NOORHAIDI HASAN

The *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn*

The work of Abdul Samad al-Palimbani or of Muhammad Arsyad al-Banjari?

The Indonesian archipelago has an abundance of classical literature on Islamic knowledge.¹ At the bottom of the pile there is an anonymous Malay treatise written in *Jawi* script whose authorship has long been debated. It is the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Ḥaqīqat Īmān al-Mu'minīn wa Mā Yufsiduhu fī Riddat al-Murtaddīn* (The Gift Addressed to Those Desirous of the Exposition of the Essence of the Faith of the Believers and of That Which Corrupts It, with Respect to the Apostasy of the Apostates), hereafter cited as the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn*. This treatise deals with various aspects of Muslim theology. Its colophon states that it was composed in 1188 of the Islamic calendar (AD 1774) to comply with the request of 'one of the people in the highest authority nowadays, whom I cannot criticize' (*setengah daripada segala orang besar pada masa ini yang tiada boleh akan daku salahi akan dia*). Some scholars have argued that this treatise was composed by Abdul Samad al-Palimbani (circa 1704-circa 1790). However, there is reason to believe that the author was actually Muhammad Arsyad al-Banjari (circa 1710-circa 1812). He was a Banjarese Muslim scholar who exerted great influence on Islamic discourse in the archipelago.²

The Dutch scholar P. Voorhoeve was the first to speculate that the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn* was the work of Abdul Samad. Voorhoeve arrived at this conclusion based largely on his observations of a photocopy of the manuscript presented to him by V.I. Braginsky, a photocopy that Braginsky had made of the manuscript preserved in the Leningrad Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies, catalogued as MS 4024. The Leiden University Library preserves this

¹ I am grateful to Nico J.G. Kaptein and V.I. Braginsky for their comments on an earlier version of this paper.

² On this figure, see Basuni 1949; Halidi 1968; Daudi 1980; Abdullah 1982; Nasution 1992:127; Dasuki 1993, I:229-31.

NOORHAIDI HASAN is lecturer at the State Islamic University Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. He holds a PhD from Utrecht University. His research interests are Malay literature and Islamic radicalism in the Malay world. He is the author of 'Faith and politics; The rise of the Laskar Jihad in the era of transition in Indonesia', *Indonesia* 73, 2002, pp. 145-69 and 'Between transnational interest and domestic politics; Understanding Middle Eastern fatwas on jihad in the Moluccas', *Islamic Law and Society* 12, 2005, pp. 73-92. Dr Noorhaidi Hasan may be contacted at noorhaidi@hotmail.com.

photocopy with Voorhoeve's notes written on the back cover, catalogued as Cod. Or. 14.359.³ On the inside cover of the Leningrad manuscript is written: 'van Doorninck, 1876', from which it may be surmised that it had reached Leningrad through the hands of F.N. van Doorninck, a Dutch civil servant who worked in Palembang from 1873 till 1875.

Voorhoeve's arguments in support of his conjecture as to the authorship of the manuscript, as handwritten by him in Dutch on the photocopy, are:

- 1 The date: Abdul Samad usually dated his writings; the dates range from 1178 to 1203 AH (AD 1764 to 1788).
- 2 From 1873 to 1875 F.N. van Doorninck was stationed in Palembang as a civil servant; he then went to Europe on furlough.
- 3 There is a marginal note in Javanese (photo 23).
- 4 The word *sanggar* is used to indicate a heathen offering, which is the Middle Malay meaning, but not the Javanese meaning. About 1774 the censured heathen practices probably occurred in the Palembang hinterland. MS VdW. 37 contains a page dedicated to jihad or holy war, one of Abdul Samad's specialties. (It is worth noting that Chapter 2 contains a lengthy abstract of al Rānirī's *Tibyān*.)

In 1976, G.W.J. Drewes published a paper entitled 'Further data concerning "Abd al-Samad al-Palimbani"' in *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*. This paper was intended to complement the data on Abdul Samad written by Voorhoeve (1967) in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. Besides a set of political letters, Drewes discussed the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn*, and attempted to unearth its authorship. He fully subscribed to Voorhoeve's hypothesis that the text was composed by Abdul Samad, elaborating on several points which had previously been highlighted by his predecessor. The same opinion is repeated in his *Directions for travellers on the mystic path* (Drewes 1977:23). Some other scholars of Malay literature simply adopted this opinion without any critical assessment of their own, and this indubitably reinforced the attribution of the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn* to Abdul Samad.⁴ The aim of my paper is to reconsider these opinions and, at the same time, present evidence that the author was actually Muhammad Arsyad.

Extant manuscripts of the Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn

During the course of my research, I located at least four manuscripts of the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn*. The first is the Leningrad manuscript mentioned above,

³ *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Haqīqat Īmān al-Mu'minīn wa Mā Yuḥsiduhu fī Riddat al-Murtaddīn*, Leiden University Library, Cod. Or. 14.359; see Iskandar 1999:675.

⁴ See, for instance, Quzwain 1985a:22, 1985b:174-190; Chambert-Loir 1985:v-xvi; Iskandar 1996:442-3; Braginsky 1999:478.

which is the one that has enjoyed the most attention from scholars. The second is the manuscript catalogued in the collection of the Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia (National Library of the Republic of Indonesia) as VdW. 37 (Van Ronkel 1909:399-400; Behrend 1998:328). The other two belong to the collection of the Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia (State Library of Malaysia), catalogued as MS 1160 and MS 1525 (*Manuskrip Melayu* 1993:11, 46). An attempt to establish the authorship of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* requires us to dig up some philological information about these manuscripts, especially in connection with their origins. It is generally believed that this sort of effort is crucial because in Malay literature the tradition of copying texts was usually not strict; a copyist could often alter, reconstruct, edit, or add something to the text being copied.⁵

Information about the Leningrad manuscript is available in the description provided by Braginsky in *Naskah Melayu di Leningrad*. He describes this manuscript as being a type of hard-cover book. It contains fifty pages, numbered with roman numerals, which were clearly added later. The format of the paper is 15.5 x 12 cm and of the text is 13.5 x 10 cm. There are fifteen lines per page. The manuscript is written on paper of two types. The first is the dense grey paper made in Europe with a watermark, a crown within an oval, above which there are two initials: CR (GR?). In addition, there is also a wider symbol, beside which there is a human being holding a halberd or possibly a key. Inside the symbol area there is another depiction, namely, a lion rampant. Beneath this symbol is written an 'a'. This manuscript was clearly copied by a professional, using Arabic *naskh* characters in black ink. Arabic quotations and the first words of every chapter and the words 'soal' and 'jawab' are written in red ink. The folios 01, 1, 12-13, 40-41, 50, and 001 of this manuscript are copied on another type of paper. This is paper made in Europe with a watermark, a lion holding a sword inside a circle. Along the edge of the circle there is a motto, 'Pro Patria Eiusque Libertate', and at the bottom there are the initials EDO & Z. The text of this part was written by another copyist. On both covers of this manuscript there is a handwritten text in Latin script reading 'Kitab dallahil'. On the second page above the text is written in Arabic script 'Kitab Hidāyat al-Īmān'. On the first page the date 1188 is mentioned, that is, the date of the composition of this treatise.⁶

