Book Reviews

- J. van Baal, Hans Nevermann, Söhne des Tötenden Vaters, Dämonen- und Kopfjägergeschichten aus Neuguinea; Röth-Verlag, Kassel, 1957; 224 pag.
 - G.W.J. Drewes, A.H. Johns, Malay Sufism as illustrated in an anonymous collection of 17th century tracts. Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, No. 178, Vol. XXX, Part 2, 1957, 111 pp.
- In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 115 (1959), no: 3, Leiden, 277-304

This PDF-file was downloaded from <http://www.kitlv-journals.nl>

BOEKBESPREKING

*Prof. Dr. Hans Nevermann, SÖHNE DES TÖTEN-
DEN VATERS, Dämonen- und Kopffjägergeschichten
aus Neuguinea; Röth-Verlag, Kassel, 1957; 224 pag.*

In dit smaakvol uitgegeven boekje, dat deel uitmaakt van de reeks „Das Gesicht der Völker”, brengt de auteur ons de ongeschreven literatuur der Marind-anim en enkele fragmenten van die hunner naburen. Wij vinden dan ook op de titelpagina nog de vermelding: Der Melanesische Kulturkreis; Dichtung der Papua. Het materiaal is door de schrijver opgetekend op een studiereis, die hij in 1933/1934 in dit gebied ondernam. Het omvat zowel mythen als profane geschiedenissen en is voorzien van een algemene inleiding, van een uitvoerige annotatie, zomede van oriënterend commentaar in de tekst. Met dit commentaar is de auteur erin geslaagd het bonte mozaiek zijner verzameling tot een goed aaneensluitend geheel te weven, een waarlijk niet geringe prestatie. Een extra woord van lof past ons voor de aangename stijl, waarin het boek is geschreven. In deze tijd, waarin wij helaas gewend zijn geraakt aan de malle zwaarwichtigheid van een pompeus Duits, is het een verademing te ervaren, dat het ook anders kan en er in deze taal nog altijd een stijlform mogelijk is, die licht genoeg van voeten is om doorzichtig te blijven. Als literaire prestatie is dit boek naar compositie en stijl een zeer geslaagd boek.

T.a.v. de wetenschappelijke waarde heb ik echter wel enige bedenkingen. Wanneer het de bedoeling is door deze confrontatie aan de eigen denkwereld de lezer een meer onmiddellijk en levendiger contact te brengen met het leven van primitieve volken, dan is deze methode ongetwijfeld een interessant experiment, waarmee i.c. prijzenswaardige resultaten zijn behaald. Maar het moet niet in de plaats komen van een naar wetenschappelijke methode gepubliceerd materiaal. Alleen uit dit laatste valt een werkelijk afgerond inzicht te putten. Daartoe echter is nodig, dat wij weten, wie en wat de informanten van de auteur waren. Heeft hij dezelfde ervaring opgedaan als Wirz, dat bepaalde mythen clan-eigendom zijn? Wij weten het niet. Belangrijker nog is, dat aan de authenticiteit van zijn tekst een zekere mate van twijfel bestaat. Het ontbreken van de gebruikelijke tegenstrijdigheden in veruit de meeste mythen doet de vraag rijzen, of de inhoud niet een beetje is aangepast aan de noodzaak om leesbaar te blijven. Er is één geval, waar wij de schrijver kunnen controleren. Hij heeft nl. één verhaal van anderen overgenomen, i.c. de mythe van Nggiwe, die hij vond opgetekend in mijn artikel over de Gab-Gab in T.B.G. 1940, pp. 10-12. Nevermann legt in die (verkorte) weergave de verteller in de mond, dat Mamoes een daemon is, terwijl het origineel hem een man noemt. Als plaats van actie noemt hij het gebied der Wamak, wat in het origineel niet te vinden is. Het is alles niet zo erg, maar het doet de vraag rijzen, waar voor de schrijver de grens heeft gelegen. Die vraag klemmt, omdat de

titel wijst in een romantiserende richting. Die titel houdt een verwijzing in naar Dé-hevai, Vader die doodt, één van de namen van de varkensdema, die ook de dema van het onweer is en meest bekend werd onder de naam Nazr. Niet bekend is evenwel, dat de Marind zichzelf ooit uitdrukkelijk zonen van Dé-hevai zouden noemen. Er zijn er wel, die zichzelf afstammelingen van Nazr (Nazr-end) noemen, maar dat zijn alleen de leden van de varkens-clan. Om nu alle Marind zonen van Dé-hevai te noemen, gaat verder dan de Marind zelf doet.

Het verbaast dan ook niet, dat Prof. Nevermann de Marind hier en daar ietwat idealiseert. Zo zijn mededeling, dat de Marind in bijzijn van vrouwen over seksuele zaken terughoudend (p. 200 nt. 88) en zelfs „fast prüde” (p. 213 nt. 106) zijn. Ik meen, dat dit iets te veel is. Ook krijgt men een vertekend beeld, wanneer de auteur verzekert: „Die Leute sind keine eigentlichen Kannibalen, sondern essen Menschenfleisch nur bei Kultfeiern oder wenn sie einen Feind erschlagen haben” (p. 208 nt. 19). Het eten van mensenvlees moge dan geen motief zijn voor het doden, maar men doet het toch maar, zij het ook, dat het nu juist met die „Kultfeiern” bepaald zulk een vaart niet liep als Nevermann meent.

Dat men met een verzameling verhalen er niet komt om een werkelijk inzicht te verkrijgen in het doen en laten der mensen, blijkt overtuigend uit het aandoenlijke verhaal van „Kungas Irrtum” (pp. 177-181), waar de auteur ons wil doen geloven, dat een man, die zich zeer teruggetrokken gedroeg en door zijn dorpsgenoten gemeden werd, dit te danken heeft aan het feit, dat zijn vader geruime tijd voor zijn geboorte bij vergissing gehuwd is geweest met een vrouw, die later diens eigen zuster bleek. Het feit, dat die zuster kort na haar geboorte in een ver verwijderd dorp was geadopteerd, had die vergissing mogelijk gemaakt. Er is echter heel wat meer nodig dan een goed vertelde geschiedenis om aanvaardbaar te maken, dat zulk een gebeurtenis uit een ver verleden voor een kind uit een later huwelijk zulke gevolgen hebben kan.

Het zelfde kan gezegd van de mededeling van de auteur, dat bij de dood van een ingewijde in het Majo-ritueel soms niet-ingewijden worden gedood, waarbij het aantal slachtoffers zou blijken uit het getal der gari-figuranten, dat optreedt tijdens de plechtigheid op de derde dag na het overlijden (p. 129). Zeer onlangs heb ik er in mijn bespreking van Schlesiers dissertatie op gewezen, dat het voorkomen van mensenslachten (het werd hierboven al aangestipt) door Verschueren op goede gronden is bestreden. Ik behoef daar thans niet op terug te komen. Waar ik wel op moet terugkomen is de ook hier weer herhaalde verzekering, dat de Marind uit het Oosten komen, voor welke verzekering onvoldoende grond is. Zij wordt ons bij Nevermann naar aanleiding van de oorsprongsmythe der mensen, waarbij hij als bewijs ditmaal niet de mythen aanhaalt (ofschoon men elders in zijn boek dit argument ook terugvindt) maar het volgende: „Die Marind-anim sind wirklich „einmal von Oosten nach Westen in ihr heutiges Wohngebiet eingewandert. Die Erinnerung daran ist noch so lebendig, dass man den „Ost- und Westteil der Dörfer durch die Vorsilben Es (Zurück) und

„Mahai (Vorwärts) onderscheidet, beispielsweise im Dorfe Wambi . . .” (pp. 190, 191, nt. 5).

Het argument is niet nieuw en de auteur zou zich er zelfs op kunnen beroepen, dat hij hiermede in het goede gezelschap is van Williams, die een soortgelijke situatie vond in het Trans-Fly gebied en daarmede het ontstaan van het daar geldend tweedelingssysteem tracht te verklaren. Het is hier niet de plaats voor een bespreking van de situatie in de Trans-Fly en ik moet volstaan met de opmerking, dat de redenering van Williams weliswaar als oplossing mogelijk is, maar niet waarschijnlijk. De mythologie geeft hem niet de steun, die hij zelf meent dat ze biedt, terwijl ook het feit, dat men deze associatie van oost met achter en west met voor over een zo veel groter gebied vindt, meer pleit voor een algemene verklaring dan voor een verklaring ad hoc. Hoe gevaarlijk het hier door Nevermann van Van de Kolk, Geurtjens en Wirz overgenomen argument is, blijkt al spoedig, wanneer men het nauwkeuriger beziet. Allereerst moet dan opgemerkt, dat Nevermann met zijn vertaling van *es* (achteraan, jongste) door *Zurück* en van *mahai* (vooraan, oudste) door *Vorwärts*, de feiten geweld doet. En in de tweede plaats heeft men bij de vertaling van de begrippen *es* en *mahai* niet te maken met één van de begrippen, die wij daarmee gelijkstellen, maar met alle. Men moet dus niet alleen recht doen wedervaren aan de betekenis voor, vooraan van *mahai*, maar ook aan de betekenis oudste daarvan. Lang geleden (Godsdienst en Samenleving, pp. 25, 26) heb ik er reeds op gewezen, dat men met die betekenissen van ouder en jonger niet uitkomt, wanneer men zich ter verklaring beroept op immigratie van oost naar west. Dan zou west jonger en oost ouder moeten zijn. Associeert men deze onderscheiding echter met de zonneloop, dan komen beide betekenissen tot hun recht, want de zon in het oosten is de jonge zon, die in het westen de oude. Dan komt er ook tekening in de mythe, die Nevermann aanleiding gaf tot deze uiteenzetting. Die mythe vertelt nl. helemaal niet, dat de mensen uit het oosten komen. Het verhaal begint zelfs in het westen. Daar vierden de *dema's* een feest. Ze moesten echter schuilen gaan voor de regen en deden dat onder de grond. Daarop gingen ze, nog altijd onder de grond (dus net als de zon, Ref.) naar het oosten en daar kwamen de eerste mensen uit de grond. Het geheel vormt wel een treffende illustratie van de zwakte van het betoog, dat de Marind volgens de mythe uit het oosten gekomen zijn. Ook het betoog van Geurtjens (K.T. 1935, pp. 115-118) heeft de migratietheorie als verklaring voor de associatie van *es* met oost en *mahai* met west niet kunnen redden. Als men ter ondersteuning van die zienswijze betogen moet, dat het woord *usus* (avond) duidelijk en nauw verwant is met *so* en *es*, is men het hellend vlak der etymologie toch wel wat erg ver afgedaald. En als men zich aan de mythe houden wil om te weten te komen, waar de Marind oorspronkelijk vandaan kwamen, kan men dus met recht volhouden, dat ze uit het westen gekomen zijn en niet uit het oosten.

