages, and was printed several times in Mecca, Istanbul, Cairo and various places in the archipelago. Delineating the details of various Muslim religious obligations (‘ibādāt), this work has been acclaimed as the most complete book on this particular aspect of fiqh. The Bughyat al-Tallāb was as popular as the Sāhil al-Muḥtaḏin of Muhammad Arshād, and it is still used in many parts of the Malay-Indonesian world.10

The Furū’ al-Mašāʾil is another ample work on fiqh; a reprinted Meccan edition (1257/1841), based on an earlier edition published in Cairo (n.d.), consists of two volumes of 275 and 394 pages. The work is an adaptation of both Shams al-Dīn al-Ramlī’s al-Fatāwā and Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Maḥallī’s Kashf al-Lithām, and was written in the form of questions and answers. By adopting this style of writing, al-Fatānī introduced a new method of delineating the intricacies of fiqh in what he considered an attractive and effective vehicle for teaching fiqh to his Malay-Indonesian audience.

Al-Fatānī, through his works listed above, played a major role in the history of fiqh in the archipelago. Although the works bore Arabic titles, they were in fact written in Malay. This reflects al-Fatānī’s concern that his Malay-Indonesian co-religionists should be able to understand the precepts of the sharīʿah. He underlines the importance of the sharīʿah or fiqh for Muslims by citing a hadith of the Prophet, which states that a good faqīh can better defend himself against evils than a thousand Muslims who perform religious obligations without sufficient knowledge of fiqh.11 It must be kept in mind, however, that al-Fatānī was not simply a great faqīh or an expert on the sharīʿah; he was also a šāfiʿi par excellence, devoting a number of writings to taṣawwuf and kalām.

So far as the eighteenth century is concerned, al-Palimbānī was the scholar most responsible for the further spread of neo-Sufism in the archipelago. He was particularly an expert on the Ghazālīan taṣawwuf. As Al-Bayṭār informs us, al-Palimbānī was renowned among his fellow scholars in the Haramayn for his outstanding expertise on al-Ghazālī’s Iḥyāʾ ‘Ulamāʾ al-Dīn. He not only taught his students the taṣawwuf of al-Ghazālī, appealing to them to study and practise it seriously, but he also wrote several works about it, including the Fadāʾil al-Iḥyāʾ li al-Ghazālī.12 It is known that al-Rānirī, al-Sinkīlī and al-Maṣṣārī referred to al-Ghazālī
in their works, but al-Palimbānī more than all of them made the Iḥyā’ ‘Uḥūm al-Dīn the basis for his works. Therefore, he can appropriately be considered the most prominent ‘translator’ of al-Ghazālī among Malay-Indonesian scholars. The immense popularity of the Ghazalian tasawwuf in the archipelago can to a great extent be attributed to al-Palimbānī.

Al-Palimbānī’s masterpieces, widely circulated in the archipelago, were two works that have been closely associated with al-Ghazālī’s writings, the Ḥidayat al-Sāliḥīn fil Sulūk Maslak al-Muttaqīn and Sayr al-Sāliḥīn ilā ‘Ībādah Rabb al-‘Ālamīn. Both works were written in Malay and were thus intended to be read by the wider Malay-Indonesian audience. The Ḥidayat al-Sāliḥīn, completed in Mecca in 1192/1778, was printed at various times in Mecca (1287/1870 and 1303/1885), Bombay (1311/1895), Cairo (1341/1922), Surabaya (1352/1933) and Singapore (n.d.). The Sayr al-Sāliḥīn, consisting of four parts, was written in Mecca and Tā’īf between 1193/1780 and 1203/1788. Like the Ḥidayat al-Sāliḥīn, the Sayr al-Sāliḥīn was printed in Mecca (1306/1888) and Cairo (1309/1893 and 1372/1953), and later also reprinted in Singapore, Malaysia and Indonesia.

The Ḥidayat al-Sāliḥīn deals mostly with rules of the sharīʿah interpreted in a mystical way. As al-Palimbānī himself points out, it is a translation of al-Ghazālī’s Bidāyat al-Ḥidayah. But this work can more appropriately be termed an adaptation of the Bidāyat al-Ḥidayah, as, according to al-Palimbānī, ‘it renders several topics found in al-Ghazālī’s [Bidāyat al-Ḥidayah] into the Jāwī language, while at the same time it introduces a number of appropriate additional [topics which] are not addressed in it’.13

Al-Palimbānī, of course, depends heavily on the Bidāyat al-Ḥidayah, but at the same time he takes material from other works of al-Ghazālī, such as the Iḥyā’ ‘Uḥūm al-Dīn, Minhāj al-‘Abidīn and al-Arbaʿīn fil Usūl al-Dīn. Of particular importance, he makes numerous references to works by several prominent scholars in the networks, such as the Yawāqīt al-Jawāhir of al-Sha’rānī,14 al-Durr al-Thamīn of ‘Abd Allāh al-‘Ayyarūsī,15 al-Bustān al-‘Arifīn of al-Qushāshī16 and Naḥbat al-Ilāhīyyah of al-Sammānī.17

In many respects al-Palimbānī’s Sayr al-Sāliḥīn is a further elaboration of the teachings contained in the Ḥidayat al-Sāliḥīn. According to al-Palimbānī, the Sayr al-Sāliḥīn is a rendering of the Lubāb Iḥyā’ ‘Uḥūm al-Dīn, an abridged version of the Iḥyā’ ‘Uḥūm al-Dīn, written by al-Ghazālī’s brother, Ahmad b. Muḥammad.18 But the Sayr al-Sāliḥīn is not just a translation of the Lubāb Iḥyā’. As in the Ḥidayat al-Sāliḥīn, al-Palimbānī in the Sayr al-Sāliḥīn takes additional material from works of such scholars as Ibn ‘Arabī, al-Jīlī, Ibn ‘Atā Allāh, al-Sha’rānī, al-Burhānūrī, al-Shinnāwī, al-Qushāshī, al-Kūrānī, al-Nabulusī, al-Bakrī and al-Sammānī. Al-Palimbānī also makes references to works of his Malay-Indonesian predecessors, such as al-Sinkīlī and even Shams al-Dīn al-Samātrānī,19 who had been considered by many an unorthodox scholar.
All this again underlines the fact that al-Palimbânî possessed not only teacher-disciple connections but also intellectual links to many important scholars in the networks. We are not going to dwell on the detailed contents of the *Hidayat al-Sâlikîn* and *Sayr al-Sâlikîn*. It suffices to say that both works elucidate the principles of Islamic faith and religious duties to which every aspirant of the mystical way should commit himself. Like many scholars in the networks, al-Palimbânî believes that the grace of God can be attained only through correct faith in the absolute Unity of God and total obedience to the *shari‘ah* precepts. Although he accepts certain notions of Ibn ‘Arabî or al-Jîlî, particularly concerning the doctrine of the Universal Man, al-Palimbânî interprets them in light of al-Ghazâlî’s teachings. He puts emphasis in his *tasâwîf* more on purification of mind and moral conduct than on the exploration of speculative and philosophical mysticism.

With such an emphasis, al-Palimbânî adopted the central teaching of other scholars in the networks. He maintained that the fulfilment of the doctrines of the *shari‘ah* concerning rituals and good deeds was the surest way to achieve spiritual progress. At a higher level, further progress would be attained through the intensification of the *dhîkr*. Al-Palimbânî outlines seven kinds of *dhîkr*, each of which is designed to uplift the *nafs* (human soul), which has seven corresponding stages. He then goes on to describe in detail various requirements of the *dhîkr* that will enable the person who performs it to achieve the intended aims.

As far as his *dhîkr* is concerned, although al-Palimbânî was mostly known as a Sammânîyyah shaykh, he followed the teachings of the Khalwatiyyah *tariqah*. This is not surprising, as he received this order from al-Sammânî. In fact, al-Palimbânî’s teaching of seven kinds of *dhîkr* and seven stages of the soul was originally developed among the circle of the Khalwatis, and later incorporated by al-Sammânî in the body of Sammaniyyah teachings.