A description of the Jakarta manuscript is provided by Ph.S. van Ronkel (1909) in the *Catalogus der Maleische handschriften* no. DCXXVI. He states that this manuscript consists of three chapters and a concluding remark, which was intended to offer 'a succinct treatise in Malay dealing with the essence of the truth and sayings, and with acts and beliefs which corrupt it' (*risalah*

⁵ See Kratz 1981, where he describes the tradition of copying Malay texts as a creative process, rather than a mechanical process of reproduction; see also Robson 1988.

⁶ Braginsky and Boldyreva 1989:6-7. This is a translated edition in Malay of an article in *Malay-sko-indonezijskie insledovaniya*, edited by B.B. Parnickel.

simpan dengan bahasa Jawi pada menyatakan hakikat iman dan barang yang membinasakan dia segala perkataan dan perbuatan dan iktikad hati). It contains 89 pages which measure 20.5 x 16.5 cm. Some pages of this manuscript are parts of other works interpolated by the copyist erroneously. The interpolated texts include page 58 dealing with the virtues of reciting the Qur'an, and pages 70 and 72 discussing the meal eaten before daybreak during the fasting month. Furthermore, page 73 contains an explanation of religious doctrines, the belief in Messengers and Angels. The second chapter of the treatise starts on page 81. There is a discussion of holy war on page 84, but this also is not part of the text of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* (Van Ronkel 1909:39-40).

The description given by Van Ronkel allows us to conclude that the Jakarta manuscript is clearly different from the Leningrad one, because the latter does not contain pages dealing with the virtues of reciting the Qur'an, the meal eaten before daybreak during the fasting month, religious doctrines concerning Messengers and Angels, or a discussion of holy war. Instead, it includes Abdul Rauf's treatise on the signs of approaching death. It is difficult to determine when these manuscripts were copied. It is possible that the Leningrad manuscript was copied in the second half of the nineteenth century because Van Doorninck was stationed in Palembang as a Dutch civil servant from 1873 till 1875. We can assume the early nineteenth century as the earliest date that the Leningrad manuscript may have been copied, and that it was later completed in the second half of the nineteenth century. This is indicated by the watermarks of the paper used in the manuscript in question. The watermarks as they appear on the manuscript, a crown in an oval with the initials CR (or GR) above, appears on paper of British origin of the early nineteenth century, while the initials EDG & Z appear on paper of Dutch origin in 1844.⁷

In contrast to the aforementioned manuscripts, one of the Kuala Lumpur manuscripts, MS 1160, clearly notes the date of copying. It is likely that this manuscript is not much younger than the Jakarta and Leningrad manuscripts. It was copied on Thursday, 2 Zulka'dah 1267 (29 August 1851) by Muhammad Nor Ibnu Haji Abdul Ghafur (*Manuskrip Melayu* 1993:11).

Nevertheless, there is no indication in any of these manuscripts where they were copied. Assuming Palembang as the place of origin of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*, based on the fact that it was Van Doorninck who transported one of the manuscripts to Leningrad, has one major weakness. Even supposing that Van Doorninck had only worked in Palembang and never travelled to other parts of the archipelago, this would not necessarily mean that the place of origin of this manuscript was Palembang. He might have received it from any other region.

⁷ In personal correspondence Russell Jones informs me that 'CR' over the oval is usual, rather than 'GR'. He also clarifies that EDG & Z are initials which usually appear in the paper of manuscripts circa 1810-1860.

The *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn* was printed several times in Istanbul, Mecca, Cairo, Singapore, and Surabaya. The treatise was first printed in 1887 in Istanbul by al-Maṭbaʿa al-Ḥaj Muḥarram Afandī under the title of *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Ḥaqīqat al-Muʾminīn wa Mā Yuḥsiduhu min Riddat al-Murtaddīn*. In many ways this edition can be considered the definitive version of the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn*. Five years later it was printed in Mecca by al-Maṭbaʿa al-ʿĀlawiyya. In 1895 it appeared in the margin of *Risālat Badīʿu al-Zamān fī Bayān ʿAqāʾid al-Īmān* by Muhammad Azhari al-Palimbani, which was published by Maṭbaʿa Muriyyat al-Kāʾinat in Mecca. The Bāb al-Halabi of Cairo published the treatise in 1935 under the editorship of Muhammad Idris Abdul Raʿuf al-Marbawī. In 1937 another edition of the treatise was printed by Maṭbaʿa Sulaymān Marʿi, in Singapore, on the initiative of Abdul Rahman Siddiq.⁸ Ahmad Nabhan, Surabaya, published an edition in 1983 which is similar to those above, the only difference being that Ahmad Nabhan's edition clearly notes the name Muhammad Arsyad as the author. In this respect, the Cairo and Singapore editions merely point out that the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn* was composed 'by one of the prolific Indonesian ulamas' (*li aḥadi ʿulamāʾi al-Jāwi al-ʿāmilīn*).

There is no indication which manuscript the first printed edition was based on. All efforts to locate the manuscript in question have proved fruitless. Evidently there was yet another manuscript, in addition to the four mentioned above, which was probably brought from the archipelago to Mecca by a pilgrim and served as the basis of this publication. There is no evidence for this; it is only speculation. I have made a comparison between the Leningrad manuscript and the first printed edition, and my conclusion is that there are very few differences. The minor differences that occur were consciously designed to modernize the language of the text, such as the phrase *ʿakan daku salahi akan dia* (Leningrad MS) > *ʿakan daku menyalahi dia* (Istanbul printed edition) and the phrase *ʿsetengah yang terlebih besar* (Leningrad MS) > *ʿsetengah segala orang besar* (Istanbul printed edition).