Na deze algemene opmerkingen mogen hier nog een aantal verspreide

notities volgen. De darau is geen reiger (p. 21 nt. 10 en 88 nt. 110) maar — voor het oog van de leek althans — een kraanvogel. Het „Groszfuszhuhn” is beslist groter dan een kip (p. 208 nt. 13). Het is niet juist, dat het voornaamste snelgebied der Marind aan de boven-Digoel lag (p. 113); dat is alleen juist voor de West-Marind. De Oost-Marind snelden bij voorkeur in het Trans-Fly district in Australisch (en niet Brits, gelijk de schrijver het op p. 197 in nt. 58 noemt) Nieuw-Guinea. Imahu (p. 118) moet zijn Imahui. Het venerisch granuloom werd veel eerder ingevoerd dan de schrijver ons op p. 203 nt. 119 doet vermoeden. Het verschil tussen eb en vloed in Straat Marianne bedraagt gelukkig niet 9 meter, doch maximaal 6, wat al erg genoeg is. Gechargeerd is de voorstelling van de gestrengheid der scheiding tussen de sexen bij de Moejoe (p. 156 en noot 19 op p. 216). Hetzelfde kan gezegd van de veronderstelde „streng mutterrechtlichen Verhältnisse” in het Mappi-gebied. De verklaring van het koppensnelen uit behoefte aan levenskracht, die geacht wordt in het bijzonder in het hoofd te zetelen (pp. 47 en 112) lijkt mij wel erg uit de tijd.

Met de spelling van niet-Marindinese namen en met het Maleis staat de auteur een tikje op voet van oorlog. Zo heette Sajir (p. 198 nt. 65) t.r. Sahir en Rosz (pp. 160 vlgg.) heette Roche, terwijl Ibrahim bin Sidi (p. 102) onmogelijk een Javaan geweest kan zijn. Het op p. 192 gemelde kandala voor trommel is het Maleise kendara; Kepala Lidjing op p. 115 heet (hij leeft nog) om de door de auteur aangegeven reden Baba (kepala) Litjin. Tuan Bentir (p. 117) moet zijn Tuan Bestir. Sekola (p. 119) schrijft men met een h aan het einde, maar seroh (p. 205 nt. 137) zonder h. Bui komt niet uit het Maleis, maar is ontleend aan het Nederlandse woord boei, keten.

Na al deze aanmerkingen wil ik niet eindigen dan na nogmaals verzekerd te hebben, dat het desondanks een alleraardigst boek is om te lezen, dat een in menig opzicht nuttige kijk geeft op de Marind. Voor wie het oude Merauke gekend heeft, gaan vele herinneringen weer leven en het is zeker een boek, dat geschikt is om de soort belangstelling te wekken, die land en volk van Nieuw-Guinea zo nodig hebben.

J. VAN BAAL.

A. H. Johns Ph. D.: MALAY SUFISM as illustrated in an anonymous collection of 17th century tracts. *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, No. 178, Vol. XXX, Part 2, 1957, 111 pp.

This treatise is a thesis to satisfy University of London requirements for the Ph. D. degree. As its date of publication the cover mentions August 1957, but in fact this issue appeared only a few months ago.

The subject of this thesis is a number of Sufi tracts bound in a single volume forming No 11648 of the Marsden Collection in the library of

the London School of Oriental and African Studies. So far these tracts had escaped the notice of Malay scholars, save only that the original European owner of the MS., William Marsden, translated and published a few excerpts from them in his Malay dictionary (1812). The tracts are anonymous but there can be little doubt as to their origin and age. The language in which they are written is called in the text language of the people of Pasai — which refers us to XVIth and XVIIth century Aceh — and, moreover, the archaic spelling and the use of obsolete words and old morphological forms point to the same remote period of Malay literature. Therefore, there is a good deal to be said in favour of the editor's belief that the author was one of Shamsu 'l-Dīn's students turned schoolmaster to another generation of North Sumatran Sufis (p. 33). At all events, these pamphlets belong to the school of the Indonesian followers of Ibn al-ʿArabī, a gnostic about whose orthodoxy the house of Islam is divided but whose Indonesian adherents, more or less outspokenly pantheistic, met with the sharpest condemnation in the writings of Nūru 'l-Dīn al-Rānīrī.

In the recent volumes of this periodical quite a number of articles and notes have been dedicated to Rānīrī's life and writings, whereas in the last decades many a Leiden thesis has treated of Indonesian — including North Sumatran — mysticism, so that in his Introduction Dr Johns justly remarks that detailed study of the doctrinal development of Islam in Indonesia has been almost exclusively a Dutch preserve. Nevertheless, we are not of the opinion that Dr Johns in preparing this thesis for an English university has trespassed on our — supposed — preserves. On the contrary, we welcome his contribution to the study of Sumatran mysticism as a laudable sign of increasing interest in the history of Indonesian Islam outside this country.

It is true, already some twenty years ago the J.M.B.R.A.S. (Vol. XV, Pt. II; 1937) contained a voluminous paper (130 pp.) on Muhammadan Mysticism in Sumatra by R. L. Archer. This too was a thesis, the first of its kind to appear in the English speaking world, as it was written for the College of Missions, Hartford, Conn. U.S.A., under the guidance of professor W. G. Shellabear, the well-known Malayist. There is, however, a marked difference between these two theses. Far and away the greater part of Archer's paper is taken up by a statement concerning Muslim mysticism in general, a list of mystical MS. literature in the Malay language, a synopsis of the famous *Ḥikam* of Ibn ʿAtā' Allāh (died 709/1309) and a translation of a very full Malay commentary on this work. The latter part of the paper is made up by about 35 pages on mysticism in Sumatra containing: *a.* a brief outline of its history; *b.* an analysis of the *Fath al-ʿArīfīn*, a treatise on the teachings of the Naqshbandi order (this treatise, written in Malay and printed in Cairo, was much in vogue in the last century); *c.* a description of the *suluk* and *ratib* ceremonies; *d.* an extract from an article on *taṣawwuf*, written in Malay by Dr H. A. K. Amrullah (alias Hadji Rasul) and published in the Muhammadiyah Almanak 1932—1933.

From this summary it will have become apparent that Archer's paper, while living up to its title in giving a certain amount of information concerning the spread of certain types of Islamic mysticism in Sumatra in comparatively recent times, is almost silent upon the peculiar kind of mysticism that flourished in North Sumatra (and Java) in an earlier period. It was during that period, round about 1600, that the two most renowned heterodox mystics lived: Hamza of Fansur (i.e. Barus in Tapanuli, once famous for its export of camphor) and Shamsu 'l-Dīn (died 1630). It seems that they and their adherents held the field until a reversal of royal favour under the successors of Iskandar Muda brought the fiercely intolerant Rānirī to the fore (1637—1644). Rānirī was a protagonist of the orthodox interpretation of Ibn al-ʿArabī. After him came ʿAbd al-Raʿūf of Singkel (W. Coast of Aceh) who on his return from Mecca (after 1661) propagated the Shattāriya order in Aceh.

But it is not in the vicissitudes of mysticism in XVIIth century Aceh that Dr Johns' interest lies. His primary aim is to present indigenous Islamic writings which, in view of the fact that as yet little of ancient mystical literature in Malay is accessible to scholars, is certainly a useful thing to do. His further aim is to emphasize the international character of the teachings of these tracts, unimpaired by local conditions (which boils down to the — not altogether novel — statement that the Sumatran mystics were faithful but unimaginative adepts of foreign doctrines).

In pursuance of this aim the plan of the thesis is as follows:

- 1°. a short sketch of the teachings of Ibn al-ʿArabī and ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Jilī, based upon the books of Affifi (*Mystical Philosophy of Muhyid-Din ibni 'l-ʿArabi*, Cambridge, 1937) and Nicholson (*Studies in Islamic Mysticism*, London, 1914);
- 2°. a synopsis of the teachings of the tracts;
- 3°. a discussion of their relation to other contemporary works and an attempt to assign them to a school;
- 4°. texts and translations;
- 5°. an appendix containing fragments translated from:
 - a. Muḥammad b. Faḍlullāh's *al-Tuhfa al-mursala ila 'l-nabī*, Cod. or. Leiden 5690;
 - b. Shamsu 'l-Dīn's *Nūr al-Daqā'iq* (J.R.A.S. 1958);
 - c. a tract by Hamza al-Fanṣūrī, edited by Doorenbos, *De geschriften van Hamzah Pansoeri*, Leiden thesis 1933;
 - d. Rānirī's *Jawāhir al-ʿulūm fī kashf al-maʿlūm*, MS. Marsden Collection no 12151 (this fragment together with the Malay text), and
 - e. a translation of a Javanese text quoted and translated into Dutch by Zoetmulder in his Leiden thesis *Pantheïsme en Monïsme in de Javaansche Soeloek-Litteratuur* (1935).