However, in contrast to the tendency among the Khalwatiyyah shaykhs to encourage a certain degree of individualism and freedom among their disciples, al-Palimbânî subscribes to the older teachings, which emphasise the absolute position of masters vis-à-vis their disciples. Al-Palimbânî, in accord with al-Maqqasârî, also a Khalwatiyyah shaykh, requires total obedience of disciples to their master. In order for disciples to succeed, they must pledge their allegiance (*bay‘ah*) to their master and obey him totally, for he is an heir or representative of the Prophet. In the final analysis, the disciples must submit themselves to the master like ‘a dead body in the hands of its washers’.

From these teachings one may gain the impression that al-Palimbânî encourages some kind of passivity, at least in the realm of mysticism, but it would be unfair to view him only from those teachings. Al-Palimbânî, like al-Maqqasârî, who was an exemplary activist against Dutch
colonialism, encouraged activism among his fellow Muslims, such as the jihād against the Dutch. It appears that it was al-Palimbānī’s concern for disciples who might be led astray if they embarked on the mystical path on their own that inspired him to adopt these teachings. Therefore, he insisted that disciples be guided by trusted masters, who would shield them from confusion about the mystical doctrines.

Al-Palimbānī categorises the travellers on the mystical path into three groups: the beginners (al-muḥtādī), the intermediates (al-muṭawāṣṣīt), and the advanced (al-muntahī). For each group, al-Palimbānī recommends a number of readings. His list of readings is interesting indeed. For the beginners he lists no fewer than 56 works: among others, six works of al-Ghazālī, two works of al-Anṣārī, seven works of al-Sha‘rānī, three works of ‘Abd al-Qādir al-‘Aydārūsī, one work each of al-Qushāshī, al-Kūrānī, Tāj al-Dīn al-Hindī and al-Sinkī, some 13 works of al-Bakrī and al-Sammānī or their students concerning doctrines and practices of the Khalwātiyyah and al-Sammāniyyah orders, and several works by other scholars. Most of these works were simple elucidations of the fulfillment of the shari‘ah in connection with the aim of achieving spiritual progress in the mystical way. With his selection of such works by these scholars, al-Palimbānī clearly intends to show to every aspirant of the mystical way that the shari‘ah constitutes the fundamental basis of Islamic mysticism.

At the intermediate level, al-Palimbānī brings the seekers after truth to a deeper exploration of Sufism. He lists no fewer than 26 works, most of which are more philosophical and theological. He includes the Ḥikam of Ibn ‘Aṭā’ Allāh, which must be read along with commentaries by Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm b. al-‘Ibād, al-Qushāshī and Ahmad b. ‘Alān. He then lists the Ḥikam of Rasālān al-Dimashqī. This work is most probably the same work as the Risalāh fī al-Tawḥīd, for al-Palimbānī mentions its commentary entitled Faith al-Rahmān by al-Anṣārī. Al-Palimbānī points out that he read the Ḥikam and the Risalāh fī al-Tawḥīd together with the latter’s commentaries by al-Nabūlūsī and al-Sammānī. Al-Palimbānī also includes theological works such as al-Yawāqīt al-Jawāhir of al-Sha‘rānī, Miftāḥ al-Ma‘ṣīya fī al-Tariqat al-Naqshbandiyyah of al-Nabulūsī, and several works of al-Bakrī and al-Sammānī.

At the advanced level, the travellers in God’s path are exposed to more complicated and, therefore, somewhat more controversial works. At the top of the list are the works of Ibn ‘Arabī, including the Fusūs al-Hikam, Futūḥat al-Makkiyyah and Mawāqī’ al-Nujūm. Then follows the al-Insān al-Kāmil of al-Jilī, the Ihyā‘ Ulūm al-Dīn of al-Ghazālī, the Tuhfāt al-Mursalāh of al-Burhānpūrī together with its commentaries written by al-Kūrānī and al-Nabulūsī, the Lawāqīḥ al-Anwār al-Qudsiyyah of al-Sha‘rānī, the Mir‘āt al-Ḥaqā‘iq of al-Shinnāwī and the Maslak al-Mukhtār of al-Kūrānī. Finally he includes works by Malay-Indonesian scholars: the Jawāhir al-Ḥaqā‘iq and Tanbih al-Tullāb fī Ma‘rūfat al-Malik al-Wahāb of Shams al-Dīn al-Samātānī, the Ta‘yīd al-Bayān Ḥāshiyyah...
Iṣāh al-Bayān ʿfi Tahqīq Masaʾil al-Aʿyān [sic] of al-Sinkīlī, and finally al-Palimbānī’s own work, Zād al-Muttaqīn ʿfi Tawḥīd Rabb al-ʿĀlamīn. Al-Palimbānī states that Zād al-Muttaqīn was written as an exposition of the doctrine of wujudat al-wujūd as he received it from al-Sammānī and his student Ṣiddīq b. ʿUmar al-Khān. 36

Al-Palimbānī, undoubtedly, was fully aware of the possibility that such works might lead to intellectual and religious confusion. Therefore, the above works were reserved for advanced disciples only. Those who did not totally comprehend and practise the shariʿah and its proper relations with the haqiqah might be led astray or even to heresy by such works. 37

With regard to the works he recommends, al-Palimbānī again demonstrates his intellectual linkage to the tendencies in earlier networks. Following the lead of al-Shaʿrānī, al-Qushāshī, al-Kūrānī, al-Sinkīlī and al-Maqassārī, who took great care not to sever their intellectual and spiritual links with the philosophical-mystical doctrines of Ibn ʿArabī, al-Palimbānī made his own attempts to reconcile Ibn ʿArabī’s teachings with those of al-Ghazālī, emphasising the importance of the purification of mind and of the fulfilment of religious obligations in the mystical way. Al-Palimbānī was opposed to the uncontrollable speculative notion of mysticism; he denounced the doctrines of the so-called wujūdiyyah muḥḥīd (lit. atheistic unity of being) as well as the practice of religious offerings to the ancestors’ spirits. 38 These religious beliefs and practices appear to have had some followers in South Sumatra during the times of al-Palimbānī, which inspired him to try to end them.

In the same way as al-Rānīrī, al-Palimbānī divides the doctrines of wujūdiyyah into two kinds: the wujūdiyyah muḥḥīd (atheistic unity of being), and the wujūdiyyah muwawāḥhīd (unitarianism of unity of being). Al-Palimbānī points out that according to the followers of the doctrine of wujūdiyyah muḥḥīd, the first article of belief—that is, lā ilāh illā Allāh (there is no god but God)—means that ‘there is no such thing as our being, but only God’s Being, that is, we are God’s Being’. 39 Al-Palimbānī moreover explains:

They further said innā al-ḥaq subḥānahu wa taʿālā layṣa bi mawjūd illā fī dīn n wujūd al-kāʾināt [sic], that is, the Reality of God does not exist but in the beings of all created things. Thus they insist that the Unity of God exists only in the beings of creation. They, in addition, say that ‘we are of the similar nature (sebahansa) and similar being (sewujud) with God and that the Essence of God is knowable, for He exists in the external world (khārij) in time and place’. Such a belief is infidelity (kufr). 40

Al-Palimbānī apparently did not cite al-Rānīrī for his denunciation of the followers of wujūdiyyah muḥḥīd. But both scholars share the same teaching. Al-Rānīrī, for instance, states that:
Now I would like to explicate and make you all aware of the falsity of the belief of wujūdiyyah mutilḥīd and zīndiq. They maintain that our beings and that of the universe are God’s Being, and (conversely) God’s Being is the being of us and the universe. Let it be known if such a belief of wujūdiyyah mutilḥīd is correct, then every thing is God. And if we kill a man and cut him into pieces, then what [we] kill and cut is God.41

Again reminding us of al-Rānīrī, al-Palimbānī includes the followers of wujūdiyyah mutilḥīd among the group of people whom he calls pseudo-ṣāfīs (kaum yang bersafti-sufian dirinya). Another group of pseudo-ṣāfīs, according to al-Palimbānī, were the followers of ḥulūliyyah (the doctrine of God’s incarnation). He maintains that their error was their belief that God incarnates Himself into the beings of man and other creations.42

Muḥammad Arshad al-Banjārī is known to have written only one work on Sufism. But because he studied together with al-Palimbānī in the same social and intellectual milieu, there is little doubt that he shared al-Palimbānī’s views on the subject. Muḥammad Arshad opposed the doctrine of wujūdiyyah mutilḥīd. According to local tradition, several years after his return a scholar named Hāji ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd Abulung came to South Kalimantan. Despite the obscurity surrounding his life, what is clear is that he introduced to the local Muslims the kind of teachings that have been categorised by both al-Palimbānī and al-Rānīrī as wujūdiyyah mutilḥīd. ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd reportedly taught people that ‘there is no being but God. There is no ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd but God; He is I and I am Him’.43

As a result, religious confusion spread among the population and ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd was summoned to the royal court. But he fiercely held fast to his belief. This led Muḥammad Arshad to issue a fatwā declaring ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd’s teachings heretical and led Sulṭān Tahlīd Allāh to order his execution.44 This is reminiscent of the heresy hunting and killing of Wujūdiyyah followers in Aceh during the time of al-Rānīrī.

