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ABSTRACT

This article is meant to formulate the theory of translation in a hermeneutical perspective. In the aftermath of such an effort, I will further put it into practice to analyze ‘Abdurra’ûf’s *Turjumân al-Mustafîd* whether it is a translation or commentary. This is for arbitrating the disagreement between Anthony H. Johns and Peter G. Riddell. Both are seemingly different in viewing the *Turjumân*.

Riddell seems to consider it a translation due to its nature itself, which is the translated version of the *Jalâlayn*. Furthermore, it has been proven that ‘Abdurra’ûf himself chose the interlinear method for the compilation of the *Turjumân*, which shows his Malay style as being imitated from Arabic grammar. Finally, the use of linguistics approach for his analysis automatically affects Riddell’s pre-supposition that the *Turjumân* is in essence a translation. Meanwhile, Johns preferred to regard the *Turjumân* as more than just a translation. This is a commentary in his eyes, and the reflection of the Malay ‘ulamâ’ attempting to vernacularize Islam and the Qur’ân. Furthermore, Johns sees this work as the result of ‘Abdurra’ûf’s oral tradition with which he taught the students the meanings of the Qur’ân in his *Madrasah*. He could be the example of how a great Malay scholar did Islamic education in the 17th century in Aceh.

In this study, I prove that translation is in the top position of all acts of understanding. While translation and interpretation are thought to be the acts of understanding, both activities are basically different and have their own uniqueness.
Every act of understanding could be considered the act of translation if it at least meets two basic requirements. Firstly, it should involve *two* languages, the original and translated languages. Secondly, it requires the *equality* in meaning between both languages. Otherwise, or if it just meet one of these two requirements, it could be merely called the act of interpretation. Taking both theology and eschatology as examples, I argue that the *Turjumân*, of course together with all acts of interpreting and translating the Qur'ân implemented in the forms of independent writings, is actually the work of interpretation.

This study would certainly give the consequence on the study of Islamic Archipelago literature, especially the works made for primarily understanding the Qur'ân. I state that the common understanding that the writing tradition of Qur'ânic exegesis has been just well established since the early 20th century will be revised by the facts that many local Muslims in Southeast Asia have actually made many efforts to understand the Qur'ân in local languages. In other words, I argue that the writing tradition of Qur'anic Exegesis in S.E. Asia has been well-established since the 17th century, which is three centuries earlier than the common understanding.
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All Arabic words that occur in this thesis are transliterated according to the following table:

**Consonants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ب</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ط</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ل</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ت</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ر</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ز</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ع</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ج</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>س</td>
<td>gh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ه</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ح</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>خ</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ص</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ق</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ذ</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ث</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ن</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>م</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>د</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ض</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Vowel and diphthongs:**

- **Short:**
  - ا = A
  - إ = I
  - ع = U

- **Long:**
  - ـَا = Â
  - ـَى = Î
  - ـُو = Û

- **Diphthongs:**
  - ـَى = Ay
  - ـُو = Aw

**Notes:**

- In the case of *tashdid* (´), the consonant is doubled, for example: ( ب ) is written *bb*, except in the case of *yâ’ nisbiyyah* ( ى written in the end of a word), it is written *î*, rather than *iyy*.
- In the case of *tâ marbûtah* (ـ), it is written *h*, unless it occurs within an *idâfah*, where it is written *t*.
ABBREVIATION


A.D. : Date to indicate the number of years or centuries that have passed since the year in which Jesus Christ is believed to have been born. (Collins COBUILD Dictionary).

A.H. : The year in Islamic calendar.

AYA : Abdullah Yusuf Ali

B.C. : Date to indicate the number of years or centuries before the year in which Jesus Christ is believed to have been born. (Collins COBUILD Dictionary).

BKI : Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde

EFEO : Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient

IAIN : Institut Agama Islam Negeri (State Institute for Islamic Studies)

JMBRAS : Journal of the Malay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society

KITLV : Koninklijk Instituut Voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde

ML : Manuscript code for Malay Collection in the National Library of Jakarta

MORA RI : Ministry of Religious Affairs Republic of Indonesia

MS[S] : Manuscript[s]

Q.S. : Qur'ân Sura

TBG : Tijdschrift voor taal-, land- en volkenkunde, uitgegeven door het (Koninklijk) Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen.


UIN : Universitas Islam Negeri (State Islamic University)

YOI : Yayasan Obor Indonesia

YPAH : Yayasan Pendidikan dan Museum Ali Hasjmy
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION
TOWARD HERMENEUTICS AS THE THEORY OF TRANSLATION

1.1. Background

Translation constitutes a fundamental process as to the transmission of knowledge from an advanced civilization to a developing one. The difference in the use of language as a medium of communication is believed to be the primary factor of why such an activity shows its importance. The Islamic civilization, for example, reached its glory from the 8th to the 15th centuries since in its early phases they developed the translation of the Greek works on Philosophy into Arabic. The Western also achieved its triumph since the 16th centuries because they initially emphasized the translation of Islamic civilization works on many fields of study into European languages.

It has been accepted that the sacred texts are regarded as the most wanted works to translate. The attempt of evangelism is certainly followed by the translation of a Holy text into local languages. This, together with all other acts of translation, is

---

to make local people easily understand what the works say without having difficulties in mastering the foreign language. Nevertheless, the term *translation* is frequently difficult to understand if it is contrasted to any other similar terms, such as *interpretation*. The unclear distinction between the two possibly becomes an important factor in suggesting that many scholars overlook their difference in use, especially in the field of hermeneutics.

The term “hermeneutics” originates in the Greek verb *hermêneuein*, which commonly means “to interpret,” and the noun *hermêneia*, “interpretation.” Richard E. Palmer, in *Hermeneutics: Interpretation Theory in Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Heidegger, and Gadamer*,\(^2\) contends that *hermeneutics* in its modern form refers to the process of “bringing to understanding. This process is clear when language as a medium is involved in it.

Such a process of course includes all three basic meanings that *hermêneuein* (v) and *hermêneia* (n) usually refer to in ancient usage. As for the use of the verb *hermêneuein*, these three basic meanings are to express, to explain, and to translate. According to Palmer, all three meanings can be represented by the English verb “to interpret.” Yet, he admits that each has its own independent meaning of interpretation. As a result, says Palmer, the act of interpretation itself points to three different manners: a[n] *oral recitation, reasonable explanation*, and *translation*.\(^3\)

When we use the term “to interpret,” as Palmer argued, to represent the Greek verb *hermêneuein*, a crucial problem comes up concerning the certainty meaning of


the term “to interpret” compared to hermêneuein. Nevertheless, it has been generally accepted that hermeneutics acts widely as the theory of interpretation. Moreover, the task of hermeneutics is to bring something foreign, strange, separated in time, space or experience to be familiar, understandable, and comprehensive. Hence, the terms “expression,” “explanation,” and “translation” automatically play the same role.⁴

There are, of course, no two words that are fully the same in meaning. As stated above, the term translation is a part of interpretation, which means that someone who is translating is at the same time considered to be an interpretation. Yet, such two words cannot be fully regarded as two synonymous words. Translation constitutes the act of understanding that involves two different languages, the language that the writer used [in linguistics: Source Language] and the language that the translator used for the translation [Receptor Language]. This fact points to a uniqueness of the term translation compared to the term interpretation.

Despite the fact that translation and interpretation constitute two different things, hermeneutics is widely accepted as the field for the theory of interpretation and has in large extent ignored the importance of the theory of translation and related methods. Since such a theory has been less developed in hermeneutics, we should take into consideration hermeneutics as a theory of translation as well. This study is thus meant to answer some primary questions as follow: [1] Can a translation be considered an interpretation?; [2] What are the effects might come up behind the

process of working translation?; and [3] What are the factors behind the use of certain [un]translatable words in attempt of understanding the Qur’ân?

1.2. Methodology

This study investigates and then formulates the concept of translation from hermeneutical perspectives. Gadamer's hermeneutics is chosen since he is one of a few hermeneutical philosophers, or even the only one ever known, who describe translation as the act of understanding compared to interpretation. This study is meant to know whether translation can be considered interpretation.

In the aftermath of such effort, I will further attempt to implement this theory to the analysis of the Malay translation of the Qur’ân, which the *Turjumân al-Mustafid* of 'Abdurra'ûf al-Fansûrî al-Sînîlî. For the purpose of this analysis, I will take two important aspects explored in the Arabic Qur’ân as my case study. These are the aspects of theology and eschatology. In this regard, I will use some manuscript (MS) copies and printed editions of the *Turjumân*. They are coded as ML 290 and ML 116 for the manuscripts (MSS) and the publication of Mustafâ al-Bâbî al-Halabî in 1951 A.D. and Dâr al-Fikr in 1990 A.D. [read: TM90]. With regards to the elaboration of theology and escathology, I will use Fazlur Rahman's work, *The Major Themes of the Qur’ân*, as his thoughts mainly reflect the mainstream of Muslim beliefs on both aspects.

In Southeast Asia, both theology and eschatology have been established as the results of "Indianization"—the coming of Hinduism and Budhism to Archipelago—for about one thousand years before the birth of 'Abdurra'uf in the 17th century. Thus,
I also examine how far Hindu has developed both aspects and their understanding in
the local communities.

1.3. Conceptual Framework

Hermeneutics as the theory of interpretation has long developed. As the
theory of translation, nevertheless, it has just established in recent decades. As the
former, hermeneutics has developed since the early 18th century and been widely
implemented to the exegesis of the Bible. It was Johann Martin Chladenius (1710-
1759 A.D.) who published the book, *Introduction to the Correct Interpretation of
Reasonable Discourses and Books* in 1742 A.D. He intended to write the book to
develop both theory and practical rules for the students of disciplines to which
interpretation is basically used. Astonishingly, argues Mueller-Volmer, Chladenius
does not consider philosophy a part of this discipline. Yet, poetry, rhetoric, history,
and the Ancients, as well as all fields in the Humanities really depend on the art of the
interpretation (*Ausglegekunst*).5 Quoted from Mueller-Volmer, Chladenius defines
hermeneutics as “the art of attaining the perfect or complete understanding of
utterances (*vollstandiges Verstehen*)—whether they be speeches (*Reden*) or Writings
(*Schriften*).”