The results of Johns' investigation are formulated on pp. 31—34. First he points out the difference between the doctrine of Hamza as

expounded in his *Sharāb al-ʿāshiqīn* and the teaching of the tracts. Then he shows that the latter links up with Shamsu 'l-Dīn, and especially with an Arabic work of his (the *Jauhar al-Haqā'iq*), by adducing a series of parallelisms which is too striking to be fortuitous. This divergence between the teaching of Hamza on the one hand — whose doctrine in his opinion is closer to Ibn al-ʿArabī and al-Jīlī — and that of our tracts and Shamsu 'l-Dīn on the other, prompts him to ask: When exactly did this framework of the seven grades originate?

It is the opinion of the author that it appeared first in *al-Tuhfa al-mursala ila 'l-nabī*, a treatise by an Indian mystic Muḥ. b. Fadl-ullāh, and "on which one commentary was written expressly for the people of Aceh" (p. 33).

Perhaps it would have been more prudent to say that probably the Sumatran mystics got acquainted with the doctrine through the *Tuhfa*, a book widely read in Indonesia at the time. Whether or not the doctrine of the seven grades was first developed in this treatise is a question which our limited knowledge of the history of Muslim mysticism in India does not permit us to decide. The author refers to the description of MS. 178 in Van Ronkel's Suppl. Cat. Arab. MSS. Batavia in support of his statement that one commentary of the *Tuhfa* was written expressly for the people of Aceh. This MS. was written in Aceh. Van Ronkel says: "The treatise itself is referred to by the commentator as: *risāla ursilat min al-diyār al-hindiyya ila 'l-jazīra al-maʿmūra al-ashīyya* etc.". These words show that the commentator was aware of the Indian origin of the *Tuhfa* on which he was going to comment.

But there is still another commentary which was written expressly for the use of Indonesian Muslims, viz. *Ithāf al-zakī bi-sharḥ al-Tuhfa*. Ibrāhīm al-Kūrānī (died A.H. 1101/1689) composed this commentary by direction of his master Ahmad al-Qushāshī of Medina, in order to impart the 'correct' (i.e. orthodox) interpretation of the *Tuhfa* to his Indonesian coreligionists, as already stated by Brockelmann (G.A.L. II: 418) and Rinkes (thesis pp. 56/57). Since al-Qushāshī died in 1661, the *Ithāf* must have been written before that year. The *Tuhfa* itself dates from 1590, which leaves about half a century for the consolidation of its position as the principal textbook of speculative mysticism in this area. For that it must have been, otherwise it would not have been reinterpreted from Medina.

Coming to the last page of Dr Johns' introduction, where he emphasizes the homogeneity of Islam at this time (and in this area) by drawing attention to parallel happenings in India and Indonesia: it is a fact that there was an orthodox reaction in Aceh after the death of Iskandar Muda, and that a few years earlier the Mogul emperor Shah Jahan (1627—1658) had inaugurated a new religious policy aiming at the extermination of Hinduism.

It may readily be supposed that the rumours about events in India strengthened the hopes of the orthodox faction in Aceh, temporarily

out of power since the king himself was an adept of heterodox mysticism. It had to wait till the death of Iskandar Muda and the accession of a less powerful personality to the throne for an opportunity to assert itself. In the subsequent persecution of heterodox mystics al-Rānirī (the man from Rander in Gujarat) exerted himself by word and deed. But it seems far-fetched to find an indication of his work as a polemist against the syncretists in India in his declaration that the Malay version of the Ramayana might be used as toilet paper. For this only means that since in the Ramayana the name Allah does not occur, the paper on which it is written may be freely used for that purpose. The same advice would have been given by the mildest of *faqīhs*.

So far the setting of the tracts. In the following pages we shall go into the translation of the treatises, for although in general Dr. Johns is successful in conveying the meaning of the original, there are a number of places where his translation needs revision. What follows below is my translation of those passages which in my opinion have been inadequately rendered. Special attention will be paid to the fragment translated from the Javanese, because here the author moves in a field which apparently is far less familiar to him.

Tract 1.

§ 2. Know that the Pure Essence of God cannot be qualified in any way. If then you are asked whether the manifold qualifications which are apparent now issue forth from it or not, answer that none of them issues from it, but that all its designations are stored away in the treasure house of its being. When God wished to manifest the inward aspect (*huwiyya*) of His absolute oneness (*aḥadiyya*) which was hidden in His treasure house, He disclosed His lofty names, as is stated in His word: "I was a hidden treasure and I desired to be known; then I created man¹ that he might know Me". By 'hidden treasure' the people of perfect knowledge hint at the hidden quintessence and the most holy absoluteness and the inner side of *huwiyya*, which is from all eternity. Thus, 'treasure' denotes the hidden Mystery. Another designation of this hidden Mystery is 'first determination', the total negation of every thing beside God, since this grade is essentially the same as *wahda*.

§ 2. When God contemplated His names through His knowledge, this action implied three things: 1°. essence; 2°. attributes; 3°. names; these are the same which are referred to as *aḥadiyya*, *wahda* and *wāḥidiyya* in the books of some of the gnostics, while others call them *ʿilm*, *ʿālim* and *maʿlūm* or *ʿishq*, *āshiq* and *maʿshūq*.

Let not your attention be diverted by this variety of names, for what is designated by them is one and the same. The only difference lies in the order of what is designated by them, as *aḥadiyya* denotes the essence, *wahda* the attributes and *wāḥidiyya* the names, but in reality essence, attributes and names are one and the same.

In the same way the only purpose of the order of the grades that

¹ Malay *makhlok*, creature, man.

you have seen in books written by some of the gnostics is to remind us of this order, viz. from the viewpoints of transcendence and immanence. That is to say: when you look (at creation) from the viewpoint of immanence, you get the order of grades as mentioned above, and when you regard it from the viewpoint of transcendence, then you find therein nothing but God, who "has no equal".

§ 5. (l. 4 From....) In point of fact, these names refer to one and the same, for what is called etc.... and *wāḥidiyya*; therefore, these three are different as to their names, whereas in reality they are one, because *aḥadiyya* signifies the essence etc....

§ 6. (l. 3 God's purpose....) The benefit of God's veiling Himself with these veils is that the lover has to exert himself to seek Him — hoping that perhaps he will be able to pierce the veil — and to look upon the place of the Lord most High — without asking how. All his efforts, however, spring from the grace which God bestows upon the lover, as.... etc.

p. 50 (l. 1).... and that this manifold world is only the external manifestation of a being that is one. This manifoldness, however, exists only on the outside; for in reality there is no variety, as all varieties are His, without asking how, and all forms are His, without asking how, and all sounds are His, without asking how, etc.

§ 7. The last words of this paragraph: *wa'illā fa 'l-kull minhu*, Mal. *dan jika tiada demikian, maka sakalian-nya daripada-nya jua*, can hardly mean anything else than:and if such might not be the case, well, all things proceed from Him!, not: despite the fact that all things proceed from Him.

§ 8 (l. 5.) Let not the utterings of those in ecstasy — be they ever so right in point of fact — mislead thee into neglect of the Law. The words of al-Hallāj: "I am God", were spoken in ecstasy, which condition prevailed over him and was not brought about by any voluntary act of his. The Lord spoke on his tongue — without any voluntary act of his — so that in reality these words pertain to God, not to al-Hallāj.

§ 9. These men of God are the cream of God's elect, He distinguished them among the pious by giving them a sincere inner heart and He favoured them with hearts which are.... etc. Their souls delight in communion with Him and their innermost hearts are turned towards Him in contemplation. He reveals to them the secrets of His Qur'ān which is a very wise book, and because they followed in the steps of the prophet to whom was revealed: Truly, thou art of a noble character, He endowed their breasts with the combined knowledge of the Holy Qur'ān and the Seven Mathānī (i.e. the Fātiḥa). Such is the prerogative of the men of perfect insight....

(End) Therefore we should leave the words in their books to God and have a sincere faith in them, so that God may grant us perfect guidance on account of our sincere faith in them, etc.

§ 10. The last sentence: You must know.... etc. belongs after: from any aspect or at any time (6 lines before).

(l. 14) With regard to the manifestations and what they display difference and distinction have a significance which is a matter of name, to the effect that by their names things are distinguished from one another, that is all²; not to the effect that the difference of names disproves (lit. points away from) the essential unity, for in reality the Essence is One and there is no manifoldness in it, as it is the Essence of the Creator. Etc.

§ 11. As in § 6 the words: *dengan tiada betapa* are a translation of Arabic *bilā kaiḥa*, without asking how. These words are always added to warn the reader against an anthropomorphic interpretation.

§ 13 (l. 5; cf. Appendices 1 and 4) ... it cannot be attained by intellectual knowledge, perception, imagination or reasoning.

(l. 9) It has an esoteric and an exoteric aspect.

(l. 16) Its outward expression, as to its esoteric aspect, etc.

§ 14 (l. 7) a perfect manifestation comprising all other....

§ 16 (Last sentence) ... while it (i.e. the intellect) obtains knowledge of the lofty attributes of God by considering the range of the obligations set down by the Law. (cf. § 18)

§ 17 (l. 5) is named the Perfect Knower, i.e. he is endowed with the grace of perfect knowledge of God (the words: he.... God, are a gloss added to explain *kāmil mukammal*).