The authorship of the Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn

So far, we do not know who the author of the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn* is. An attempt to solve this puzzle requires that we look at historical evidence related to the text. One of the most important facts has been put forward by Wan Mohd. Shagīr Abdullah, a Malaysian scholar of Malay literature, who notes that Muhammad Arsyad had been mentioned as the author of the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn* long before either Voorhoeve or Drewes suggested the name of

⁸ See the notes that appear in the end of the Surabaya printed edition, *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Ḥaqīqat al-Muʾminīn wa-mā Yuḥsiduhu min Ridd Murtaddīn*, Surabaya: Ahmad Nabhan, 1928, p. 55.

Abdul Samad. He points out that in Dawud Abdullah al-Patani's *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*, it is stated:

Maka disebut oleh yang empunya karangan Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Haqīqat Īmān al-Mu'minīn wa Mā Yufsiduhu fī Riddat al-Murtaddīn bagi alim al-fādīl al-allāma Shaikh Muhammad Arsyad [...] (Abdullah 1982:106).

Thus, it is mentioned by the author of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Haqīqat Īmān al-Mu'minīn wa Mā Yufsiduhu fī Riddat al-Murtaddīn* namely, the learned, the outstanding, the distinguished, Syaikh Muhammad Arsyad [...].

If this information is correct, then it would be the earliest historical evidence of Muhammad Arsyad's authorship of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*. Dawud al-Patani was one of Muhammad Arsyad's contemporaries who lived from circa 1740 till circa 1847 (Ismail 1992:33). He studied in Mecca together with some other Malay-Indonesian students, including Abdul Samad and Muhammad Arsyad himself (Azra 2004:114).

It is worth mentioning that Muhammad Arsyad went to Mecca around 1740. He studied with some prominent ulamas of Mecca and Medina, including 'Aṭā Allāh al-Miṣri, Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Damanhūrī, Ibrāhīm al-Ra'īs al-Zamzamī, Sulaymān al-Kurdī, and Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Karīm al-Sammān. Having studied for approximately thirty years, he was reportedly given permission to teach at the *Masjid al-Harām* (Steenbrink 1984:92; Azra 2004:118). Upon return, he emerged as a prolific Muslim scholar who wrote a number of Islamic books in Malay, including *Uṣūl al-Dīn*, *Qaul al-Mukhtaṣar*, *Bidāyat al-Mujtahid*, *Luqṭāt al-Ajlān*, and above all *Sabīl al-Muhtadīn li al-Tafaqquh fī 'Amr al-Dīn* (Noorhaidi Hasan 1999).

The claim that the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* was composed by Muhammad Arsyad is unequivocally confirmed somewhat later in 1937 by Abdul Rahman Siddiq, Muhammad Arsyad's own grandson, in his *Risālat Shajārat al-Arshādiyya*:

Maka Sultan Tahmidullah Thāni inilah yang disebut orang Penembahan Batu dan ialah yang minta karangkan Sabīl al-Muhtadīn li al-Tafaqquh fī 'Amr al-Dīn dan Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Haqīqat Īmān al-Mu'minīn wa Mā Yufsiduhu fī Riddat al-Murtaddīn kepada jaddī al-'ālim al-'allāmah al-'ārif bi Allāh Shaikh Muhammad Arsyad bin Abdullah al-Banjari (Abdul Rahman Siddiq Al-Banjari 1937:100).

It was thus Sultan Tahmidullah II, called Panembahan Batu, who requested my grandfather, the learned, the distinguished, the knower of God, Syekh Muhammad Arsyad ibn Abdullah al-Banjari, to compose the *Sabīl al-Muhtadīn li al-Tafaqquh fī 'Amr al-Dīn* and *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn fī Bayān Haqīqat Īmān al-Mu'minīn wa Mā Yufsiduhu fī Riddat al-Murtaddīn*.

Nevertheless, the arguments brought forward by Voorhoeve pointing to Abdul Samad as the author of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* are worth taking into consideration. According to him, the author mentions the date of the composition of the text, one of Abdul Samad's practices in writing his works. The date coincides with the period during which Abdul Samad was composing his works. Abdul Samad started composing his works in 1764. His first work was *Zuhrat al-Murīd fī Bayān Kalimat al-Tawhīd*, which was a summary of theology lectures given by Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Mun'im al-Damanhūrī at the *Masjīd al-Ḥarām*. In 1772, he wrote an Arabic treatise dealing with the holy war, the *Naṣīḥat al-Muslimīn wa Tadhkirat al-Mu'minīn fī Faḍā'il al-Jihād fī Sabīl Allāh wa Karāmat al-Mujāhidīn fī Sabīl Allāh*.⁹ Six years later he translated the *Bidāyat al-Hidāyat* of al-Ghazālī into Malay. Published under the title *Hidāyat al-Sālikīn fī Suluk al-Muttaqīn* he included annotations in this edition. In 1779, he began to translate another work of al-Ghazālī, *Lubāb Iḥyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn*, into Malay with the title *Sayr al-Sālikīn 'ilā 'Ibādat Rabb al-'Ālamīn*. It took him approximately nine years to complete the translation (Quzwain 1985a:18-9).

Indeed, Abdul Samad usually mentions the dates of the composition of his works. Yet this fact is insufficient as a basis to conclude that he was the author of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*. This is particularly so because Abdul Samad is not the only author from the archipelago in the eighteenth century who had the habit of dating the composition of his works. Muhammad Arsyad and other authors did precisely the same thing. In addition, Voorhoeve does not mention that in the colophons of his works Abdul Samad commonly records, besides the date, the locality where he finished the work. Such a custom was not followed by Muhammad Arsyad. The colophon of the *Zuhrat al-Murīd*, for instance, notes that it was finished in Mecca in 1178 (AD 1764). Similarly, the colophons of the *Hidāyat al-Sālikīn* and the *Sayr al-Sālikīn* volumes I, II, III and IV have such a date clearly inscribed.¹⁰ It is surprising that Abdul Samad did not record such information in the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*, were this work indeed written by him.

Drewes argues that the highly placed person whose request could not be turned down by Abdul Samad was the Palembang sultan, and to be sure, at the Palembang court during the second half of the eighteenth century there was much interest in religious matters. However, the Palembang sultan's patronage of Abdul Samad has never been demonstrated convincingly. It is based only on speculation. None of his works was composed at the behest of the Palembang sultan; rather, they were the fruit of his own religious motiva-

⁹ A manuscript of this treatise is preserved in the Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia, catalogued as W. 51; see Behrend 1998:328. A microfilm copy is available in Leiden University Library, Cod. Or. A. 20c.