Chladenius asserts that if the art of the interpretation functions to help us
achieve a “perfect understanding,” it is certainly the task of hermeneutics
philosophers to describe the goals, the obstacles that need to be solved, and the

methods that should be used for reaching the expected targets.\textsuperscript{6} Despite the fact that the result of interpretation is always relative, interpreters should take responsibility for making the readers realize and repair textual transparency whenever they find obstacles to the process of understanding. Thus, the interpreter, for Chladenius, plays a role as a mediator between the writer and his perspectives and the reader and his world.\textsuperscript{7}

Then, Friederich D.E. Schleiermacher (1768-1834 A.D.) came with—as Palmer puts it\textsuperscript{8}—“the project of general hermeneutics.” Schleiermacher asserts that, using Muller-Volmer’s words, “hermeneutics was no longer occupied with the decoding of a given meaning or with the clearing away of obstacles in the way of proper understanding, but was above all concerned with illuminating the conditions for the possibility or understanding and its modes of interpretation.”

Schleiermacher grasps understanding as:

1. an act of speaking cannot even be understood as a moment in a person’s development unless it is also understood in relation to the language…

2. nor can an act of speaking be understood as a modification of the language unless it is also understood as a moment in the development of the person.

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
Schleiermacher called the two sides of understanding concerning two different modes of interpretation as grammatical and psychological or technical.\

Regarded as “the Bacon of the Historical sciences,” Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835 A.D.) was in line with Schleiermacher in analyzing understanding grounded in language and linguisticality, just as was the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure who developed a distinction between language as a system (language) and speech (parole). Humboldt argues that a speaker cannot transmit what he means in his mind to another. Understanding can be achieved due to the fact that, says Humboldt, humans construct and grasp speech in accordance with the same grammatical principles.

Apart from these stated scholars, we find more scholars who are concerned with the development of the theory of interpretation in Hermeneutics. Certainly, they developed the theory for different disciplines in social sciences. Some to be mentioned here are: Johann Gustav Droysen (1808-1884 A.D.), in the field of ancient history; Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911 A.D.), who focused on the Hermeneutics of the Human Sciences; and Martin Heidegger (1889-1976 A.D.), who developed hermeneutics as—in Palmer’s term—“phenomenology of dasein.”

As the theory of translation, hermeneutics has relatively developed since the second half of 20th century. It was Hans-George Gadamer (1900-2002 A.D.) who gave the space for the study of translation in hermeneutical perspective in his book,

---


Truth and Method. Unlike many other hermeneutical philosophers, Gadamer relatively paid more attention to the analysis of translation while analyzing understanding and interpretation as well. In his magnum opus, Truth and Method,\textsuperscript{11} he elaborates a close link between language and hermeneutics. He confirms that language is considered the medium of hermeneutic experience. With respect to the concept of translation, he generally accepts that a translation can be regarded as an interpretation.

However, it is clear that he actually tried to emphasize the uniqueness of translation as the act of interpretation. Hence, it seems that Gadamer wanted to emphasize the development of the theory of translation in a hermeneutical perspective. Initially, we are of course able to formulate such a theory based on Gadamer’s previous study.

However, the attempt in developing the hermeneutic theory of translation has not been taken into consideration. Such a theory has been richly developed in both linguistics and semiotics while this is less developed in hermeneutics. Some recent scholars have actually tried to conceptualize the theory of language and linguisticality in hermeneutics. One example of this is Lawrence K. Schmidt who edited some articles concerning Gadamer’s hermeneutics on language and linguisticality.\textsuperscript{12} One of collected articles is written by John Sallis entitled “the Hermeneutics of Translation.” In this ten page article, he investigates Gadamer’s concept on translation. Apart from

\textsuperscript{11} For this study, I will use the second, revised edition, translation revised by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall, published by Continuum, London & New York, in 2004.

this, I have not found any articles or even books which fully conceptualize the theory of translation in a hermeneutic perspective. Therefore, this study definitely shows its significance.

With regards to the study of ‘Abdurra’ûf’s *Turjuman al-Mustafid*, there are some scholars dedicated to the study of this work. The greatest contribution certainly comes from three scholars: Peter Riddell, Salman Harun, and Anthony Johns. The two formers wrote the Ph.D. theses on the *Turjumân al-Mustafîd*. The titles are respectively “‘Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sinkilî’s Tarjuman al-Mustafid: A Critical Study of His Treatment of Juz 16”\(^\text{13}\) and “Hakekat Tafsir Tarjumân al-Mustafîd Karya Syekh Abdurrauf Singkel.”\(^\text{14}\)

The *Turjumân* was initially thought to be the translation adopted from the *Anwâr al-Tanzîl wa Asrâr al-Ta'wîl* by al-Baydâwî (d. 1286 A.D). Taking the treatment of chapter sixteen as his object of study, Riddell states that for centuries the *Turjumân* has been printed many times in Malay as well as other Muslim worlds by mentioning that this work is derived from the *tafsîr* of al-Baydâwî, or even the *Turjumân* is its translation. Muslims in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, and Europe predominantly accept the claim.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{13}\) Ph.D. Dissertation at the Australian National University in 1984. Then, it was published by Centers for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of California in 1990. The title of this is “Transferring a Tradition: ‘Abd al-Rauf al-Singkili’s Rendering into Malay of the Jalalayn Commentary.” For this study, I will use his Ph.D. thesis.


One evidence of this is the publication of Mustafâ al-Bâbî al-Ḥalabî Cairo, Egypt, in 1923 A.D., wherein the translation of 'Abdurra’ûf al-Sinkîlî is called Anwâr al-Tanzîl wa Asrâr al-Ta’wîl, and also the publication of Farsam Faries in Penang–Malaysia that is entitled Tafsîr Anwâr al-Baydâwî. Salman Harun then re-examines Riddell’s argument with taking the treatment of chapter thirty as his example. Having studied the Turjumân, he strengthens Riddell’s argument that the Turjumân is really derived from the Jalâlayn.

In the following years, Riddell produced some studies analyzing the Turjumân. In 1984 A.D., he wrote an article entitled, “The Sources of ’Abd al-Rauf’s Tarjuman al-Mustafid.” Then in 1989 A.D., he published an article in Archipel Journal which is “Earliest Qur’anic Exegetical Activity in the Malay-Speaking States.” In this article, he made a comparison between the Turjumân and the oldest manuscript at the Cambridge University. After that, in 2002 A.D. and 2004 A.D. again he produced two articles. The titles are respectively “Literal Translation, Sacred Scripture, and Kitab Malay” and “From Kitab Malay to Literary Indonesia: A Case Study in Semantic Change.”

Anthony Johns, on the other hand, made one article which fully discusses the ‘Abdurra’ûf’s commentaries in the Turjumân. In this article, he focuses on the study

16 JMBRAS, LVII (2), 1984.
17 Published in Studia Islamika 9:1 (2002).
of an episode of the Joseph Story. While we can see that there are many more works discussing the *Turjumân*, all stated works basically represent how far the *Turjûman* has been studied.

1.4. Significance of Study

The significance of this study can be seen from each chapter, which also points to the contributions. Chapter Two focuses on the socio-political context in which the *Turjumân* was produced. It contains the intellectual biography of Abdurra’ûf al-Sinkîlî, the sources and writing structure of the *Turjumân*, and the *Turjumân* in the forms of extant manuscripts and printed works.

Chapter Three attempts to conceptualize the hermeneutical theory of translation, especially in reference to Gadamer’s *Truth and Method*. In this chapter, I first of all examine the interpretive strategy in Gadamer’s points of view. Then, I go further to the study of—as Sallis puts it—“the Hermeneutics of Translation.” This chapter is of course meant to answer the two primary questions of whether a translation can be considered an interpretation, and the effects that might come up behind the process of doing a translation.

Chapter Four is aimed to put the hermeneutics of translation to practice. In this regard, the *Turjumân* becomes the object of study. Firstly, I elaborate the characteristics of the two exegetical schools of thought in Islamic tradition, namely—borrowing Abdullah Saeed’s terms—Tradition-based Understanding and Textualism

---

schools. Then, it is followed by identifying some [un]translatable words used by Abdurra’ûf al-Sinkîî in different fields, such as theology, law, and gender equality. This study will use some classical and modern translations of the Qur’ân for the measurement how far certain Arabic words can or cannot be translated into Malay or the Indonesian language. Then, I examine the problems of incongruous language in the process of rendering the Qur’ân into Malay. In the case of the *Turjumân*, the whole study is of course intended to see how far the *Turjumân* has legitimized multiple understandings.

Finally, I will bring these together to show that, while translation and interpretation constitute the acts of understanding, both activities are basically different and have their own uniqueness. The study of those two activities will give the consequence as for the study of Islamic Archipelago literature, especially the works made for primarily understanding the Qur’ân. The common understanding that the writing tradition of Qur’ânic exegesis has been just well established since the early 20th century will be revised by the facts that many local Muslims in Southeast Asia have actually made many efforts to understand the Qur’ân in local languages.
CHAPTER II

THE TURJUMÁN AL-MUSTAFÎD

2.1. THE BIOGRAPHY OF ‘ABDURRA’ÛF AL-SINKÎLÎ (1615-1693 A.D.)

His complete name—as many scholars¹ put it—is ‘Abdurra’ûf ibn ‘Alî al-Jâwî al-Fansûrî al-Sinkîlî. Yet, many people call him Syiah Kuala after his place of burial: Kuala. The date of his birth is not accurately known. Nevertheless, most scholars agree with Rinkes’ calculation,² who based his prediction on other events with a certain level of certainty, suggesting that his departure from Arabia took place in 1661 A.D. Rinkes estimates that ‘Abdurra’ûf was born in 1615 A.D. under the assumption that Southeast Asian Muslim scholars used to start to travel to the Arabian peninsula when they were twenty years old.³

However, in his article published in the *Encyclopedia of Islam*, Voorhoeve argues that ‘Abdurra’ûf was born in 1620 A.D. though many scholars do not agree with this estimation. Wan Shaghir Abdullah, on the other hand, proposes the year of ‘Abdurra’ûf’s birth; 1592 A.D., which is much earlier than these two scholars. For this study, I will consider the year of his birth to be between 1615 and 1620 A.D., under the reasoning that there are many Muslim scholars from the region who traveled to Arabia before they were twenty years old. Some examples are Shaykh Nawawi of Banten and Shaykh Mahfûz of Termas, though these are sometimes held to be special cases.

