
TEXTS AND MANUSCRIPTS: DESCRIPTION AND RESEARCH

W. Jamaluddin

Universitas Islam Negeri (Islamic State University) Raden
Intan Lampung, Indonesia
E-mail: averro99@yahoo.com

A. Syaiful

Universitas Islam Negeri (Islamic State University) Raden
Intan Lampung, Indonesia
E-mail: syaiful.rifda@gmail.com

I. Katkova

St. Petersburg State University, St. Petersburg, Russia
E-mail: katkova_irina@yahoo.com

RETHINKING MANUSCRIPT HERITAGE OF ‘ABD AL-ŞAMAD AL-PALIMBĀNĪ. CONTROVERSIES INVOLVING *TUĤFAT AL-RĀĠHIBĪN*

Abstract. The article argues the authorship of *Tuĥfat al-rāġhibĪn fĪ bayĀn ḥaqīqat al-īmĀn* [“A Gift Addressed to those Desirous of an Exposition of the Essence of the Muslim Faith and that which Corrupts It, with Respect to the Apostasy of the Apostates”], one of the works of famous Malay Islamic religious scholar ‘*ulamā*’ ‘Abd al-Şamad al-PalimbĀnĪ who appeared in the focus of a controversial discussion of contemporary scholars. Some scholars proposed the opinion that *Tuĥfat* was written by *shaykh* Arşhad al-BanjārĪ. First of all, this writing reflects the polemics of different scholars but it is also an attempt to reveal the authenticity of this manuscript as al-PalimbĀnĪ’s work since it obviously contains his original way of thinking and intellectual characteristics. Known as a translator of the famous al-GhazālĪ treatises he was also attracted much by the mystical ideas of Ibn ‘ArabĪ. Some of his works represent the synthesis of the two different schools of thoughts. Al-PalimbĀnĪ’s typical characteristic of works is on translation and adjusted adaptation clearly reflected not only in his major works like *Sayr al-sĀlikĪn* (“Mystical Path for Travelers”) and *HidĀyat al-sĀlikĪn* (“Directions for Travelers on the Mystical Path”) but also in *Tuĥfat al-rāġhibĪn*. Besides, the article touches on the problems of standards of Islamic writing, precisely ḤanafĪ tradition.

Keywords: *Tuĥfat al-rāġhibĪn*, ‘Abd al-Şamad al-PalimbĀnĪ, SufĪsm in Indonesia, Islamic legal tradition of ḤanafĪsm, *mujaddid*

Polemics Around *Tuĥfat al-rāġhibĪn*

One of the most outstanding ŞūfĪ scholars in the Archipelago is *shaykh* ‘Abd al-Şamad al-PalimbĀnĪ [1] due to his vital role in Islamic transformation and widespreading of SufĪsm from the Arabian Peninsula to Southeast Asia region. ‘Abd al-Şamad al-PalimbĀnĪ’s strong influence shows the existence of intense interaction between two intellectual traditions in Islamic world i. e. Ḥaramayn, particularly Mecca and Medina as the centre of Islamic science and knowledge and the countries in the Southeast Asia in the 12th / 18th century, especially the Sultanate Palembang Darussalam in Sumatera island [2].

Through the network of Jawi community commonly known as *Jamā’at al-JāwĪyyĪn* or *AşĥĀb al-JāwĪyyĪn* where various Islamic traditions interacted and were transformed to be a widespread cosmopolitan Islamic tradition [3] — *shaykh* ‘Abd al-Şamad al-PalimbĀnĪ contributed to the development of the 12th / 18th century SufĪsm strengthening the *murshĪd* — *murĪd* (instructor — disciple) relationship throughout the Southeast Asia, Arabian-Persian region up to Africa [4]. In this context it was not exaggeration when Martin van Bruinessen distinguished ‘Abd al-Şamad to be the most edu-

cated religious scholar of Malay-Archipelago Šūfi [5] milieu. Likewise, Azyumardi Azra [6] asserted that ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbānī was the pioneer among the Malay-Archipelago ‘ulamā’ who was recorded and reported in the Arabic scriptures *tabaqat*.

Ironically, although *shaykh* ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbānī had a remarkable intellectual career, not all of his works acquired equal recognition by the Islamic scholars. In the last decade, the authorship of one of his works was debated. Some researchers expressed the opinion that the book entitled *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn fī Bayān ḥakīkat al-īmān al-mu’minīn wa-mā yuḥsiduhu fī riddat al-murtaddīn* [“A Gift Addressed to those Desirous of an Exposition of the Essence of the Muslim Faith and that which Corrupts It, with Respect to the Apostasy of the Apostates”] was written by *shaykh* Arṣhad al-Banjārī [7], instead of ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbānī.

Nowadays, besides various scripts found in Surabaya and Banjarmasin, there are two copies of manuscripts of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*: one copy is preserved in National Library of Jakarta [8]. It was described by Van Ronkel [9], but without any indication of the authorship. The other copy belongs to the collection of Van Doorninck from the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts in St. Petersburg, Russian Academy of Sciences [10]. The other four copies of this text can be found in the General Office of Islamic Exhibition (Pejabat Am Balai Pameran Islam bagian Hal Ehwal Islam Jabatan Perdana Menteri) or BAHEIS in Malaysia (call Nos. ML 115, ML 267, ML 487, ML 650), besides four manuscripts are kept in the Centre of Malay Manuscripts of the State Library of Malaysia or Pusat Manuskrip Melayu Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia (call Nos. MS 5, MS 309, MS 506, MS 455), and two private manuscripts belong to Kemas H. Andi Syarifuddin's collections (30 MS) are in the possession of Umariyah Library in Palembang, South Sumatera. In addition, there is a copy of St. Petersburg manuscript kept in the Library of Leiden University, the Netherlands [11]. Like most works of the ‘ulamā’ of Nusantara composed during the period from the sixteenth to nineteenth centuries, these works were written in the Malay language using Arabic script or the so-called Jawi.

Regarding to the printed publications of this treatise and the origin of the manuscripts of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* mentioned above, one can see the recent research by Noorhaidi Hasan [12], and also by Mujiburrahman [13]. (Both articles concluded that the true author of the book is not *shaykh* ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbānī, but *shaykh* Muḥammad Arṣhad al-Banjārī. Mujiburrahman underlined, that the authorship of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is controversial, but there is strong evidence that it was written by Muḥammad Arṣhad al-Banjārī. Furthermore he explained, that the question of the authorship of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* emerged among the Banjarese intellectuals after the publication of M. Chatib Quzwain's dissertation [14]. Referring to two earlier works by Dutch scholars, P. Voorhoeve [15] and Drewes [16], M. Chatib Quzwain argues that *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is the work of al-Palimbānī.

Regarding to the controversial position, expressed by Aṣhwadīe Šukur's [17] in his report, Mujiburrahman's expressed his opinion. As he explains:

Noteworthy that almost all of the arguments analyzed in Noorhaidi Hasan's work are the same as those in Aṣhwadīe Šukur's work. It seems that the only new argument from Hasan is that, a Malaysian scholar, Wan Mohd. Shagir Abdullah wrote that Dāwūd al-Patānī (1740—1847) mentioned *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* as the work of al-Banjārī. If this information is true, argues Hasan, then it is an early piece of evidence that the author of the work is al-Banjārī because Dāwūd al-Patānī was al-Banjārī's friend when both studied at Mecca [18].

According to the opinion of such scholars as P. Voorhoeve [19], G. W. J. Drewes [20], Vladimir I. Braginsky [21], M. Chatib Quzwai [22], Azyumardi Azra [23] and Teuku Iskandar [24] *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is one of the works of *shaykh* ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbānī, and not Muḥammad Arṣhad al-Banjārī's. Furthermore, some other previous researchers also revealed similar findings, e. g. the one conducted by Nyimas Umi Kalsum as her graduate thesis, proves that the content of the manuscript was part of intellectual heritage of *shaykh* ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbānī [25].

In one of the articles by Russian scholar I. Katkova the authorship of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is also proposed as a work by *shaykh* ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbānī [26]. Similarly, Mal An Abdullah, a researcher from Palembang also confirmed the same suggestion [27]. By comparing the content and the style of writing of al-Palimbānī's other works like *Fayḍ al-iḥsānī wa midād li al-rabbānī* (“The Emanation of God's Beneficence and the Ties to God”) as well as some oral traditions well-nurtured in the Muslim community in Palembang, he came to a conclusion that *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* was al-Palimbānī's original work. The same opinion is expressed in Wan Jamaluddin's previous study at St. Petersburg, Russia [28].