¹⁰ See Abdul Samad al-Palimbani, *Hidāyat al-Sālikīn* (Cairo: Isā al-Bāb al-Ḥalabī, 1924), p. 2 and *Sayr al-Sālikīn ilā 'Ibādat Rabb al-'Ālamīn* (Mecca: litograph edition, n.d.), p. 3.

tions. This can be seen both in the *Hidāyat al-Sālikīn* and the *Sayr al-Sālikīn*. Abdul Samad himself went to Mecca when he was only fourteen years old and reportedly never returned to the archipelago (Azra 2004:113-4). For this reason, it is difficult to envisage that it is a reference to Abdul Samad, when the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* explains that it was composed at the request of 'one of the people in the highest authority nowadays, whom I cannot criticize'.

However, if we suppose that it was Muhammad Arsyad who was asked by the Banjar sultan, Tahmidullah, to compose the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*, a different picture emerges. There is no doubt that Muhammad Arsyad was involved in collaboration with the elite of the Banjar sultanate. Because of his ability to memorize the Qur'an by heart when he was only ten years old, Muhammad Arsyad was taken to the court of the sultanate. Later the Banjar sultan sent him to Mecca by to pursue further studies at the sultanate's expense. During his studies there he did not lose contact with the sultanate. Concern with his own region reportedly encouraged him to request a number of fatwas (religious decrees) from his master at Medina, Sulaymān al-Kurdī. At that time, he asked for comments on certain religious policies promulgated by the Banjar sultan, who happened to have imposed a heavy fine on Muslims who did not perform the collective Friday prayer. This fatwa became part of al-Kurdī's collected fatwas, *Qurrat al-'Ayn bi Fatāwā 'Ulamā' al-Haramayn* (Steenbrink 1984:92; Van Bruinessen 1995:3). It is understandable therefore that upon return he was given the opportunity by the Banjar sultan to establish an Islamic educational institution on a large plot of wasteland granted to him, and in addition was appointed to the office of mufti responsible for issuing fatwas on religious and social matters (Azra 2004:119-20).

The close relation between Muhammad Arsyad and the Banjar sultan is confirmed by the fact that the most important of his works, the *Sabīl al-Muhtadīn*, was composed specifically at the sultan's request:

Menuntut daripada aku pada tahun seribu seratus sembilan puluh tiga tahun (1193) daripada segala tahun hijrah nabi atas yang empunya dia daripada Tuhannya rahmat Allah yang amat lebih dan haluannya yang suci seorang raja yang amat besar hamam (sic. himmah) nya lagi yang mempunyai cerdas dan bicara yang sempurna lagi yang suci jihin lagi yang banyak paham ialah yang mempunyai tadbir atas sekalian isi di daerah segala negeri Banjar lagi yang berdiri dengan memperbaiki segala pekerjaan agama dan pekerjaan dunia yaitu persandaran kita yang dibesarkan dan ikutan kita yang dimulihkan maulana Sultan Tahmidullah [...] (Muhammad Arsyad al-Banjari 1925).

In 1193 [= AD 1778] of the Hijra era of the Prophet, I was requested by one endowed by his God with notable compassion and sacred guidance, a king whose concern for his people was very great, endowed with intelligence and fluency, blessed with aptitude and sound common sense, who ruled all the

residents of the Banjar sultanate and devoted himself to the revival of all religious and temporal matters, our powerful and honoured chief, Sultan Tahmidullah [...].

Philological evidence

Apart from the historical evidence, we have a number of philological facts in the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* which can go some way towards determining the authorship of this text. The *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* begins with a doxology in Arabic followed by its Malay translation, as follows:

Dengan nama Allah ta'ala yang amat meanugerahi nikmat yang besar-besar lagi yang amat meanugerahi nikmat yang seni-seni jua. Kumulai risalah ini [...] Segala puji tertentu bagi Allah yang memeliharaakan Ia akan iman segala mereka yang beriman dengan limpah laut taufiknya dan dengan semata-mata karenanya.

In the name of Almighty God Who bestows both major and minor gifts, I begin this treatise [...]. All praises be to God, Who guards the faith of the believers with an overflow of His guidance, and thanks be to Him.

This doxology is fairly long and displays some similarities with the doxology of the *Sabīl al-Muhtadīn*. Muhammad Arsyad opens this book with the following words:

Dengan nama Allah ta'ala yang amat meanugerahi nikmat yang besar-besar lagi yang amat meanugerahi nikmat yang seni-seni jua. Aku memulai menghimpunkan kitab ini [...] Segala puji tertentu bagi Allah tuhan yang mengaruniai taufik akan segala mereka yang ikutan ...

The use of the same sentence '*Dengan nama Allah yang amat menugerahi nikmat yang besar-besar lagi yang amat menugerahi nikmat yang seni-seni jua*' at the beginning of both these doxologies is clearly not a coincidence. Malay authors often had a particular pattern, peculiar to themselves, with which to begin the doxologies of their works. To be more precise, this similarity indicates the possibility that the two books were written by the same author. More interestingly, these doxologies are different from the doxological type consistently chosen by Abdul Samad, who usually uses the sentence '*Kumulai kitab ini dengan nama Allah yang amat murah lagi mengasihani akan hambaNya*', which means 'I begin this book with the name of God, the Merciful and the Compassionate upon His servants'. This can be seen in almost all of his works, including the *Hidāyat al-Sālikīn* and the *Sayr al-Sālikīn*.

Moreover, the fact that the author of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* prefers to use the phrase '*Pasal yang pertama pada menyatakan*' to begin each chapter of his book is another piece of evidence for associating this work with Muhammad

Arsyad. In his works Muhammad Arsyad consistently uses the phrases '*Pasal pada menyatakan*' and '*Pasal yang pertama pada menyatakan*'. These phrases are slightly different from those chosen by Abdul Samad for the same purpose. Abdul Samad shows a preference for '*Ini suatu pasal pada menyatakan*' and '*Bermula pasal yang pertama itu pada menyatakan*'.

No less significant is the fact that the author of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* never in his book uses the word *hamba* as a personal pronoun. This fact should be emphasized, because Abdul Samad does occasionally use this personal pronoun in his works:

ilmu yang tersebut di dalam kitab Bidāyat al-Hidāyat yaitu daripada ilmu yang memberi manfaat seperti hamba sebutkan di dalam kitab ini... (*Hidāyat al-Sālikīn*, p. 3).

kebanyakan kitab yang hamba sebutkan dahulu itu ... (*Sayr al-Sālikīn*, I:9).

Kitab Mukhtasar Ihyā' 'Ulūm al-Dīn yang hamba terjemahkan akan dia itu di dalam kitab yang bernama Sayr al-Sālikīn... (*Sayr al-Sālikīn*, III: 165).