**2.1.1. His Early Life**

Very little is known about ‘Abdurra’ûf’s early life. Peter G. Riddell contends that our knowledge of his early life is primarily based on Rinkes’ work. Yet, we could also refer to A. Hasjmy’s work in 1980 A.D., even if many scholars, like Azyumardi Azra, question its accuracy. ‘Abdurra’ûf is a Malay coming from Fansur, 4 Voorhoeve, “‘Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sinkîlî,” *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1960), p. 88. 5 Wan Mohd. Shaghir Abdullah, *al-Ma’rifah: Pelbagai Aspek Tasawuf di Nusantara*, vol. 2, (Kuala Lumpur: Khazanah Fathanîyah, 2004), p. 4. 6 Everyone who is already more than 20 years old would be brave enough to do long traveling. Thus, if there is someone who begun long traveling to Arabia under 20 years, it will be certainly assumed that he has family or a guarantee of protection in Arabia during his sojourn there. 7 Riddell, ‘Abdurra’ûf al-Sinkîlî’s *Tarjumân al-Mustafid*, p. 20. 8 See his work, “Syekh ‘Abdurrauf Syiah Kuala, Ulama Negarawan yang Bijaksana,” in *Universitas Syiah Kuala Menjelang 20 Tahun*, (Medan: Waspada, 1980). 9 The example of this is ‘Abdurra’ûf went to Banda Aceh to be a student of Hamzah Fansuri and Syamsuddin al-Sumatranî. To Azra, it is impossible for ‘Abdurra’ûf to meet Hamzah Fansuri which possibly passed away in about 1607 A.D. Nevertheless, Azra does not doubt that ‘Abdurra’ûf
Sinkil, on the west coast of Aceh. Vladimir Braginsky predicts that two *nisbah makānī*, i.e. “al-Fansūrî” and “al-Sinkīlī,” which are commonly put behind his name probably refer to the possibility that his mother is from Fansur (Barus), while himself from Sinkil. It also suggests that his father, Shaykh ’Alî, is of Arabian descent. This is up for debate, however, as Azra asserts that no other sources corroborate this argument, though he also never denies the possibility.

According to Oman Fathurahman, ‘Abdurra’ûf is often associated with the myth. He is, for example, believed to be the first ‘ulamā’ to preach Islamic doctrine in Aceh, despite the fact that Muslim communities have been clearly established in Aceh for centuries before his lifetime. Another legend tells how ‘Abdurra’ûf successfully made the prostitutes aware of their sins in the brothel reportedly built by Hamzah Fansūrî in Aceh city. Regardless of what the myth is, Azra and Fathurahman assure that ‘Abdurra’ûf must have realized the dispute over the *wujūdiyyah* teachings between Shaykh Nûr al-Dīn al-Rânîrî and the followers of Hamzah Fansūrî and Shams al-Dīn al-Sumatra-î, the acts of killing the wujūdiyyah followers, and the burning of both scholars’ works. In the aftermath of his departure,

had contact with Syamsuddin al-Sumatranî (d. 1630 A.D.) in the age of 10s years. See Azra, *The Origins of Islamic Reformism*, p. 71.

---


12 See also Azra, *The Origins of Islamic Reformism*, p. 71.

13 See Fathurahman, *Tanbîh al-Mashî*, p. 25-26. This myth must be critically analyzed and not be merely quoted by which we do not make a wrong assessment to the life of Hamzah Fansuri. See Braginsky, *The Heritage*, p. 648.

Abdurra’uf is said to have attempted to be neutral, and restrain the more dangerous effects of their bloody conflicts. This can be seen from his writings, particularly in his first Malay commentary of the Qur’ân, *Turjumân al-Mustafîd*, as will be elaborated later on.

### 2.1.2. His Journey in Arabian Peninsula (1642-1661 A.D.)

Compared to the other periods of his lifetime, his life during the period of his education in Arabia is well-documented. This period is relatively better recorded because he wrote about the process of gaining his knowledge and about how he linked himself to the networks of the ‘ulamâ’. He wrote about this time as a codicil for one of his works, the *‘Umdah al-Muḥtâjîn ilâ Maslak al-Mufridîn*. Undoubtedly, the *‘Umdah* is already treated as a primary source for the reconstruction of his life, particularly his lifetime during his travels ranging from about 1642 to 1661 A.D. In this section, I will specially refer to Azra’s analysis on the networks of ‘Abdurra’uf for he comprehensively studied these nineteen years in Arabia.

Quoted from Rinkes, Azra estimates that ‘Abdurra’uf probably left Aceh in 1642 A.D. His first sojourn was to Doha, in the Persian Gulf. He believes that ‘Abdurra’uf moved to study with ‘Abdulqadîr al-Mawrir. He then went to Yemen, likely to Bayt al-Faqîh and Zabid. At that time, both places were important centers for Islamic studies. In Bayt al-Faqîh, ‘Abdurra’uf was a student of some distinguished teachers from the Ja’man family, such as Ibrâhîm ibn Muhammad ibn Ja’man, Ibrâhîm ibn ‘Abdollâh ibn Ja’man, and Qâdhî Ishâq ibn Muhammad ibn Ja’man. His most well-known teacher here, says Azra, was Ibrâhîm ibn ‘Abdollâh ibn Ja’man (d.
1672 A.D.), who was famous for his expertise in Hadîth and Islamic jurisprudence (fiqh). Some ‘ulamâ’s with whom ‘Abdurra’ûf communicated were Faqîh al-Ṭayyib ibn Abî al-Qasim ibn Ja’man, the Muftî of Bayt al-Faqîh, and one other jurist, Muḥammad ibn Ja’man. Azra informs us that some of the ulamâ’ of Ja’man were also the students of Aḥmad al-Qusyāṣyîl and Ibrāhîm al-Kuranî.\(^\text{15}\)

In Zabid, ‘Abdurra’ûf continued to strengthen his networks through studying under ‘Abdurrahîm ibn al-Ṣiddîq al-Khâṣ, Amîn ibn al-Ṣiddîq al-Mizjajî, and ‘Abdullâh ibn Muhammad al-‘Adanî. He also held constant communications with prominent ‘ulamâ’ of Zabid and of other Yemeni regions, such as ‘Abdulfatâh al-Khâṣ, the Muftî of Zabid; Sayyid al-Thahir ibn Husayn al-Ahdal; Muhammad ‘Abdulbâqî al-Mizjajî (d. 1664 A.D.), who was the teacher of Yûsuf al-Maḥassarî; Qâdhî Muḥammad ibn Abî Bakr ibn Muṭayr; and Aḥmad Abû al-‘Abbâs ibn al-Muṭayr (d. 1664 A.D.).\(^\text{16}\)

Having studied in Zabid, ‘Abdurra’ûf went to Jeddah where he became the student of ‘Abdulqâdîr al-Barkhalî. His travels continued when he headed to Mecca. Here, he met some ‘ulamâ’ and studied with them, including Badr al-Dîn al-Lahurî; ‘Abdullâh al-Lahurî; and ‘Alî ibn ‘Abdulqâdîr al-Tabarî. According to Azra, the latter is his most important teacher. Mecca was the place in which ‘Abdurra’ûf had the best chance to communicate with many prominent ‘ulamâ’, who lived permanently in Mecca or only made a short stay there for a pilgrimage. Azra convincingly states that ‘Abdurra’ûs personality and capability as a prominent international scholar were

\(^{15}\) Azra, *The Origins of Islamic Reformism*, p. 73.

\(^{16}\) Azra, *The Origins of Islamic Reformism*, p. 74.
primarily established through his maintainance of communications in Mecca, rather than any other areas he stayed previously.\footnote{Azra, \textit{The Origins of Islamic Reformism}, p. 74.}

Eventually, ‘Abdurra’ûf arrived at his last destination, which was Medina. Here, he studied intensively with Ahmad al-Qusyâsyî until his death in 1660 A.D.,\footnote{Wan Shaghir is not in the same opinion as to the encounter between Ahmad al-Qusyasyî and ‘Abdurra’ûf. For him, al-Qusyasyî is a great Sûfî ‘Ulamâ’ who lived in Mecca, not in Medina. Thus, says Shaghir Abdullah, ‘Abdurra’ûf learned with al-Qusyasyî in Mecca, and with al-Kuranî, the disciple of al-Qusyasyî, in Medina. See for further, Shaghir Abdullah, \textit{al-Ma’rifah}, vol. 2, p. 27.} and then continued studying with his \textit{khalîfah}, Ibrâhîm al-Kuranî. From al-Qusyasyî, ‘Abdurra’ûf learned Sufism. His educational success can be shown from the fact that he was appointed to be the \textit{khalîfah} of both his Shattariyyah and Qâdiriyyah order. From al-Kuranî, on the other hand, he strengthened his intellectual capacity. The last item led Azra to conclude that while al-Qusyasyî became ‘Abdurra’ûf’s spiritual teacher, al-Kuranî was his intellectual teacher.\footnote{Azra, \textit{The Origins of Islamic Reformism}, p. 74-75.}

Interestingly, though Azra describes ‘Abdurra’ûf’s sojourn as only limited to the Arabian peninsula with Medina as his last destination,\footnote{Azra, \textit{The Origins of Islamic Reformism}, p. 74.} Riddell astonishingly adds information suggesting that ‘Abdurra’ûf once stayed for a moment in the University of the Azhar, Cairo. In this regard, Riddell writes:

“Some biographical notes on ‘Abd al-Ra’uf will help us to understand the sources for the enourmous degree of Arabic influence on his life and work. He was born in about 1615 .... He spent the period 1642-1661 studying the Islamic sciences in the Arab world, including periods in Mecca, Medina, Jedda, and also at al-Azhar University in Cairo.”\footnote{See Riddell, “Literal Translation, Sacred Scripture, and Kitab Malay,” \textit{Studia Islamika} 9:1 (2002), p. 11-12.}
Unfortunately, Riddell does not inform us as to the source of the reference to his transit to Cairo, Egypt. Surprisingly, to the best of my knowledge, he only puts this additional information in his article published in 2002 A.D., not in his other articles.\textsuperscript{22}

\subsection*{2.1.3. His Departure from Arabia (1661-1693 A.D.)}

Most scholars who study the life of ‘Abdurra’uf or his works seem to agree with Rinkes that the year of ‘Abdurra’uf’s departure from Arabia was around 1661 A.D. They also agree that ‘Abdurra’uf had written most, or even all, of his works after his return to his homeland. Yet, they do differ as to the total number of ‘Abdurra’uf’s works. Quoted from Voorhoeve, Azra notes that ‘Abdurra’uf wrote twenty-two works containing various Islamic fields, including \textit{fiqh}, commentary on the Qur’an, theology, and sufism.\textsuperscript{23} On the other hand, Oman turns out to have a longer list of works that could be “associated with”\textsuperscript{24} ‘Abdurra’uf, constitutes thirty-six works. The works are as follows:

In the field of \textit{fiqh}:

1. \textit{Mir’ah al-Ṫullâb fī Taṣīl Ma’rifah al-Ahkâm al-Shar’iyyah li al-Mâlik al-Wahhâb}.\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[24] Fathurahman preferred to use the word “associated” due to the fact that in many cases his name is not written in the colophons as the author. See Fathurahman, \textit{Tanbîh al-Mashi}, p. 28.
\end{footnotes}
5. Fatîhah Shaikh ‘Abdurra’âf.26
7. Sebuah uraian mengenai niat sembahyang.
8. Wasîyyah.
10. Sakaratul Maut.27

In the field of Sufism:

11. Tanbih al-Mashî al-Mansûb ilâ Tarîq al-Qusyâsyi.28
12. ‘Umdah al-Muhtâjîn ilâ Sulûk Maslak al-Mufridin.29

---

27 See for further Shaghir Abdullah, al-Ma’rifah, vol. 2, p. 82-87.
17. Bayân Tajallî.  
22. Risâlah A’yân Tsâbitah.  
23. Risalâh Jalan Makrifatullah.  
27. Otak Ilmu Tasawuf.  
29. Îdâh al-Bayân fî Tahqîq Masâ’il al-Adyân.  
32. Risalâh Simpan.  
33. Shattâriyah.  

