M. B. HOOKER

ISLAM IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

ISLAM
IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

EDITED BY

M. B. HOOKER

LEIDEN – E. J. BRILL – 1983

This publication was made possible by a grant from the
British Institute in South-East Asia.

ISBN 90 04 06844 9

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

PREFACE

Islam is the religion of about 140 million people in South-East Asia living in an area stretching from southern Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia to the southern Philippines. The existence of this population has not, however, impinged on Western consciousness in the same way as has that of their co-religionists in the Middle East. The reasons are clear – the general absence of the politics of oil, of Arabic and Israeli nationalism, and the historical prominence of the Middle East in European consciousness. But to view a sophisticated theology, a complex philosophy, and achievements in art and literature in terms of narrow dogmatics, economic self interest and traditional prejudices is grossly misleading and only serves to perpetuate the narrow Euro-central 'orientalist' approach which has recently been pilloried by Edward Said.[1]

Islam is the youngest of the world's monotheisms and, in its own view, it is the completion of the Jewish and Christian traditions. The Muslim submits to God and, in the teachings of the Prophet Muhammad, a complete scheme for the temporal and spiritual worlds is prescribed. Religion is thus not separate from daily life, a point which much of the secular West finds difficult to grasp. The press, for example, presents us with a vision of Islam via the political language of "assertion"[2] and "stability"[3]. South-East Asian Islam has been no exception to this sort of misleading treatment; it is seen in almost wholly political terms[4] which largely ignore religion, philosophy or social life.

The purpose of this book of essays is to provide a concise and introductory discussion of some fundamental aspects of Islam in South-East Asia. Ethnic, linguistic and cultural variation is here the norm. In addition, the area is heir to Hindu and Buddhist traditions as well as to three European colonial systems of government and administration. Islam is but one amongst all these, and it has not escaped the influence of the others; indeed in some aspects of life it has been considerably reformulated by them. It follows, therefore, that to understand Islam in South-East Asia one must begin with data from the area rather than with some middle-Eastern and theological formulation of Islam. This, however, is not to deny that Islam is a universalistic theology originating in the Arabic Middle East.

---

1 Edward Said, *Orientalism* (1979) Routledge and Kegan Paul (London).
2 *The Times* – leader of 16th November 1978.
3 *The Guardian* – leader of 28th December 1978.
4 See the note in *The Guardian*, 13th November 1979, p. 21.

These essays were written in 1978–79 and arose from courses and seminars given in the University of Kent at Canterbury within which Islam was a focal theme. All the authors have approached Islam through the medium of their own discipline, but would not necessarily claim to be Islamicists as this term is ordinarily employed. We hope that these perspectives, from the outside as it were, provide a reasonable view of a complex subject. If this aim is achieved, we shall be well satisfied.

We are very grateful to Professor A.H. Johns of the Australian National University for his comments on an earlier draft. A considerable debt is owed to Dr. John Villiers of the British Institute in South-East Asia which, through the British Academy, made available a generous subsidy for the publication of these essays. We are also very grateful to Mr. F.N. Crofts who undertood the difficult task of indexing essays written in six different disciplines.

Finally, we would thank Mrs. V.J. Howard of the University secretarial staff who typed up the essays cheerfully and efficiently.

M. B. HOOKER

Centre of South-East Asian Studies,
University of Kent at Canterbury,
December 1982.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION:
THE TRANSLATION OF ISLAM INTO SOUTH-EAST ASIA

M. B. HOOKER

١٥٨- قُلْ يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ
إِلَيْكُمْ جَمِيعًا الَّذِي لَهُ مُلْكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَ
الْأَرْضِ لَا إِلَٰهَ إِلَّا هُوَ يُحْيِي وَيُمِيتُ
فَآمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ النَّبِيِّ الْأُمِّيِّ
الَّذِي يُؤْمِنُ بِاللَّهِ وَكَلِمَاتِهِ
وَاتَّبِعُوهُ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَهْتَدُونَ ①

Islam is the religion of about 140 million people in South-East Asia concentrated in a "Muslim archipelago" stretching from southern Thailand through Malaysia and Indonesia and north to the southern Philippines. As the verse cited emphasizes, the religion is a whole, encompassing a social, a legal and a moral order. It is only one of many verses stating the fundamental premises that Dominion belongs to God, that faith is required of man and that the individual Muslim is bound to obey the commands of God as expressed in the words of the Prophet Muhammad.