As far as I know, the use of this form of personal pronoun is never found in the works of Muhammad Arsyad. He uses the word '*aku*' or '*daku*' consistently.

A number of Banjarese words (Banjarese is my own mother tongue) which we can find in the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* confirm all the evidence mentioned above. There are, for instance, the words *manyumpah* (meaning 'to cuss in anger', photo 89 of the Leningrad MS), *mangarut* (meaning 'to lie', photo 88), *lanjuran* (meaning 'excess', photo 42), *manyaru* (meaning 'to call', photo 37), *manyarung* (meaning 'to possess', photo 38), *kasarungan* (meaning 'being possessed', photo 38), *disambur* (meaning 'being spit upon', photo 35), *dilimpas* (meaning 'being accepted', photo 35), and *mawarasi* (meaning 'curing', photo 34). These words are mostly found in *Kamus Banjar-Indonesia* by Abdul Djebar Hapip (1997) and are still used by Banjar people up to the present time with the same meanings as in the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*. They can be considered as exclusively Banjarese words, as they cannot be found either in the *Kamus besar bahasa Indonesia* or in the *Kamus dewan*. The only exception is the word *manyarung*, which can be found in the *Kamus dewan*. But its meaning there is different from that intended by the author of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*.

As far as I am concerned, these facts much more strongly support Muhammad Arsyad's authorship of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* than the philological evidence proposed by Voorhoeve to support Abdul Samad as author. Voorhoeve notes, for instance, that there is a page (81) in the Jakarta edition of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* which contains a discussion on jihad, an area of expertise of Abdul Samad. But this is not really an indication that the text was composed by Abdul Samad because, as Van Ronkel suggests, this page should be excluded from the main text. It was obviously interpolated by the copyist erroneously.

This is also the case with Drewes's argument in support of the claim. He argues that about a third of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* is derived from the *Tibyān fī Ma'rifat al-Adyān* by Nuruddīn al-Raniri, namely, the explanation of the 72 heretical sects in Islam and of *wujūdiyya mulḥid*, heretical pantheism, and also the section on *bid'a* (heresy) following it. Drewes adduces this to clarify Voorhoeve's last note that the second chapter of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* contains a lengthy abstract of al-Raniri's *Tibyān*. Certainly, when we compare Chapter 2 of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* with Part 2 of al-Raniri's *Tibyān*, which deals with heretical sects in Islam, there are reasons to agree with Drewes that Chapter 2 is drawn from al-Raniri's work.¹¹ However, this by no means indicates that Abdul Samad was the author of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*. Both Abdul Samad and Muhammad Arsyad could easily have had access to this source. They had studied together in the *Haramayn*. One of the reasons that inspired Muhammad Arsyad to compose the *Sabil al-Muhtadīn* was that the first Malay book on *fiqh*, al-Raniri's *Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaḳīm*, in Muhammad Arsyad's opinion, was rife with confusing Acehnese terms and expressions. This is clear evidence that Muhammad Arsyad had access to and respect for al-Raniri's work.

Manyanggar and mambuang pasilih

In the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* a few traditional practices are given special attention: *manyanggar* and *mambuang pasilih*. The author qualifies these practices as *bid'a dalāla* (heretical innovations). Voorhoeve draws attention to the words *manyanggar* and *pasilih* in arguing that the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* was composed by Abdul Samad. He points out that in 'about 1774 the censured heathen practices probably occurred in the Palembang hinterland'. Drewes (1976:281) later elaborated upon this argument by comparing a similar practice in Java and in the Batak region.

Judging from the ample discussion of these, the obvious conclusion is that he was greatly scandalised by their existence, as was to be expected of a schooled theologian who, during a prolonged sojourn in the centre of Islam, had been imbibed with principles far more rigid than those prevailing at home, and who, therefore, could not condone anything inconsistent with these rigid principles.

Voorhoeve's comment tells us that he was only speculating about the existence of the two practices in Palembang. This is clear from his use of the word *probably*, which means that he could not have guaranteed that both practices really existed there.

Drewes's explanation does not confirm whether these practices had indeed existed in Palembang, such that Abdul Samad was inspired to criticize them

¹¹ See the facsimile edition of the *Tibyān* made by Voorhoeve in Voorhoeve 1955:51-127.

in the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*. The resemblance of the *manyanggar* to the so-called *njajèni* in Java, namely, depositing small offerings at a crossroads or at a place held sacred, or near an old tree or other object whose magic potency arouses apprehension, as defined by Drewes, cannot serve as evidence of the existence of such a tradition in the Palembang region. This also holds true when he identifies the *mambuang pasilih* with the ritual *parsilihi* in the Batak region, in which a changeling, usually made out of a banana stem and destined to be thrown away, is placed, for instance, at a crossroads.

Alternatively, a number of ethnographical reports affirm that the *manyanggar* and *mambuang pasilih* were still being practised by the Dayaks and the Banjarese in the southern part of Kalimantan. The *manyanggar* is a ceremony which requires the making of particular offerings, believed to be a way to avoid disasters which may have been caused by spirits of ancestors. If this ceremony is neglected, there would be a disaster. The *pasilih*, a ceremony of reversing the calamity, is then needed in order to appease the spirits. One of the Dayak communities, Paju Empat, is even said to have petitioned the Banjar sultan to send protection for their ceremonies, the implication being that they had faced pressure from the Banjarese who attempted to reduce, if not eliminate, their customary rituals.¹² The question of whether or not this pressure was the result of the 'excessive campaign' of Muslim Banjarese against Dayak ceremonies cannot be determined. Similarly, we do not have a single shred of evidence which relates this appeal to the composition of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*.

What should be emphasized here is the fact that even though Drewes was aware that the author provides ample discussion of this problem, he was uncritical and overly hasty in drawing the conclusion that Abdul Samad would really be in a position to tackle this matter. As mentioned earlier, reliable evidence confirms that Abdul Samad left for Mecca when he was only fourteen years old. He never returned to the archipelago till his death in the 1790s. Therefore, we certainly have sound grounds for doubting that Abdul Samad would have been able to launch into a lengthy discussion of two local practices in a region which he had left when he was only fourteen. The discussion covers no fewer than eighteen pages (photos 49-33) complemented by illustrations and examples.