34 See for further Shaghir Abdullah, al-Ma’rifah, vol. 2, p. 96-98.  
In the field of *tafsîr*:

34. *Turjumân al-Mustafîd*.

In the field of *ḥadîth*:


I do not further elaborate ‘Abdurra’ûf’s works one by one. Instead, we can draw exclusively on scholarly studies of his works as seen in the footnotes, including his monumental Malay commentary. For the next section, I tried to examine the characteristics of the *Turjumân* and how far this Malay commentary has been studied by Anthony H. Johns, Peter Riddell, and Salman Harun for two last decades.

### 2.2. THE *TURJUMÂN AL-MUSTAFÎD*

#### 2.2.1. Its Extant Manuscripts and Printed Editions.

During his Ph.D. thesis research, Riddell collected ten manuscripts (MSS) of the *Turjumân* preserved mostly in the Indonesian National Library at Jakarta. In their identification, Riddell classified them coded from MS A to MS J, he then uses MS A as a single object of study with the consideration that MS A, for him, is the oldest copy that could be traced and its date of copy was predicted in 1730 A.D. He treated

---

38 See for further Shaghir Abdullah, *al-Ma‘rifah*, vol. 2, p. 31-64.

other versions as comparisons as necessary. I follow Riddell’s description of the MSS below with some critical points attached in the footnotes.\footnote{For further description of these ten MSS of the Turjumân can be found in his Ph.D. thesis. See Abd al-Ra’îf al-Sinkîlî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 24-29.}

MS A, transliterated in Riddell’s Ph.D. Thesis, is preserved in the Indonesian National Library and coded as ML 116. This MS contains 504 pages, measuring 22x16 cms. There are 17 lines per a page. It is written on paper made in Europe, indicated by the watermarks and its shadows of chain-line. The verses of the Qur’ân are written in red and vocalized in black, with the Malay commentaries phrased by phrased in black. The Malay texts are not commonly vocalized.\footnote{During the time of writing this thesis, I found that the condition of ML 116 relatively corresponds to Riddell’s description in 1984, with a few exceptions as to the measurement: 23x15.5 cms. Similarly, in the folio 1, there is Q.S. al-Baqrârah (2): 275-278 followed by the Malay commentaries. Then, the text starts from page 2 [folio 1] with Q.S. al-Kahf (18): 75.}

MS A contains the Arabic Qur’ân and its Malay commentaries from Q.S. al-Kahf (18): 75 to Qâf (50): 36. There is no page for the title. Some lacunae can be found in the MS. Apart from its lost chapters, the main lacunae are found in between the folios 63 and 64 [Q.S. al-Hajj (22): 46—al-Qasas (28): 55]; between the folios 133 and 134; and between the leaves 193 and 194.\footnote{As I found as well, the 504 page MS should have been thicker if the lost folios were found, especially between folios 63 and 64: Q.S. al-Hajj (22): 46—al-Qasas (28): 55.} Riddell informs that the first source for this MS lies in the Notulen of the Batavia Society meeting in February 1880. This Notulen indicates that this MS was one of the MSS collections in Arabic, Malay, and Javanese and belonged to the Society at that time.\footnote{Riddell, Abd al-Ra’îf al-Sinkîlî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 25.}
MS B is also kept in the National Library, coded as A 233. It has 290 pages, measuring 29.5x20 cms, and contains the Arabic Qur’ân and Its Malay commentaries from the Chapter 16 to the end of the Qur’ân. Each page contains 33 lines. Its Arabic is written in red phrased by phrased, followed by the Malay commentaries in black, and vocalized.\textsuperscript{44}

MS C is preserved in the National Library. This MS is coded as ML 41, measuring 26x20 cms, and has 330 pages. Each page contains 23 lines. This MS contains the Arabic Qur’ân and its Malay commentaries from the beginning of the Qur’ân to Q.S. al-Qas\textsuperscript{45}

MS D and E are also preserved in the National Library at Jakarta. The former is coded as ML 322, while the latter is ML 290. MS D has 321 pages, containing 19 lines per page. Meanwhile, the latter has 539 pages measuring 23x18 cms which containing 19 lines per page. ML 290 also contains the Qur’ân in Arabic followed by its commentaries in Malay from Q.S. 29: 45 to 77: 50. On the other hand, ML 322 measures 29.5x19.5 cms, containing the Qur’ân in Arabic with its Malay commentaries from Q.S. 6: 124 to 17:111.\textsuperscript{46}

The two more Turjumân MSS are classified as MS F, coded ML 291, and MS G, coded ML 373. MS F [ML 291] has 967 pages, measuring 25x17.5 cms,\textsuperscript{47} and each page has 19 lines. Riddell explains that MS F shows an interesting fact for it bears the title “Turjumân al-Mustafid.” This MS contains the Qur’ân in Arabic with

\textsuperscript{44} Riddell, \textit{Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sinkîli’s Tarjumân al-Mustafid}, p. 26.
\textsuperscript{45} Riddell, \textit{Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sinkîli’s Tarjumân al-Mustafid}, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{46} Riddell, \textit{Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sinkîli’s Tarjumân al-Mustafid}, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{47} Now, it measures 21.8x15.8 cms.
its Malay commentaries from the beginning of the Qur'ân to Q.S. 17: 111, and written in the last: “Tammat nisf pertama daripada tafsir.” ⁴⁸ Meanwhile, MS G [ML 373] has 528 pages, measuring 25x17 cms ⁴⁹ and contains 21 lines per page. This MS contains the Arabic Qur'ân and its Malay commentaries from the beginning of the Qur'ân to Q.S. al-Tawbah (9): 88. ⁵⁰ Like the others, the Arabic is in red while the commentaries are in black. ⁵¹

Apart from their preservation in the National Library at Jakarta, Riddell informs us that the Turjumân MSS are also kept in the Rijksuniversiteit Bibliotheek Leiden, the Private Library of Teungku Dachlan al-Fairusy in Tanoh Abee, Aceh, and in Cape Town, South Africa.

MS H kept in Leiden is coded as Or. F596/Mal.2563. This MS has 216 pages, measuring 24x16.75 cms. Each page has 19 lines, containing the Arabic Qur'ân and its Malay commentaries from Q.S. 30:5 to 40:7. On the other hand, MS I is situated in the private library of Teungku Dachlan al-Fairusy, Tanoh Abee Islamic School, Aceh. This MS has 120 pages, measuring 21x15.5 cms. Each page has 19 lines, containing the Arabic Qur'ân and its Malay commentaries from Q.S. 70:19 to the end of the Qur'ân. The red ink is used for the writing of its Qur'ânic Arabic and the black one is for its Malay commentaries. The last classified MS is identified as MS J. Basing

---


⁴⁹ Now, it measures 23x16.2 cms.

⁵⁰ The correct one is Q.S. al-Tawbah (9): 93.

⁵¹ Riddell, Abd al-Ra‘ūf al-Sinkîlî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 28. Yet, I found that the red ink in which the Qur'anic text was written changes into violet.
himself on Voorhoeve’s information, this MS is kept in the Cape Malay Community, Cape town, South Afrika. This MS contains the Arabic Qur’ân from Q.S. 12 to 29.52

In its printed editions, Riddell listed at least five printed editions of the *Turjumân*, as follow:53

2. *Turjumân al-Mustafîd*, 4th ed. (Cairo) reprinted Sulaymân Marâghî, Singapore 1951 A.D.

As for the identification of the *Turjumân* in its extant MSS and printed editions by Riddell, I tried to investigate whether there are any others not yet listed, both as extant MSS and printed editions. I found at least three other handwritten copies of the *Turjumân* not in Riddell's list. These are both kept in the Yayasan Pendidikan Ali Hasjmy (YPAH) Library and in the South African Cultural History Museum Collection. The first is identified by Oman Fathurahman in the time of the catalogue project of Islamic MSS in the YPAH between 2005 A.D. and 2006 A.D., one year after the great disaster [read: tsunami] in Aceh, in December 2004 A.D. According to Fathurahman, this MS is copied by Abdussamad ibn Thalib and ʿAbdul

52 Riddell, *Abd al-Ra‘ûf al-Sinkîlî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd*, p. 29.
53 Riddell, *Abd al-Ra‘ûf al-Sinkîlî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd*, p. 36.
Mu’thi in which the process of copying was completed on 4 Rabi’ul Awwal 1248 A.H./1 August 1832 A.D. Its physical condition is good in general, except for a few pages. This MS is re-bound and has a catchword to show the sequence of its pages. The text is written in naskhî script in black and rubricated in red. This MS uses a paper made in Europe as indicated by the watermarks, Goey or Goei M. De (1775-1794 A.D.). This MS is a gift from the Acehnese to the YPAH in 1995. Like all other copies, this copy is also not complete.

As to the MS of the Turjumân in South Africa, Riddell basically notes the availability of one copy of the Turjumân there. Basing my analysis to the study of Muhammed Haron, there are at least two copies of the Turjumân preserved in the South African Cultural History Museum Collection, coded as MS 7 and MS 8. MS 7, says Haron, is a handwritten copy containing Qur’anic commentaries based on the work of al-Baydhwî and translated into Malay by ‘Abdurra’ûf ibn ‘Ali al-Jâwî. This MS is thought to be from the mid-19th century. It has 176 folios, measuring 23.4x16.6 cms and contains 17 lines per page. The Arabic text is also in naskhî style. It contains the chapters 12 to 17, 19 and 21 to 29. The chapter 18 is found, but is not complete. If we compared with the information of Voorhoeve on which Riddell based his identification of MS J, it seems to me that MS 7 above is what Voorhoeve informed Riddell of.