In al-Palimbānī’s opinion, the true ṣāfīs were followers of the doctrine of wujūdiyyah muwahhid. These ṣāfīs affirmed the absolute Unity of God in Himself. They were called the wujūdiyyah because ‘their belief and intellectual disposition centre on the absolute Unity of God’.45 Al-Palimbānī does not elaborate his teachings about true ṣāfīs. However, it is clear from al-Palimbānī’s short statement that true ṣāfīs put more stress on the transcendence of God than on His immanence. Although they accept the notion that God is immanent in creation, it is anathema for them to hear any statement saying that God is identical with creation.

Al-Palimbānī shares the view of many scholars in the networks that God and the universe are two different entities: each possesses distinct realities. At this stage, al-Palimbānī and many scholars in the networks accept the view of Ibn ‘Arabī that the universe is the exterior expression (al-a’yān al-khārijiyyah) of God. As such, the exterior expression of God is not God Himself; it is simply a shadow of God’s Being.
In such a view, the doctrine of *wujūdyyah muwahhid* is basically similar to that of *wahdat al-wujūd* of Ibn ‘Arabī, according to which all created beings come into existence only when God reveals Himself. Men and other creatures, in essence, are separate from the Self of God, and it is only through revelation, as a way opened up by God Himself, that they are able to reunite with God. This reunion requires purification and total conformity to the Divine norm on the part of men. All this finally leads to a stage where men fully realize the Unity of Being. This stage of *wahdat al-wujūd* is also called by al-Palimbānī the stage of *tawḥīd al-Ṣiddiqīn*—that is, the stage of the *tawḥīd* of the truthful whose spiritual progress makes them occupied solely with God; they come to realise that there is no other being but God. As al-Palimbānī points out:

At the fourth stage of *tawḥīd*, he [who seeks after truth] sees nothing in the existence of the universe but *Dhār* (Essence) of the One Supreme God, who is the Necessary Being (*al-wājib al-wujūd*) this is the vision of those *Ṣiddiqīn* (who fully believe), those *ārifīn* (who are adept); the *ṣāfi* master calls them people who experience *fanā*’ (perish) in the *tawḥīd* they then will not realize themselves, for their spirit is occupied with the *shuhd* (vision) of God, the Real Being.46

At this point al-Palimbānī apparently succeeds in his attempt to reconcile the tradition of Ibn ‘Arabī with that of al-Ghazzālī. The concept of the fourth stage of *tawḥīd* of the *Ṣiddiqīn*, taken from al-Ghazzālī,47 is equated by al-Palimbānī with Ibn ‘Arabī’s *wahdat al-wujūd*. But this does not mean they are identical.

To explicate the revelation of God in accordance with the concept of *wahdat al-wujūd* or to achieve *fanā*’ in the fourth stage of *tawḥīd*, al-Palimbānī adopts the doctrine of the seven stages of revelation or seven grades of being (*martabat tuḥūb*). This doctrine was originally developed by Ibn ‘Arabī but was later reinterpreted in a more orthodox sense by al-Burhānpūrī. According to al-Burhānpūrī, God reveals (*ta’ayyun or *taḥjīl*) Himself through seven stages of being. The creation of man is the last stage of God’s revelation.48 While al-Burhānpūrī believes that nobody will be able to grasp the essence of the Real Being,49 al-Palimbānī maintains that it can be known through *ma’rifah* (gnostic knowledge), centred in the *qalb* (lit. heart = intuition).50 Emphasising the teachings of al-Ghazzālī, al-Palimbānī considers that *ma’rifah* can be attained through spiritual purification and concentration, all of which will result in, as al-Ghazzālī puts it, ‘the vision of the Essence of God’.51

An attempt to reconcile the tradition of al-Ghazzālī’s *shari’ah*-oriented *tasawwuf* with that of Ibn ‘Arabī’s philosophical Sufism was also made by Muhammad Nafis in his *Durr al-Nafs*. This work, completed in Mecca in 1200/1785, apparently enjoyed wide circulation. Printed several times in various places in the Middle East and the archipelago, it is still used in many
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places in the Malay-Indonesian world. The Durr al-Nafis was written in the 'Jâwî language, so that it can be read by those who do not read Arabic.' 52

A glance at the Durr al-Nafis attests to the fact that Muhammad Nafis made a conscious attempt to reconcile the tradition of al-Ghazâlî and that of Ibn ‘Arabi. In preparing this work, aside from using the oral teachings of his masters in the Haramayn he makes extensive use of the Futûhât al-Makkiyyah and Fuşûs al-Ḥikam of Ibn ‘Arabi, the Ḥikam of Ibn ‘Ajûl Allâh, the al-Insân al-Kâmîl of al-Jili, the Ibyâ ‘Ulûm al-Dîn and Minhâj al-’Abîdîn of al-Ghazâlî, the Risâlat al-Qushayriyyah of al-Qushayrî, the Jawâhir wa al-Durar of al-Sha’râ’înî, the Mukhtâsir al-Tuhfât al-Mursalah of ‘Abd Allâh b. Ibrâhîm al-Mîrghânî and the Manhâj al-Muhammadiyyah of al-Sammânî.53

According to Muhammad Nafis, the Unity of God (tawhîd) falls into four stages: the tawhîd al-Af’âl (Unity of the Acts of God), tawhîd al-Śifât (Unity of God’s Attributes), tawhîd al-Asmâ (Unity of God’s Names), and tawhîd al-Dhât (Unity of God’s Essence). At the highest stage, the tawhîd al-Dhât, seekers after truth will experience fanâ’, during which they will be able to have a vision (mushâhâdhâh) of God. Like al-Palimbânî, Muhammad Nafis believes that the Essence of God cannot be known through the five senses and reason: only with kashîf (direct intuition) will one be able to grasp the Essence of God.54

Muhammad Nafis stresses the importance of the fulfilment of the sharî’ah both outwardly and inwardly in order to attain the stage of kashîf. It is impossible for anybody to reach that stage without intensifying his spiritual power through performing the religious rituals and obligations laid down by the sharî’ah.

A comprehensive study of Dâwûd al- Fa’tânî’s mystical teachings is not yet available, but it is clear that he was a great proponent of al-Ghazâlî’s taswâwaf as well as a prominent defender among Malay-Indonesian scholars of Ibn ‘Arabi’s tradition. Al- Fa’tânî is known to have written several works along the same lines as the doctrines of al-Ghazâlî, bearing such titles as the Tarjamah Biddîyat al-Hidâyah and Minhâj al-’Abîdîn.55

For al- Fa’tânî, al-Ghazâlî was the greatest šâfi. As he puts it: ‘ Imâm al-Ghazâlî is like a very deep sea, containing precious pearls which cannot be found in other seas’.56

In al- Fa’tânî’s view, the greatest šâfi next to al-Ghazâlî was al-Sha’râ’înî. He points out in the introductory notes to his Malay translation of al-Sha’râ’înî’s Kashîf al-Ghummah that al-Sha’râ’înî was his ‘ penghulu’ (master), who guided him in the path of God.57 It is no surprise, therefore, that al- Fa’tânî, like al-Sha’râ’înî, staunchly defends the doctrine of Ibn ‘Arabi’s wahdât al-wujûd and the seven grades of being in a little-known but important work entitled Manhâj al-Šâfî fi Bayân Zamar Ahl al-Šâfî.58

Al- Fa’tânî was very critical of people who styled themselves as šâfîs while in fact being simply pseudo- šâfîs (berlagak seperti šâfi) and ignorant
of the true teachings of Sufism. According to al-Ṭāfānī, among the groups of pseudo-ṣūfīs were people who claimed to have complete union (ittihād) with God. He bitterly denounces them:

The people of ittihād believe that their essence (dhār) becomes the Essence of God. This is a gross infidelity (ṣiḥr). Those who worship idols are much better than they are, they think that they gain the true vision, [in contrast] they have come to the presence of ʿiblīs (devil).59

In connection with this view, al-Ṭāfānī conceives the Manhal al-Ṣāfi as an answer and explanation of various concepts and terms in taṣawwuf. In addition to discussing such concepts as wahdat al-wujūd, marṭabat tuḥuḥ and other mystico-theological matters, al-Ṭāfānī complements the work with a list of some key terms in ṣūfī vocabularies and their meanings. In the introductory notes to the Manhal al-Ṣāfi, the author again criticises pseudo-ṣūfīs who misunderstood the concept of, for instance, wahdat al-wujūd because they simply embraced its literal meaning. For that reason, he reminds the Muslims that books dealing with such topics should be read only by experts or by those who have solid grounding in the “ṭariqah Muhammadadiyyah”.60

The fact that the Malay-Indonesian scholars in the eighteenth century continued to cling to the central doctrine of Ibn ‘Arabī is hardly surprising. Despite criticism of the concept of wahdat al-wujūd, it is in fact the fundamental and central doctrine of all kinds of Sufism. Criticism of this doctrine by such scholars as Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Ṣubkī (d. 745/1344) and Ibn Khaldūn (d. 780/1378) is essentially based on the fact that it can be easily misunderstood. It may lead to the belief that there is a continuity, or a total unity, between the creation and God. In other words, it could bring one to a pantheistic belief, which is anathema to legal scholars (ahl al-sharīʿa).

It is important to note that the doctrine of wahdat al-wujūd, quite surprisingly, was defended by several eminent legal and ḥadīth scholars, including Muḥy al-Dīn al-Nawawī (d. 676/1278), Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī and Zakariyyā al-Anṣārī. We have shown how al-Anṣārī, for example, possessed ḥadīth inād which can be traced to Ibn ‘Arabī. The staunchest defender of Ibn ‘Arabī among neo-ṣūfīs was, of course, al-Sha’rānī, to whom many scholars in the networks traced their mystical teachings.61

It is of particular importance to keep in mind that many scholars in the networks, from al-Qushāshī, al-Kūrānī, ‘Uṯmān b. ʿUbād, al-Sinkī, al-Maqṣūsī, al-Palimbānī and Muhammad Naḏīs to al-Ṭāfānī, responded in a similar fashion to controversy surrounding Ibn ‘Arabī’s doctrines. Much like al-Sha’rānī, they insisted that Ibn ‘Arabī’s doctrines should not be taken at face value: they must be understood in connection with other mystical concepts.

In order to avoid misinterpretation of Ibn ‘Arabī’s doctrines, these
scholars unanimously urged disciples in the mystical path to read Ibn ‘Arabi’s books only after they had achieved the degree of the ‘khāṣṣ’ (elite). Disciples must have firm grounding in all aspects of mystico-philosophical doctrines and understand fully their relations with the legal teachings of Islam before they can understand the teachings of Ibn ‘Arabi in their proper contexts. It is equally important to note that these scholars took great care not to associate themselves entirely with Ibn ‘Arabi; they cited other authorities, unanimously known as ‘orthodox’ scholars, such as al-Ghazālī, as their central sources.

JIHĀD AND THE RADICAL COURSE OF REFORMISM

Sufism, particularly among modernist Muslims, has been regarded as one of the main causes of regression of the Muslim world. Religiously it has been accused of being the source of bid‘ah (unwarranted innovation) and takhayyl (delusion) or khurāfāt (superstitions). Socially, Sufism has been blamed for pulling the Muslim masses into ‘passivity’ and withdrawal (‘uzlāh) from worldly affairs. It allegedly promoted escapism from the socioeconomic and political ills of their societies. As a result, so the accusation goes, Muslim societies failed to cope with the advanced but hostile Western world, which from the early seventeenth century increasingly penetrated the Dār al-Islām.

Most of the accusations are ill-founded. There is no need to repeat the arguments and evidence presented throughout this book: that the central teaching of the reformed Sufism or neo-Sufism was puritanical in its nature. It called for the total obedience, both outwardly and inwardly, of Muslims to orthodoxy, or more precisely to the sharī‘ah. The scholars in the networks agreed that it was simply impossible for the sūfīs to achieve their spiritual goal without committing themselves fully to the orthodox doctrine of Islam. There were, of course, deviant manifestations of Sufism, particularly at the level of the masses, but these were generated mostly by a lack of understanding of the correct teachings of Sufism. Therefore, Sufism as such could not be held responsible for all bid‘ahs and khurāfāts found in Muslim societies.

Similarly, the modernists’ accusation that Sufism encouraged passivity and withdrawal from worldly affairs was based mostly on ignorance or misunderstanding of the whole teachings of Sufism. We have shown throughout this discussion that none of the scholars in the networks taught passivity and withdrawal. On the contrary, they appealed to Muslim activism; for them, the fulfilment of Muslims’ worldly duties was an integral part of their spiritual progress in the mystical journey.

In the case of Malay-Indonesian scholars in the seventeenth century, we have seen that al-Sinkī and al-Maqqāsārī presented themselves as exemplary sūfīs, who were absorbed not only with their own spiritual journeys
but also with worldly affairs, holding the office of Mufti in their respective Sultanates. Al-Maqassâri went so far as to become one of the most important leaders and heroes of the Bantenese war against the Dutch.

This was also true of Malay-Indonesian scholars in the eighteenth century. We have already mentioned Muhammad Arshad’s reformism and activism; he was the pioneer of the establishment of the office of Mufti and of Islamic educational institutions in the Sultanate of Banjar. Even though the Sultanate was, from 1021/1612 onwards, continually harassed by the Dutch before they finally subdued it in 1237/1860, it is surprising to find how little Muhammad Arshad had to say about the struggle against the Dutch; neither his own works nor other sources indicate that he ever preached the doctrine of jihad (holy war) against the Dutch.63

Appeals for jihad, strangely enough, came from al-Palimbânî and al-Fâtnî, who spent most of their lives and died in the Haramayn. This is strong evidence of their very close attachment to and concern for Islam in their homelands. It indicates that they were not the şîfîs pictured by modernist Muslims merely occupied with their spiritual journeys and alienated from their societies. This also suggests that contacts and communications between the Malay-Indonesian world and the Haramayn were well maintained, so that the Jâwî scholars were well informed about the development of Islam in the archipelago, particularly in connection with the continued encroachment by unbelievers.

On more than one occasion al-Palimbânî urged his Malay-Indonesian fellows to wage jihad against European colonialists. Voorhoeve and Drewes64 even argue that jihad was one of al-Palimbânî’s specialties. This seems to be an exaggeration, which has led to a misunderstanding and distortion of al-Palimbânî’s teachings as a whole.

The major work of al-Palimbânî on jihad is Nashîhat al-Musîlimîn wa Tadhkîrât al-Mu’mînin fî Fâdâ’il al-Jiḥâd fî Sâbîl Allâh wa Karâmât al-Muṣâhîdîn fî Sâbîl Allâh.65 The work is unquestionably the first of this type known widely in the archipelago. However, the Fâdâ’il al-Jiḥâd was apparently intended to be read not only by a Malay-Indonesian audience, but by a much wider one, for it was written in Arabic. He appears to have deliberately not written it in Malay, so that, he might have assumed, the Dutch would not understand it. The work, consisting of seven chapters delineating the virtues of the holy war according to the Qur’an and the hadith, was a concise but substantial writing on the subject. After explaining that it was obligatory for Muslims to wage holy war against hostile unbelievers, al-Palimbânî concludes the Fâdâ’il al-Jiḥâd with a short supplication (du’â’), which would make the mujâhidîn (those who carry out jiḥâd) invulnerable.

Snouck Hurgronje has maintained that al-Palimbânî’s Fâdâ’il al-Jiḥâd was the main source of various works on jiḥâd in the long Acehnese wars against the Dutch. It became the model of the Acehnese version of admon-
ition to Muslims to fight the unbelievers. Known collectively as the *Hikayat Prang Sabi*, such works played an important role in sustaining the fighting spirit of the Acehnese throughout the protracted wars fought between 1873 and the early twentieth century. Roff rightly points out that the Acehnese resistance to Dutch aggression from the early stages assumed the character of *jihād* led by the independent ‘ulamā’ who were best fitted to organise and prosecute a holy war.