It is a completely different story when assessing the putative authorship of Muhammad Arsyad. Before going to Mecca, he had lived in the Banjar region for approximately thirty years. He could have known precisely about the traditions of the people in his country of origin, which were intermingled with heretical elements, before he began his Meccan learning period. After spending thirty years in the *Haramayn*, Muhammad Arsyad came back to the Banjar region in 1772. Two years after his return from Mecca, having had time to take stock, was an ideal time for him to address the situation of Muslims

¹² See Syarifuddin, Saleh and Usman 1984:1-13; see also Nawawi 1987:1-3.

in his region. Doubtless the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* was one way of responding to realities with which the author found himself confronted.

The author of the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* acknowledges that the *manyanggar* and *mambuung pasilih* customs were based on a traditional narrative recorded in a number of *hikayat*, in which the ancestors of participants were said to have requested them to bring special offerings (photos 40-39). This is most likely a reflection of the legends originating from the *Hikayat Lambung Mangkurat* and the *Hikayat Banjar*, which were popular among Banjarese Muslims. A number of figures in both *hikayat* were said not to have died, but, according to the *Hikayat Banjar*, to have disappeared (*kembali pada asalku*) and become mysterious (*gaib*). They were believed to have been still alive in a mysterious nature (Ras 1968:354, 370). This is reflected, for instance, in the tale of the mystery of the disappearance of Pangeran Suryanata, who was believed to be one of the notable Banjarese ancestors. It is much easier, therefore, to imagine Muhammad Arsyad being greatly scandalized by the *manyanggar* and the *mambuung pasilih* practices, than Abdul Samad.

Moreover, as the grand mufti of the Banjar sultanate, Muhammad Arsyad would have had no choice but to give his opinion about a variety of current issues which came up in his society, especially when requested by the authorities in his sultanate. It is surely not a coincidence that in the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* the author clearly positions himself as a mufti (legal opinion giver). From the author's point of view it is compulsory for a king and other political authorities to take the actions necessary to curb the spread of heretical practices popular in the society, such as *manyanggar* and *mambuung pasilih* (photo 49). To support this opinion he advances some legal considerations (photos 48-42) by stating that:

- 1 One of the reprehensible acts which exists in the *barbuang pasilih* and *manyanggar* is *tabzīr*, squandering, that is to squander property and use it for improper purposes. Such squandering is a forbidden act, prohibited by God and His messenger in some texts of the Qur'an and Prophetic Traditions; *wa lā tubazzir tabzīra inna al-mubazzirīn kānū ikhwān al-shayāṭīn*, meaning, do not squander because the squanderers are the friends of devils.
- 2 Another reprehensible act which exists in the *barbuang pasilih* and *manyanggar* is *ittiba' al-shayāṭīn wa ghurūrihim*, following devils and their delusions. It means to follow devils by fulfilling their demands; *wa lā tattabi'ū khutuwāt al-shayāṭīn innahū lakum 'aduwwun mubīn*.
- 3 Another reprehensible act which exists in the *barbuang pasilih* and *manyanggar* is idolatry and heresy. This is the most reprehensible act. If a person believes that a patient cannot heal from illness or escape from danger except through the intervention of the *manyanggar* and *barbuang pasilih* themselves, this must be carefully examined: if the person believes that these practices can intrinsically produce an effect, he becomes an unbeliever.

In explaining his legal opinions, the author seeks to refute all arguments that might be proposed by participants in the two ceremonies, for instance that the ceremonies are held as a form of respect to the ancestors and thus the offerings given are not useless and squandering. The author considers he cannot accept this argument since the very existence of the ancestors cannot be proved at all.

The debate on the waḥdat al-wujūd

Another topic discussed in the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn* is the issue of the *waḥdat al-wujūd*. This doctrine is a mystical philosophy asserting the theory of the unity of Being, or pantheism, which is mainly based upon the doctrine of an understanding of God as developed by earlier Sufis, such as Ibn 'Arabī and Al-Jillī.¹³ It is known in the archipelago as the doctrine of *martabat tujuh* (seven stages), which began to spread in the early sixteenth century. This doctrine was introduced into the Malay world by Syamsuddin Pasai (died 1630), who adopted the mysticism of Muḥammad ibn Faḍl Allāh al-Burhanpūri from his work *Al-Tuḥfat al-Mursala ilā al-Rūḥ al-Nabī* (Van Nieuwenhuijze 1945:22-7; Al-Attas 1963).

The author of the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn* strongly criticizes and condemns the dissemination of the *waḥdat al-wujūd*. He classifies the doctrine as heretical pantheism and uses the term '*kaum yang bersufi-sufi diri*' (those who pretend to be Sufis) to refer to the followers of the doctrine. He fulminates that the followers of the doctrine do not deserve the title Sufi because of their heretical beliefs. Instead, they have fallen into the trap of infidelity (photo 54):

Maka aku nyatakan pula iktikad kaum mulhid yang bersufi-sufi dirinya seperti yang telah dinyatakan Imam Ghazālī dan Syaikh Abū Najīb al-Suhrawardi dan Imām Najm al-Dīn 'Umar al-Nasafī dan lainnya qaddasa Allāhu arḥāmahum. Syahdan adalah kaum yang bersufi-sufi diri itu amat sesat mereka itu tiada patut dinamai akan dia dengan nama sufi hanya terutama dinamai akan dia dengan kafir dan fasik.

Then I also expose the doctrine of the deviant who wrongly claim to be sufis, as has already been shown by Imam al-Ghazālī dan Syaikh Abū Najīb al-Suhrawardi dan Imām Najm al-Dīn 'Umar al-Nasafī and others, may God sanctify the deceased. It is said that 'Sufis of this kind' have truly erred. It is not right to call them 'Sufis'; they can only be called unbelievers or sinners.

The repudiation of the *waḥdat al-wujūd* doctrine expressed in the *Tuḥfat al-Rāghibīn* supports the putative authorship of Muhammad Arsyad. He was known as a figure who fought against the dissemination of the *waḥdat al-*

¹³ For a further account of this concept, see Chittick 1995.

wujūd in the Banjar sultanate. The whole issue became a tragedy when a proponent of the *waḥdat al-wujūd* was executed because of the doctrine which he had propagated. He was Abdul Hamid Abulung. According to the local historiography of Banjar, his theological doctrine diverged from mainstream Muslim theology, declaring that 'there is nothing in existence except Him, every other thing is nothing. There is no being except Him, He is me and I am Him.' The dissemination of this doctrine stirred up Banjarese Muslims and fuelled enormous disputes among them. In response to this, the Banjar sultan at that time, Tahmidullah, required Muhammad Arsyad to give his opinion. Heeding the counsel of Muhammad Arsyad, the sultan decided to execute Abdul Hamid.