MS 8 has many similarities with MS 7. Yet, it has many more folios, that is 456 folios. This MS is measured 23.3x16.4 cms and contains 17 lines per page. It also dates to the mid-19th century and also has the same style in writing (naskhī style). Nevertheless, Haron does not further describe the content of its Malay commentaries.56

As for the copy in the Tanoh Abee Pesantren, I find another copy which is different from Riddell's description. This copy is a fragment of the Turjumân, which contains Qur'anic texts and its Malay commentaries from Chapter One (Q.S. al-Baqarah (2): 104) until Chapter Ten (Q.S. al-Tawbah (9): 93). I identify it as the Turjumân after analyzing its Malay commentaries [Q.S. al-Baqarah (2): 105] which is the same [with the exception of a few changes] as—to the best of my knowledge—the most current publication of the Turjumân, published by Dâr al-Fikr in 1990. The Qur'anic text is in red, while its tafsir is in black. This copy has 600 pages and 19 lines per page, with three blank paper, uses European paper from the early 18th century, and is scribed in Mecca by Ma'sûm ibn 'Abd al-Jamâl al-Jâwî al-Fathânî on Ramadhan 9, 1243 A.H. It measures 24.5 x 17 cms. Yet, it has a new cover showing the title, "Tafsir al-Qur'an min al-Baydhâwî." Its title identification is absolutely new, not originally taken from the text.

With regards to the printed editions, I will list some other editions not listed yet. Apart from the edition of Farsam Faries Publisher, in Penang in 1961 A.D., Ekmeleddin Ihsanoğlu, for instance, also listed one edition of ‘Abdurra’îf Malay

commentary published in 1923 A.D. by Mustafâ al-Bâbî al-Halabî.\(^{57}\) This publisher has apparently printed this Malay commentary many times. This can be seen because in 1951 A.D., the publisher printed its fourth edition. As seen in its previous editions and also in other publications, this 1951 A.D. edition, printed in one volume, states on the title page the heavy dependence of this Malay commentary on the work of al-Baydâwî:

\[
\]

The Holy Qur'ân and, on the side lines of it, the Turjumân al-Mustafîd, and it is the Malay translation of the tafsîr entitled Anwâr al-Tanzîl wa Asrâr al-Ta’wil of al-Imâm al-Qâdî Nâsîr al-Dîn Abî Sa’îd ‘Abdullâh ibn ‘Umar ibn Muhammâd al-Shâyrâzî al-Baydâwî.

So far, the most recent edition of the Turjumân is published by the Dâr al-Fikr publisher in 1990 A.D. The title, as seen on the cover, does not change.\(^{59}\) Taking this case into account, the critical studies of the Turjumân have not apparently changed the common opinion that the Turjumân is the work of al-Baydâwî in Malay.


\(^{58}\) See the title page of ‘Abdurra’ûf’s Malay commentary printed by the Mustafâ al-Bâbî al-Halabî Publisher in 1951 A.D.

\(^{59}\) For further, see the title page of this edition. I have got this 1990 A.D. edition in April 2007 A.D. in the Beirut bookstore in Tanah Abang, Jakarta. Since I wanted to have it, I asked the price. Interestingly enough, the owner and his staff could not find the book in the list. Then, I suggest they could find it under the title “Tafsîr Baydhâwî.” It turns out to be that the book was found entitled, “Tafsîr Baydhâwî (Melayu).”
Moreover, Shaghir Abdullah, a prominent Malay scholar, in his article published in 2005 A.D. still argues that the Turjumân is also named the Tafsir al-Baydâwî.\(^{60}\)

### 2.2.2. The Sources and Structure of the Turjumân

One of the most important points that Riddell revealed in his Ph.D. thesis, and his subsequent publications, is the misunderstanding between the Middle East, Southeast Asian, and European scholars on the identification of the Turjumân, which is believed to be mostly taken, or even translated, from the work of al-Baydâwî. Salman Harun later researched the same subject for his Ph.D. thesis at the IAIN Syarif Hidayatullah at Jakarta. Harun’s primary goal in this study was to investigate whether the Turjumân draws heavily upon the Jalâlayn. The result was entirely the same. Harun showed that the Turjumân is not the translation of al-Baydâwî’s tafsir, but of the Jalâlayn. He initially rendered the verses in a literal way then referred to the Jalâlayn. But in many cases, he did not actually translate the verses, but translate them directly from the Jalâlayn.\(^{61}\)

Nevertheless, both are different in that Riddell looked at the work from a Malay linguistic perspective, while Harun used Islamic studies (tafsîr). Furthermore, Riddell focused on ‘Abdurra’ûf’s treatment of Chapter 16 of the Qur’ân. He seemed to choose the chapter for the purpose of making comparisons with the earliest fragments of the Malay renderings of the Qur’ân, which is the Cambridge MS Li.6.45

---


from the first decade of the 17th century. Meanwhile, Harun took Chapter 30 of the Qur’ân as his object of the study with the reasoning that this is the most popular chapter of the Qur’ân recited and memorized by Moslems, especially in Southeast Asia. Thus, for Harun, this study was also meant to make the meanings of the Qur’ânic chapter clearer for Moslems in Southeast Asia.

Riddell states that for centuries the Turjumân was thought to be the translation of the Anwâr al-Tanzîl wa Asrâr al-Ta’wil of al-Baydâwî (d. 1286 A.D.). Various printed editions of this Malay commentary have been published around the world and, especially, in the Malay-Indonesian world. They all associate the work of ‘Abdurra’ûf with the work of al-Baydâwî.62

‘Abdurra’ûf Malay tafsir was firstly printed in Istanbul in 1884 A.D. Riddell informs that the title page of this edition states:

Inilah Kitab yang bernama Turjumân al-Mustafîd bi’l-Jâwî yang diterjemahkan dengan bahasa Jâwî yang diambil setengah ma’nanya dari Tafsîr al-Baydâwî.63

This is the Book entitled the Turjumân al-Mustafîd in the Malay language, that is translated in the Malay language in which its half meaning is taken from the al-Baydâwî tafsîr.

In spite of this statement, which was partially taken from the work of al-Baydhâwî, Riddell suggests that the title pages of the second and last volumes of this edition identify the work itself as the second part of the Baydâwî’s work.

62 Riddell, ‘Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sinkîlî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 47.
63 Quoted from Riddell, ‘Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sinkîlî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 47.
Riddell points to Snouck Hurgronje as the main actor responsible for the spread of this misunderstanding throughout Europe. In his private library, Hurgronje reportedly collected the Istanbul copy, after which it becomes the ownership of the Leiden Library. The most likely reason that this mistake arose is that he too quickly believes the work’s title page, which states that this is taken from al-Baydâwî’s tafsir without doing appropriate investigations. Hurgronje wrote:

Another famous work of ... Abdurra’ûf is his Malay translation of Baidâwî’s commentary on the Qur’ân, published in A.H. 1302 at Constantinople in two handsomely printed volumes ... From his work we perceive among other things, that the learning of [‘Abdura’ûf] was not infallible; his translation for instance of chap. 33 verse 20 of the Qur’ân is far from correct.  

His mistake in identifying this Malay commentary as being translated from the work of al-Baydâwî generated misunderstanding between European and Malay scholars as to the characteristics of the Tarjumân.  

Furthermore, says Riddell, Rinkes admits that he used earlier Hurgronje’s observations which analyzed the literary works of ‘Abdura’ûf. A too literal study of other scholarly works and failure to study the MSS caused Rinkes to mistakenly assume that ‘Abdura’ûf wrote three commentaries of the Qur’ân. In fact, these three works are different copies from the same work. Voorhoeve is another Dutch scholar

\footnote{Quoted from Riddell, ‘Abd al-Ra’îf al-Sinkîli’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 48.}
\footnote{Abd al-Ra’îf al-Sinkîli’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 48.}
\footnote{Riddell, ‘Abd al-Ra’îf al-Sinkîli’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 47-48.}
who was greatly influenced by Snouck Hurgronje in mistakenly identifying the work of ‘Abdurra’îf, though he then made a more careful statement in his next work:

‘Abdurra’îf moreover translated the Kur’ân into Malay with a concise commentary taken from various Arabic exegetical works.

Riddell further investigated some printed editions of ‘Abdurra’îf commentary published in the Malay-Indonesian world. These editions assert that this work is a translated version of the work of al-Baydâwî. The Sulayman Marâghî edition printed in 1951 A.D., for example, makes the statement in its title page: “al-tarjama al-jâwîyah lil-tafsîr al-musammâ Anwâr al-Tanzîl wa Asrâr al-Ta’wil lil-imâm al-qâdî ... al-Baydâwî” (The Malay translation of the tafsîr entitled Anwâr al-tanzîl wa asrâr al-ta’wil by al-Imâm al-Qâdî ... al-Baydâwî). Equally, The Pustaka Nasional edition in 1951 A.D. bears the title “Tafsîr al-Baydâwî.” Both the Singapore and Dâr al-Fikr editions in 1981 A.D., which is already examined by three prominent Malay ‘ulamâ,’ also states that the content of the text is the translation of the work of al-Baydâwî. They state:

... fa-innî qad utli’tu wa tâla’tu hâdhâ al-tafsîr al-sharîf al-munîf lil-imâm al-‘allâmî al-Baydâwî ... fa-wajadnâhu mutarjaman bi-al-lughah al-jâwiyah tarjama muwâfiqah li-‘asîl al-nuskhah al-latî bi-al-‘arabiyah bi-dîn ziyâdah wa là nuqsan wa là taghyîr wa là tabdîl li-anna al-mutarjim huwa al-Shaykh ‘Abdurra’îf ibn al-Shaykh ‘Ali al-Fansûrî min ajall ‘ulamâ’ zamânîhi ...

---

69 Quoted from Riddell, ‘Abd al-Ra’îf al-Sinkîlî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 49, footnote no. 4. This translation in English is made by Riddell.
… I testify that I have examined and inspected this celebrated and excellent tafsir by the distinguished Imâm al-Baydâwî … we have found it [to be] translated into Jâwî as a reliable translation of the original manuscript which is in Arabic, without addition or omission, and without change or substitution, as the translator was al-Shaykh 'Abdurra'ûf ibn al-Shaykh 'Alî al-Fânsûrî, one of the greatest scholars of his time …


With regards to this legislation from the three ‘ulamâ’, Riddell asserts that we should look at it with doubt. It seems that, argues Riddell, Dâ’ûd Paţânî would not sign it without examining this work. If he had, he would have realized that this was a wrong identification. This declaration was apparently designed to increase the prestige of the work.