[1] Say: "O men! I am sent
Unto you all, as the Apostle
Of God, to Whom belongeth
The dominion of the heavens
And the earth: there is no God
But He: it is He that giveth
Both life and death. So believe
In God and His Apostle,
The unlettered Prophet,
Who believeth in God
And His Words: follow him
That (so) ye may be guided.:: S.VII.158
[from A. Yusuf Ali's translation]

But the verse is written in the Arabic language, its premises are expressed in terms of the Arabic culture of the Middle East and its *raison d'être* originates in Revelation. The cultural realities of South-East Asia, on the other hand, include the Malay and other languages; and pre-Islamic explanations of the world order deriving either from indigenous philosophies or from Indian sources. The purpose of this Introduction is to describe the structure of the accommodation between the Middle-East derived form of Islam and the culture(s) of South-East Asia.

It is apposite to consider a little further the main structural features of Islam which have a particular relevance to this book. As suggested above, the main issue is the extent to which the formalism of Islam is culturally derived. A very obvious example is the divergence of doctrine within Sunnī Islam as represented by the existence of four different schools of Sharī'a; these, moreover, were originally representative of different local traditions, the two oldest (Hanafī and Mālikī) being derived respectively from Kufa and Medina. Indeed, a wide cultural variation in early Muslim jurisprudence was the rule rather than the exception and, as Schacht[2] has demonstrated, cultural elements from the heartlands of Islam were more often in opposition than not. The law originated in the provinces rather than radiating from a centre at Medina and reference to the Sunna of the Prophet was often *ex post facto* rather than *res ipsa*. Individual *hadīth* (the vehicle of the Sunna) were essentially local and represented the social, legal and religious ideas of their places of origin. From the ninth century onwards, the main concern of Muslim jurists became the formulation of commonality of doctrine. This was achieved through the doctrine of consensus (*ijmā'*) and the recognition of mutual orthodoxy within the four Sunnī schools. However, even today each school tends to retain a geographical reference;[3] more important, the *hadīth* through which the Sunna was and is known remain in their own culturally defined forms.[4] They are *literary* emanations from certain places and times and for the South-East Asian Muslim they are culturally foreign. The result is a tension between local culture or, more exactly, indigenous modes of conceptualizing the world and thinking about the eternal verities, and the literary information defining the belief in God and the practice of His commands. This internal conflict is of a severity such as to prompt one South-East Asian author to call for the development of culturally relevant traditions.[5] However, even in the unlikely event of this call being heeded, it would not accommodate the Middle-Eastern derived modes of scholasticism, e.g. the *uṣūl al-fiḳh*. The gulf between literary tradition and cultural reality remains a fact of Islamic life.

---

[2] See Schacht (1950).
[3] See Coulson 1969: 24.
[4] See Goldziher 1971: 193f. See also Burton 1977.
[5] Hazairin 1964.

For the student of Islam in South-East Asia these comments reduce to two issues;

(i) the modes of transfer, *i.e.* the temporal and intellectual dimensions by and through which the religion came to the "Muslim archipelago".

(ii) The "translation" of Islam, *i.e.* the means through which the absorption of principle came to result in the formation of an original South-East Asian dimension for Islam. In its dictionary sense "translation" means to move from one condition to another, to turn from one language to another either by simply making a version or by use in a metaphorical sense, or by interpretation and explanation. It can also mean to enrapture or to entrance, as well as to change form and appearance. Examples of all these cognate meanings can be found in South-East Asian Islam and they are the subject of the essays in this book. Together they make up a sufficient description of cultural accommodation, a process which is both historical and contemporary.