§ 18. Know that knowledge of God's Essence is only attainable through His merciful and mysterious assistance. You will, however, learn to know God by His names and attributes through the teachings of the Law which is immutable in its provisions. And when you will have attained gnosis, oh journeyer who knows to observe transcendence and immanence in outer manifestness and hidden inwardness, you will surely attain the vision of God, bringing your heart into His holy presence and submerging your transitory existence in His loving nearness through the compelling attraction of His beauty, when the veil of darkness will be removed, so that you will gaze upon His lofty names and attributes in the macrocosm and the microcosm. Truly, He has revealed Himself to the men of perfect knowledge.

Tract 2 explains the meaning of the (spurious) tradition: Whosoever knows himself knows his Lord. In the second paragraph the author points out what is to be understood by 'self' (*diri*), in order to establish the connection between man and God. Therefore, the translation of this paragraph should be as follows:

§ 2. The meaning of 'self' is this:

The *Fixed Prototypes* subsist in God's knowledge which subsists in His Essence. The *World of Spirits* subsists in the Fixed Prototypes. The *World of Ideas*.... subsists in the World of Spirits. The *World of Bodies*.... subsists in the World of Ideas. These four together are called the 'self'.

§ 3. When you have acquired thorough knowledge of the 'self' as

² The comma of the Malay transcription belongs after, not before *hanja*.

explained above, you know God, for the Fixed Prototypes comprise the ideal prototypes of all things exterior to God's knowledge, all alike. The World of Spirits.... etc.

§ 5. The gnostics who have attained perfection deny and affirm, that is to say: When they declare *Lā ilāha illā 'llāh*, i.e. God is the Only Being, they attribute non-being to the phaenomenal world and attribute being to God's Essence. The 'self' is only the manifestation of God's Essence and Attributes, and that is why non-being is attributed to it. When it has been reduced to non-existence God's Absolute Essence i.e. God's Real Being remains for ever. —

Menapikan (occurring here in § 5 and in Tract 7 § 9) and its opposite *mengithbatkan* are not only used in their ordinary meaning of 'deny' and 'affirm' but also in that of 'to attribute non-being to' and 'to attribute being to'.

In this kind of literature, both in Javanese and Malay, *napi* often denotes Arab. *ma'dūm*, non-existent. So for instance Schrieke, *Het Boek van Bonang* (Leiden, 1915) p. 112, last lines: *Sira Pangéran ma'dūm binafsihi*, is glossed: *sira Pangéran napi*. On p. 115 the same Arabic words are explained by: *nora ing dèwèké*. Thus *ma'dūm* = *napi* = *nora*, to be non-existent.

Sometimes *napi* is a synonym of *liwung*, which in Javanese represents Arab. *al-ʿatl*, the void. So for instance Schrieke *o.c.* p. 94: *napining Allah* is followed by the glosse *liwunging Allah*, whereas *liwung napi dhāt Allah* is explained by: *nora ing dèwèké* (= Arab. *ma'dūm bi-nafsihi*).

Menapikan, therefore, may be used in the sense of: to consider as non-existent, to attribute non-being to, just like Jav. *anapèkken* (Zoetmulder, *o.c.* p. 199).

Tract 3.

§ 1 (l. 3). The true significance of knowing one's self is to know one's self as existing in God's knowledge, i.e. to know one's self as an object of His Knowledge. When you have realized this and, further, comprehend that God's Knowledge for ever coheres with His Knowing and His Knowing with His Being, then you certainly have grasped the connection with God and understand how it is that you are one with Him, etc.

§ 2. If this be so it is the duty of everyone who strives after knowing God to know that He is eternal in His Essence and that this outer 'self' will return to that Inward Essence. Said Shaikh Hamza:

If ye, o seekers, really want to return to the state of 'hidden treasure', then be enamoured of your real self. That is the meaning of perpetual prayer. Etc.

§ 3 (l. 7). What is called coming is the overflow of Pure Being into this world of possible existents, as the (actual) existence of possible existents is part of the manifestations of God in both worlds, the visible and the invisible. For this world of possible existents has neither

being nor power, and what has neither being nor power cannot possibly exist by itself, as its "being" is only derived being.

§ 4. Said Shaikh Hamza:

This wisdom is shared by all the wise:

Make yourself familiar with the form of 'self'.

Tread warily on the path towards knowing God.

Whosoever studies with a teacher cannot go astray.

§ 5 (1. 3). For the many beings that are to be seen merely manifest the Being of the One, and the many attributes that are to be seen merely manifest the Attributes of the One etc.

(1. 6). As it says in the *Rubāʿī* (name of a poem or a collection of poems by Hamza).

Tract 4.

§ 3. God brought into existence the World of Spirits, the World of Ideas, the World of Bodies and (the World of) Man, because He wished to manifest (more explicitly) His manifestations of Himself at the grades of *Wahda* and *Wāḥidiyya*. If then you are asked whether these four worlds exist at both grades, treat the question in a fundamental way and answer: These four worlds do exist at the grade of *wahda*, only in a general sense, i.e. as to their essence; likewise they exist at the grade of *wāḥidiyya*, but here their existence is qualified, i.e. they are determined as World of Spirits, Worlds of Ideas, World of Bodies and World of Man. That is to say, each of these four worlds in its own specific determination exists by virtue of the determinations (at the grade of *wāḥidiyya*) mentioned just now; these, however, exist only in thought, i.e. as ideas, not as entities, i.e. they have no existence of their own.

§ 4 (1. 5). And whosoever says that these four worlds exist at both grades in their present condition, viz. as separate entities, temporal in existence and bound to perish, that man is an unbeliever in the opinion of the gnostics, for that is tantamount to saying that temporality and dissolution reside in God. The only true answer to the question is that these four worlds all do exist at the grade of *wahda*, only in a general sense i.e. as to their essence, and that all of them exist at the grade of *wāḥidiyya*, but that here their existence is qualified, i.e. they are determined as World of Spirits, World of Ideas, World of Bodies and World of Man. That is to say: each of these worlds in its specific determination exists by virtue of the determinations (at the grade of *wāḥidiyya*) mentioned just now. These, however, are determinations existing only in thought, not in fact, i.e. their existence is ideal, not actual.

Tract 5.

§ 1 (1. 6). After: first determination, add: and that of *wahda*.

§ 5 (1. 5). Predispositions and relations, read: Predispositions and indications (of further developments).

(1. 6). These predispositions which lie hidden in *wahda* the men of

God call *Lofty Letters* when they represent the determination of all things which exist eternally in the Eternal Knowledge seen from the aspect of non-differentiation; when, however, these predispositions represent the determination of all things which exist eternally in the Eternal Knowledge seen from the aspect of differentiation, they call them *Fixed Prototypes*.

§ 7 (1. 3).*dengan nyata tafsili* = in detail; not: in their generality.

Tract 6.

§ 1 (1. 2). When God wished to reveal Himself He manifested His attribute of knowledge, at which grade there became manifest in Him a seer.... etc.

Tract 7.

§ 3 (1. 7). *sa-benar Hakk ta'ala* = *dhāt allāh*, cf. Tract 3 § 2 and Tract 12 § 6: *sa-benar-benar dirinya* = *dhātuhu*. Therefore, the preceding *mir'ātu 'l-haqq wa 'l-haqqā* should not be translated: the Mirror of Reality and Truth, but: the Mirror of God and the inner reality (of creation), conformably to the Malay version and as explained in the next words: because the Essence of God and the inner realities of all things are reflected in it.

(1. 9). *tuboh yang menanggung* = substratum.

(1. 12).because the spheres of being and determination clearly originate from it.

§ 4 (1. 2 and 5).a light unequalled in its essence, brightness and clearness, and without modality....

....lights which have something like to their essence, their brightness and their clearness; they have modality.... etc.

§ 5 (1. 1). *Ruh Insan* = Spirit of Man; there is no reason for a plural.

§ 6. The Spirit of Man has many names. It is called the Spirit of Man because it gives life to man; in its turn it receives life from the Holy Spirit (*ruh al-kudus*) which is its life.

Another name of it is heart (*qalb*), because it is by means of the 'heart' that man 'revolves' ideas and forms an opinion; but the heart of man is like a mould of light and the *ruh al-kudus* is the focus of the heart. —

In Arabic, *qalb* not only means 'heart', but also: mind.

Berbalēk-balēk is the translation of Arabic *qallaba*, to turn over and over, by which verb the meaning of *qalb* is explained, but this etymology of *qalb* given in the Arabic original becomes incomprehensible in the Malay translation.

§ 9 (1. 1. but 3). For this reason the men of God attribute non-being to the various determinations as belonging to creation, and attribute being to God who is one etc..... (cf. Tract 2 § 5).

Tract 9.

§ 5. The grade of *ilāhiyya* (godhead) is the grade of the manifestation of God's Essence under the name Allah. This name comprises and covers all His other names such as the Living One.... etc. By reason of this the gnostics teach that the name Allah is identical with as well as distinct from the other names and that is why they only make use of this name when practising *dhikr*.

Tract 10.

§ 5 (1. 5).to follow the path of extinction in God and immortalizing himself in God i.e. the substitution of his human attributes by the attributes of God which become apparent in him (literally: the shaking off of his human attributes while consolidating the divine ones which....). This takes place at the grade of those saints who have attained *qurb nawāfil*. This shaking off and consolidating is hinted at by the words of the creed: *Lā ilāha illā 'llāh*. —

What the author means to say by his interpretation of the words *fanā' fī 'llāh baqā' bi 'llāh* is: *al-fanā' fī ṣifāti 'llāh 'an ṣifātihi*. As to this, one may compare Ibn al-ʿArabī's *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* (with the commentary of al-Kāshānī, Kairo, 1321) p. 118, where the author quoting a wellknown tradition says: *fa-minnā man yakūnu 'l-ḥaqq samʿahu wabaṣarahu wajamīʿa quwwāti jawārihihi* etc..