Al-Palimbānī’s appeal to Malay-Indonesian Muslims for *jihād* was not confined to writing the *Fadā’il al-Jihād*. He is said to have written letters, three of which were intercepted by the Dutch. They contained exhortations to Javanese rulers and princes to wage holy wars against the infidels. The letters were written in Arabic and later translated into Javanese and then into Dutch. The writer of the letter called himself Muhammad, but in the text of the Javanese translation he is referred to as ‘Abd al-Rahmān, a Palembang scholar in Mecca. Drewes has established that the writer was ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī; according to Arabic sources, al-Palimbānī was also called Ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān.

The first letter, translated into Dutch in Semarang, Central Java, on 22 May 1772, was addressed to the Sultan of Mataram, Hamangkubuwana I, previously known as Pangeran Mangkubumi. After a quite lengthy doxology in praise of God, al-Palimbānī writes:

> A sample of God’s goodness is that He has moved the heart of the writer [al-Palimbānī] to despatch a letter from Mecca, the Lord has assured that those Sultāns shall enter it [paradise] whose magnanimity, virtue and prowess against enemies of other religion [sic] are without equal. Among these is the king of Java, who maintains the religion of Islam and is triumphant over all potentates, and furthermore excels in good works in the war against those of other religion [sic]. The Lord reassures those who act in this way by saying ‘Do not think that those who fell in the holy war are dead; certainly not, they are still alive’ [Qur’ān 2:154, 3:169]. The Prophet Muhammad says: ‘I was ordered to kill anyone but those who know God and me, His Prophet’ [sic]. Those who are killed in the holy war are in odour of sanctity beyond praise; so this is a warning to all followers of Muhammad.

The conclusion of the letter then follows, which recommends two hājjis for religious positions in the Mataram and mentions that the writer has sent with them a small quantity of Zemzem (Zamzam) water (from Mecca) for the Sultan.

While the contents and addressee of the second letter were almost identical to the first letter, the third one was sent to Pangeran (Prince) Paku Nagara, or Mangkunagara, together with a banner reading *al-Rahmān al-Rahīm, Muhammad Rasūl Allāh ‘Abd Allāh*, meaning ‘the Merciful and Compassionate [God], His apostle and servant Muhammad’. After praising God and the Prophet in the opening, the letter runs as follows:
God will forgive the sins of the most pious people like Pangeran Mangkunagara, whom He has created to win such repute in the world, and also because Your Highness is a scion of the House of Mataram, upon whom God has bestowed Abundant mercy beside Muhammad the Prophet, considering that Your Highness’ justice is a matter of common knowledge. Furthermore, Your Highness should bear in mind the words of the Qur’an, to the effect that a small host is capable of gaining the victory over a mighty force.

Will it please Your Highness to also keep in mind that it says in the Qur’an:

‘Do not say that those who fell in the holy war are dead’ [Qur’an 2:154, 3:169]. God has said that the soul of such a one enters into a big pigeon and ascends straight up to the heaven. This is a thing all devout people surely know in their hearts, and more particularly this will be the case with Your Highness, who is comparable to a flower which gives forth its fragrance from sunrise to sunset, nay all Mecca and Medina and the Malay countries are wondering at this fragrance, and pray to God that Your Highness may triumph over all his enemies. Please think of the word of Muhammad, who has said: ‘Kill those who are not of the Islamic faith, one and all, unless they go over to your religion’.

Be confident of permanent good fortune and exert yourself in the fear of the Lord; do not fear misfortune and eschew all evil. One doing so will see the sky without cloud and the earth without squalor. Derive comfort from the following words of the Qur’an: ‘Those who have believed and worked the works of righteousness, shall obtain the grace of the Lord [in the paradise]’, [Qur’an 2:25] for the Prophet Muhammad has said: ‘If a man can live forever in this world, he will also live forever and enjoy eternal bliss in the hereafter’.

This is to notify Your Highness that I am directed, to deliver to Your Highness the accompanying jimar [amulet, in the form of banner], the potency of which is such that when it is used by Your Highness, when campaigning against your enemies, [with God’s blessing Your Highness] will always be victorious, which will lead to the protection of the Muslim faith and the extermination of all its malevolent adversaries.

The reason why this banner has been sent to you is that we in Mecca have heard that Your Highness, being a truly princely leader, is much feared in battle. Value it and make use of it, please God, in exterminating your enemies and all unbelievers. Good wishes and greetings are conveyed to Your Highness on behalf of the old Godfearing people of Mecca and Medina: Ibrāhīm, Imam Shāfi‘ī, Imām Ḥanāfī, Imām Mālikī and Imām Ḥanbalī, and furthermore on behalf of all the other people here, whose unanimous wish is that the blessings of the Prophet and his four great companions Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān and ‘Alā, may abide with Your Highness’ person.70

Ricklefs71 concludes that these letters were a significant historical landmark in the history of the struggles of Malay-Indonesian Muslims against the Dutch. In his opinion, they are the first evidence to come to light of an attempt from the world of international Islam to foment holy war in Java in the second half of the eighteenth century. On the other hand, Drewes72 argues that the letters had only modest purposes: recommending two scholars for religious posts in the Mataram Sultanate, and sending a
banner to a Javanese prince. Even though Drewes recognises that *jihād* was one of al-Palimbānī’s concerns, he suspects that the letters were simply a display of the writer’s learning in religious matters, particularly in the holy war, not really exhortations to wage the *jihād*.

Even though I do not subscribe to Ricklefs’ view that the letters contained the spirit of pan-Islamism, I accept the notion that the main purpose of the letters was indeed to encourage the addressees to lead the *jihād*. Al-Palimbānī evidently devoted the larger part of the letters to the virtues of *jihād* against the unbelievers to incite the Javanese rulers to take the lead in holy wars. The letters, as Ricklefs believes, reinforced potential indigenous antagonism towards the Dutch.73

It is worth noting that al-Palimbānī did not criticise the Javanese ruling house for division and quarrels among themselves, nor did he question their attachment to Islam. For that reason, it is clear that he did not wish to exacerbate their conflicts by criticising any one among them. Instead, he recalled the greatness of the Mataram Sultanate and, therefore, appealed to its rulers to once again revive it by way of *jihād*. Although al-Palimbānī made no explicit mention of the Dutch in the letters, what he calls unbelievers or infidels were undoubtedly the Dutch, who had intensified their attempts to subdue the Mataram Sultanate: it is the Dutch who were to be the target of the *jihād*.

Al-Palimbānī failed in his attempts to instigate Javanese rulers to wage the *jihād*, for the Dutch intercepted the letters before they reached their destination. The original letters were subsequently destroyed by order of the Dutch authorities in Batavia. But it is not impossible that the central message of the letters was conveyed orally to the addressees by scholars recommended by al-Palimbānī. If so, as Ricklefs argues, the oral communication of the contents of the letters did not immediately affect the course of events in Java. The 1770s marked the beginning of major steps towards political stability on the part of the Javanese monarchs. The incendiary message from al-Palimbānī in Mecca did not impede this progress.74

Another leading proponent of the *jihād* among Malay-Indonesian scholars in the eighteenth century was Shaykh Dāwūd ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Faţānī. In his case, his period saw the increasing attempts of the Thais to tighten their grip over the Muslim region of Patani. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that this sorry political situation in his homeland also became a main concern for al-Faţānī.75 Abdullah asserts that al-Faţānī returned home to lead *jihād* himself against the Thais before he finally returned and settled permanently in the Haramayn. We cannot support this assertion, as there is no evidence to corroborate it. Al-Faţānī never returned to Patani from the time he left it in search of knowledge: he spent the rest of his life teaching and writing in the Haramayn.

Al-Faţānī appeals to Muslims, especially those in Patani, through his writings. However, he did not write a special work on the *jihād*, nor did he
send letters to the Muslim rulers of Patani. He delineated his ideas on the jihād in his various works. It is known, for example, that his work on prayer (ṣalāt), entitled Munyat al-Musallī in Malay, completed in Mecca in 1242/1827, has some political overtones. Matheson and Hooker suggest that the work was written particularly for the Muslims in Patani in order to support them in their struggles against the Thais.