Moreover, some arguments carried out by Mujiburrahman [29] based on Aṣhwadīe Šukur's observation [30] concluded that the *manyanggar* ritual practice of heathen offering had been held only in Barikin village of Central Hulu Sungai District, South Kalimantan and the *mambuang pasilih* ritual practiced in Banjarmasin and Barito Kuala of South Kalimantan are not enough satisfying since one can find similar ritual practiced among Palembangese. In this context the notes made by Dutch scholar Dr. P. Voorhoeve concerning the St. Petersburg copy of the manuscript which he considered to be the full text of the treatise are worth mentioning. He wrote:

The name of the author is not mentioned but there are many indications that the author was ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbānī. They are:

The date. ‘Abd al-Šamad usually dated his writings; the dates range from 1178—1203 A.H. (1764—1788).

From 1873—1875 F. N. van Doorninck was stationed in Palembang as a civil servant; then he went to Europe on furlough.

There is a marginal note in Javanese (f. 23).

The word *sanggar* is used to indicate a heathen offering, consequently in the Middle Malay, but not in the Javanese meaning. In 1774 the censured heaven practices probably occurred in the Palembang area (it has a synonym in Javanese *nyajeni*, i. e., to deposit small offerings in places deemed unhealthy, for example, cross-roads and places held sacred, and also near old trees and objects whose magic potency makes one apprehensive).

MS VdW.37 (Jakarta's sample of the text) contains a page dedicated to the holy war (*jihād*), one of 'Abd al-Şamad's specialities [31].

Moreover, belief in the existence of hidden people (*urang gaib*) is not found in Banjarese society of Kalimantan only but is also widely spread among Palembangese people as Islam was not solidly rooted in the Palembang hinterland until the 11th / end the 17th century, during the reign of *sultān* 'Abd al-Raḥmān.

Ironically, several researchers confidently categorize the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* as a work of al-Banjārī but Mujiburrahman himself found a fact that the treatise is unfamiliar among Banjarese Muslim affiliated to about 109 *pengajians* (*halaqas*) in South Kalimantan. In this case Mujiburrahman reports:

In 1982, a team of students of the Ushuluddin Faculty at IAIN Antasari were assigned to study the theological texts taught in various *pengajians* in South Kalimantan. The scope of the research is quite impressive. The students investigate 109 *pengajians* in three districts, namely 51 *pengajians* in Hulu Sungai Utara district, 29 *pengajians* in Banjar district, and 29 *pengajians* in Banjarmasin City. The findings of the research indicate that there are 24 titles of theological texts used in the *pangajian*, and *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is not one of them [32].

On the contrary, among Muslim people in Palembang and another districts in South Sumatra the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is widely used in the curriculum of several *halaqas* and *pengajians* (*majelis taklims*). In this context the most reliable version of the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is the one studied by Nyimas Umi Kalsum [33]. In spite of an earliest print edition of the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* published in 1304/1887 by al-Maṭba'a al-Ḥāj Muḥarrām Affandi, Istanbul, Turkey, she concludes that the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is one of the works of Palembangese Şūfī as far as it was published and printed out in Mecca 1310/1892 by Maṭba'a al-Mishriya al-Kā'ina.

In this edition of Mecca, the text of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is printed out in the right side of the main text of the *Badī' al-zamān fī 'aqā'id al-īmān* ("The Marvel of Time of Muslim Faith Principles") of *shaykh* Muḥammad Azharī b. 'Abdullāh al-Jāwī al-Palimbānī, another famous Şūfī from Palembang who lived in the same era as *shaykh* 'Abd al-Şamad al-Palimbānī in Ḥejāz. The conclusion of Nyimas Umi Kalsum is not new since Shaghīr Abdullah, one of the most authoritative Malaysian scholars in Sufism, states the same fact in his recent book [34]. Moreover, the Mecca print out edition unites two works of Palembang Şūfī titled *Badī'*

al-zamān and *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* and explicitly states that both of them are the works of Şūfī from Palembang.

The statement that the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is a work of 'Abd al-Şamad al-Palimbānī could be proved by a small paragraph of Malay-Palembang poems existing in the Mecca edition:

*Inilah Kitab baharu dikarang // Bagi yang menuntut
supaya terang*

This is a new book compiled for who seeks a light

*Tentulah ini sekarang masa // Malayu Palembang em-
punya bahasa*

Indeed, now is an era of Malay-Palembang language

*Bicara Aqid Tuhan yang esa // Badi'uz zaman nama-
nya terbahasa*

Talking about believe in the only one God; titled: *Badī' al-zamān*

*Ilmu tasawuf beserta amalnya diiringkan // faham yang
taḥqiq jua dipersatukan*

Followed by Şūfī treatise and its practices. United by the most believable point of view [35].

Unlike the Istanbul edition, the book or manuscript of Mecca edition has 130 pages with the total size ca. 27.5×19.0 cm, while the text of *Badī' al-zamān* sized 21.0×11.0 cm and the size of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is 20.5×3.0 cm. Undoubtedly, the sentence of *ilmu tasawuf beserta amalnya diiringkan* ("Followed by Şūfī treatise and its practices") refers to the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*, printed out in the right and left sides of the main text of *Badī' al-zamān*.

The similar indication is reflected in *faham yang taḥqiq jua dipersatukan* ("united by the most believable point of view"). It is evident that *faham yang taḥqiq* refers to the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* as far as the manuscript of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* explicitly mentions:

*...fī taḥqiq al-mathlub wa al-marām 'alā ḥasbi ma
zahara lī min aqwāl al-'ulamā' al-kirām...*

...to correct the request and question based on the most respectfull Muslim scholars points of view.

Indeed, the other paragraph of the poem *Tentulah ini...* ("Indeed, now is an era of Malay-Palembang language") proves that both *Badī' al-zamān* and *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* are works of Palembang's religious scholars who used Malay language. In this most important point, Mal An Abdullah [36] accurately underlines that *shaykh* Muḥammad Azharī, the author of *Badī' al-zamān*, has not only the same geographical line with 'Abd al-Şamad al-Palimbānī but also has the same spiritual-genealogical line (*silsila*) relating him to Sammāniyya, the most influential and phenomenal Şūfī mystical brotherhood (*ṭarīqa*) in Sumatera particularly and Nusantara (South-east Asia) generally. The line shows how Muḥammad Azharī had been affiliated to the *ṭarīqa* by 'Abdulla b. Ma'ruf by Muḥammad Aqib b. Ḥasan al-Dīn by 'Abd al-Şamad al-Palimbānī. These evidences strongly indicate that the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is one of 'Abd al-Şamad al-Palimbānī's works too.

Another key to the polemics is the name stated in the main text of the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*: “Imām Najam al-Dīn ‘Amr al-Nafsī”. According to local oral traditions and the “Sistem Otoritas...” [37], “‘Amr al-Nafsī” is well known as a *laqab* for the ruling *sultān* of Palembang, Aḥmad Najam al-Dīn reigned in the years of 1197—1215 / 1758—1776, namely at the time when the manuscript is written in 1213/1774. Although G. W. J. Drewes found some difficulties to make sure himself in whether it refers to *sultān* Najam al-Dīn or to his son *sultān* Bahā’ al-Dīn (r. 1215—1242 / 1776—1803), Nyimas Umi Kalsum confidently concludes that it

refers to *sultān* Najam al-Dīn [38]. These facts indicate that the manuscript was composed by ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī as well as that he was one of the prominent Ṣūfī of *Aṣḥāb al-Jāwiyyīn* who had a close relationship with *sultān* in the Sultanate of Palembang in Sumatera. At least, it could be supposed that there is an existing version of the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* by ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī along with another version written by al-Banjārī. All evidences and indications above are absolutely difficult to be rejected by analyzing *shaykh* ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī’s peculiar characteristics of intellectuality described below.

‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī: Between al-Gḥazālī and Ibn ‘Arabī

‘Abd al-Ṣamad Al-Palimbānī was a phenomenal figure, especially in the context of history of Ṣūfī tradition which was widespread in the Archipelago. His charisma and significant role in the Islamic world are often compared with that of Abū Ḥāmid al-Gḥazālī (*ḥujjat al-islām*) (d. 501/1111). For this reason he is considered to be a Muslim scholar grown up on the sole of al-Gḥazālīan teaching. Although, through a comprehensive analysis of his insights and teachings reflected in his works, we can easily find out that he was also influenced by the ideas of Ibn ‘Arabī (d. 638/1240).