The commentator remarks: *al-mutaḥaqqiq bi 'l-ḥaqq huwa 'llādhī fanā fī ṣifāti 'l-ḥaqq 'an ṣifātihi fa-qāma 'l-ḥaqq maqāma ṣifātihi, aw fī dhāti 'l-ḥaqq 'an dhātihi fa-qāma 'l-ḥaqq maqāma dhātihi* etc.

So beside substitution of attributes he distinguishes substitution of essence — which is a higher stage than that of attributes. The commentator adds that the saints of the first named stage enjoy *qurb al-nawāfil*, those of the second stage *qurb al-farā'id*, which implies a still closer proximity to God. To them applies Qur'an 8, 17: *wa-mā ramaita idh ramaita walākinna 'llāha ramā*, "nor didst thou shoot when thou didst shoot, but God did shoot".

The "nearness of the supererogatory works" derives its name from the wording of the tradition referred to above: *Lā yazālu 'l-ʿabd yataqarrabu ilayya bi 'l-nawāfil hattā uḥibbuhu fa-idhā aḥbabtuhu kuntu samʿahu 'llādhī yasmaʿu bihi wa-baṣarahu 'llādhī yabṣiru bihi*.... etc., i.e.: The servant incessantly draws nearer to Me by supererogatory works so that I love him, and when I love him I am his ear through which he hears and his eye through which he sees etc.....

Tract 11.

§ 1 (1. 2). The Fixed Prototypes, i.e. fixed in the divine knowledge, depend on the divine names. Within the divine knowledge they represent the primordial stage of the different forms comprised by that knowledge as predispositions within the essence.... etc.

ya'ni yang nyata dengan nyata segala laku dhat Hakk ta'ala is the

interpretation of: *berpakaian shu'un dhatnya* and may be omitted in the translation.

Tract 12.

§ 6 (l. 1). To symbolize the extinction in God and the immortalizing of oneself in God, the gnostics obliterate the line that is drawn in the essence as represented by that circle but preserve the place where the line was, only void of the line — i.e. the Absolute represented by the *dhat* of that circle — because the line represents the essence of the mystic's own being becoming manifest in God's knowledge which subsists in His Essence. So when the true gnostic loses the essence of his being in gnosis, ecstasy or contemplation, that what remains in his gnosis, ecstasy or contemplation is the Absolute Essence. He has certainly become extinct in God and achieved permanence in God.

§ 7. With the gnostics that which symbolizes *dhikr*...., *murāqabah*...., *tawajjuh*.... and *mushāhadah*...., is the same circle wherein a line is drawn (?).

Appendix 4.

DOORENBOS, *De Geschriften van Hamzah Pansoeri*; p. 191 et seq.

Know that the gnostics name the innermost essence of God 'non-determination' because it cannot be attained by intellectual reasoning, knowledge or gnosis, while even the prophets and the saints stand bewildered. That is why the Prophet said: "Praise unto Thee! We have no adequate knowledge of Thee!"....

First of all there was a fourfold particularisation, viz. into Knowledge, Being, Vision and Light. This fourfold particularisation is called: first determination.

Because there was Knowledge, the knower and the known became distinct.

Because there was Being, creator and creature became distinct.

Because there was Vision, the seer and the seen became distinct.

Because there was Light, that what is illuminated and that what illuminates became distinct.

All these belong to the first determination; knower and known, first and last, outward and inward became distinct by their names.

To 'the known' the mystics give the name of: Fixed Prototypes; others call it the (latent) realities of things; while still others call it the conceptual forms or the Spirit of relation. All these are reckoned as second determination.

The spirits of man, of the animal kingdom and of the vegetable kingdom are reckoned as third determination. The fourth and fifth determinations are the corporeal determinations comprising all living creatures in their endless variety of particular forms.

Knowledge, Being, Vision and Light are not divorced from all these determinations, for were it not for these four, the four determinations (which come after the first) would not exist. For this reason the mystics say: The being of the world is the Being of God.

As to the being of the world: contrary to our opinion the world has no being, as its being depends upon the One Being which differentiates itself. It is only our heedlessness which makes us think that the world has being.

The first determination is called *aḥad* and *wāḥid*. When we consider the Essence in itself it is called *aḥad*; when on the other hand we attribute to it its attributes and names, it is called *wāḥid*, for *aḥad* is called *wāḥid* when it is considered as comprising creation in its entirety, from first to last.

Appendix 3.

Before trying my hand at an emended translation of the stanzas quoted in Zoetmulder's thesis pp. 109—110, 113 I wish to make a few preliminary remarks.

The first is concerned with the meanings of a number of words which occur in these stanzas and are misunderstood by Zoetmulder as well as by Johns, following in his wake. These words are: *aib*, *rasanipun*, *bénah*, *awali* and *makhum*.

1. *aib* (st. 15 l. 7). Both Zoetmulder and Johns read *aib* (in Javanese spelling *ha-ib*, with *aksara swara i*) as *ghaib* and translate 'hiddenness' (Z.: *verborgenheid*; Arabic *ghayb*). But there can be no doubt that *ha-ib* = Arab. *ghā'ib*, which in Arabic as well as in various Indonesian languages not only means 'hidden' but also: vanished, absent, non-extant. According to Javanese prosody lines 6 and 7 must be taken together, and rightly so, for instead of marking the beginning of a fresh sentence line 7 is a sequel to line 6. It conveys the same idea as the preceding line only couched in different words. Parallelisms of this kind are very frequent in Javanese poetry; they abound even in these few stanzas. Therefore, the translation of lines 6 and 7 should be:

The *ma-lumāt* (intelligibles) are not yet in existence; their name is (they have to be called): non-extant.

2. *rasanipun* (st. 16 l. 4). The context leaves no doubt that this word is *rasan* + *ipun*, not *rasa* + *nipun*, as tentatively already suggested by Zoetmulder (thesis p. 366) but eventually rejected by him in favour of the other interpretation. Johns has followed Zoetmulder in his translation of this line ("This being is... beyond experience"). But here too both Zoetmulder and Johns have dissected the stanza wrongly. Lines 4 and 5 belong together; line 5 gives the motivation of the preceding words so that in my opinion the correct translation is as follows:

One cannot (even) talk about it,

since the attributes and the names have not yet become manifest.

3. *bénah* (st. 16 l. 6). Zoetmulder interprets *bénah* as deriving from Arabic *bayyina*, decisive proof; Johns translates: outward sign, apparently accepting Zoetmulder's derivation. But this word is not to be derived from the Arabic, but from Skr. *bhinna*. It means: distinct, different; one may compare J. Gonda, *Sanskrit in Indonesia* p. 85,

where besides Bal. *bina* Jav. *béna(h)* should have been mentioned. Here again Zoetmulder and Johns have failed to observe that lines 6 and 7 belong together. They form a sentence of a well-known syntactical structure viz. a negative communication followed by an exception introduced by *anging* (corresponding to Arabic *lā... illā...*). The translation of these lines should be:

For as yet nothing distinct (from Him) exists,

Only He (is),

which in Javanese of this kind is the common way of saying: For there still does not exist anything beside Him. One may compare the Jav. translation of the *shahāda*: *Orana Pangéran sabeneré anging Allah uga*, There is no god but Allah, and sentences like: *norana amudjia ing anané anging sifaté amudji ing dhaté*, only His attributes praise His Essence (Schrieke, *Het Boek van Bonang*, p. 95).

4. *awali* (st. 25 l. 5). Following Zoetmulder Johns has translated *awali* by return (Jav. *bali, wali*). But, as already stated by Van der Tuuk, *Kawi-Bal.-Ned. Wdbk.* s.v. *wali, mawali* (= *awali*) means: *gumanti, sumilih*, i.e. to take the place of, to replace. The reduplicated form i.a. can have iterative and intensive meaning³: (a)*wali-wali* = to change places repeatedly; with negation: not change at all. Allah is said to be *tan asipat wali-wali*, not possessed of attributes which are subject to change (Schrieke *o.c.* passim). Obviously the words *tan kena awali* or *tan (a)wali-wali* are translations of Arabic *lā tanqalibu* so that the meaning of st. 25 l. 4 and 5 is:

Not a single intelligible can be replaced by another (i.e.: the intelligibles are not interchangeable, Arabic: *al-ma^clūmāt lā tanqalibu*).

5. *makhum* (st. 50 l. 8). Zoetmulder (*o.c.* p. 370) has a note on the possible meaning of *makhum*. Tentatively he suggests two — in his opinion equally improbable — derivations of this word, whereas in his translation of the stanza (*o.c.* p. 119) it is left untranslated. Johns omits the line without further notice.

In my opinion the solution of this puzzling word is a very simple one. I take it as a scribal error for *mashūm*. The manuscript is a not very old copy, dating from the first half of the XIXth century. It is written in Javanese character but it may have been, nay most probably was copied from an original in Arabic script (*pégon*). A copyist not familiar with the Arabic language could easily read *makhum* instead of *mashūm*.

This stanza seems to convey the same idea as the passus from Ibn al-^cArabi's *Futūhāt* translated by M. Asín Palacios in his *El Místico murciano Abenarabi IV* (Extracto del Boletín de la Academia de la Historia 1928) pp. 93, 94:

"Cuando Dios hubo creado el mundo sin el *Hombre Perfecto*, es decir, sin el hombre en conjunto o compendio, comenzó por adaptar o confrontar la forma de éste con la forma del mundo entero. De modo que no hay parte alguna del mundo que no se encuentre en la forma

³ Cf. UHLENBECK, *Verdubbelingsprocédé's bij het Jav. werkwoord*, B.K.I. 110 (1954) p. 372.

del hombre, y entiendo por mundo todo lo que no es Dios. Hecha esta adaptación, separó Dios al hombre del mundo. Y después de esto, lo confrontó idealmente con la majestad de los nombres divinos, y estos nombres aparecieron en él, al modo como aparecen en al espejo los imágenes a los ojos del que mira... etc." —

All divine names becoming manifest in the Perfect Man he may well be called *mafhum al-asmā'*, the meaning of all names. —

My second remark is concerned with the rules of Javanese prosody.