It is said that Abdul Hamid was a follower of Muhammad Nafis al-Banjari, who wrote a popular Malay treatise in 1786, *Al-Durr al-Nafis fī Bayān Waḥdat al-'Af'āl al-'Asmā wa al-Ṣifāt was al-Dhāt, Dhāt al-Taqdīs* (The Precious Pearl on the Exposition of the Unity of the Acts, the Names, and the Attributes, and the Essence, the Sacred Essence). A contemporary of Muhammad Arsyad, he also studied in the *Ḥaramayn*, during which he was especially attracted to Sufism, particularly to the theosophy of Ibn 'Arabī. This is demonstrated by the tendency shown in his book to advocate the doctrine of the seven stages of existence, *Martabat tujuh* (Nafis n.d.). There is no information on whether or not Muhammad Nafis had met Muhammad Arsyad or whether they studied with the same masters in the *Ḥaramayn*. Yet, in the *Durr al-Nafis*, he calls Muḥammad al-Sammān a principal master of Muhammad Arsyad and other Malay-Indonesian students, 'the master of his masters' (Muthalib 1995).

The doctrine of the *martabat tujuh* developed by Muhammad Nafis claims that unity with God can be attained through seven stages. These stages consist of *aḥadiyya al-aḥadiyya*, the unity of oneness; *al-waḥda*, oneness; *al-wāḥidiyya*, aloneness; *'ālam arwah*, world of spirits; *'ālam mithāl*, world of similitude; *'ālam ajsād*, world of bodies; and *martabat al-insān*, stage of humankind. In his explanation of these stages, the universe is viewed as the manifestation of God, which reaches its complete expression in humankind (Nafis n.d.). Interestingly, the technical terms used by Muhammad Nafis are similar to those used by Abdul Samad when he discusses the same doctrine in his *Sayr al-Sālikīn*. The only difference is that he calls the last stage *martabat al-insān*, rather than *'ālam al-insān*. Like Muhammad Nafis, Abdul Samad in this book clearly accepts the doctrine of Ibn Arabī's *waḥdat al-wujūd*. But this is confined to a more moderate interpretation of the doctrine.¹⁴ The *Durr al-Nafis* was banned by the Dutch colonial authorities because of their growing anxiety about resistance movements inspired by the idea of holy war and the messianic expectation of the *Imām Mahdī* among Muslims in the Banjar sultanate (Sjamsuddin 1991:10; Soeroto 1976:173).

¹⁴ For a further account of the distinction between the two types of *waḥdat al-wujud*, see Al-Attas 1975.

Conclusion

We can conclude that the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* was not composed by Abdul Samad, but rather by Muhammad Arsyad. The statement that the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* was composed to comply with the request of 'one of the people in the highest authority nowadays, whom I cannot criticize' corresponds well with the historical record of Muhammad Arsyad's collaboration with the Banjar sultan at that time. Muhammad Arsyad's authorship is also supported by some philological evidence, as appears in a comparison of the doxologies, the chapter headings, and the use of the word *hamba* as a personal pronoun in Abdul Samad's works, as well as the occurrence of a number of Banjarese words in the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn*. Moreover, the discussion of the *manyanggar* and *mambuang pasilih* embedded in the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* indicates the author's considerable interest and familiarity with local practices and discourses which would not likely have been acquired by one who spent almost his entire life far away from his country of origin. Last but not least, the author's repudiation of the *wujūdiyya* doctrine confirms the inaccuracy of scholars' opinions associating the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* with Abdul Samad, one of the late proponents of the more moderate interpretation of the doctrine. All these pieces of evidence support the validity of the claim to authorship of Muhammad Arsyad and thereby refute the arguments of Voorhoeve, Drewes, and other scholars who identified the *Tuhfat al-Rāghibīn* as the work of Abdul Samad.

References

- Abdul Djebar Hapip
1997 *Kamus Banjar-Indonesia*. Edisi ketiga. Banjarmasin: Grafika Wangi Kalimantan. [First edition 1993.]
- Abdullah, Wan Muhd. Shaghir
1982 *Syekh Muhammad Arsyad al-Banjari, Matahari Islam*. Pontianak: Al Fathanah.
- Al-Attas, Muhammad al-Naquib
1963 *Some aspects of Sufism as understood and practised among the Malays*. Singapore: Malaysian Sociological Research Institute.
- 1975 *Comments on the re-examination of al-Raniri's Hujjat al-Siddiq; A refutation*. Kuala Lumpur: Muzium Negara.
- Al-Banjari, Muhammad Arsyad
1925 *Sabil al-Muhtadin li'l-Tafaqquh fi 'Amr al-Din*. Cairo: n.n.
- Al-Banjari, Abdul Rahman Siddiq
1937 *Risalat Shajarat al-Arshadiyya wa Ma Ulhiqa Bihā*. Singapore: Al-Ahmadiyah.
- Al-Palimbani, Abdul Samad
n.d. *Sayr al-Salikin ila 'Ibadat Rabb al-'Alamin*. Mecca: n.n.

- 1924 *Hidāyat al-Sālikīn*. Cairo: Isā al-Bāb al-Halabī.
- Al-Palimbani, Muhammad Azhari
- 1895 *Risālat Badī'u al- Zamān fī Bayān 'Aqā'id al-Īmān*. Mecca: Maṭba'a Muriyyat al-Kā'inat.
- Azra, Azyumardi
- 2004 *The origins of Islamic reformism in Southeast Asia; Networks of Malay-Indonesian and Middle Eastern 'ulama in the seventeenth and eighteenth century*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Basuni, Ahmad
- 1949 *Djiwa jang besar (Sjeh Muhammad Arsjad Bandjar)*. Bandung: Pustaka Galunggung.
- Behrend, T.E. (ed.)
- 1998 *Katalog induk naskah-naskah Nusantara. Jilid 4: Perpustakaan Nasional Republik Indonesia*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor.
- Braginsky, V.I.
- 1998 *Yang indah; Berfaedah dan kamal: Sejarah sastra Melayu dalam abad 7-19*. Jakarta: Indonesian-Netherlands Cooperation in Islamic Studies (INIS). [INIS Materials 34.]
- Braginsky, V.I. and M.A. Boldyreva
- 1989 *Naskah Melayu di Leningrad*. Kuala Lumpur: Institut Bahasa, Kesusasteraan dan Kebudayaan Melayu, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia. [Siri Latar 2.]
- Bruinessen, Martin van
- 1995 *Kitab kuning, pesantren dan tarekat; Tradisi-tradisi Islam di Indonesia*. Pengantar Abdurrahman Wahid. Bandung: Mizan.
- Chambert-Loir, Henri
- 1985 'Abdussamad al-Falimbani sebagai Ulama Jawi', in: *Sair as-Salikin*, pp. v-xvi. Banda Aceh: Museum Negeri Aceh, Direktorat Jenderal Kebudayaan, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. [Seri Penerbitan Museum Negeri Aceh 14.]
- Chittick, William C.
- 1995 *The Sufi path of knowledge; Ibn al-'Arabi's metaphysics of imagination*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- Dasuki, Hafizh (ed.)
- 1993 *Ensiklopedi Islam*. Vol. 1. Jakarta: Ichtiar Baru van Hoeve.
- Daudi, Abu
- 1980 *Maulana Syekh Moh. Arsyad Al Banjari*. Martapura: Madrasah Sullamul 'Ulum.
- Drewes, G.W.J.
- 1976 'Further data concerning Abd al-Samad al-Palimbani', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 132:267-92.
- 1977 *Directions for travellers on the mystic path; Zakariyya al-Ansari's Kitab Fath-al-Rahman and its Indonesian adaptations*. With an appendix on Palembang manuscripts and authors. The Hague: Nijhoff. [KITLV, Verhandeligen 81.]