A Dutch orientalist Martin van Bruinessen wrote a thorough study on this matter [39]. He asserted that ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī was well-known as the translator of al-Gḥazālī’s works, but it did not mean that he tended to the practice of *akhlāqī* Sufism rather than *falsafī* Sufism. Unlike his predecessor Nūr al-Dīn al-Rānīrī (d. 1077/1666), a Ṣūfī scholar who neglected *wujūdiyya* doctrine of Ibn ‘Arabī in Malay Archipelago, al-Palimbānī tried to adapt the concept of metaphysics of earlier representatives of Malay-Indonesian (Nusantara) Ṣūfī tradition such as Ḥamza Faṣṣūrī and Ṣhams al-Dīn al-Sumatrānī with their Ibn ‘Arabīan perspectives. Furthermore, according to Bruinessen, al-Palimbānī considered the works of Ibn ‘Arabī, al-Jillī and al-Burhānpūrī to be recommended more for reading by advanced adherents of Ṣūfī path, than by the beginners. For the beginning disciples he suggested to start by reading al-Gḥazālī’s works. Al-Palimbānī described the Islamic curriculum especially for Jawi disciples in his books written in Arabic Malay (Jāwī).

The above conclusion by Martin van Bruinessen was based on his study of al-Palimbānī’s two masterpieces, *Sayr (Siyar) al-sālikīn* and *Hidāyat al-sālikīn*. In his study, Bruinessen pointed out that ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī was a Ṣūfī scholar who was trying to combine Ṣūfī doctrines of al-Gḥazālī and Ibn ‘Arabī [40]. Likewise, the writer’s analysis and study was also in line with Bruinessen’s findings in which he shows the typical characteristics of ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī’s works, the traces of which can be followed not only in those two masterpieces but also in other works of al-Palimbānī.

In addition, Mal An Abdullah’s study revealed the same findings [41]. He asserted that al-Palimbānī’s works reflected his deep understanding of the outlooks of al-Gḥazālī as well as the ideas of philosophical mysti-

cism of Ibn ‘Arabī. It can be seen from another work of al-Palimbānī entitled *al-Mulakhkhash al-tuḥbat al-mafḍhat min al-rahmāt al-mahdhat ‘alayh al-ṣalāt wa al-ṣalām min Allāh* (“The Summary of the Spacious and Wide Gift Spread out from the Beneficence of (Muḥammad), the Pray and Peace from Allāh Be upon Him”), a commentary on the work by *Shaykh* Muḥammad b. Faḍl Allāh al-Burhānpūrī al-Hindī’s work (d. 1029/1619) with interlinear translation and interpretation in Malay language. Further, Mal An Abdullah stated that in this book al-Palimbānī modified the philosophical high level of the doctrine *taṣawwuf (martabat tujuh)* for making it comprehensible for the beginners (*mubtadi’*) [42].

It is also believed that there is still another copy of work by al-Palimbānī with Ibn ‘Arabīan perspective. It is entitled *Waḥdat al-wujūd* (“The Unity of Being”) — a photocopy of text, written in Latin script and owned by Kemas Andi Syarifuddin of Palembang. According to Mal An Abdullah [43], the colophon informs that the book was composed by *shaykh* ‘Abd Ṣamad b. ‘Abd Raḥmān of Palembang. It was completed on Thursday evening, 16 Hapit (Dhu al-Qa‘da) 1379 or 12 May 1960.

Still, another work of al-Palimbānī shows the same type — *Zād al-muttaqīn fī tawḥīd Rabb al-‘ālamīn* (“The Provisions for Muslim in the Greatest Perfection to Belief in the Unity of God”). It is a compilation of *shaykh* al-Sammān’s teaching about the content of *Waḥdat al-wujūd* in Medina. It emphasizes also al-Palimbānī’s inclination and deep knowledge of the mystical thought of Ibn ‘Arabī in spite of his being the pioneer of al-Gḥazālīan teaching. Moreover, al-Palimbānī endeavoured the combining of two doctrines of al-Gḥazālī and Ibn ‘Arabī. This kind of tendency, synthesizing two different phenomena, was inherited from his teacher, prominent ‘ulamā’, *shaykh* Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Sammān (1132—1189 / 1719—1775), the founder of Sammāniyya Ṣūfī mystical brotherhood.

Shaykh Muḥammad al-Sammān initially was a deputy *khalīfa* of Muṣṭafā Kamāl al-Dīn al-Bakrī (1099—1141 / 1688—1749), *shaykh* of *Khalwatiyya tariqa* in Dimashq and Miṣr. However, al-Sammān became more famous as the guardian of the Prophet’s grave and a founder of his own doctrine and *tariqa* which originated at Medina in the latter part of the 12th / 18th century. Al-Sammān’s reputation of sainthood (*wilāya*) and won-

der-working must have been well-established in the late seventies of 12th century / early sixties of the 18th century, and according to his followers his coming was predicted [44].

Al-Palimbānī must have studied such sciences as *hadīth*, *fiqh*, *sharī'a*, *tafsīr*, *kalām* and *taṣawwuf*, and it is evident that he studied *taṣawwuf* mainly with *shaykh* al-Sammān in Medina, from whom he also took both *ṭurūq*: *Khalwatiyya* and *Sammāniyya*. Al-Palimbānī is considered to be the most prominent followers of *shaykh* al-Sammān, the founder of *Khalwatiyya* branch — *ṭarīqa* *Sammāniyya*, and it is through al-Palimbānī that *Sammāniyya* found a ground and expansion in Malay-Indonesian world.

Furthermore, in his study, the writer found that the Arabian-Persian tradition that coloured al-Palimbānī's thought comprised *akhlāqī* Sufism tradition derived from the popular works of al-Ghazālī, Abū Ṭalīb al-Mālikī (d. 368/966), al-Qushayrī (d. 465/1075) and 'Umar al-Suhrawardī (d. 633/1234); and also *falsafī* tradition of Ibn 'Arabī, al-Qunawī (d. 673/1274), Jāmi'

(d. 898/1492), Mahā'imi al-Nābulisī (d. 835/1432) and 'Abd al-Karīm al-Jīlī (d. 841/1424). Meanwhile, the Indian tradition was represented by the works of Muḥammad b. Faḍlallāh al-Burhānpūrī (d. 1029/1619), Muḥammad al-Ghāūs (d. 970/1563), Sibghatullāh (d. 1015/1606–7), Aḥmad al-Shinnawī (d. 1028/1619), Aḥmad al-Qushashī (d. 1071/1660) and Ibrāhim al-Kūrānī (d. 1101/1682).

Besides, Azyumardi Azra's study [45] reveals that three mentioned al-Palimbānī's teachers, namely al-Shinnawī, al-Qushashī, and al-Kūrānī used to be the successors of the widely-accepted Sūfī tradition from Egypt introduced by Zakariyā' al-Anṣārī (d. 926/1520) and 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha'rānī (d. 973/1565), well-known *fiqh* experts (*fuqaha'*) among Indonesian Muslims, especially Indonesian Islamic boarding school students. Concerning the tradition of Maghribian Sufism it is known that al-Palimbānī acquired it through famous Shādhiliyya Sūfīs such as Abū Madyan (520—594 / 1126—1198), Abū Hasan al-Shādhilī (d. 655/1258) and Ibn Athā' Allāh (d. 709/1309).

Al-Palimbānī and the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*

Like other works of al-Palimbānī, the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* also contains the typical characteristics of al-Palimbānī's intellectual style. It is stated overtly in the author:

With the blessing and mercy from Allāh and totally devoted to Him, I am always trying to respond the phenomenon or question by relying to the ideas of the noticeable Muslim scholars that I know [46].

In the manuscript of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*, one can find the names of prominent religious scholars which are often quoted by al-Palimbānī in his other works like Imām Sa'd al-Dīn, Abū Manṣūr al-Māturīdī (d. 333/944), Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī (d. 973/1565), al-Mizjajī (1179—1255 / 1766—1839), Abū al-Najīb al-Suhrawardī (d. 563/1168), Najm al-Dīn 'Umar al-Nasafī (d. 537/1142), al-Ghazālī, Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (b. 543/1149), al-'Arabī, al-Nawawī (Muḥammad b. 'Umar b. 'Arabī al-Jāwī) (d. after 1305/1888), 'Izz al-Dīn b. 'Abd al-Salām (d. 660/1262), 'Abd al-Shukur al-Sālimī (d. 8th / second half of the 15th century), Ibrāhim al-Laḡānī (d. 1041/1631), Zakariyā' al-Anṣārī (d. 926/1520), and Imām al-Qurṭubī (d. 567/1172). We can find one more name of 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha'rānī, a prominent figure of Sūfī tradition in Egypt. He was one of outstanding '*ulamā'*' as well as one of the famous representatives of *fiqh* in Indonesia as mentioned above. As a matter of fact, he was a prominent writer in Sufism where he became one of the successors of Ibn 'Arabī by his work entitled *Al-Yawāqit wa al-jawāhir fī bayān 'aqā'id al-kabīr* ("The Intrinsic and Essential Nature for Describing the Main Faith in Islam") which is remarked in the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*.