When analysing the contents of these stanzas both Zoetmulder and Johns overlooked the valuable aid to translating *tembang* which is offered by Javanese prosody. So, for instance, by not giving heed to the *guru wilangan* of the *dandanggula* metre, i.e. the number of syllables prescribed for each line, Johns has failed to observe that in Zoetmulder's transcription of stanza 20 not less than eight syllables are missing after line 8. The XIXth century copyist cannot be blamed, for the MS. has a complete line of 12 syllables:

1. 8. Singgih amba singgih tuwan,
1. 9. Ja Muhammad singgih tuwan singgih djati,
1. 10. Ja amba ja Muhammad.

Far more serious, however, is that neither of them heeded the caesurae, as already will have become apparent from the discussion of terms dealt with in the preceding remark. Therefore, a short exposition of the rules of caesura does not look out of place here.

One should always keep in mind that Javanese poetry is primarily meant to be sung (or hummed), not to be read silently. In singing one needs breath, and therefore breathing places or caesurae have to be put in, first of all the minor caesurae or *pedotan*, then the major pauses called *ukara*.⁴

The *pedotan* (lit.: break, interruption) are distributed over each single line, preferably in such a way that they coincide with the end of a word or a small group or unit of words. The better a poet succeeds in reaching this goal the higher his art is valued.

In a stanza of the *dandanggula* metre the *pedotan* have to be distributed as follows:

- in ll. 1 and 2, each containing 10 syllables: 4-4-2 or 4-3-3 or 4-2-4;
- in ll. 3 and 8, 8 syllables: 4-4 or 3-3-2 or 3-2-3;
- in ll. 4, 6 and 10, 7 syllables: 4-3 or 3-4 or 2-3-2;
- in l. 5, 9 syllables: 4-3-2 or 4-2-3;
- in l. 7, 6 syllables: 4-2 or 3-3 or 2-4;
- in l. 9, 12 syllables: 4-4-4 or 4-3-3-2 or 4-3-2-3.

The application of this scheme to stanza 16 gives the following result:

1. malaékat/ kang mukarab/ sami,
2. tan amanggih/ ing kunhi/ taala,
3. tan na weruh/ ing anané,

⁴ Cf. M. HARDJAWIRAGA, *Patokaning njekaraken* (Manual of metrical composition), Balai Pustaka serieno. 725, pp. 18, 25—29.

4. tan wonten/ rasanipun,
5. sipat asma/ pan durung/ lair,
6. bènah pan/ durung ana,
7. anging/ dèwèkipun,
8. ingaranan/ wudjud mahal,
9. dad semata/-jin ajum/ anané/ sepi,
10. sapa wruha/ ing kana.

The *peḍotan* shows that one has to read *dad semata-jin ajum* (with contraction of the final *a* of *semata* with the initial *a* of *ajin*) and not *dad semat* (= Arab. *dhāt šamad*) *ajin ajum*, as Zoetmulder did. *Dad semata* is almost the same as *wudjud mahal* (= Arab. *wujūd mahd*, pure being), so that by the use of these words lines 9 and 10 link up with line 8.

Now the system of *peḍotan* would meet the need of breathing places if every line contained a full sentence. Telegraphic brevity, however, is not the ideal of Javanese poetry. Most sentences contain more than the exact number of syllables allowed for in each line of a stanza of a given metre, so that they exceed the limits of one line. On the other hand the poet is not entirely free in fixing the length of his sentences: he has to observe the rules of *ukara*. In Javanese grammatical terminology *ukara* means sentence, but when applied to versification it indicates the distribution within a stanza of the obligatory pauses that mark the end of a sentence and the beginning of a fresh one.

In the case of the *ḍaṇḍanggula* metre the ten lines of each stanza have to be distributed over four, or at the utmost five, sentences, in this way: ll. 1, 2, 3; ll. 4, 5; ll. 6, 7; ll. 8, 9, 10 (or 1. 8; ll. 9, 10).

So stanza 16, scanned completely, reads as follows ⁵:

1. malaékat/ kang mukarab/ sami,
2. tan amanggih/ ing kunhi/ taala,
3. tan na weruh/ ing anané.//
4. Tan wonten/ rasanipun,
5. sipat asma/ pan durung/ lair.//
6. Bènah pan/ durung ana,
7. anging/ dèwèkipun.//
8. Ingaranan/ wudjud makal.//
9. Dad semata/-jin ajum/ anané/ sepi,
10. sapa wruha/ ing kana.

The first half of stanza 23 may be quoted here to show that these rules are not too strict and that a certain measure of liberty is left to the poet.

- st. 23: Lawan ana pralambiné malih, .
 kadi mangsi kang ana (ing) waḍah.//
 Sagungé aksara kabèh,
 ing dalem mangsi kumpul,
 nora béda kurub sawidji.// etc.

⁵ / indicates a *peḍotan*, // an *ukara*; the end of a line is marked by a comma; before an *ukara* by a full stop.

My final remark regards the contents of the stanzas in general. The poem from which the quotations in Zoetmulder's thesis pp. 124—125 and 109—114 are taken, is not a spontaneous creation. It seems to be a rather amplified as well as simplified versification of a treatise on the doctrine of the seven grades, either Muḥammad b. Faḍlullāh's *Tuhfa* itself (cf. Johns' extract on p. 101) or, more probably, a Javanese prose tract based upon it. Such tracts are found in the primbons; see for instance Cod. Or. Leiden 7475, a copy of a primbon from Banjarmas, pp. 73 sqq.⁶). No doubt a further scanning of primbon MSS. will bring to light other copies of the same tract in more or less divergent redactions and similar texts. It is among treatises of this kind that one must look for the prose original of the *tembang* version quoted by Zoetmulder. A previous edition of the Arabic text of the *Tuhfa* accompanied by a translation, would facilitate the search for this tract.

What follows now is a translation of the stanzas 6—14 (text in Zoetmulder, *o.c.* p. 124—125) which precede the stanzas translated by Johns in Appendix 3, by way of an introduction to the doctrine of the seven grades contained in the stanzas 15—25 and 50. The latter stanzas will be given in Jav. text and translation.

6. Phenomenal being is called metaphorical being because it exists only through its essence.
Ideal being is not at variance with it, it is the same.
The situation may be compared with that of Wisnu and Kresna.
When Wisnu had assumed the form of Kresna, this outward form was a shadow of the real Wisnu, the essence of the noble Kresna.
7. All-powerful, the revered real Kresna is the one who is venerated by all the world, (although) nobody is aware of his activity.
For the real Kresna is Wisnu; they are not individual persons: Essentially they are one.
The reason for the creation of the world was to display the skillfulness of Lord Wisnu, revealing himself in (the outward form of) the noble Kresna.
8. The situation is comparable with that of a panel on which a picture is painted. In its entirety the picture is visible on the panel; its purpose is to represent something.
The form of the panel is the form of the picture.
They cannot be separated one from another.....⁷

⁶ Cod. Or. Leiden 8586 is a copy in Latin character of this MS., made for Dr D. A. Rinkes. The tract referred to is on pp. 28—32. The framework of this treatise seems almost the same as that of the poem and even the words are sometimes identical, only the author, besides being rather wordy, is at great pains to give a running commentary as well, adding *tegesé*... to all and sundry. One of the major differences is that in the poetical version an undue amount of attention is paid to the question of the 'fixed prototypes' (*ʿaṣyān thābita*), once a very controversial point in Indonesian Islam. Zoetmulder (*o.c.* p. 121) already noticed the circumstantial treatment of this question and suggested that a number of stanzas on the *ʿaṣyān* might be interpolated.

⁷ Text: *sangsaja atuduh*. The meaning of these words escapes me.

only, the one along with the other.

The picture, however, has the shape given to it by the painter, not a different one.

9. The Being of God is above form and outward appearance, it is not subject to change.
But afterwards all visible things came into being and became manifest in this world.
The Being of God, however, is now as it was before.
It does not suffer change or alteration, as it is everlasting.
10. The Being of God has no form or outward appearance; it shows no variety as it is not affected by the plurality of visible things.
But an uninitiated person does not grasp the real situation.
He sticks at the outward forms and his vision is blurred.
He is quite at sea
.....⁸ because he has lost his way and gone astray.
11. But whosoever has been imparted true initiation knows all things he considers as 'possible existents' for what they really are.
He does not stick at the visible things because he sees them as reflections in a mirror.
A man whose vision has attained the Being of God
sees all things which have metaphorical being as revealed in a mirror.
12. Whosoever knows Reality knows the being of shadows as non-being⁹, since in fact they are not.
They only can act conformably to what they reflect.
Their being as well as their movements are illusory.
They only follow the movements of what they reflect, as shadows of the Real Being.
13. No creature whatsoever is devoid of the Being of God.
Nothing exists outside the Being of the Lord Most High, all things alike being encompassed by Him.
Even the smallest particle is not devoid of God,
as everything is encompassed by Him,
before the world expanded into being and afterwards.
14. Each single thing was encompassed by Him before the world expanded into being, as it existed already in its conceptual form.
Before it came into actual being it was already destined in His Knowledge.
After it has sprung into phenomenal existence its being remains the same.
Through the power, will and knowledge (of God) everything is now as it was before, without any difference.

⁸ Text: *upamané lir dalam atuduh margi*: he is comparable to a road which shows the way? I don't know what this means.