Al-Faḍānī’s teachings on jihād appear to bear some relation to his idea of the Islamic state. In his opinion, an Islamic state (dār al-Islām) should be based on the Qur’ān and the ḥadīth; otherwise it would be called a state of unbelievers (dār al-κfīr). We have no details on his notion of the Islamic state, particularly with regard to its system and administration. However, an Islamic state must function to protect Islam and the Muslims. Therefore, apostasy (murtadd) from Islam is not allowed, and those who so deviate should be killed.

In connection with the protection of Islam and the Muslims, according to al-Faḍānī, it is an essential obligation (fard al-‘ayn) for every Muslim to wage jihād against hostile unbelievers (kāfir al-κarb). If an Islamic state is attacked and annexed by unbelievers, the Muslims are obliged to fight them until they regain their freedom. As for the jihād to expand the realm of Islam, which involves the subduing of the unbelievers, it is only a fard al-κfiṣyah, an obligation which is acquitted in the name of all as long as it is performed by some. In both cases of the obligation of jihād, al-Faḍānī stresses the need for Muslims to have fighting strategies; they must not wage jihād if they are ill-prepared militarily.

Having seen such teachings of Malay-Indonesian scholars, known as ṣūfī scholars, it is no surprise that the Dutch in particular considered these teachings and tarīqah highly dangerous to their rule. Snouck Hurgronje, the most prominent adviser on Islamic affairs to the Dutch authorities, points out that ṣūfī shaykhs were the most dangerous enemies of Dutch rule in the archipelago. He claims that the menace of Malay-Indonesian ṣūfī scholars to the Dutch was no less than that of the Sanṣiyyah to the French in Algeria. For the Dutch, ṣūfī scholars, whom they also called ‘independent teachers’, were very difficult to control. It is thus not hard to understand why the Dutch did whatever they possibly could to contain their influence, including the banning of their books and interception of their letters.

One of the best-known examples of Islamic renewal and reformism originating among ṣūfī and tarīqah circles, which resulted in long wars between the Dutch and the native population, was the Padri Movement in Minangkabau or West Sumatra. We have discussed in chapter 4 how al-Sinkūl’s renewalist teachings and tarīqah, mainly by way of his student Burhān al-Dīn, spread to this region. Burhān al-Dīn in turn, through his famous surau of Ulakan, established himself as the most important Minangkabau scholar towards the end of the seventeenth century, with whom most of the next generation of Minangkabau scholars studied. After his death, the tomb of Burhān al-Dīn became a centre of religious visitation,
where pilgrims performed what Hamka calls some strange religious practices but which were in fact the rituals of the tariqah people, such as dhikr followed by dancing or singing.

Despite such practices, Shattariyyah writings, such as those of al-Sink al-Gunl, and the teachings of Burhan al-Din himself, again and again emphasised the need for the tasawwuf followers to commit themselves totally to the precepts of the shari’ah. It appears that tariqah practices in Ulakan, particularly at the popular level, had become uncontrolled and tended to be excessive and extravagant; this in turn invited criticism among ex-students of the Ulakan surau. From this it is evident that the embers of reformism did not die out.

In the late years of the eighteenth century, clearer signs of religious reform came to the forefront in Minangkabau society. For instance, among the Shattariyyah suraus, mainly located in the Minangkabau inner highland (darek), there were conscious attempts to revive al-Sinkil’s teachings, particularly on the importance of the shari’ah in the practice of tasawwuf. Furthermore, as Jalal al-Din, a contemporary Minangkabau who also took part in this new wave of renewal and reform, tells us, there were constant arrivals in Minangkabau of scholars from Mecca, Medina and Aceh, who contributed to reformism. Jalal al-Din makes no mention of their names, but he does state that scholars from the Haramayn were experts in manṭiq (logic) and ma’āni (ideal realities), both sciences being crucial to understanding shari’ah as well as tasawwuf. Meanwhile, an Acehnese scholar came to teach such sciences as hadith, tafsir and fara'id (inheritance).

The leading scholar in Minangkabau in this period was Tuanku Nan Tuo, the principal teacher of Jalal al-Din. The latter tells us that Tuanku Nan Tuo (1136–1246/1723–1830) of Ampat Angkat was a student of Tuanku Mansiangan Nan Tuo, who was in turn a student of Burhan al-Din. Tuanku Nan Tuo was also reported to have studied in the Ulakan surau with other students of Burhan al-Din. Later he established his own surau in Cangking, Ampat Angkat, and gained fame as a scholar of both shari’ah and tasawwuf. For his expertise in these two aspects of Islam, Tuanku Nan Tuo earned the title of ‘Sultan ‘Alim Awliya’ Allah’, who was the ‘leader of all Minangkabau ulama of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jam’ah’ (‘people of the approved way and community’).

The surau of Tuanku Nan Tuo accordingly became the best-known centre for the study of fiqh and tasawwuf in Minangkabau. Similarly, the students of Tuanku Nan Tuo, when they later returned to their own villages and devoted themselves to teaching in the suraus or in society in general, stressed the importance of the shari’ah. Jalal al-Din, the foremost disciple of Tuanku Nan Tuo, for instance, established his surau in Kota Lawas, which was already the home of another, older, Shattariyyah surau. The aim of Jalal al-Din in establishing his surau was to create a genuine Muslim community in Minangkabau by way of total commitment to the implementation of the Islamic way of life as
prescribed by the *shari’ah*. For that purpose, Jalāl al-Dīn taught his students the various aspects of Islamic law.\(^90\)

Tuanku Nan Tuo committed himself to the cause of the reform of Minangkabau society. He made clear to the people the differences between good and evil, as well as between the conduct of Muslims and kāfirs. He impressed on his students the need for the Minangkabaus to follow the path of the *Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah*, who based their lives on the Qur‘ān and the *hadith*. At the same time, he warned them that failure to do so would only lead to social insecurity and disruption.\(^91\)

Tuanku Nan Tuo was not content with simply lecturing his students in his *surau* on the importance of the *shari’ah*; he himself, together with his students, led the way to the field where un-Islamic practices such as robbery, arrack drinking and slavery held sway.\(^92\) According to Jalāl al-Dīn, Tuanku Nan Tuo visited places where robbery occurred and people were held captive to be sold as slaves, or where the precepts of the *shari’ah* were violated. He appealed to those who were involved in such things to rid themselves of those wrongdoings; otherwise they would be attacked and punished. As a result, peace returned to the region and trade once again revived in the region; Tuanku Nan Tuo, himself a well-to-do merchant, was renowned as a ‘tempat pernaungan’ (protector) of the traders.\(^93\)

The Ṣhaṭṭāriyyah *tariqah* was not the only *sīfī* order in Minangkabau. It is known that the Naqshbandiyyah *tariqah* was introduced to the region in the first half of the seventeenth century by Jamāl al-Dīn, a Minangkabau who initially studied in Pasai before he proceeded to Bayt al-Faqīh, Aden, the Haramayn, Egypt and India. On his way home he stopped in Aceh before finally reaching his homeland in West Sumatra, where he was active in teaching and preaching the Naqshbandiyyah *tariqah*. Jamāl al-Dīn’s travels remind us of al-Sinḵlūl’s earlier. Even though Jamāl al-Dīn provides lively accounts of his travels to these places, unlike al-Sinḵlūl, he makes no mention of his teachers, so we are not able to trace his scholarly connections. Both Van Ronkel and Johns\(^94\) have suggested that Jamāl al-Dīn was the author of a Naqshbandi *fiqh* text entitled *Lūbāh al-Hidāyah*, which was based on the teachings of Ahmad Ibn ‘Alān al-Ṣīdīqī al-Naqṣbandī. By the late eighteenth century, the Naqshbandiyyah and the Qādiriyyah *tariqahs* had made substantial inroads on Minangkabau. Both *tariqahs*, like the Ṣhaṭṭāriyyah, contributed significantly to Islamic renewal in the period.\(^95\)

The renewalism of the Ṣhaṭṭāriyyah, Naqshbandiyyah and Qādiriyyah, best represented by Tuanku Nan Tuo and Jalāl al-Dīn, met strong opposition from the *penghulu* (adat, custom chiefs) as well as from the followers of the extravagant type of Sufism. More importantly, some disciples of Tuanku Nan Tuo himself considered his reform simply a piecemeal one. The most prominent among such students was Tuanku Nan Renceh, who envisaged a more thorough and radical reform.