THE MODES OF TRANSFER

(a) *The temporal dimension*

By this I mean the ways by which Islam "came" to South-East Asia, a subject of perennial fascination. There is one semantic trap to be avoided in this formulation. "Came" means either *routes* of introduction or the *methods* by which acceptance was achieved. Both are in question here but will be kept separate. Together, they comprise the "temporal dimensions" of Islamic history in South-East Asia. As we shall see the temporal dimension remains uncertain in shape and hazy in outline.

To take first the question of routes; the consensus of modern scholarship[6] is that the period in time is the very end of the thirteenth century and the following fourteenth century, *i.e.* from about 1292 to the 1390s. The argument and the evidence for the existence of Muslims in South-East Asia runs as follows.

(i) Evidence: the hard evidence for a Muslim presence consists: *first* of three Muslim gravestones discovered in the Pase district of north Sumatra, dated in the first half of the 15c, another at Gresik in east Java of 1419. It has been determined that these originated at Cambay in Gujarat. In addition, a much earlier gravestone, but not known to be of Cambay origin and dated 1297, is also known from Page. This stone *may* have an Indian origin. Two further gravestones from Léran in Java dated 1102 and 1391 are also known although there is considerable uncertainty about the first date. Also in East Java are the Trålàyà inscriptions, dated in the *saka* era as being from 1298–

6 Drewes 1968 for a full account.

1397S (*i.e.* 1376–1475). Finally, there is the celebrated Trengganu inscription dated variously as 1303 or 1386-87, the latter being the preferred date.

The *second* body of evidence on origin and routes comes from early travellers' accounts. The great Moroccan traveller, Ibn Baṭṭūta visited Pase in 1345 and describes its people as Muslim. Marco Polo was in the area in 1292 and describes Perlak as Muslim but that "Samara" remained heathen. There is difficulty in identifying "Samara" with Samudra or Pase. Consensus at the moment seems to be that Samara is Samudra thus giving us a date of 1292. The next source of information comes from Tomé Pires whose *Suma Oriental*, completed in 1515, described Pase as a cosmopolitan city with an important Muslim population among whom Bengalis were especially prominent. The ruler was Muslim though the country outside the urban area was still heathen. Finally, there is evidence from Chinese sources (the History of the Sung Dynasty (960–1279) bk. 489) which may be read to indicate an Arab presence in Sumatra but given the then propensity to confuse the west coast of Sumatra with Arabia, this reference is most uncertain.

The *third* and final body of evidence are the indigenous histories which relate the beginnings of Islam. The oldest are the *Hikayat Raja Raja Pasai* and the *Sejarah Melayu* (1612); while both repeated earlier material (now lost) they considerably post-date the evidence already cited. They will be considered more fully in a later section because they provide examples of the intellectual transmission of Islamic values rather than evidence of transfer. For present purposes it is enough to notice that the accounts of the beginning of Islam are posited on the position of the ruler or prince and assume a definite religious function for him. The significance of this will appear below.

(ii) Interpretation of the Evidence: the evidence just outlined is meagre and the various interpretations put on it have suffered from obvious deficiencies. With the exception of the Trengganu inscription, the surviving epigraphy merely gives (Muslim) names and dates, and the accounts of travellers to the region are not wholly reliable, either with respect to their geography or to information on the depth and spread of response to Islam. But the evidence must still be read for what it can tell us about the immediate origins of South-East Asian Islam so that we may determine the effect (if any) of the particular cultural form in which it arrived.

Three places of origin have been put forward. First, that Islam derived directly from the Arabs of the Hadramaut. This, the Arabian thesis, was held by Niemann and de Hollander (both 1861) and, given that the Shāfi'ī are the dominant school in the southern part of the Arabian peninsula, this was not an improbable ascription. Evidence for an Arabic origin, though via the Persian and Indian coasts, was given by Pijnappel in 1872 based on a French translation of Arabic accounts of the voyages of Suleiman and of

Marco Polo and Baṭṭūta. The conclusion drawn from this last class of evidence was as to feasible sea routes which, when combined with much later evidence from indigenous Sumatran material (see below) in which Persian terms are common, indicated a Persian/West Coast of India origin. The argument is inconclusive because, as has been shown by Bausani the great majority of Persian terms are known as borrowings from India. As yet, the part of India from which they derive is not established. The earliest dated evidence does not, therefore, conclude anything on the origin of Islam except as inferential support for later literary evidence.