It is also the case with the publication of Mustafâ al-Bâbî al-Halabî, Cairo-Egypt, in 1923 A.D. where the work of ‘Abdurra’ûf is given the title: Anwâr al-Tanzîl wa Asrâr al-Ta’wîl, in addition to the publication of Farsam Faries in Penang–Malaysia which bears the title Tafsîr Anwâr al-Baydâwî. This misunderstanding continues until the year 1951 A.D. when this Malay commentary came to its fourth printing by the Mustafâ al-Bâbî al-Halabî publisher, or even until the year 1990 A.D. where it is written on the title page:

70 Quoted from Riddell, ‘Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sînkîlî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 49.
71 Riddell, ‘Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sînkîlî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 50.
73 See the Tarjumân edition published by the Dâr al-Fikr publisher in 1990 as already explained previously.

Riddell then moved back to the study of the extant MSS in which they identify themselves. There are very little data due to the fact that the MSS are basically fragments of the work, and poor colophons at that. Those which bear the title “Turjumân al-Mustafîd” are MSS B, F, and I. There is no other MS with the titles except MS G which bears the title “Tafsîr al-Jalâlayn” in the colophon. This title is apparently overlooked by both Eastern and Western scholars except for a “passing reference” by Van Ronkel, short explanation by Rinkes, and the same explanation by Voorhoeve. The important point is that there is of course no single MS claiming itself to be the translation of the work of al-Baydâwî.

Another important point asserted by Riddell is that the *Turjumân* is not fully the work of ‘Abdurra’ûf himself. According to Riddell, the important fact as to the issue contains in the colophons of two extant MSS, namely MSS B and I. He explains that these colophons clearly show that the Malay commentary form as represented by

---


75 Riddell, ‘Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sinkîlî’s *Turjumân al-Mustafîd*, p. 50. I still follow this Riddell's argument despite the fact that there is a copy of the Turjuman in the Tanoh Abee which bears the title “Tafsîr al-Qur'an min al-Baydhâwî.” Yet, my description show that the title is absolutely new and not originally taken from the text.
the two MSS—as Riddell puts it—is “composite in respect of its authorship,” containing the extracts compiled by ‘Abdurra’ûf and additional comments from his prominent student, Bâbâ Dâ’ûd Rûmî.\footnote{Riddell, ‘Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sinkilî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 52.}

The colophons clearly indicate that Dâ’ûd Rûmî made some additional information under the command of his teacher, showing that he is the most important student of ‘Abdurra’ûf before his death circa 1693 A.D., and in all possibility did this under the supervision of his teacher. In other words, those commentary texts took their final form until the time of his teacher’s death, which further strengthens the possibility that MS A came into existence during the lifetime of Isaac de Saint Martin.\footnote{Riddell, ‘Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sinkilî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 52.}

Riddell suggests that we could divide the work of ‘Abdurra’ûf into some parts, compiled by ‘Abdurra’ûf himself and added by Dâ’ûd Rûmî. The identification of additions by Dâ’ûd Rûmî contains two types: [1] the anecdotes taken from the \textit{Lubâb al-Ta’wil fî Ma’ânî al-Tanzîl} of al-Khâzin, and [2] the information based on the qirâ’ât.\footnote{Riddell, ‘Abd al-Ra’ûf al-Sinkilî’s Tarjumân al-Mustafîd, p. 53.}

For Riddell, in order to identify such categories in the \textit{Turjumân}, one does not necessarily need to look further into the work with some exceptions: under the headings entitled “qissah” and “fâ’idah,” which are regularly come up to present any
information related to *Asbâb al-Nuzûl*, and detailed comments on the *qirâ’ât*. Hence, such comments are considered additions mentioned in the colophons.  

Apart from the “*qissah*” and “*fâ’idah*”, Riddell adds that the *Turjumân* ostensibly contains three other additional components, namely the Introduction, Malay commentaries on the Qur’ân, and progressive comments on the Qur’ânic verses. Those five components altogether created the body of this work as appeared in its extant MSS and printed editions.

As for the structure of the *Turjumân*, Riddell finally asserts that a true identification of this Malay commentary work would be of significant aid in grasping the motivation behind the compilation of this work and its original perceived role as an instrument for religious studies. The task of identifying all these sources will be conducted in systematic investigations of information contained in those five components. When such investigations are done, they enable us to understand the stages through which the *Turjumân* has passed before it reached its final form today.

### 2.2.3. The Characteristics of the *Turjumân al-Mustafid*

#### 2.2.3.1. Its Comparison with MS Ii.6.45. Cambridge

Except for the *Turjumân*, there is no copy of the Malay commentaries in its entirety to be found from the 17th century. There are only partial Malay renderings of

---

79 Riddell, ‘*Abd al-Ra’îf al-Sinkiî’s *Tarjumân al-Mustafîd*, p. 53.
80 Riddell, ‘*Abd al-Ra’îf al-Sinkiî’s *Tarjumân al-Mustafîd*, p. 53.
81 Riddell, ‘*Abd al-Ra’îf al-Sinkiî’s *Tarjumân al-Mustafîd*, p. 54.
sûrah al-Kahf of the Qur’ân, which is called the Cambridge MS Ii.6.45. The two works then become a starting point that the tradition of Qur’ânic exegesis in the Malay-Indonesian world begun together with the development of what Azra calls it the networks of the Jawî ‘ulamâ’ in the early phase.

As for the Cambridge MS, Van Ronkel describes that it renders all verses of the sûrah and contains many stories, particularly the story of ashâb al-kahf. This Malay rendering uses Arabic scripts.  

As for the Cambridge MS, Van Ronkel describes that it renders all verses of the sûrah and contains many stories, particularly the story of ashâb al-kahf. This Malay rendering uses Arabic scripts.\textsuperscript{82} This now exists in Cambridge, but was previously owned by a European traveller, Erpenius, who donated it after having brought it back from Aceh sometime in the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. It is reported that the Arabic sûrah is written in red followed by its commentaries in Malay in Black.\textsuperscript{83} We could estimate that Erpenius got the MS in the first decade of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. If it is a fresh copy at the time, argues Riddell, we could fairly assume that it was copied in about 1600 A.D.\textsuperscript{84}

The Cambridge MS enjoyed a significant position, says Riddell. This is due to the fact that the date of compilation could be predicted to the lifetime of Shams al-Dîn al-Sumatra-î and in all possibility Hamzah Fansûrî. The fact that, apart from it, there is no other extant copies show that this copy was brought from Aceh before the burning of their works by al-Rânîrî and his followers in the following decades, which seemingly destroyed all other copies and their other works. This also shows that the


\textsuperscript{84} Riddell, \textit{Islam and the Malay-Indonesian World}, p. 151.
works on the commentary of the Qur’ân had been one of his main targets, and that acts were done so that they could make sure that no more copies existed in Aceh. Certainly, it should be noted that the Cambridge MSS would be very important in the attempt to grasp the tradition of Qur’ânic exegesis long before the compilation of the *Turjumân* in the late-17th century. There is no single work on the commentary of the Qur’ân which could be associated with al-Râniî. Since there is no record on the burning of al-Râniî’s works, we can argue that he did not write any commentary.  

When we look at carefully these two works for identifying the sources, for Riddell, we are confronted to two contrary important points. Firstly, the Cambridge MS does not use a single source. Its commentary of Qur’ânic verses is more diverse so that the author himself would take responsibility for the making of such commentaries despite the fact that he would have more freedom for expression compared to the style of ‘Abdurra’ûf’s renderings, which greatly depend on the *Jalâlayn*. Secondly, the work of al-Khâzin is mainly used for additional commentaries between the verses instead of referring to the work of al-Baydhâwî. Such commentaries are very lengthy, to the point that this takes more space than the writing of the Arabic Qur’ân and the intra-verse commentaries. It is very different from the *Turjumân* in which the inter-verse phrases of commentary are short and seem to have been added by Bâbâ Dâ’ûd Rûmî.  

---


86 Riddell, “Earliest Quranic Exegetical Activity,” p. 120.
Except for his Ph.D. thesis and one article published in 1989 A.D., the works of Riddell dealing with this Cambridge MS are an article published in 1997 A.D. and a book in 2001 A.D. Riddell mentions some characteristics of the Cambridge MS. To him, this work draws heavily upon the narrative commentaries of al-Baghâwî dan al-Khâzin. Nevertheless, another commentary uses the work of al-Baydawî as one of its source for making “phrase-by-phrase” commentaries and narrative additions between the verses.\(^{87}\) Riddell then concludes that the Cambridge MS is known for its use of narrative-based exegetical approach due to its heavy dependence on the works of al-Baghâwî dan al-Khâzin. It can be regarded therefore as a Malay descendant of the triumvirate of Arabic commentaries above. Unlike those of al-Baghâwî dan al-Khâzin, the author of the Cambridge MS seems not to have identified his main sources.\(^ {88}\) Rather, he transmitted various stories no doubt contained in the previous Arabic commentaries to his Malay commentaries. Yet, argues Riddell, he unintentionally transferred some earlier characteristics of Qur’ânic exegesis containing certain controversial things that led some scholars to criticism.\(^ {89}\) Riddell further states that the structure of the Cambridge MS represents the structure of al-Baghâwî’s and al-Khâzin’s commentaries upon which its Malay renderings are


\(^{88}\) Riddell, “The Transmission of Narrative Based Exegesis,” Islam, p. 70.; dan Islam and The Malay Indonesian World, p. 153. Riddell reveals the fact that in Islamic tradition, for example, al-Khazin reached his popularity in the Arab world for its commentary work of the Qur’an containing many stories. Nevertheless, such popularity is achieved by hijacking significant parts of the popularity of al-Baghaii. See Riddell, “The Transmission of Narrative Based Exegesis,” Islam, p. 65.

Theologically speaking, this Cambridge MS puts more emphasizes on the Asy‘arıyyah doctrines evidenced by the way the author describe the One and transcendental God.  