Having failed to persuade Tuanku Nan Tuo to change his evolutionary and peaceful approach to Islamic renewal, Tuanku Nan Renceh found
strong supporters in the famous three hājjīs who returned from Mecca in 1218/1803: Haji Miskin, Haji Sumanik, and Haji Piboang. Their pilgrimage coincided with the capture of Mecca by the Wahhābis. Therefore, they are considered to have been influenced by the Wahhābi teachings, such as opposition to bid‘ahs, the use of tobacco and silk clothing, which they attempted to spread by force in the Minangkabau region.

Tuanku Nan Renceh, together with the three ḥājjīs, now known as the Padris, declared jihād against those Muslims who declined to follow their teachings. As a result, civil war erupted among the Minangkabau; the suraus, considered the bastion of bid‘ahs, were attacked and burned to the ground, including those of Tuanku Nan Tuo and Jalāl al-Dīn. The royal family and the penghulus, who also became a major target, soon asked the help of the Dutch. With the intervention of the Dutch, the Minangkabau struggles for reform led to the famous Padri wars, which ended at the close of the 1830s.96

It is beyond the scope of this book to discuss the teachings of the Padris and the course of events surrounding the Padri wars. Important for our purpose here is that Islamic renewal and reform in the Minangkabau region, whether initiated by Tuanku Nan Tuo and the tarīqah circles or launched by Tuanku Nan Renceh and the Padris, found their origins in the scholarly networks. The differences in their approach to renewal and reform, peaceful or evolutionary on the one hand and radical on the other, reveal that the course of reform was not a simple one.

Muhammad Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb (1115–1201/1703–87), the pioneer of the radical wahhābi movement, despite his connection with the networks, was also influenced by other factors that substantially determined his approach to renewal and reform. Similarly, although most of the leading proponents of the Padris in Minangkabau derived their inspiration for renewal and reform from the tarīqah circles, at a later stage they were influenced by a string of other factors, such as the ‘success’ of the Wahhābis in Arabia and the local conditions in Minangkabau that led them to adopt radicalism.

Despite its excesses, the Padri Movement was a major landmark in the history of Islamic renewal and reform in the archipelago. Its impact on the development of Malay-Indonesian Islam was tremendous. The Padri Movement, in retrospect, not only questioned the degree of renewalism among the tarīqah circles but more importantly challenged the established formulation of relations between the ‘great tradition’ of Islam in the centres and an Islamic ‘little tradition’ that mixed with the adat (customs) at the local level. The transmission of reformist ideas and teachings through all Malay-Indonesian scholars, as we have shown throughout our discussion, constituted a conscious attempt to bring the great tradition of Islam to supremacy in the archipelago. This also becomes one of the most distinctive features of Islamic development in the Malay-Indonesian world in later periods.
Epilogue

THE LEGACY OF THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURY NETWORKS; THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND BEYOND

This book has been concerned with the transmission of the reformist tradition from the seventeenth and eighteenth century Haramayn to Southeast Asia. The nature and form of transmission is fundamental to our understanding of tradition—the latter defined broadly as a body of knowledge. The data, the traditions in this book, are the Arab biographical dictionaries (tarājim) of the period. The primary research on which this book is based was completed a decade ago, and during that time knowledge about many of the outstanding Muslim scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has grown considerably. It has not been possible to include references to all the new contributions to the fields since the time I prepared my dissertation. However, in this Epilogue I draw on that research to offer some preliminary notes on the persistence of the reformist tradition into the nineteenth century and beyond to the formation of new traditions originating from the reform movements at the end of the nineteenth century.

Some preliminary comment on transmission is, however, apposite at this stage. 'Transmission' means to hand on through time, and we thus need some basic understanding of time in Islam and in Indonesian Islam.

TIME: THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

From the linear view, time gives us a past, a present and a future; for Islam the Torah was revealed, as was the Injil, and Islam has completed revelation. Similarly, the networks of transmission are completed transmissions, datable in historical time. This last phrase is clearly referring to linear time, but it also creates two difficulties.
First, from the internal point of view, the Arab biographies are in the present. By this I mean they are a continuing and present authority in the traditional Muslim boarding schools and circles of Muslim scholarship in the fifteenth/twenty-first century in Indonesia. They exist now and have meaning and authority now because they are how we know original Islam. Their time is present. This can be seen for instance in the case of Shaykh Muhammad Yāsin al-Padani (originally from Padang, West Sumatra, died in Mecca in 1990), who had a number of students that are now kiyais of the pesantrens and ‘ulamā’ at the same time. His students proudly maintain the chain of authority (isnād) from al-Padani, who was regarded as one of the most important authorities of the hadith in the contemporary times. Al-Padani himself produced a manuscript entitled Tarājim ‘Ulamā’ al-Jāwi, in which he gave an account of the isnād he and his students possessed.

Second, the truths of Islam, which is transmitted, are timeless. This is not to propose that they are ahistorical, although this was the view of much nineteenth century European historiography. Such a view is comprehensively misunderstand revelation. Unfortunately, remnants of this position persist in occasional social science accounts of Indonesian Islam, which fail to realise that time is historical but that networks are both in the historical past and in the present.

Transmission through time is achieved by isnād and silsilah (chains of transmission). Indeed, Islam may be described (up to a point) as a religion and law formulated by chains of transmission. Accuracy of linkage is thus fundamental. Here time must be historically demonstrable. However, linkages are not solely linear, as the Arab biographies show; historical links are equally important. They indicate sometimes a variability in the material being transmitted. There are many examples of these, not only in the isnād ‘ilmīyyah (chain of transmission of Islamic learning) but also in the tariqah silsilah (chain of transmission of esoteric sciences of taṣawwuf). Among the isnāds—both isnād ‘ilmīyyah and isnād taṣawwuf—there exist what are called as the isnād ‘āli (supreme isnāds), which indicate that the sources of authority occupied a higher or even highest position, but also that the sciences they had transmitted were of the highest values. This can clearly be seen in some of the isnāds of al-Sinkīlī (seventeenth century), al-Palimānī (eighteenth century), Muhammad Nawawī al-Bantānī (nineteenth century) and Muḥammad Yāsin al-Padani (twentieth century).1

NEW TIMES, NEW AUTHORITIES: THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURIES

By 1800, the Malay-Indonesian world or, more correctly, the various parts of what later became Indonesia and Malaysia, no longer drew authority, sovereignty or legitimacy primarily from Islam. While it is true that some areas, such as Aceh, maintained an ethic of Muslim authority (and still do, though
in a different form) until the end of the nineteenth century, Islam itself began
to be redefined in European (Dutch and English) terms. The colonial period
saw the introduction of a new sort of authority, which essentially reduced
Islam to a private and personal religion and justified itself in secular terms
(treaties, the colonial state). This was the context for nineteenth and twen-
tieth century Islam. That was a real context, as it remains today, but this
does not mean that seventeenth and eighteenth century isnāds and silsilahs
became irrelevant; of course they did not, and they persist. What it does
mean is that we have to recognise two streams of authority: the traditional
isnād and silsilah, and the new ‘reform’ isnād and silsilah of the nineteenth
and twentieth centuries.

THE TRADITIONAL ISNĀD AND SILSILAH

The time is the nineteenth century and the material is the Malay scholar-
ship of this period. That scholarship is extensive, and there is space here
only for some illustrative examples, all from the northeast Malayan Penin-
sula (Kelantan-Patani), a somewhat neglected area.

There are 15 or so major authors, plus a number of others in the mid to
late nineteenth century. In terms of time, the context is important. These
scholars were writing in the timeless of revealed Islam, but the context
was the time of European triumphalism. The lines of transmission could no
longer be taken for granted. The Islamic, while timeless and true, was
also in European zaman, which imposed its own time. Intellectual Sufism
was not self-contained, as in the past: it had to cope with a new and appar-
ently superior way of thinking—the so-called scientific rationalism, which
is even more apparent in the Islamic modernism that began to take roots.
This challenge comes through in the writing of the period. The ‘ulama’ had
to look over one shoulder at the past and, at the same time, to a new future
in a new world.