This brings us to the second interpretation, associated with Snouck, who took the Indian suggestion considerably further. In 1894 he moved, by way of Indian *data*, to an assumption of an Indian *origin*: when Islam had gained a hold in the port cities of south India.

> "...The inhabitants of the Deccan, who resided in great numbers in the port-cities of this island would as middlemen in the trade between the Muslim states [*i.e.* West Asia] and the East Indies, were as if in the nature of things destined to scatter the first seeds of the new religion. Arabs, especially those who passed for descendants of the Prophet... Sayyid or Sharif, found a welcome opportunity to demonstrate their organizational ability. As priests, priest-princes and as sultans they often put the finishing touches to the formation of new realms".[7]

This hypothesis rests on the demonstration of three points. First, a significant Muslim presence in south India. This is known to have occurred at the correct time.[8] Second, the existence of trading links between south India and South-East Asia. This has also been demonstrated.[9] Third, the existence of a prominent Muslim element in this trade, and thus a Muslim element in the South-East Asian population. The latter is supportable from the epigraphy earlier described. Snouck himself, when he returned to the subject in 1907, cited Ibn Baṭṭuta's report, mentioned the three Pase gravestones and drew attention to their similarity with the stone commemorating Malik Ibrahim in Gresik dated 1418. In 1912 it was established by Moquette that the Pase and Gresik tombs originated from Cambay in Gujarat thus demonstrating a relation with India in the fifteenth century. The origin of the oldest known stone, that of Malik al-Salih dated 1297 from Pase, is not known. However, the advance is considerable, an Indian link being shown. But it is a far cry from saying that Islam came to South-East Asia from Gujarat because gravestones came from that place. There are good reasons for not making this assumption: Gujarat only came under Muslim rule in

---

7 Snouck Hurgronje cited in Drewes 1968: 441.
8 See Marrison 1951: 34ff.
9 Reid and Castles 1975:45f.

1297 whereas the Muslims had been established much earlier in south India. More important, the later Malay literature of Sumatra has a strong south Indian background and the intellectual significance of Gujarat is not apparent until al-Raniri in the seventeenth century.

In other words, the argument is inconclusive on the evidence except that an Indian connection in trade, and thus the presence of individual Muslims, is demonstrated (see below also at pp. 44–45).

The third interpretation of the evidence brings us to Bengal. Tomé Pires describes Pase as a rich trading city in which the most prominent men were Bengali or of Bengali origin. This comment forms the basis of a recent argument by S.Q. Fatimi[10] to the effect that Bengal was the origin of South-East Asian Islam. It is of course undeniable that trading relations long existed between Bengal and the archipelago and indeed the Śailendra monarchs derived Mahayana Buddhism from that area. But Fatimi's arguments from the evidence to show a derivation of Islam are not acceptable. They rest on strained and unnecessary interpretations of the epigraphy and contain "wild conjecture".[11] Data from Bengal itself which Fatimi brings forward to make a case, rest on a further assumption that Islam in South-East Asia derives from the Ṣūfī form. This again is misleading. Sufism is not a cultural form but an attempt to state the outer limits of doctrine (see further below). A yet further difficulty is that the predominant school of law in Bengal is Hanafī and not the archipelago-wide Shāfi'ī. There is no evidence, internal or external, to support a change in school. This does not, of course, exclude a Bengali element in the Muslim population of the archipelago.

To sum up, the interpretation of the evidence is not conclusive as to origins. On the other hand, there are two important implications. First, we know from the later history of Islam in South-East Asia that, while cultural formalism played an important role in the understanding of Islam, it was not the only factor. The indigenous modes of adaptation were equally and perhaps more important. The evidence brought forward so far has value in a negative sense; it tells us that Middle Eastern formalism was not necessarily a constituent part of the initial Islamic experience in the formative period (see below).