Al-Palimbānī also mentioned *shaykh* Zakariyā' al-Anṣārī, another representative of intellectual tradition of Egypt by referring to his work *Rawḍat al-ṭalīb*

("A Garden of the Seeker"). As the faithful follower of Ibn 'Arabī, he wrote a book on *tasawwuf* entitled *Al-futūḥāt al-ilāhiyya* ("God's Triumphs") [47]. One can also find there the references to Ibn Ḥajar whose full name is Abū al-'Abbas Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Ḥajar al-Malikī al-Haythamī to his work entitled *Al-zawājir 'an iqtirāf al-kabā'ir* ("The Forcible Prevention of Perpetration of the Great Sins").

Besides, there is another famous religious scholar quoted in the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* namely al-Mizjajī who can unquestionably prove that the manuscript belongs to al-Palimbānī. Al-Palimbānī had received great appreciation by the intellectual community in the Middle East which was recorded by al-Ahdal in his book entitled *Al-naḥs al-yamānī wa al-rūḥ al-rayḥānī fī ijāzat al-quḍat banī al-sawkānī* ("The Yemeni's Soul and Its Godness Spirit for Muslim Judge Inauguration Among Sawkani People"). Al-Mizjajī's full name was Wajīh al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Sulaymān b. Yahyā b. 'Umar Maqbūl al-Ahdal, he belonged to *sayyid* family resided in the Southern Arabia. Al-Mizjajī was famous for his Islamic knowledge. His genealogy was believed to be related to a prominent figure called *Quṭb al-Yaman* whose name was Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. 'Umar b. Muḥammad al-Ahdal, and continued to *imām* Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. It was also believed that one of his instructors was al-Mizjajī, the one quoted in *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ahdal used to be one of the influential '*ulamā'*' in Zabīd, Yemen. 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ahdal learned Islamic religion from many outstanding religious scholars of his era including al-Palimbānī. Mal An Abdullah's study on the manuscript *Fayḍ al-iḥsānī* [48] revealed that there was a relationship of *al-murīd wa al-murshīd* between al-Palimbānī and the al-Mizjajī. They included 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ahdal and "all of his male offsprings"; some other famous names like 'Amr Allāh b. 'Abd al-Khāliq al-Mizjajī, Yūsuf b. Muḥammad 'Alā'

al-Dīn al-Mizjajī and all chiefs of villages in Mizjaj; ‘Umar b. Ismā‘īl al-Muṣḥarrī’ and all of Muṣḥarrī’ off-springs; Muḥammad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥmad al-Zufarī, Faqīh ‘Abd Allāh b. Aḥad al-Khayrī, ‘Ali b. ‘Abd al-Barr al-Ḥusaynī al-Wana’ī and Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Khāliq b. ‘Alī al-Mizjajī (al-Hindī).

The name of ‘Abd al-Khāliq b. ‘Alī al-Mizjajī and his works such as *Kitāb athnā’ al-mathālib* (“Book of the Pleats of Desires or Wishes”), *Kitāb al-‘imād* (“Book of Pillars”), *Kitāb al-rawḍ* (“Book of Gardens”) and *Kitāb udāb* (“Book of Waves and Floods”) are referred and mentioned in the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*. Nowadays, the descriptions of those al-Mizjajī’s books can be found in Al-Ahdal and Kattani works [49]. It is very important to underline that according to the investigation by Martin van Bruinessen [50] factually those works are referred many times by ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī in his masterpieces (*Sayr al-sālikīn* and *Hidāyat al-sālikīn*). In the same context, it is worth noticing that one can find the following statements in *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*:

...demikianlah yang disebutkan Sheikh Mizjaji dalam Imad dan tersebut di dalam Raudh dan Sharh-nya Athna Mathalib...

...these all are explained by *shaykh* Mizjajī in his ‘Imād and mentioned in his *Rawḍ* and in *Sharḥ athnā’ mathālib*...;

...kata Shaykh al-Islam di dalam Kitab atsna al-Mathalib bahwasanya...

Shaykh al-Islām said in *Kitāb athnā’ al-mathālib* that...;

...yang disebutkan Sheikh Mizjaji di dalam ‘Abab...
...mentioned by *shaykh* Mizjajī in the ‘Ubāb... [51]

This very close relationship between al-Palimbānī and al-Mizjajī is indeed another proof to claim that the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is al-Palimbānī’s work. In other words, the statement that the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is someone else’s work needs reconsidering; or at least, one version of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* was written by al-Palimbānī and possibly another version, if any, was written by al-Banjārī or others.

Besides, the name of Ibrāhīm al-Laḳānī played key information. In this point, his work titled *‘Umdat al-murīd sharḥ jawharat al-tawḥīd* (“Pillars of the Seeker as an Explanation on the Fear of Belief in the Unity of God”) is referred to not only by ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī in the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*, but also by another great Ṣūfī from Sultanate Palembang *shaykh* Shihabuddīn b. ‘Abdullāh Muḥammad, well known as his translator and interpreter into Malay language in 1163/1750. The manuscript of Ibrāhīm al-Laḳānī’s work *‘Umdat al-murīd* is preserved in the Indonesian National Library in Jakarta by a similar title: *Majmū’ kitāb ‘umdat al-murīd li jawharat al-tawḥīd* (“Collection of the Book of Pillars of the Seeker as an Explanation on the Fear of Belief in the Unity of God”). Noteworthy, it belonged to *sulṭān* of Palembang Darussalam, Maḥmūd Badar al-Dīn, the name points at Susuhunan Susuhunan (or the King in Malay language) Aḥmad Najamuddīn (‘Amr

al-Nafsī) stated in the main text of the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*. It is written on the cover of the manuscript:

Alamat “Kitāb ‘umdat al-murīd” milik Sri Paduka Sasuhunan Ratu Maḥmūd Badar al-Dīn b. al-Sulṭān Muḥammad Bahā’ al-Dīn b. Sasuhunan Aḥmad Najam al-Dīn b. al-Sulṭān Maḥmūd Badar al-Dīn b. al-Sulṭān Muḥammad al-Manṣur b. al-Sulṭān Sasuhunan ‘Abd al-Raḥman b. al-Sulṭān Jamāl al-Dīn yang bertahta kerajaan di dalam negeri Palembang Darussalam.

This *Kitāb ‘umdat al-murīd* belongs to Sri Paduka Sasuhunan Ratu Maḥmūd Badar al-Dīn b. al-Sulṭān Muḥammad Bahā’ al-Dīn b. Sasuhunan Aḥmad Najam al-Dīn b. al-Sulṭān Maḥmūd Badar al-Dīn b. al-Sulṭān Muḥammad al-Manṣur b. al-Sulṭān Sasuhunan ‘Abd al-Raḥman b. al-Sulṭān Jamāl al-Dīn who ruled in the Sultanate Palembang Darussalam [52].

It is evident how the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* (by quoting ‘*Umdat al-murīd* of al-Laḳānī) is close to Palembang tradition of Sufism and gave a confidential indication to considerate it as a work of ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī.

Another aspect which is to be considered for verifying the authorship of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is the analysis of text. In Umi Kalsum’s study [53] it is indicated that the Palembangese lexics of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* cannot be found in Banjar language. Besides, Bradley’s study on Dāwūd al-Patanī [54] noted that there was a version of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* written by al-Patanī (1230/1814) as an adaptation of al-Banjārī’s work using the same title. As suggested by Mal An Abdullah [55], this may indicate that there is more than one version of the early *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*. Thus, apart from the claim that the it is al-Banjārī’s work, there is strong verification that it was written by al-Palimbānī.