⁹ Text: *nora*, cf. p. 287.

ZOETMULDER, *Pantheïsme en Monïsme in de Jav. Soeloek-litteratuur*; p. 109.

15. Angandika sèh kang luwih ngarip, [t]andarbèni ananing Hjang Suksma, martabat pitu anané// kang sawidji la takjun, tegesipun martabat sepi// maklumat durung ana, (gh)ā'ib djenengipun// ingaranan dat mutelak// kunhining Hjang tan anemu wong sawidji, nabi wali tan ana.
16. malaékat kang mukarab sami, tan amanggih ing kunhi tangala, tan na weruh ing anané// tan wonten rasanipun, sipat asma pan durung lair// bènah pan durung ana, anging dèwèkipun// ingaranan wudjud mahal// dad semata-jin ajum¹⁰ anané sepi, sapa wruha ing kana.
17. (s)ing sapa wruh ing kunhi sedjati, mangka dadi wong iku kesar, anégakaken umuré// singsapa ngaku weruh, sira kon angèmpèri langit// ambutula pratata, nawu samudra gung// surja wulan agawéa// jèn sira anemu kunhi sedjati, iku wangsiting kita.
18. sakèh martabat tan angluhuri, ing martabat akadijat ika, sadaja anèngandapé//lan kaping kalhipun, ingaranan wahdat sedjati// ija martabat wahdat, witing takjun iku// kakékat mukamadijah (/) kang kasuksma ing rahsaning Hjang sedjati, ing djro su'un datijah.
19. sagungé para kakékat sami, apan ta durung pinisah-pisah, dé maksih kumpul¹¹ anané// ing dalam sukun iku, nora béda maklum sawidji// kasuksma dalem wahdat, maksih kumpul iku// kasuksmèng mukamadijah (/) kang minangka wiwitan gèning tadjali, ing dalem su'uning Hjang.
20. pangandikanira sèh Muhjidin, wali kutub kang abangsa ngarab, ing dalem batin wuwusé// ana ing djero ingsun, kang aluhur nora angalih// tetep ing dalem dérah, kalarat kang luhur// singgih amba singgih tuwan// ja Muḥammad singgih tuwan singgih djati, ja amba ja Muḥammad.
21. kang ingaranan wahdat sadjati, iku kakékat mukamadijah, kasuksmèng dalem su'uné// ngèlmu ngaliman maklum, nora béda kukumé iki// wahdat tan ana lijan, ing martabat iku// sagungé para

¹⁰ *ajin ajum* = Arab. *ʿayn al-ʿayn*.

¹¹ Jav. *kumpul*, translated here and in st. 21 by: being together, is a loan-translation of Arabic *mujmal*, collected (into a small compass), summed up, and *fi 'l-ʿijmāl*, summarily, in a general way. In st. 23 the literal meaning seems to prevail.

15. The Being of God has seven grades. The first is *lā taʿayyun* (non-determination) i.e. the grade of voidness. The intelligibles are not yet in existence; they have to be called non-extant. This grade is named Absolute Essence. Nobody can attain the Essence of God; even among the prophets and saints there is none.
16. Not even the angels who are near (the throne) can attain the innermost Being of God, (as) nobody whosoever knows His Being¹². One cannot (even) talk about it, since the attributes and names have not yet become manifest. For there still does not exist anything beside Him. He is called Pure Being. This Pure Essence, the Self of Selves, still devoid of manifestation: who could have knowledge of it?
17. Whosoever strives to know the real innermost Being, that man has gone astray and is playing with his life. Whosoever claims to know it, let him build a shed over the sky; let him pass into the bowels of the earth by bailing out the ocean; let him make a sun and a moon! That is my counsel when you should claim to have reached the real innermost Being of God.
18. None of the (seven) grades is higher than that of *ahadiyya*; the (six) other grades are all below it. The second grade is called real *wahda*.¹³ The grade of *wahda* marks the beginning of determination; it is (the grade of) the Reality that is Muḥammad, still subsisting in the Hidden Being of God, in the predispositions within His Essence.
19. For the inner realities of things are still undifferentiated one from another, being still together. In the predispositions within the Essence as yet no intelligible is distinct. In their primordial state at the grade of *wahda* they are still together, contained in the Reality that is Muḥammad which marks the beginning of irradiation, in the predispositions within the Essence.
20. Shaikh Muḥyi 'l-Dīn, the Pole of Arab lineage, once said to himself: Inwardly I the most high do not shift; I am constantly within the circle of the Exalted Presence. I am You; Muḥammad is You and is Reality; I am Muḥammad.
21. What is named real *wahda* is the Reality that is Muḥammad, implied in the predispositions (within the Essence). Knowledge, Knower and Known are not yet distinct. (Beside the Reality that

¹² Translation of Arabic: *Lāsa liḥāṭihi wāqifun*, quoted in the original language in the Javanese text edited by B. J. O. Schrieke (thesis pp. 94, 145).

¹³ The addition 'real' may be a stop-gap — as suggested by Zoetmulder — and therefore redundant, or it may denote that at the grade of *wahda* the unity of all things is still more absolute than at the grade of *wāḥidiyya*.

kakékat, maksih kumpul ing martabat wahdat djati, dèrèng apisah-pisah.

22. pralambiné kang wahdat sedjati, sebdané ingkang alul kakékat, lir widji ing pralambiné// uwit pang goḍong iku, pan kasuksma ing dalem widji// durung apisah-pisah, wit pang goḍongipun// pang goḍong mangka angutjap, upamané ija sira ija mami, puniku widji tunggal.
23. lawan ana pralambiné malih, kadi mangsi kang ana (ing) wadāh// sagungé aksara kabèh, ing dalem mangsi kumpul, nora béda kurub sawidji// mangkana ta ing wahdat, ing pralambinipun// sagungé aksara kotjap// salairé singgih tuwan singgih mami, sadèrèng pisah-pisah.
24. kaping tiga dèn sami ngawruhi, ing martabat wakidijat ika, ing takjun sani arané// pangawruhing Hjang Agung, ing datira iku pribadi// miwah ing sipat asma, djroning maklumipun// dadalan apisah-pisah// ing sakèhé maklumat pan sampun pesti, ing dalem ngèlmuning Hjang.
25. datan kinèn angutjapa malih, ing martabat nenggih wakidijat, déné wus pesti anané// sawidji-widji maklum, datan kena iku awali// kadi ing dalem wahdad, kukuming Hjang dawuh, ing martabat wakidijat// wus pinastī maklumat déning Hjang Widi, ing dalem wahdat ika.
50. sagungé martabat iku sami, akumpul anèng martabat insan, iku enggoné njatané// tadjalining Hjang Agung, goning njata akumul samī// wahdat mring wakidijat, lan kang karidj iku// dju-djuluké mafhūm (?) asma// pakumpulan iku enggoné tadjali, njata nabi mustapa.

- is Muhammad) there is nothing else at the grade of *wahda*. The inner realities of all things are still together at the grade of real *wahda*; they are not yet differentiated one from another.
22. The gnostics compare real *wahda* to a seed. For in a seed stem, branches and leaves are contained, in a still undifferentiated state. Branches and leaves, they say, are comparable to you and me, in so far as we (too) have sprung from one and the same seed.¹⁴
 23. Another simile is that *wahda* is comparable to the ink in an inkpot. All letters are together in the ink; as yet not a single one is distinct. A similar situation obtains in *wahda*: all letters¹⁵ are extant (literally: are spoken), but on the outside you are I as long as we are not distinct one from another.
 24. Thirdly you should know the grade of *wāḥidiyya*, called second determination. It represents God's knowing of His Essence, Attributes and Names in His knowledge, all these as separate entities. For all the intelligibles are predetermined in the knowledge of God.
 25. There is no need to speak at greater length of *wāḥidiyya*, as here (all) being has acquired its predestined form. Not a single intelligible can be substituted by another. The decree of the Lord at the grade of *wāḥidiyya* is conformable to (the predispositions at) the grade of *wahda*, since at this grade the intelligibles were predetermined by God.
 50. All these grades come together at the grade of Man; here they become manifest. He (the Perfect Man) is the irradiation of the Lord Most High, wherein the grades all together become manifest: *wahda* and *wāḥidiyya* as well as the exterior grades. His name encompasses all (Divine) names and this totality is manifested most clearly in the Chosen Prophet.

¹⁴ The last 3 lines may also be translated: If branches and leaves were capable of speech (they would say:) You and I are identical, in so far as we are (contained in) one and the same seed.

¹⁵ A reference to Ibn al-ʿArabi's well-known lines: *Kuwwā ḥurūfān ʿaliyātīn*, we were lofty letters, etc.?

ERRATA

On p. 35 the author puts 'an accurate transcription of these tracts' first among the aims of his thesis. But alas, human performance lags ever behind human intention so that I could not help noticing the following errata, for part of which it seems that the printer is to be blamed. The list is not intended to be exhaustive.

Introduction.

- p. 5, l. 18 Kraemer's thesis was published in 1921. The author does not mention my translation of the same primbon, accompanied by a re-edition of the text which appeared in 1954 as publication no. 15 of the De Goeje Stichting.
- p. 7, l. 2 S-gh-k-h, r. s-ng-g-h.
l. 4 s-b-g-l, r. s-g-l.
l. 19 *awugerahai*, r. *awugerahāi*.
- p. 10, l. 9 Quashāshī, r. Qushāshī.
p. 10, l. 4 from below, *ita*, r. *itu*.
p. 12, note 1 gnostishe r. gnostische; Ḥadīṭ r. Ḥadīth.
- p. 18, ll. 19, 34 *ḥaḳīḳatu*, r. *ḥaḳīḳatu*.
p. 26, l. 6 *canāsir*, r. *canāsir*.
p. 27, l. 19 from below, *mukālafatuhu li'l-ḥawādīth*, r. *mukhālafatuhu li 'l-ḥawādīth*.
l. 13 from below, *Hayy*, r. *Hayy*.
l. 12 from below, *sāmīc*, r. *sāmīc*.
p. 36, l. 4 from below, *baḳā'bi'llāh*, r. *baḳā' bi'llāh*.