Second, we are now in a position to summarize the main factors in the initial accommodation of Islam in the area for the period from the end of the thirteenth century to the early fifteenth century. It is the mode of acceptance rather than the route with which we are now concerned. The evidence for the period is unhelpful, and the difficulty is compounded by the multiple referents of the term "Islam". It refers simultaneously to a simple faith, to a social identity, to a cultural heritage and to an explanation

---

[10] Fatimi 1963.
[11] Drewes 1968: 450–451.

for and a theory of power and authority. Apart from the fact that the faith of Islam was physically present in some degree in the city-ports of Sumatra and north Java, our evidence tells us two things. First, Islam was characteristically a court phenomena; it was here that trade took place and it was at this point that the local rulers became involved with the religion. Trade has always been a princely or royal interest in South-East Asia for it was on wealth and the control of wealth-producing activities that rulers depended. The foreign trade was in Muslim hands and thus the culture and ethos of the city-ports were Muslim.[12] The idea or concept of Islam as an aspect of authority or wealth or rule must, therefore, have been of early significance in South-East Asia.

Further, and following from this, it is not too much to say that this was the primary referent of Islam so far as the indigenous urban population were concerned. While the accounts of foreign travellers emphasize this point, the most informative of the early inscriptions – the Trengganu inscription – provides unmistakable evidence[13] confirming this interpretation. The inscription is written in Malay (in Arabic script) and contains a short list of ten rules, breach of which was punished. The actual provisions are fragmentary, and indeed the first three rules are entirely missing. A full description has been provided elsewhere[14] and we need notice only three points here; first, the content of the rules is not Islamic but local Malay/Javanese. Substantially the same provisions can be found in the Malacca and Malacca-derived law texts of the seventeenth century and later. Second, the language used contains a large proportion of Javanese and Sanskrit terms; there are no less than twenty-nine words of Sanskrit origin in the inscription. The nearest parallel is to the fifteenth century tax and land charters of Java where a similar "Javanization" of Sanskrit technical terms of (legal) classification occurs.[15] Finally the "Islamic" element in the inscription is confined to the preamble which defines the officers of government, or bearers of authority as "expounders on earth of the doctrines of God's Apostle [Muhammad]"... "such exposition being incumbent on all Muslim Raja Mandalikas...". In other words, the inscription is not Islamic-derived in either substance or technical terminology. The Islamic connection is solely confined to validating the provisions by reference to God's will. It is worth noting that the date of the inscription makes it contemporary with Majapahit and that the

---

12 The "urban centred" factor in understanding South-East Asian Islam has been most fully described in Johns (1975) (1976).

13 In all the debate on this period it is remarkable that this inscription has only been cited as evidence of dating. In fact its provisions tell us more about Islam at this time than any other single source;

14 Hooker (1976).

15 See Hoadley 1975: App. V for examples of the ways in which Sanskrit terms were defined in technical classes of relevance to Javanese legal thought.

Nāgarakṛtāgama of 1365 a.d. mentions "Tringgano" as one of Majapahit's vassals.

From whence did the inscription originate? The probable answer is the northern coast of Java. The use of Javanized Sanskrit terminology can have originated nowhere else; for example, not only is "derma" (*dharma*) used in the inscription in the same way as in the central Java "Ferry Charter" of 1358 A.D.[16] but 1.9 of the Preamble actually uses the term "*tamra*" (Skt. *tamrasasana*), "edict inscribed on copper". A Javanese derivation is the only one possible, but what about the Islamic reference? Again, one of the port-cities of the north and east Java coast would seem to be the answer. The function of the Islamic reference is significant here – it is to validate rules which are local in content and expressed in an Indian-derived form. Notice that the Indian reference is not to a place but to a language and mode of conceptualizing abstracts such as laws, which had been at home in Java and parts of south Sumatra for the preceding two hundred years at least.[17] The Muslim element, therefore, is but the latest gloss on an already old established usage. The function of the gloss is its most significant feature – to state a change in the sources and origins of law and authority; in 1303 or 1386/87, therefore, the definition of authority in north and east Java was undergoing major change.

As to why this inscription was raised in Trengganu, that we shall never know.