Other typical features of al-Palimbānī’s works are translation and adaptation which were also found in the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*. Although he did not overtly mention the source for the ideas about the heart condition which could decline faith in the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*, the writer supposes that his narrative on that particular case referred to the ideas of *shaykh* al-Bazdawī from his book entitled *Kitāb uṣūl al-dīn* (“Book of Religious Principles or Fundamentals”) [56]. *Shaykh* al-Bazdawī’s full name was Abū al-Yusr Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. ‘Abd al-Karīm al-Bazdawī. Information about him is quite scarce. Nevertheless, it was indicated that he lived in Bukhārā in 478/1085 and was *qādī* in Samarqand in 481/1088. He died in 493/1099 in Bukhārā.

Textually, W. Jamaluddin and A. Syaiful found out that al-Palimbānī’s description of the 72 “sects” in Islam originated from six major groups i. e. Rafidliyya, Kharijiyya, Jabbariyya, Qadariyya, Jahmiyya, and Murji’a was identical to the one written by al-Bazdawī. There are also some other related works like *Al-milal wa al-niḥal* (“Religions and Sects”) written by al-Shahrastānī, *Kitāb maqālāt al-islāmiyyin wa ikhtilāf al-mushallīn* (“Book of Islamic Treatises and Disparity of Worshipers”) by Abū Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī. According to the writers’ opinion it is evident that a part of the text is a translation in Malay

from al-Bazdawī's *Kitāb uṣūl al-dīn* written in Arabic [57]. Furthermore, it is well known that the intellectual Islamic tradition of Central Asia (Bukhārā,

Samarqand and Herāt) influenced significantly the development of Islamic thought in the further corners of Islamdom, including Malay Archipelago.

Tuhfat al-rāghibīn in Modern Controversies

Following the polemical character of this article one cannot help mentioning some arguments on the controversial data promoted by Indonesian scholars regarding the authorship of *Tuhfat al-rāghibīn*. Especially, it concerns the content of this treatise and the so-called “intellectual style” of ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī. Regrettably, in the course of the discussion and viewing of different opinions regarding to the authorship of *Tuhfat al-rāghibīn* Indonesian scholars did not pay serious attention to the previous works of Dutch scholars [58]. Meanwhile, the works of these three prominent Dutch scholars in Islamic studies touched on the problem of the content and structure of *Tuhfat al-rāghibīn* which is, undoubtedly, the key point for the abovementioned polemics. Especially, the manuscripts' texts investigations conducted by P. Voorhoeve are worth noticing here.

However, first of all it should be mentioned that the text of *Tuhfat al-rāghibīn* was written according to the traditional Muslim method of advancing arguments by quoting verses of the Qur’ān, statements from Holy Tradition and the dicta of many of the famous Islamic writers usually together with the works quoted. The treatise consists of three chapters and the *khātima* (epilogue). It is worth noting, that chapter II which is about a third of the treatise, contains a lengthy abstract from the work written by the well-known ‘ulamā’ Nūr al-Dīn al-Rānīrī (d. 1076 / 1666) *Tibyān fī ma’arifa al-adyān* (“Exposition to the Perception of Creeds”), precisely *firaq*-writing, or the enumeration of the 72 “sects” destined for hell and of the self-styled Ṣūfīs and also an additional paragraph on *bid’ā* (“innovation”). According to the Voorhoeve's investigation of *Tibyān* [59], about a quarter of this work was copied from the treatise of the prominent Persian mystic ‘Abū Ṣhakūr al-Sālimī (d. 8th / second half of the 15th century) *Al-tamhīd fī bayān al-tawhīd* (“Introduction to the Explanation of the Unity of God”) (Leiden, Or 5664). In the 11th—12th / 17th—18th centuries this text was rewritten in Javanese script in the Sultanate of Banten in Western Java. In 1906 this manuscript was brought to Leiden by Sn. Hurgronje together with his collection of manuscripts from Banten. P. Voorhoeve indicated also that the abstract in *Tibyān* dealing with the 72 “sects” in Islam had been rewritten partly from *Tamhīd* by al-Sālimī and from Arabic work *Ma’arifa al-mawāhib* (“Gifts of Knowledge”) composed by the *īmām* of Ḥanafī school ‘Abū Ḥanīfa (d. 150/767) as well as almost all mentioned Ṣūfī groups, 11 from 13, had referred to the Persian source compiled by Najm al-Dīn ‘Umar al-Nasafī *Kitāb fī bayān al-mawāhib al-mutasāwwifa* (“Treatise on the Explanation of Gifts for Those Becoming Travelers on Sufī Path”). Besides, Dr. Voorhoeve noticed that the description of *bid’ā* is also a portion of mixed texts from *Tamhīd* and *Tibyān*.

Moreover, the copy from St. Petersburg contains a full text followed by the additional abstract from ‘Abd

al-Raūf as-Siṅkilī's treatise *Bayān tajallī* (“The Meaning of Revelation”) on the signs of approaching death, which was drawn from *Tadhkira bī-ahwal al-mawtā wa-ahwal al-akhira* (“The Signs of Death and the Beginning of Hereafter”) written by Ibn Farḥ al-Anṣarī al-Qurṭubī (d. 671/1273). This text is known by P. Voorhoeve's edition of *Bayān tajallī* [60]. The abstract about the signs of death can also be found in other treatise by ‘Abd al-Raūf, namely *Asrār al-sulūk ilā malik al-mulūk* (“Secrets of the Mystic Path for the Favoured King”).

In spite of this compilation *Tuhfat al-rāghibīn* does not avoid the individuality of its author, especially concerning the descriptions of the pre-Islamic practices of heaven's offerings *menyanggar* and “a changeling” *berbuang pasilih*. Similar practice was described in Batak area (Batak *parsilihi* means “a changeling”) [61] and was also known in Java [62]. ‘Abd al-Ṣamad promoted the arguments for disapproving these rituals according to the classification of *bid’as*, borrowed from al-Sālimī's *Tamhīd*, into those pertaining to God's Essence, His speech, His attributes, the Companions of the Prophet, and man's acts.

In addition, individual features of al-Palimbānī as a religious scholar of Islamic tradition of the 12th / 18th century are evidently traced in his Jakarta's manuscript copy of *Tuhfat al-rāghibīn* (MS VdW. 37) which contains a separate page devoted to *jihād*. From the first glance, it looks like the very beginning of Salafī discourse on Indonesian soil, as the struggle against indigenous rituals and beliefs has normally been a chief concern of reformists. Western scholars on Islam beginning from Sn. Hurgronje consider the “pan-Islamic reformists” to be a movement of political character. Q. Wiktorowicz distinguishes three major Salafī factions: purists, politicians and jihadis. All three factions have various positions on *jihād* apostasy and the priorities of activism [63]. In fact, such Indonesian representatives of Islamic thought of the 12th / 18th century as ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī was equally known as scholars of *fiqh* as of *taṣawwuf*. Therefore, it is important to mention the point of view of Indonesian scholar A. Azra who calls the Malay-Indonesian ‘ulamā’ “adherents to renewalism” (*mujaddid*) [64] as the return to Sunni “ortodoxy” which means the harmony between *sharī’a* and *taṣawwuf*. A. Azra underlines that great Ṣūfī mystical brotherhoods like Naqshbandiyya, Qadiriyya, Khalwatiyya and Sammāniyya brought religious life in the Archipelago more in line with current Sunni normative Islām.

Besides, having done the translation and editing of the text of St. Petersburg copy of *Tuhfat al-rāghibīn*, which was published as a book in Russian [65] I. Katkova can fully subscribe to the arguments of Dutch scholars concerning the authorship and content of *Tuhfat*

al-rāghibīn consisting mostly of abstracts from different famous works of Islamic literature. The composing of such work by ‘Abd al-Ṣamad is an additional proof that he sustained the contacts with Malay Archipelago during his whole life and influenced significantly on the development of the Islamic thought in this region and its connections with religious scholars in Transoxania, Middle East and North Africa. Due to his scholar's intuition Wan Jamaluddin compares *firaq* description in the text of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* with the work by Central Asian scholar al-Bazdawī which is, indeed, the subject of further debates beyond the scale of this article. However, in this context it would be important to pay attention to one of the conspicuous features of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn*, precisely, indicating that it was composed on base of the sources of Islamic literature written in the tradition of eastern Ḥanafism of Māturīdī school of theology.