- Drewes, G.W.J. and L.F. Brakel (eds)
 1986 *The poems of Hamzah Fansuri*. Edited with an introduction, a translation and commentaries, accompanied by the Javanese translations of two of his prose works. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson: Foris. [KITLV, Bibliotheca Indonesica 26.]
- Halidi, Jusuf
 1968 *Ulama besar Kalimantan Sjech Muhammad Arsjad al-Bandjari (1710-1812)*. Martapura: Jajasan Sjech Muhammad Arsjad al-Bandjari.
- Iskandar, Teuku
 1996 *Kesusasteraan klasik Melayu sepanjang abad*. Jakarta: Libra.
 1999 *Catalogue of Malay, Minangkabau, and South Sumatran manuscripts in the Netherlands*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Documentatiebureau Islam-Christendom.
- Ismail, Engku Ibrahim
 1992 *Syeikh Dawud al-Fatani; Satu analisis peranan dan sumbangannya terhadap khazanah Islam di Nusantara*. Kuala Lumpur: Akademi Pengajian Melayu, Universiti Malaya.
- Kratz, E.U.
 1981 'The editing of Malay manuscripts and textual criticism', *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 137:229-43.
- Manuskrip Melayu*
 1993 *Manuskrip Melayu koleksi Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia; Satu katalog ringkas: Tambahan kedua*. Kuala Lumpur: Perpustakaan Negara Malaysia. [Siri Bibliografi Manuskrip 11.]
- Muthalib, Abdul
 1995 'The mystical thought of Muhammad Nafis al-Banjari; An Indonesian Sufi of the eighteenth century'. MA thesis, McGill University, Montreal.
- Nafis, Muhammad
 n.d. *Al-Durr al-Nafis fi Bayān Wahdat al-'Afāl al-Asmā' wa'l Sifāt wa'l Dhāt, Dhāt al-Taqdīs*. Singapore: Al-Haramayn.
- Nasution, Harun (ed.)
 1992 *Ensiklopedi Islam Indonesia*. Jakarta: Djambatan.
- Nawawi, Ramli
 1987 *Upacara tradisional Manyanggar Banua (Babunga Tahun) di Daerah Kalimantan Selatan*. Banjarmasin: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Nieuwenhuijze, Christoffel Anthonie Olivier van
 1945 *Samsu'l-din van Pasai; Bijdrage tot de kennis der Sumatraansche mystiek*. Leiden: Brill. [Mededeelingen der Afdeeling Volkenkunde van het Indisch Instituut, Extra Serie 8.] [PhD thesis, Leiden University.]
- Noorhaidi Hasan
 1999 'Muhammad Arshad al-Banjari (1710-1812) and the discourse of Islamization in the Banjar sultanate'. MA thesis, Leiden University.
- Quzwain, M. Chatib
 1985a *Mengenal Allah; Suatu studi mengenai ajaran tasawuf Syaikh Abdus-Samad al-Palimbani, ulama Palembang abad ke-18 Masehi*. Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.

- 1985b 'Syeikh Abd al-Samad al-Palimbani: Suatu Studi Mengenai Perkembangan Islam di Palembang dalam Abad ke-18 Masehi', in: K.H.O Gajahnata and Sri-Edi Swasono (eds), *Masuk dan berkembangnya Islam di Sumatera Selatan*, pp. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.
- Ras, J.J.
1968 *Hikajat Bandjar; A study in Malay historiography*. The Hague: Nijhoff. [KITLV, Bibliotheca Indonesica 1.]
- Robson, Stuart
1988 *Principles of Indonesian philology*. Dordrecht: Foris. [KITLV, Working Papers 1.]
- Ronkel, Ph.S. van
1909 *Catalogus der Maleische handschriften in het Museum van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen*. Batavia: Albrecht, 's Hage: Nijhoff. [Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen 57.]
- Sjamsuddin, Helius
1991 'Islam and resistance in South and Central Kalimantan in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries', in: M.C. Ricklefs (ed.), *Islam in the Indonesian social context*, pp. 7-17. Clayton: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University. [Annual Indonesian Lecture Series 15.]
- Soeroto, Soeri
1976 'The Beratib Beamaal Movement in the Banjar War', in: Sartono Kartodirdjo, *Profiles of Malay culture; Historiography, religion and politics*, pp. 167-77. Jakarta: Directorate General of Culture, Ministry of Education and Culture.
- Steenbrink, Karel A.
1984 *Beberapa aspek tentang Islam di Indonesia abad ke-19*. Dengan kata pengantar M. Rasjidi. Jakarta: Bulan Bintang.
- Syarifuddin, M. Idwar Saleh and A. Gazali Usman (eds)
1984 *Upacara tradisional dalam kaitannya dengan peristiwa alam dan kepercayaan Daerah Kalimantan Selatan*. Banjarmasin: Proyek Inventarisasi dan Dokumentasi Kebudayaan Daerah Kalimantan Selatan, Direktorat Penelitian Sejarah dan Nilai Tradisional, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Voorhoeve, P.
1955 *Twee Maleise geschriften van Nūr al-Dīn al-Rānirī*. Leiden: Brill. [Uitgaven van de Stichting De Goeje 16.]
1967 'Abdul Samad al-Palimbani', *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, new edition, vol. I. Leiden: Brill.