The Patani ‘ulama’ were no exception. By the early to mid-nineteenth
century, the scholarship coming from this area was overwhelmingly
concerned with fiqh and usūl al-din; tasawwuf is poorly represented in the
surviving material. In part, this may be explained as a consequence of what
was happening in Mecca where, as Snouck describes,3 the chief branches of
learning had been reduced to these two. However, there is also the local
factor to take into account. Patani in the nineteenth century was a mere pawn
in the power struggle between Britain and France for political control in
Southeast Asia. Siam itself was desperately trying to retain its status as an
independent state, and part of its success lay in convincing European powers
(in this case Britain) of its actual exercise of sovereignty over its southern,
and Malay-populated, possessions. The ‘ulama’ were well aware of this, and
their priority became the protection of Malay Muslim identity. In this effort,
tasawwuf had little obvious practicality to offer. This is not to say that it was
neglected—it was not—but that the prior emphasis was elsewhere.
An excellent example is Shaykh Dāwūd ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Faṭānī discussed above. But we can also give an illustration in the life and work of Shaykh Ahmad Muhammad Zain (1856–1906), one of the greatest Patani ‘ulamā’ in post-Dāwūd ibn ‘Abd Allāh period. His grandfather, two of his three uncles and two cousins were all well-known scholars. In Mecca, Shaykh Ahmad studied medicine and later became supervisor of the Malay (Jāwī) printing press, which published many of Shaykh Dāwūd’s works. He was also a noted teacher and his students went on to fill high positions in politics, as Muftī in various parts of Malaya, Kalimantan and Cambodia and as teachers and founders of pondok. His influence has extended into the twentieth century. One of the most prominent of his students was Che Muhammad Yūsuf, better known as Tok Kenali (1868–1933), who established the Majlis Ugama Islam in Kelantan and was a leading commentator and teacher of religion in the Malay world. Shaykh Ahmad’s own writing is distinguished, in particular his al-Fatāwā al-Faṭāniyyah. This is a complex collection of fatāwā and may be compared with those of Ahmad Hassan in the Persis collections one generation later in Indonesia. The pressures of time were clearly beginning to transform isnād and silsilah from those delivered in person to include also those transmitted from a distance through new print media.

However, this transformation has never been linear, as can be shown in the works of Muḥammad al-Nawawi al-Bantani (1813–97). Born in Tanara, Banten, West Java, al-Nawawi settled in Mecca permanently in 1855, where he became one of the most important Jāwī ‘ulamā’ in the Haramayn. Prior to his becoming an ‘ālim, he had studied with a number of prominent ‘ulamā’ in the Haramayn, among whom were Shaykh Ahmad al-Nahrawī, Shaykh Sayyid Ahmad al-Dimyātī, Shaykh Sayyid Ahmad Dahlan, and Shaykh Muḥammad Khāṭīb al-Hanbali. Many Malay-Indonesian flocked to him, and many of them later became kiyais of many pesantrens in Java. They carried with them the isnāds and silsilahs of religious learning and tradition in the time of translation from Islamic traditionalism to modernism. Among al-Nawawi’s prominent students were Kiyai Haji (KH) Hasyim Asy’ari (founder of Tebu Ireng pesantren and the Nahdlatul Ulama organisation); KH Khalil of Bangkalan, Madura; and KH Asnawi of Caringin, West Java. He produced 26 works, some of which are still used in many pesantrens in Indonesia. His most important work is the Tafṣīr al-Nār Marah Lābīd, which, according to Riddell, represents an exegetical approach in harmony with the new reformist spirit of the time.

THE NEW ISNĀD AND SILSILAH

The new isnād and silsilah could just as well be named the ‘reform’ isnād and silsilah, and we conventionally date them from about 1900, with the works of Egyptian reformers (Muḥammad ‘Abduh and Rashīd Ridā) plus
the explosion of journals such as _al-Imām_ and _al-Manār_. Internally within the Muslim reform groups (Kasaem Muda, Sarekat Islam and others), there began the long debate on how to renew Islam in the face of modern challenges, chief among which was the successful Western imperialism and, even more fundamentally, secularism. In addition, from within Muslim thought arose views that were critical of ṣūfī scholars such as al-Bantani and his fellow in Mecca, Shaykh Ahmad Khalīf al-Minangkabawi, which were widely disseminated in the later nineteenth century. These ‘ulama’ on the surface would seem staunchly anti-Sufism; but careful examination of their works reveals that what they opposed was the excessive and escapist Sufism as practised by certain ṭarīqahs. On the other hand they accepted a more puritan Sufism, which was strongly oriented to the socio-moral reconstruction of Muslim society.

The twentieth century was a time of great intellectual turmoil, and this is represented in a number of authors. Hamka (1908–81) is a good example. He grew up in a religious household and was educated in religious schools. By his mid-20s he had published widely on both religious and secular subjects as well as working as a journalist, including as an editor. He was also a novelist, often using religious themes, and a teacher in religious institutions. His own personal _isnād_ and _silsilah_, therefore, were formed from a number of different sources which, in typical nineteenth and twentieth century fashion, included new media forms, new educational methods and new intellectual derivations. Taken together, these are perhaps a definition of modernism. His _Pelajaran Agama Islam_ (1984) and _Tasawuf Moderen_ (1987) are good examples, because in them he attempted to show that orthodox ṣūfī belief and practice were consonant with modernity, provided that the individual’s response to the latter did not lead to syncretism, especially with reference to local customs. He was himself well aware of the dangers of mixing elements of different philosophical traditions.

The same is true of Harun Nasution (1919–98), although the contradictions in his _isnād_ and _silsilah_ are much more marked. He was educated in both Western and Islamic traditions and is now remembered primarily for his reforms of the IAIN curricula in the 1960s–70s. His contribution to Islamic education was notable. But this is not the whole sum of his achievement. Nasution was a bold and constructive thinker on the place of revelation in the contemporary state, Indonesia, which was avowedly secular but populated by Muslims whose intellectual _isnād_ and _silsilah_ went back many centuries. While he did not dismiss that heritage, he was concerned to contextualise it in the new circumstances of the time. This took several forms.

First, he held very strongly to the view that no one of the revealed religions can be held to be prior to any other; time, as such, is not a determinant because any completion of how one knows and experiences God is impossible. All that is possible is the individual effort, the will to approach God,
and each of the three monotheisms accepts this premise as fundamental. The logical consequence therefore, for Indonesia, is not an ‘Islamic state’. To hold otherwise is to deny that the revealed message is outside time: that is, social, cultural, language and geographic circumstances are the determining factors in how one ‘knows’.

Second, and following from this, it is true that these factors cannot either be ignored or diminished at any stage of history. Indonesia is not the Arabic Middle East, though it shares the Prophethood of Muhammad. The temporal factors, therefore, are ‘natural’ and this itself is God-willed. This allows different temporal expressions of truth but it is the same truth. To insist on a common or general form for truth is (a) not necessary and (b), given the diversity of Muslim cultures and societies, actually quite perverse. Harun is presenting here a form of Mu’tazili argument, which allows even for asceticism. In his view there is no necessity to force oppositions between reason, revelation and/or Sufism. Reason, for Nasution, is a God-given capacity, but the ways in which it is exercised are various. However, variety is always limited by revelation, which imposes its own intellectual and spiritual constraints. The laws of science are an example: there is no value-free science, although science does tell us about the ‘nature of things’. Scientific truths certainly do describe possible behaviour and do not deny choice.

This rationalist trend also makes the values of Islam relatively compatible with political ideologies, and Nasution himself was not unsympathetic to the ideology of Pancasila. He read it as a possible intellectual justification for modernisation and development, which also allowed space for religion. But to hold this position is to come close to a ‘rational’ Islam, and the danger here is that revelation itself can be made into an ideology or, worse, reduced to one ideology among others. Pancasila, in fact, becomes a manifestation of Islam for the nation-state.

There is a serious implication here: are the new isnād and silsilah in time, are they conditioned in the modern world by the state and by science? The discussion in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was conducted from within Islam. This is not now a possibility, because with the best will in the world it is now hard to avoid the objectification of religion. The new isnād and silsilah are responsive to secularism to the extent that they may now even be conditioned by it. Time, and hence transmission through time, is now linear, so that timeless truths in Islam are now debatable in a place and in the circumstances of that place at a given time. This is the real challenge for Islam in contemporary Indonesia. The lessons of the historical seventeenth and eighteenth century transmissions are thus still with us.
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