In this context, it is also worth paying attention to the tradition of *firaq* writing, or the description of “heretical sects” in Islam as the main purpose of al-Palimbānī's *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* was exposing the apostates of faith. Noteworthy, that heresiographical format of schematic *‘ilm al-firaq* type of writing was largely shaped by Ḥanafite scholars of Māturīdīte tendency in theology. The Ḥanafite religious scholars from Central Asia generated a heresiographical tradition which would be preserved and developed for centuries in the Middle East, India and Southeast Asia. ‘Abū Maṣū‘ al-Māturīdī is considered to be the first writer of *firaq* type literature in his treatise *Kitāb al-maqalat* (“The Book of Teachings”). The earliest references to his book can be found in the *Uṣūl al-dīn* by al-Bazdawī [66], which was pointed out before. However, Al-Nasafī's treatise *Kitāb al-radd ‘alā-l’-bid‘a* (“The Book of Resistance Towards Disillusions”) is considered to be the most recognizable work in this field [67]. It should be noted that eastern Ḥanafite tradition's distinctive literary features stand apart from the standard Ash‘arite tradition of *firaq* writing. In her brilliant article Lewinstein distinguished both the peculiar heresiographical format of Ḥanafite texts and special Ḥanafite character of language [68]. She indicated that all texts of eastern Ḥanafite writers are structurally distinct from the standard heresiographers, based on the principle of fragmentation into 72 heterodox “sects”. They promoted their own scheme of 6×12, dividing the community in 6 “mother sects” which splits into 12 “sub-sects”. Moreover, the eastern Ḥanafite writers prefer the exegetically based refutation of “sects” over description, which is peculiar feature of their works [69]. In his text al-Palimbānī indicates 13, but not 12 heterodox “sects”; writing concise refutation of these sects in the tradition of eastern Ḥanafite writers [70]. So by looking at the structure of al-Palimbānī's *firaq* chapter it is evident that *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* was composed as a mixture of eastern Ḥanafite and standard (Ash‘arite) material.

Regarding the role of the Ḥanafī legal tradition peculiarities in the development of Islamic literature it is noticeable that there is the prevalence of Transoxanian legal tradition as a major force within Ḥanafism, in general, many of whose great authors were paramount fig-

ures in legal studies. The triumph of Ḥanafism in Transoxania came with the reign of Sāmānid dynasty as Sāmānids originated from a village near Balkh. The Ḥanafite scholar Ishāq b. Muḥammad al-Ḥakīm al-Samarqandī (d. 342/953) composed a statement of the orthodox creed (*al-sawād al-a‘zām*), it became the official catechism of official creed. Besides, Bukhārā school of Islamic legal writing contributed tremendously to Islamic schooling for centuries. It is now common knowledge that both the Ottoman and Mughal Empires officially adhered to Ḥanafism and Māturīdism. Wilfred Madelung presented a paper about the interrelatedness of the spread of the Māturīdī school of *kalām*, originating from Samarqand, and the accession to power of Turkish (Seljuk) dynasties in the heartland of Islam [71]. He underlined in his work the wide transmission of this theological school through the conquest of the Seljuks with their attachment to eastern Ḥanafism, and also to Māturīdism in spite of widespread assumption that the Seljuks were generally patrons of Shafī‘ism.

Evidently, a number of quotations of religious scholars and treatises mentioned in *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* mainly belong to this tradition, beginning with ‘Abū Ḥanīfa himself, the *īmām* of Ḥanafī school of law, then his disciple ‘Abū Maṣū‘ al-Māturīdī, the founder of Māturīdī school of dogmatics and two recognized Māturīdī writers ‘Umar al-Nasafī with his *Al-‘aqā‘id* (“Symbol of Faith”) and Sa‘d al-Dīn al-Taftazānī (d. 791/1389) with his *Sharḥ al-‘aqā‘id al-nasafīyya* (“Commentary on the Symbol of Faith by al-Nasafī”). Moreover, *Al-tamhīd* by al-Sālimī which was the key source for al-Palimbānī's writing of *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* is considered to be Māturīdī classical work with *kalām*. It is important to notice that evidences of transmitting the Māturīdī ideas and works to Malay Archipelago date from 10th—11th / the late 16th to early 17th century. Two of the early preserved Malay manuscripts are Māturīdī texts. Firstly, the Malay translation of al-Nasafī's *Al-‘aqā‘id* supposedly originated from Aceh [72] and secondly there was an earlier fragment of Sirāj al-Dīn al-‘Ushī's (d. 1173/1704) *Lamiyya* (“The Outburst of Light”) with Malay interlinear translation [73]. Nūr al-Dīn al-Rānīrī of mixed Ḥaramayn and Gujarat origin was influenced by Māturīdī ideas as Surat in Gujarat witnessed a notable influx of Transoxania Muslims in 10th—11th / the late 16th and the 17th centuries [74]. He composed the only one Malay translation on al-Taftazānī's commentary.

Notwithstanding the existence of the limited number of later manuscripts of SEA origin containing the Māturīdī texts, such as al-Sālimī's *Al-tamhīd*, and the lacking of evidence of the influence of these school ideas, Ash‘ari works prevailed there (exceptions are traditional Ḥanafī catechism by al-Samarqandī still widely used with interlinea Malay translations and al-‘Ushī's creed [75]). The question of islamization of SEA is usually connected with Shafī‘i Muslims from Arabia or Ḥaramayn but the Ḥanafī influence on the region at that particular time of 10th—11th / the 16—17th centuries, most probably emanating from North India, Bengal or even the Ottoman Empire, and it seems to be negligible. It is interesting to note that Al-Taftazānī's *Sharḥ*

al-'aqā'id al-nasaḥīya has remained a mandatory ingredient to traditional Islamic education in North India and that in the prestigious *madrasa* of Lucknow Nadwat al-'Ulamā' al-Sālimī's *Al-tamhīd* was reintroduced to the program in 1906 [76]. In this context it is important to add *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* to the list of the works of Ḥanafī school of law which is still in the focus of interest in the education curriculum of contemporary Islamic institutions in Indonesia.

Evidently, there is an underlying mechanism behind the spread of long-term persistence of the school

throughout large parts of Islamdom seemingly dominated by Ash'arism in the sphere of scholarship theology, precisely the prevalence of Transoxanian legal tradition within Ḥanafism and its linkages to Māturīdism [77]. In spite of common opinion that Shāfi'ism was the main tool for the penetration of Islamic ideas in the areas of polytheism, actually the creed of Murji'it school of theology concerning the problem of true believer (*mu'min*), originated in Balkh in the domicile of eastern Ḥanafism remains in the background of spreading of Islamic ideas [78].

Conclusion

Finally, *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* composed by 'Abd as-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī in the 12th /18th century enables perceiving the peculiarities of religious life on the Malay Archipelago, in general. Besides, one can observe that such writings, mostly compiled, are generally consid-

ered to be authoritative in Islamic tradition. The end of this polemic at least drives to the conclusion that *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* still remains one of the classical Islamic works in the contemporary curriculum of Muslim institutions on the Archipelago.

Notes

1. His full name is 'Abd al-Ṣamad b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abd al-Jalīl b. 'Abd al-Waḥhāb b. Aḥmad al-Mahdanī al-Mahdalī (1150—1247 /1737—1832 or 1254/1839). His grandfather, 'Abd al-Jalīl, was a *muftī* of Sultanate Kedah in Malaysia during 1112—1184 / 1710—1782, while his grandmother, Raden Ranti, was a daughter of Prince Purbaya, a son of *sultān* Muḥammad Maṣṣūr who ruled Sultanate Palembang Darussalam in Sumatera during 1108—1126 / 1706—1714. An attractive and more accurate study on biography of 'Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī is presented in Abdullah, 2015.

2. In 18th century Sultanate Palembang Darussalam in Sumatera raised as a new centre of Islam in the region not so long after the declining of Sultanate Aceh. In this historical context Palembang played an important role as well as Aceh before in connecting two worlds of Islam. See Fathurahman, 2002.

3. Voll, 1982.

4. Fathurahman, 2007.

5. Martin van Bruinessen is one of a modern Dutch scholars, who dedicated his fruitful life to study and analysis of Islam in Indonesia in general and Indonesian Sufism in particular. Wan Jamaluddin and Syaiful Anwar owe our thanks to him for a brief and vis-a-vis dialog during his visit to Balik Papan in Kalimantan island, November 2014. His works such as Bruinessen, 1997 and 1998 have inspired this recent paper.

6. Azra, 1995.

7. Muḥammad Arṣhad b. 'Abdullā al-Banjārī (b. 15 Ṣafar 1122 /19 March 1710, Martapura, South Kalimantan). For more detail on his biography see: Anwar, 1996.

8. 'Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī, *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn fi bayān ḥaqīqat al-īmān*. Dutch paper, 18.5×13.0; 55 ff. Mecca, 1188/1774. National Library of Indonesia, Jakarta, call No. VdW37. Sutaarga, 1972.