In conclusion, all the evidence available suggests changes in the definition and pattern of authority under the impulse of the Islamic ethic, as it manifested itself in the relations between sovereign and foreign trader in the port-cities. More we cannot say except that this is the definition of Islam which the evidence of the period indicates. We do not know the place of origin, but given the lack of evidence for any foreign cultural formalism, indeed the Trengganu material suggests already an *indigenous* Java/Sanskrit formulation, this is not the important question it later became. I suggest indeed, that origin becomes important for cultural derivation and borrowing only from the beginning of the sixteenth century.

(b) *The intellectual dimension*

By this I mean the forms through which the values of Islam and the structure of its thought were communicated to the South-East Asian populations. We are speaking now about the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries from which derive the extant *mss.* The emphasis is not so much on the transmogrification of Islam (this is dealt with below) as on the absorption of

---

[16] Pigeaud 1960–62: (iii) 156–162, (iv) 399–411.
[17] See Hoadley 1971 for the earlier evidence.

some elements of Islam. The gaps in that which was absorbed are at least as significant as those locally incorporated. We may distinguish two modes of transmission.

(i) *Fiḳh*: The standard words of the Shāfi'ī school are well represented in translations which date from the mid-sixteenth century onwards. The *Fatḥ al-Wahhāb* of Syaikh Zakarīyā al-Anṣārī is found in Achenese, Malay and Patani versions. The *Fatḥ al-Qarīb* of Ibn Qāsim al-Ghazzī is known in Malay, Javanese and Sumatran versions as is the *al-Taḳrīb* of Abū Shudjā in a vast number of *mss*. The *Minhaj al-'Abidin* is similarly widely distributed, being known in Achenese, Malay and Javanese. There are likewise many versions of the *Tuhfah* by Ibn Ḥajar and the *Ilah* (*Īḍāḥ fī l-Fiḳh*) by al-Rāfī.

It seems to have been the standard practice for these books to have been either translated or to be given in the original Arabic with a paraphrase. It was also not unknown for the local scribe to provide glosses on the original.

What then are the characteristics of this form of Islamic transmission? The answer cannot be sought in assuming a simple application of principles of *fiḳh* to the day to day life of South-East Asian Muslims. The standard works just outlined, which include prescriptions on all aspects of Muslim social and religious duty, never formed the sole law for local Muslims. There is contemporary evidence to show otherwise, e.g. the contents and function of the Malayan legal digests as well as those of Sumatra and Java.[18] But this does not mean that the introduction of *fiḳh* was without effect. It fulfilled two related functions.

First, it transmitted the results of Middle Eastern scholasticism to South-East Asia. The main canons of this scholarship had of course been settled from the time of Shāfi'ī and South-East Asia was heir to the scholastic elaborations of the succeeding five hundred years. A major legacy was the mode of reasoning by analogy. This may be summed up for present purposes as the formation of doctrinal limits on the use of reason in relation to the Qur'an and Sunna.

Second, the heritage of *fiḳh* in South-East Asia, which is derived entirely from the writing of Shāfi'ī, is a highly systematic body of writing concerned with the statement of formally consistent propositions. The reasoning is juristic and explicit. In other words, the "material considerations of a religious and ethical kind"[19] which played such an important role in the doctrines of Auzā'ī, Abū Ḥanīfa and Malik hardly appear in his writings. There is, rather, a consistent separation of moral and legal aspects where both appear in the same problem. The law is concerned with the *forum externum* alone; Shāfi'ī proves this by reference to passages from the Qur'ān

---

18 See below pp. 161–166.
19 Schacht 1950: 317.

and Sunna. The mode of argument is based in analogy, an important implication of which is the lack of differentiation on principle between the finding of general rules and the decision of individual cases.[20] This is a technical characteristic of *fiḳh* which South-East Asian Islam always attempted to avoid (see below pp. 162 f.).