2.2.3.2. Its Language  

Another important point asserted by Riddell is the mastery of Malay language after the nineteen years of ‘Abdurra’uf’s sojourn in Arabia in about 1661 A.D. In this regard, Riddell tried to explain the reason why there are significant differences between the characteristics and structure of Malay language in the *Turjumân* and those of other Malay texts. Apart from his Ph.D. thesis, his other articles dealing with the study of ‘Abdurra’uf mastery of Malay language have been published in 2002 A.D.\(^2\) and 2004 A.D.\(^3\)  

The lengthy of his sojourn in Arabia no doubt affects his mastery of Malay language. He spent his crucial times to develop his religious doctrines, write in Arabic, and of course live in the Arabic culture. One could take for granted that he had been possibly alienated as to the use of language after his return to Aceh in about

---

1661 A.D. In this regard, Riddell quoted two comments of Voorhoeve concerning the use of Malay language in ‘Abdurra’uf’s works:

“... his translations from the Arabic are so literal that they are unintelligible without knowledge of that language ....”

‘... the Sultan (of Aceh) engaged Abdurra’uf to write a fiqh work in Malay; the request was refused as he didn’t have a proper command of Bahasa Melayu Pase due to the length of time he had spent in the Arab world.’

For this reason, it is fairly assumed that ‘Abdurra’uf did not find himself in an easy situation as to the communication in Malay after his nineteen-years absence in Malay communities. However, asserts Riddell, some factors should be taken into consideration with regards to assessing his mastery of the Malay language. Firstly, he spent his first twenty years lifetime as the user of Malay language in a great imperium which approved of Malay as administration language. The local (Acehnese) language was not a written language for a few next centuries to come. Furthermore, he spent his last thirty years lifetime living in Aceh, from 1661 A.D. to his death in circa 1693 A.D. during which he became a prolific writer. Therefore, he must have regained his lost Malay during this period.

The fact remains that his translation from Arabic, as seen in the Turjumân, is very literal. He frequently utilizes a technique of—what Riddell puts it—“word for word correspondence between the Arabic and Malay” and paid less attention towards

---

96 Quoted from Riddell, “Literal Translation,” p. 12.
the syntactic forms of Malay literary. As a result, says Riddell, the product is virtually Arabic text but with Malay words. Riddell further makes critical questions: [1] can this stylistic features be held up as proof that ‘Abdurra’ôf merely had a poor grasp of Malay, or did he have some other purpose in translating with such a style? Why didn’t he adhere to literary Malay syntactic norms? Then, he proposed the answers that these phenomena based on the conviction of the translator that he was dealing with the sacred task of translating the scripture. In this situation, he was not allowed to change the original language of revelation, while at the same time he was obliged to send accessible messages for Malay readers.

During the period of ‘Abdurra’ôf’s sojourn in Arabia, estimates Riddell, he seems to have encountered various methods of translation, ranging from the freer technique to more literal. Riddell argues that ‘Abdurra’ôf seems to have felt more comfortable with the literal method of translation as the only way to translate the scripture into Malay language. This corresponds to established methods for the translation of sacred texts in other Islamic traditions.

2.2.3.3. Interpretation

---

98 Riddell frequently states that the use of Malay language in the *Turjumân* is greatly influenced by the Arabic grammar. However, this is one of the common characteristics of the Malay language in early phase. Although Malay has been regarded as administration language in the 17th century, it was in the early evolution adopted from the Arabic orthography. For further, see W.G. Shellabear, “The Evolution of Malay Spelling,” *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 36 (July 1901), p. 78.


Both Johns and Riddell are of the same opinion that ‘Abdurra’uf’s tafsir is mostly taken from the Jalâlayn or even its translated version in Malay. Both, however, differ as to whether the *Turjumân* is to be considered a commentary or translation, though in his articles Johns frequently praises Riddell for his academic achievements, particularly in the identification of the sources of the *Turjumân*. Riddell clearly states that compared to the Cambridge MS, the *Turjumân* is produced in the situation that the author did not feel freedom of expression resulting in a work that was very literal in nature. In his article in 2002 A.D, he supports this characteristic of the *Turjumân* despite the fact that he then realizes the semantic changes in the *Turjumân* in his article submitted to the committee of the 8th International Symposium of Archipelago Manuscripts held in 26-28 July 2004 A.D. at the State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta.¹⁰¹

On the other hand, Johns, particularly in his 1999 A.D. article, tried to assert that the *Turjumân* basically reflects the vernacularization of Islamic (and also Qur’ânic) teachings. Thus, says Johns, the *Turjumân* could not merely be considered the work of translation for its literal characteristic. Its representation for the vernacularization lies in the context of its role, for Johns, “an authoritative commentary,” creating the understanding of the Qur’ân for Malay communities over

¹⁰¹ Unfortunately, he could not present his writing in the Symposium for a number of reasons.
the next three-hundred years. Therefore, it should be noted that, following Johns’ words, “we have not a translation of the sûrahs, but a commentary.”

His main target is to provide accessible authentic renderings of the Qur’ân to the Malay speakers at a basic level. And though he mainly drew on the Jalâlayn to transfer the meanings of the Qur’ân into Southeast Asia, he did not certainly further elaborate the mystical aspects of Ibn al-‘Arabi.

Johns admits that the Turjumân is in essence a translation of the Arabic tafsir. However, he always asserts the important of Qur’anic vernacularization into Malay. Since it represents the way the Qur’ân should be understood in Malay, it can be regarded as his own work. This means that his exegetical activities are an encounter with the Qur’ân, which he mediated to his students.

Based on the explanations above, it is the context that made him find proper situational renderings although they are far from their original meanings, or in Johns’ words, “meaning is not totally innate in words, but determined by context.” In his 1999 A.D. article, he takes many examples of how the renderings are to be contextualized. The example of this is the word sû’ (evil) and faḍhshâ (disgrace) which originally have general meanings. ‘Abdurra’ûf interpreted these two words, but did

---


103 Johns, “She Desired Him and He Desired Her,” p. 119.

104 Johns, “She Desired Him and He Desired Her,” p. 120.

105 Johns, “She Desired Him and He Desired Her,” p. 120.
not translate them. He has two contextualized meanings, namely *khianat* (betrayal) and *zina* (adultery). These two chosen words turn out to be derived from Arabic.\(^{106}\)

Johns finally concludes that the use of Malay language in the *Turjumân* is commonly thought to be an imitation of Arabic grammar and a product of interlinear translations from Arabic texts.\(^{107}\) Instead, he suggests that the origin of the *Turjumân* does not lie in its scriptorium, but in the oral tradition in the madrasah he built.\(^{108}\) In this regard, Johns suggests we read his 1998 A.D. article, but I will also draw upon his earlier work, published in 1997 A.D. Here, Johns argues that the *Madrasah* played a role in preserving and assuring the process of transmission and diffusion of core Islamic works for the learning. They compiled the number of secondary texts extended and vernacularized for the needy to create the future ‘ulamâ’ to be guides for the local communities.\(^{109}\)

On the contrary, Riddell suggest that we look at how far translation in Islamic world has been developed and disputed for the approval of the translation of sacred texts. These two points are very important to be considered due to the fact that the Southeast Asian ‘ulamâ’, especially ‘Abdurra’ûf, appears to have encountered various methods of translation and followed this debate. Subsequently, they determined what methods would be appropriate in Southeast Asian communities.

---


107 Riddell is in the position of stating that.


Riddell explains that the literal method of translation had been concurrently used by the Arabic translators taking them into practice for the Greek texts, and become established techniques during the reign of the Abbasite Khalifah al-Ma’mûn (r. 813-833 A.D.). The Arabs themselves adopted the techniques from the Syrian translators, using them for translating the Greek literary works in earlier phases.\textsuperscript{110}

The Muslim Biographer from the 14\textsuperscript{th} century, al-Safadî, identified various methods simultaneously used during his lifetime for the translation of classical Greek works into Arabic as follow:

1. A word-for-word correspondence technique, which imported Greek syntactic into the Arabic of the translation on a massive scale.

2. A freer technique, where the meaning content of each Greek sentence was translated without adhering to Greek syntactic patterns. The Arabic of such translations adhered to the syntactic norms of literary Arabic.\textsuperscript{111}

During the period of their sojourn in Arabia from the 16\textsuperscript{th} century onward, they would have encountered such methods and might further have realized the controversies over the translation of the Qur’ân into other languages. At that time, the only acceptable way to do translation of the Qur’ân for traditional Muslims was through the interlinear method.\textsuperscript{112}


\textsuperscript{111} Quoted from Riddell, “Literal Translation,” p. 10, see for further, Peters, \textit{Aristotle}, p. 64-65.

\textsuperscript{112} Riddell, “Literal Translation,” p. 11.
In 2004 A.D., Riddell wrote the article entitled “From Kitab Malay to Literary Indonesian” submitted to the committee of the 8th International Symposium of Archipelago MSS at the State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah, Jakarta. Taking the same object of study as Johns (1999 A.D.), that is the story of Joseph, Riddell tried to prove that there was semantic movement in Malay Islamic texts over about 300 years. In this article, it seems that both Riddell and Johns start to be of the same opinion that—in Johns’ words—“meaning is not totally innate in words, but determined by context.”


As to the study of semantic changes, Riddell adopts Gustav Stern’s model. He then explains that the analysis of semantic movement needs to consider the three

---


¹¹⁴ Riddell, “From Kitab Malay,” p. 4.
important terms; *sign*, *sense*, and *referent*. They are three terms in the “triangle of meaning,” a concept initiated by two linguists in the early 20th century, Ogden & Richards. They argue that *meaning* is not *linear* but exists through indirect processes. The sign relates to the sense which is also connected to the real objects and realities (referent). The relationship between *sign* and its-*referent* is arbitrary, and *sense* could change over times. Such change then is called *semantic change*.\(^{115}\)

With regards to the linguistic aspects of Malay language, Riddell mainly draws upon the study of Asmah Haji Omar, which curtails the systems in Malay-Indonesian language into three parts: [1] nominals (nouns, pronouns, numerals); [2] verbals (verbs, adjectives, aspect verbs, modal verbs); and function words.\(^{116}\) The main result is that in the analysis of various renderings of the episode of Joseph, they found semantic changes in all categories of word classes, as well as in the three sub-categories, namely interjections, numerals and pronouns.\(^{117}\)

2.3. **IS THE *TURJUMÂN* A TRANSLATION OR COMMENTARY?**

**BRIDGING THE DISCREPANCY**

Riddell has devoted himself to the study of the *Turjumân*. This can be seen—to the best of my knowledge—from the publications of his works ranging from his Ph.D. thesis and one article dealing with the sources of the *Turjumân* in 1984 A.D. until his last article in 2004 A.D. He analyzes the early exegetical activities in

---

\(^{115}\) Quoted from Ogden & Richards, See Riddell, “From Kitab Malay,” p. 8.