9. Ronkel, 1913: 399—400, No. DCXXVI.

10. 'Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī, *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn fi bayān ḥaqīqat al-īmān*. Dutch paper, 13.5×12.0, 50 ff. Mecca, 1188/1774. Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, call No. B 4024.

11. See Braginsky & Boldyreva, 1977.

12. Hasan, 2007: 57—85.

13. Mujiburrahman, 2014.

14. Quzwain, 1985.

15. Voorhoeve, 1955.

16. Drewes, 1976.

17. M. Ashwadi Shukur is a professor of Dakwah Faculty at IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin: Shukur, 1990.

18. Mujiburrahman also explained that the issue gave rise to serious discussion during the seminar on Muhammad Arshad al-Banjari, held at the State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN) Antasari Banjarmasin (in South Kalimantan) on November 17, 1988, and another discussion attended by Banjarese intellectuals on December 25, 1988.

19. Voorhoeve, 1960: 92.

20. Drewes, 1976: 274—275.

21. Braginsky is one of the prominent Russian scholars in the field of Malay Islamic literature. Braginsky, 1983 had been translated and published into Indonesian language in 1998.

22. Quzwain, 1985.

23. Azra, 1995.

24. Teuku, 1996: 442—443.

25. Umi Kalsum, 2004.

26. Katkova, 2007.

27. Abdullah, 2015.

28. Jamaluddin, 2005.

29. Mujiburrahman, 2014.

30. Shukur, 2009.

31. Drewes, 1977: 273—274.

32. Mujiburrahman, 2014.

33. Umi Kalsum, 2004.

34. Abdullah, 1996. In his two older works Shaghīr Abdullah mentioned the *Tuḥfat al-rāghibīn* as a work of Muḥammad Arṣhad al-Banjārī. See idem: 1982 and 1990. But in 1996 he changed his point of view and recognized the manuscript as a work of 'Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī. See idem, 1996.

35. See Umi Kalsum, 2004: 23, the same quotation about the poem see Abdullah, 2015: 96.

36. *Ibid.*
37. Rahim, 1998: 41—87.
38. Drewes, 1976; Umi Kalsum, 2004: 23.
39. Bruinessen, 1995, vol. III: 56—57.
40. *Ibid.*
41. Abdullah, 2015: 99.
42. *Ibid.*: 101—102.
43. *Ibid.*: 93.
44. Katkova, 2011.
45. Azra, 1995.
46. In this paragraph al-Palimbānī expressed it in Arabic:
- muṣṭa‘inan bī Allāh wā mu‘tamidan ‘alāyih fī taḥqīq al-maṭlūb wā al-marām ‘alā ḥaṣḥbī mā zahara lī min aqwāl al-‘ulamā’ al-kirām...*
- With the blessing and mercy from Allah and totally devoted to Him, I am always trying to respond the phenomenon or question by relying to the ideas of the noticeable Muslim scholars that I know.
47. Brockelmann, 1943—1947, vol. I: 432; supplements-bande I: 771.
48. Abdullah, 2015: 66—69.
49. Al-Ahdal, 1979: 108—119; and al-Kattānī, 1989, vol. II: 734.
50. Bruinessen, 1997: 76.
51. Sutaarga, 1972: 4, 6, 26.
52. Drewes, 1977: 219. Ibrāhīm al-Laḳānī’s fullname is Nāṣir al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Salām b. Ibrāhīm al-Laḳānī al-Malikī (d. 1078/1668). See Brockelmann, 1943—1947, vol. II: 419, 436.
53. Umi Kalsum, 2004.
54. Bradley, 2010.
55. Abdullah, 2015: 124—125.
56. Al-Bazdawī, 1963.
57. For more detail see: Jamaluddin, 2010.
58. Ronkel, 1913; Drewes, 1977 and Voorhoeve, 1955.
59. *Ibid.*
60. Idem, 1952: 91—99.
61. Tobing, 1956.
62. Hurgronje, 1924.
63. Wiktorowicz, 2006: 34.
64. Azra, 1995: 220.
65. Katkova, 2009.
66. Al-Bazdawī, 1963: 241, II, 6f.
67. Massignon, 1922; Bernard, 1980.
68. Lewinstein, 1994.
69. *Ibid.*: 590—591.
70. Katkova, 2007.
71. Madelung, 1971/1985.
72. Al-Attas, 1988.
73. Drewes, 1977: 94—100.
74. Buehler, 1998.
75. Bruinessen, 1990.
76. Malik, 1997: 444.
77. Brukmayr, 2009.
78. Madelung, 1982.

References

- Abdullah, M. A. (2015), *Syaikh Abdus-Samad al-Palimbani: Biografi dan Warisan Keilmuan [Shaykh ‘Abd al-Ṣamad al-Palimbānī: The Biography and Intellectual Heritage]*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pesantren.
- Abdullah, W. M. S. (1982), *Syekh Muhammad Arsyad al-Banjari, Matahari Islam [Shaykh Muḥammad Arṣhad al-Banjārī, the Sun of Islam]*, Pontianak: al-Fathana.
- Abdullah, W. M. S. (1990), *Syeikh Muhammad Arsyad al-Banjari, Pengarang Sabilal Muhtadin [Shaykh Muḥammad Arṣhad al-Banjārī, the Author of Sabīl al-Muhtadīn]*, Kuala Lumpur: Khazana Fathaniya.
- Abdullah, W. M. S. (1996), *Syeikh Abdu Samad [Shaykh ‘Abd al-Ṣamad]*, Kuala Lumpur: Khazana Fathaniya.
- Al-Ahdal, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. Sulaymān (1979), *Al-naḥs al-yamānī wa al-rūḥ al-rayḥānī [The Yemeni’s Soul and Its Godness Spirit for Musim Judge Innaguration among Sawkani People]*, Ṣan‘ā’: Markaz al-dirāsa wa al-abḥāth al-yamāniya al-jumhūriyya al-‘arabiyya.
- Al-Attas, S. M. N. (1988), *The Oldest Known Malay Manuscript. A 16th century Malay Translation of the ‘Aqid of al-Nasafi*, Kuala-Lumpur: University of Malaya.
- Al-Bazdawī, Abū al-Yusr Muḥammad (1963), *Kitāb uṣūl al-dīn [Book of Religious Principles or Fundamentals]*, U. P. Linn (ed.), Al-Qāhira, Dār iḥyā’ al-kutub al-‘arabiyya.
- Al-Kattānī, ‘Abd al-Ḥayy b. ‘Abd al-Kabīr (1989), *Fihris al-faḥāris wā al-aṣbāt wā mu‘jam al-ma‘ājim wā al-maṣākhāt wā al-musalsalāt [An Index of Catalogue and the Validation, and the Dictionary of Dictionaries of College of Shaykhs and Their Chains]*, Beirut: Dār al-Ḡharb al-Īslāmī.
- Anwar, Ch. (1996), “‘Ulamā’ Indūnisiyyā al-qarn al-thāmin ‘aṣḥar: tarjama Muḥammad Arṣhad al-Banjārī wa afkaru” [“An Indonesian Muslim Scholar in 18th Century: Biography of Muḥammad Arṣhad al-Banjārī and His Thoughts”], *Studia Islamika*, vol. 3/4, pp. 137—164.
- Azra, A. (1995), *Jaringan Ulama Timur Tengah dan Kepulauan Nusantara Abad XVII dan XVIII. Melacak Akar-akar Pembaruan Pemikiran Islam di Indonesia [The Origin of Islamic Reformism in Southeast Asia: Networks of Malay-Indonesian and Middle Eastern ‘Ulamā’ in 17th — 18th Centuries]*, Bandung: Mizan.
- Bernand, M. (1980), “Le ‘Kitab al-Radd ‘ala l-Bida’”, *Annales Islamologiques*, vol. 16, pp. 8—126.
- Bradley, F. R. (2010), *The Social Dynamics of Islamic Revivalism in Southeast Asia: The Rise of Patani School, 1785—1909*. PhD, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Braginsky, V. I. & Boldyreva, M. A. (1977), “Opisanie malajskih rukopisej v sobranii Leningradskogo otdelenija Instituta vostokovedenija Akademiy Nauk SSSR” [“Remarks on Malay manuscripts in the Leningrad Institute for Oriental Studies of Soviet

Academy of Sciences”], *Malajsko-indonezijskie issledovanija: Sbornik statej pamjati akademika A. A. Gubera*, Moscow: Nauka. See: idem (1990), “Les manuscrits malais de Leningrad”, *Archipel*, vol. 40/40, pp. 153—178.