Tract 1.

MS.

- p. 3, l. 5 li^canna r. li'anna.
p. 6, l. 2 i^cbārāti r. *ṣibārāti*; note 3, *ṣibārāti*, r. *ṣibārāti*.
l. 3 'l-maknūnāti 'l-maknūzati r. 'l-maknūnata 'l-maknūzata.
l. 4 mahzara r. mazhara.
- p. 9, l. 3 dar-, r. dari-.
- p. 22, l. 3 nafshihi r. nafsīhi.
- p. 24, l. 4 mukakkin r. muhakkikin.
- p. 27, l. 1 *ṣilmu* r. *ṣilmu*.
- p. 32, l. 2 'l-ashya'i r. 'l-ashyā'i.
- p. 38/39 ... Aku yang sa-benar-nya itu. Maka ada lah... r. Aku yang sa-benarnya itu, maka ada lah...
- p. 45, l. 1 *ṣulama'i* r. *ṣulamā'i*.
- p. 49, l. 1 la^callā r. la^calā.
- p. 50, l. 2 karene r. karena.
- p. 53, l. 5 bima^carafta r. bima *ṣarafta*.
- p. 56, l. 1 awwaliyyatihi r. awwaliyyatahu.
akhiriyyatihi r. ākhiriyyatihi.
akiriyyatihi r. ākhiriyyatahu.
l. 3 bāṭiniyyatihi r. bāṭiniyyatahu.
- p. 57, l. 3 'l-asma'i 'l-muttaṣifātu r. 'l-asma'i 'l-muttaṣifatu.
- p. 59, l. 3 fa kat r. faḳaṭ.
- p. 60, l. 3 ismu yang lain-nya, hanya tiada r. ismu yang lainnya hanya, tiada.
- p. 63, l. 1 'l-jawābu^canhu r. 'l-jawābu *ṣanhu*.
al-awwaliyyati r. al-awwaliyyata.
bi ma^cnā iftitāhi r. bi ma^cnā 'ftitāhi.
- p. 69, l. 5 orang^cam r. orang *ṣam*.
- p. 73, l. 3 yukhayala r. yukhayyala.
- p. 74, ll. 4/5 di-mushahdahkan r. di-mushahadahkan.
- p. 75, l. 4 'l-*ṣuyā* r. 'l-*ṣulyā*.
- p. 76, l. 3 'l-Aḥmadiyya r. 'l-Aḥmadiyyu.
- p. 78, l. 3 'l-dā' irati fi ba^cḍi *ṣibārāti* r. 'l-dā'irati fi ba^cḍi *ṣibārāti*.

1. 4 'l-marsūmatu r. 'l-marsūmati.
 p. 81, 1. 3 mulia, r. mulia :.
 p. 82, 1. 2 mustahikkun r. mustahikkatun.
 1. 3 mutahakkikun r. mutahakkikatun.
 1. 5 fi'ālun r. fa'c'ālun.
 p. 85, 1. 5 husnā r. husna.
 li-yufarrika r. li-yufarrika.
 1. 6 yuhkima r. yahkuma; l-ghā'ibi r. 'l-ghā'ibi.
 note 33 *atali* r. *aṭali*.
 p. 88, 1. 3 menghimpukan r. menghimpunkan.
 p. 91, 1. 5 majliyyi r. majlā.
 p. 92, 1. 1 makhfiyyi r. makhfā.
 1. 2 'l-faniyyati r. 'l-fāniyyati.
 1. 5 'l-kāmil r. 'l-kāmilina.
 p. 93, 1. 4 mushshadah r. mushahadah.
 translation § 9 Saba^cl Mathānī r. Sab^c al-Mathānī.

Tract 2.

- translation § 3, 1. 7 cannot suffer partition r. cannot be quartered or halved
 (a characteristic expression which occurs often in this connection).

Tract 3.

- p. 116, 1. 5 Sa-Nya r. Sa-nya.
 p. 117, 1. 7; 118, 1. 1 The only word in which capital N is not out of place is kapada-Nya.
 p. 118, 1. 4/5 Capital N in -Nya is not out of place in cilmu-Nya (4) and sifat-Nya (5).
 p. 119, 1. 2 bahawa-sa-Nya r. bahawa-sa-nya.
 bagi-Nya r. bagi-nya.

Tract 4.

- p. 123, 1. 3 dan insan r. dan [c'alam] insan.
 p. 125, 1. 1/2 den-gan r. de-ngan.
 1. 4 mukayad r. mukayyad.
 p. 130, 1. 2 id.

Tract 5.

- p. 147, 1. 2/3 men-gempukan r. meng-empukan.
 p. 149, 1. 4 tarkan r. tarkun.
 tarahu r. tarāhu.

Tract 6.

- p. 156, 1. 5 Ma^cshūk wa c'ishk wa c'āshik har sihrā yakast r.
 Ma^cshūk u^cishk u^cāshik har sih <rā> yak ast.
 p. 157, 1. 4 paba r. pada.

Tract 7.

- p. 164, 1. 4 atla^caka r. aṭla^caka.
 auda^cahu r. awda^cahu.
 p. 170, 1. 2 'l-dawa' ir r. 'l-dawā'ir.
 p. 172, 1. 4 'l-maujudāt r. 'l-mawjūdāt.
 p. 187, 1. 2 darajatan r. darajata.

Tract 8.

- p. 188, 1. 2 lagi yang r. lagi Yang.
 p. 189, 1. 1 salam-nya r. salam-Nya.
 p. 193, 1. 4 kapada-abad, r. kapada abad.
 p. 199, 1. 3/4 men-yatakan r. me-nyatakan.

Tract 10.

- p. 228, 1. 3 and 4 c'ilmi-nya, dhat-nya and ma^clum-nya r.
 c'ilmi-Nya, dhat-Nya and ma^clum-Nya.
 p. 229, 1. 3/4 shu'/un r. shu'-/un.

Tract 11.

- p. 240, l. 4 lahā iʿtibārāni r. lahā ʿtibārāni.
 wa iʿtabārūn r. waʿtibārūn.
 l. 5 ʿl-aʿyān al-khārījīyya r. ʿl-aʿyāni ʿl-khārījīyya.

Tract 12.

- p. 250, l. 5 sa-suata r. sa-suatu.
 p. 251, l. 5 mukayad r. mukayyad.

Tract 13.

- p. 261, l. 3/4 ak-hirat r. a-khirat.
 p. 262, l. 1 biʿl-tarīki ʿl-hudā wa ʿl-jāddati ʿl-mustakīm r.
 bi tarīki ʿl-hudā wa ʿl-jāddati ʿl-mustakīmāti.
 (or, perhaps for the sake of the rhyme: wa jāddati ʿl-mustakīm).
 p. 280, l. 3 rashiā r. rahsia.

Tract 14.

- p. 285, l. 5 maka azal r. maka (nyata-lah) azal.

Tract 16.

- p. 294, l. 1 dhat dii-nya r. dhat diri-nya.

Tract 18.

- p. 311, 312 Dhikr-nya, Murakabah-nya, Mushahadah-nya r.
 dhikr-Nya, murakabah-Nya, mushahadah-Nya.
 p. 316, l. 3 illā ʿllāh r. illā ʿllāh.

Appendix 5

The correct reading of the title of the MS. (here and p. 82 note 1) is: Jawāhir al-ʿulūm fī kashfi ʿl-maʿlūm.

- § 1, l. 1 waʿl-akhiru waʿl-zahiru r. wa ʿl-akhiru wa ʿl-zāhiru.
 l. 4 ʿilmi-nya r. ʿilmu-nya.
 4, l. 11 I wonder whether here and in § 6 the MS. really reads *bahawa-sa* and *hanya-sa*. If this should be the case, an explanation of this abbreviation would not be out of place here. Is it a scribal error, or perhaps an intermediate form between *bahawa-sa-nya* and *bahasa*? One would expect *bahawa-sa-nya* and *hanya-sa-nya*; the latter form actually occurs twice in § 6.
 l. 9 ta-ayyun-nya r. taʿayyun-nya.
 § 3, l. 7 warna? r. warna.
 l. 11 wa li ʿllāhi ʿl-mathaluʿl aʿlā r. wa li ʿllāhi ʿl-mathalu ʿl-aʿlā.
 § 5, l. 1 terkelin chir r. tergelin chir.
 l. 2 Al ʿālamu huwa ʿl-llāhu r. al-ʿālamu huwa ʿllāhu.
 l. 9 Yuharrifūna r. Yuharrifūna.
 § 6, l. 2 Ibn al-ʿArabi r. ibn ʿArabi.
 l. 4 Miskat r. Mushkilāt.
 l. 5 fāṣilun baina ʿl-llāhi r. fāṣilun baina ʿllāhi.
 l. 8 jamīʿa ʿlkāʿināti hattā ʿl-dharrati r. jamīʿa ʿl-kāʿināti hattā ʿl-dharrati.
 l. 21 jamīʿa ʿl-kāʿināti r. jamīʿa ʿl-kāʿināti.
 l. 25 nūru ʿl-samawāt r. nūru ʿl-samāwāti.

The list of 'Works consulted' (p. 109/110) is full of inaccuracies which need not to be enumerated here, and even the short selective index of technical terms is not free of misspellings.

G. W. J. DREWES