The primacy of technical legal thought had long been established as the major concern of jurists by the time their writings reached Asia. The abiding issue was the relation between Revelation and Reason or, more specifically in the Shāfi'ī version, the distinction between argument taken from tradition and the result of systematic thought.[21] The question was not so much source, authorities were agreed on the sources, as the relation between them, which essentially resolved itself into determining the proper use of *qiyās* (conclusion by analogy). This is both technically legal and yet also a general term or concept of a systematizing nature (e.g. see the relation between *ijtihād* and *qiyās*).[22] It is easy to see how argument based on analogy must assume proportions in excess of the requirements of technical minutae. Thus, while *qiyās* is used on questions of detail in which one looks for indication (*dalā'il*) and parallels (*mithāl*) it remains limited methodologically in that a *qiyās* cannot to based on a special case, i.e. exceptions cannot be extended by analogy. This rule is valid within the sphere of Qur'ān, Sunna and between them. Such limitation is necessary to prevent excessive fragmentation but it also states the limits of that which is conveyed by "reason" (*'aql*) or "that which is reasonable" (*ma'qūl*). These usages, occasionally used as synonyms for, or replacements of, *qiyās* refer us to the complex area of how one conceptualizes the process of reason. This is not the place to describe the complexities and sophistication of Muslim thought on this point, but the set-*qiyās, ijtihād, ra'y*- (sound opinion as opposed to arbitrary decision) is a necessary explanation though not wholly sufficient. The insufficiency is found in the variable uses of the terms of the set. These were and are still culturally confined as Goldziher has demonstrated, indeed many are quite spurious though framed in terms of ancient traditions.[23]

From the seventeenth century, and for a later period stretching up to the early twentieth century, the legacy of *fiḳh* encompassed the sophisticated or sophistic thought just outlined. This was a legacy on two levels; first, a technical inheritance of considerable subtlety and second, a more general but derivative reference to general canons of phenomenology and epistemology. For purposes of ordinary discourse, these two levels coalesced more often than not in South-East Asia. The evidence of the surviving texts shows

---

20 *Ibid* 125.
21 *Ibid* 122f, 135f on *qiyās*.
22 *Ibid* 127f.
23 See Ibid 125ff and generally Goldziher 1971: chs. VII and VIII.

a fairly consistent tendency toward generalization, within which the more arcane or abstruse aspects of technical legal thought became absorbed into a general mass of prescriptions. South-East Asian scholars never developed any contribution to technical thought nor, indeed, to modes of reasoning. Their genius expressed itself, rather, in the translation of inherited modes into the cultures of the area.

(ii) Literature and Philosophy: With these two classes we come to less readily ascertainable modes of transmission. By this I mean that the contents of the extant *mss* transmit general values rather than a specific scheme of normatives.

We have already seen that, even in respect of *fiḳh*, there was a tendency to generalize and this is even more marked in literature and philosophy. To these we must add indigenous historical writing, which is both a form of literature and an explication of philosophical concepts. This might perhaps be thought an overstatement, but South-East Asian historical activity of the seventeenth and eighteenth and later centuries was a creative literary form in which Islamic values were transmitted and interpreted. One has only to look at the *Babad Tanah Jawi*, for example, to see this point illustrated.

The literature, histories and philosophies have been described elsewhere,[24] (see also below p. 130., 23f., 92f.) and they accomplished a two-fold function in transmitting Islamic values.

(a) In respect of philosophy; to set limits to doctrinal interpretation. There is a very real sense in which Hamzah and Abdul-Rauf pushed the rationalization of the mystic mode to its furtherst conclusions. Many of the orthodox were not prepared to follow this train (e.g. al-Ranirī), even to a limited extent, but the polemic did state the tension between reason and revelation in a way quite unique. The polemic was of course literary in form but it was not confined to the literati; the impact of this thought penetrated into the mass of South-East Asian Muslims for whom the mode became "natural". Its effect was non- or indeed anti-legalistic and thus, of course, of danger to orthodoxy. In the eighteenth century this was the framework within which ideas of power and rule were formulated. We shall not, therefore, be surprised at the non-legalistic modes of the latter. Indeed, it is in this sphere that South-East Asian Islam has made its outstanding contribution. "Transmission" merges into "translation".

(b) In respect of literature and histories: the function was to provide a set or series of basic referents from which indigenous thought could radiate and inform. The stories about the Prophet, the accounts of the deeds of his Companions, the basic theological issues in the form of Persian speculation and rationalization all contributed to a body of historical verities. Indigenous

---

[24] See the preceding reference for full discussion.