Braginsky, V. I. (1983), *Istorija Malaikoj literatury [History of Malay Literature]*, Moscow: Nauka. In Indonesian: idem (1998), *Yang Indah, Yang Berfaedah dan Kamal [The Beautiful, the Usefull and the Perfect]*, Jakarta: Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde.

Brockelmann, C. (1943—1947), *Geschichte der arabischen Literatur I—II. Zweite den Supplementsbänden angepasste Auflage*, Leiden: Brill.

Bruinessen, M. van (1990), “Mencari Ilmu dan Pahala di Tanah Suci: Orang Nusantara Naik Haji” [“Seeking knowledge and rewards in the Holy Lands: the pilgrimage of Nusantara people”], *Ulumul Qur’an Journal*, No. 2.5, pp. 42—49.

Bruinessen, M. van (1995), *Tarekat Naqsyabandiyah di Indonesia [The Naqshabandi Order in Indonesia]*, Bandung: Mizan.

Bruinessen, M. van (1997), *Kitab Kuning Pesantren dan Tarikat. Tradisi-tradisi Islam di Indonesia [The Yellow Books, Islamic Boarding Schools and Islamic Sufi Orders: The Islamic Traditions in Indonesia]*, Bandung: Mizan.

Bruinessen, M. van (1998), “Studies of Sufism and the Sufi orders in Indonesia”, *Die Welt des Islams*, vol. 38/2, pp. 192—219.

Brukmayr, Ph. (2009), “The spread and persistence of Maturidi kalam and underlying dynamics”, *Iran and the Caucasus*, vol. 13, pp. 59—92.

Buehler, A. F. (1998), *Sufi Heirs of the Prophet. The Indian Naqshbandiyah and the Rise of the Mediating Sufi Shaykh*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Drewes, G. W. J. (1977), *Direction for Travellers on the Mystic Path*, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Drewes, G. W. J. (1976), “Further data concerning ‘Abdus-Samad Al-Palimbani’”, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, vol. 132, pp. 267—292.

Fathurahman, O., (2002), “Penulis dan Penerjemah Ulama Palembang: Menghubungkan Dua Dunia” [“Writers and translators of ulema in Palembang: connecting two worlds”], *Seminar on History of Translation in Indonesia and Malaysia*, Paris, 1—5 April.

Hasan, N. (2007), “The ‘Tuhfat al-raghibin’: the work of Abdul Samad al-Palimbani or of Muhammad Arsyad al-Banjari?”, *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-en Volkenkunde*, vol. 163/1, pp. 57—85.

Hurgronje, S. (1924), “Brieven van een Wedono-pensioer”, *Versprede Geschriften*, vol. 4/1, pp. 111—248.

Jamaluddin, W. (2005), *Pemikiran Neo-Sufisme Abd Al-Samad Al-Palimbani: Kajian Naskah Tuhfat al-Raghibin dan Badjoe Bacan di Saint-Petersburg [Al-Palimbāni’s Neo-Sufisme Notion: An Analysis of Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn and Badjoe Bacan Scripts]*, Jakarta: Pustaka Irfani.

Jamaluddin, W. (2010), “Al-Palimbani’s thought in his Sufistic work: study on manuscript in St. Petersburg, Russia titled ‘Tuhfat al-raghibin fi bayan haqiqat al-iman’ or ‘A gift for those who seek the real faith’”, in E. Revunenkov (ed.), *Avstralija, Okeanija i Indonezija v prostranstve i vremeni*, St. Petersburg: MAJE RAN, pp. 171—179.

Katkova, I. R. (2007), “Revising history of Sūfism in Indonesia. 18th century treatise *Tuhfat al-rāghibīn fī bayān-i haqīqat al-īmān* by *shaykh* ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbānī”, *Manuscripta Orientalia*, vol. 13/1, pp. 3—11.

Katkova, I. R. (2009), *Pamjatnik Malaikoj literatury Tuhfat al-Raghibin fi Bayani Hakikat al-Iman kak istochnik po istorii Sufisma na Malayskom Arhipelage [A Monument of Malay Literature “Tuhfat ar-Raghibin” as a Source on the History of Sufism on Malay Archipelago]*, St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg University.

Katkova, I. R. (2011), “Notes in Malay Archipelago: tariqah Sammaniyah”, *Journal of Amin Research & Cultural Center Hikmah*, No. 1, pp. 107—149.

Lewinstein, K. (1994), “Notes on Eastern Hanafite heresiography”, *Journal of American Oriental Society*, vol. 114/4, pp. 583—598.

Madelung, W. (1971/1985), “The spread of Maturidism and the Turks religious schools and sects in medieval Islam”, *Actas do IV Congresso de Estudos Arabes e Islamicos, Coimbra — Lisboa, 1968*, pp. 109—168.

Madelung, W. (1982), “The early Murji’a in Khurasan and Transoxania and the spread of Hanafism”, *Der Islam*, vol. 59, pp. 32—39.

Malik, J. (1997), *Islamische Gelehrtenkultur in Nordindien Entwicklungs Geschichte und Tendenzen an Beispiel von Lucknow*, Leiden: Leiden University.

Massignon, L. (1922), *Essai sur les origines de lexique technique de la mystique musulmane*, Paris: Librairie Orientaliste, Paul Geuthner.

Mujiburrahman (2014), “Islamic theological texts and contexts in Banjarese society: an overview of the existing studies”, *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, vol. 3/3, pp. 23—37.

Quzwain, M. Ch. (1985), *Mengenal Allah: Suatu studi mengenai ajaran taṣawuf Syaikh ‘Abdus-Samad al-Palimbani ‘ulama Palembang abad ke-18 Masehi [Knowing Allāh: A Study on Sūfī Treatise of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Šamad al-Palimbānī, 18th Century]*, Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.

Rahim, H. (1998), *Sistem Otoritas dan Administrasi Islam (Studi tentang Pejabat Agama Masa Kesultanan dan Kolonial di Palembang)* [“The Authority System and Administration in Islam, A Study on Religious Bureaucracy during Sultanate and Colonialism in Palembang”], Jakarta: Logos.

Ronkel, Ph. S. van (1913), *Supplement to the Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts Preserved in the Museum of the Batavia Society of Arts and Sciences*, Batavia: Albrecht & Co.; The Hague: Nijhoff.

Shukur, M. A. (1990), *Naskah Risalah Tuhfatur Raghibin [The Text of Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn]*, Banjarmasin: Laporan Penelitian IAIN Antasari.

- Shukur, M. A. (2009), *Pemikiran-pemikiran Syekh Muhammad Arsyad al-Banjari dalam Bidang Tauhid dan Tasawuf* [*Shaykh Muhammad Arshad al-Banjari's Thought in Theology and Sufism*], Banjarmasin: Comdes.
- Sutaarga, A. (1972), *Katalogus koleksi naskah Melayu Museum Pusat Jakarta* [*The Catalogue of Melayu Manuscripts Collections in Jakarta Central Museum*], Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI.
- Teuku, I. (1995), *Kesusasteraan klasik Melayu sepanjang abad* [*Malay Literatures Across Millenniums*], Brunei: Universiti Brunei Darussalam.
- Tobing, Ph. L. (1956), *The Structure of the Toba-Batak Belief in the High God*, PhD, Utrecht University.
- Umi Kalsum, N. (2004), *Tuhfat al-Raghibin fi Bayan Haqiqat Iman al-Mu'min: Suatu Kajian tentang Tanggapan terhadap Doktrin Wujudiyah yang Berkembang di Palembang Abad ke-18: Suntingan Teks dan Analisis Isi* [*Tuhfat al-rāghibīn fi bayān ḥaqīqat al-īmān: A Study on Respons to Wujudiyah Doctrines (The Unity of Being) in Palembang in 18th Century: Text and Content Analysis*], Thesis Magister, Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya, University of Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Voll, J. O. (1982), *Islam: Continuity and Change in the Modern World*, Boulder: Westviews Press.
- Voorhoeve, P. (1952), "Bajan Tadjalli", *Tijdschrift Batavian Genootschap*, vol. 85/1, pp. 87—117.
- Voorhoeve, P. (1955), *Twee Maleise Geschriften van Nuruddin ar-Raniri*, Leiden: Leiden University.
- Voorhoeve, P. (1960), "Tuhfat ar-Raghibin", *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. 1, Leiden: Brill, p. 92.
- Wiktorowicz, Q. (2006), "Anatomy of the Salafi movement", *Studies of Conflict & Terrorism*, vol. 29/3, pp. 207—239.
-