\(^{116}\) Quoted from Riddell, “From Kitab Malay,” p. 8.

\(^{117}\) Riddell, “From Kitab Malay,” p. 28.
Southeast Asia. Johns, on the other hand, also gives great contributions for the study of this first Malay commentary of the Qurʾān as a whole. Both scholars have spent more than twenty years of analyzing the *Turjumān*. Thanks to their efforts, their achievements no doubt contribute to the construction of the history of Southeast Asian Islam, especially the tradition of classical Qurʾānic exegesis in the Malay world.

However, both intensive researchs still leave us a crucial question, that the identification of the *Turjumān* itself as the representation of translation or commentary activities. Riddell seems to consider it a translation due to its nature itself, which is the translated version of the Jalâlayn. Furthermore, it has been proven that ‘Abdurra’ūf himself chose the interlinear method for the compilation of the *Turjumān*, which shows his Malay style as being imitated from Arabic grammar. Finally, the use of linguistics approach for his analysis automatically affects Riddell’s pre-supposition that the *Turjumān* is essentially a translation.

Meanwhile, Johns prefers to regard the *Turjumān* as more than just a translation. This is a commentary in his eyes, and the reflection of the Malay ‘ulamā’ attempting to vernacularize Islam and the Qurʾān. Furthermore, Johns sees this work as the result of ‘Abdurra’ūf’s oral tradition with which he taught the students the meanings of the Qurʾān in his Madrasah. He could be the example of how a great Malay scholar did Islamic education in the 17th century in Aceh.

On the other hand, Harun basically identifies the *Turjumān* as a commentary as shown in his Ph.D. thesis title: “Hakekat Tafsir Tarjumān al-Mustafid Karya Abdurrauf Singkel.” Nevertheless, he does not comment on the use the term “tafsir”
in it. While he calls the *Turjumân* “tafsir,” he seems not to feel this kind of identification as a serious matter worth for academic inquiry. As a matter of fact, these two terms are very different in terms of their definitions as well the acceptance of the work in the Arab world.

Taking this into account, in the next chapter I try to arbitrate between these two scholars’ arguments as to whether the *Turjumân* is a translation or commentary. In this regard, I will investigate to what extent the concept of the translation has been developed in hermeneutics. As elaborated in the Introduction, Palmer combines three different meanings of the word “hermeneutics” into the word “to interpret” showing three different features, namely oral recitation, reasonable explanation, and translation. If so, every translation can be classified as commentary. What is vice versa? Are both terms the same in their perspectives and scopes? Thus, in Chapter Three, I try to formulate the discourse on translation using a hermeneutical framework.
CHAPTER III

DISCOURSE ON TRANSLATION IN HERMENEUTICS

Hans-Georg Gadamer was born in 1900 A.D. in Marburg, and then studied philosophy there. In 1922 A.D., he received his Ph.D. and became an instructor (Privatdozent) in Marburg. From 1938 A.D. until 1947 A.D., he taught in Leipzig, and from 1947 A.D. to 1949 A.D. in Frankfurt. In 1949 A.D., he moved to the University of Heidelberg to teach until his retirement in 1968 A.D. Gadamer became a disciple of Heidegger. In his works, he combines his interest in the Greek thought and civilization with the German tradition. His works on hermeneutics are heavily based upon his historical and philosophical studies in addition to his understanding of literature and poetry, both in the classical and modern styles.¹

Gadamer’s magnum opus is Wahrheit und Methode [in English; Truth and Method]. In this work, he criticizes the objectivism established in both the Enlightenment and Romanticism, suggesting that we need to adjust the meaning of

prejudices in all academic activities. Gadamer’s thought on hermeneutics is appropriately called the “new hermeneutics.” In his *Truth and Method*, Gadamer also develops a critical analysis by giving the readers deep understanding of classical hermeneutics in its various forms. The concept of the "historicity of understanding," which draws heavily on Heidegger's *Being and Time*, is the core of his argument. Nevertheless, he is also indebted to the methodological studies by Dilthey in humanities. Yet, as opposed to Dilthey, he does address his analysis in favor of the methodologies of the humanities sciences. Gadamer thus prefers to focus on the disclosure and criticism of hermeneutical principles by which the humanities are developed in their actual history and manifestation in the present.²

### 3.1. Gadamer’s Theory of Interpretation

Many criticisms have been addressed to his *Truth and Method*. Two of them come from Habermas and the Frankfurt School, focusing on Gadamer’s interest in the concept of transcendence which is alleged to be narrow-minded in the realms of hermeneutics and the humanities sciences. Habermas expressed this criticism in his work, *On the Logic of the Social Sciences* in 1967. Gadamer immediately replied it in *Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and the Critique of Ideology* in the same year.³


---

of Interpretation,” Hirsch delineates how serious the effects might be due to the “new hermeneutics” perspectives proposed by Gadamer. He writes:

“... the new hermeneutics Gadamer offers to replace the tradition of Schleiermacher, Humboldt, Droysen, Böckh, Steinthal, Dilthey, and Simmell may be more destructive in its implications than he had reckoned. In any case, his theory contains inner conflicts and inconsistencies which not one of the above masters would have allowed to pass into print.”

I do not intend to ignore the significance of such intellectual debates. Yet in this chapter, I directly formulate and examine Gadamer’s theories of both interpretation and translation.

It is worth noting here, generally speaking, Gadamer is not trying to propose the "true" hermeneutical method. Rather, in *Truth and Method*, he attempts to disclose what is really happening when the activity of understanding is being done. Then, he asserts what the real task of hermeneutics is, in terms of a hermeneutical outlook.

3.1.1. The Indeterminacy of Meaning

People often think that in order to maintain their communication with the capability of telling what they mean and understand what is meant by others, they need effective forms of communication. However, there are at least two acts by which people communicate with each other, i.e. oral and written communications. In oral communication, people create languages containing vocabularies socially agreed in

---

certain cultures by which each member might be able to say things, without
necessarily pointing out those things directly. In written communication, people
create symbolic scripts by which they produced thousands—or even millions—of
texts that can be read by many people over time.

Communication is defined as “the process by which people exchange
information or express their thoughts and feelings.” Roman Jakobson, (1896-1982
A.D.), a linguist, defines all acts of communication as:

[t]he adresser sends a message to the adressee. To be operative the message
requires a context referred to (“referent” in another, somewhat ambiguous,
nomenclature), seizable by the adressee, and either verbal or capable of being
verbalized; a code fully or at least partially, common to the adresser and
adressee (or in other words, to the encoder and decoder of the message); and,
finally, a contact, physical channel and psychological connection between the
adresser and the adressee, enabling both of them to enter and stay in
communication.

One of the distinguished Muslim scholars, Naṣr Hāmid Abû Zayd, heavily draws
upon Jakobson’s explanation on the act of communication to see the Qurʾān as an act
of communication. Yet, criticizes Yusuf Rahman, Abû Zayd does not make
distinction between oral and written communication. Basing himself on Paul
Ricoeuer’s analysis, Rahman states that as there is no dialogue in the forms of

6 Quoted from Yusuf Rahman, “The Hermeneutical Theory of Nashr Hāmid Abû Zayd: An
Analytical Study of His Method of Interpreting the Qurʾān,” Ph.D. thesis submitted to the Institute of
Islamic Studies, (McGill University, Montréal, 2001), p. 123. See for further, Jakobson, “Linguistics
elements of communication, see Paul Ricoeur, Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of
7 Rahman critically studied Abu Zayd’s hermeneutics for his Ph.D. thesis stated above in
McGill University in 2001 A.D.
questions and answers, there is only one-way indirect communication. In a literary text, the reader is absent in the time when the act of writing is done. The author is also absent when the reader does the act of reading. Accordingly, the text brings about “a double eclipse” for the author as well as the reader. Hence, the text is considered the medium that indirectly connects one side to the other.\(^9\) Then, we might regard a written communication as an “indirect communication” due to the fact that both might be in different times and occasions.

With regards to face-to-face communication, we find the possibility of clarification on the unclear meanings from each side during the act of communication.\(^10\) Thus, we could consider an oral communication a “direct communication” since both the addresser and addressee are fundamentally in the same situation. Indeed, both oral and written communication conducted by two people or more [the speaker—the audience; the author—the reader] have their own characteristics and, most importantly, their own consequences.

Oral communication is called conversation. In conversation, both speaker and audience build the face-to-face communication and acts of understanding. If misunderstandings arise, the addressee as stated might directly ask for clarification from the addresser. Therefore, apart from the acts of understanding, the acts of clarification are frequent in conversation. In this stage, oral communication could prevent people from being misunderstood as to the message sent by the addresser to


the addressee. Moreover, being in the same situation points out and thus realizes both the experience and context underscoring the conversation. As a result, the act of understanding is relatively easy in such a communication.

Written communication, on the other hand, produces texts, comprising of the arranged symbols, which contain messages for the readers. In such a communication, the author no doubt has his own context in which he meant to write. Equally, the reader lives in his own context when he begins to do the reading of the text. Hence, the discrepancies of contexts, in addition to the far distance of time and place, make the acts of understanding in such a communication more difficult, and consequently misunderstandings will be more likely to happen. To make matters even worse, if the author has already passed away, there will be no chance to ask clarification for any meanings intended in the texts. These acts of understanding will become more and more difficult as we apply it to the old literary texts and near impossible across history and culture.

Regarding as the theory of interpretation, hermeneutics should take account of such sharp differences toward the characteristics of these two forms of communication. According to Gadamer, the task of hermeneutics does not necessarily work in conversation. Such a type of communication is not in need of complicated theories for the sake of gaining a valid comprehension. The audiences generally do not have difficulties in asking for clarification. Instead, the task of hermeneutics as an interpretive theory is to study written communication [read: written texts], which are much more difficult to interpret. Hermeneutics is intended to solve any obstacles hindering the acts of understanding. Thus, written texts are where the real task of
hermeneutics is required. Writing is regarded as “self-alienation.”\textsuperscript{11} For this reason, to him, the actual condition of writing becomes central for hermeneutical phenomena owing to the aloofness of the text from the author, as well as from the readers, giving the text its existence. Thus, the first and most significant task of hermeneutics is no doubt the understanding of the texts.\textsuperscript{12}

In relation to language, of course, writing seems to be a secondary phenomenon. “The sign language of writing” refers to “the actual language of speech.” This phenomenon is based on the fact that speech itself shares in its pure meaning, which holds communication in it, completely separated from all emotional elements of expression and communication. The text, thus, cannot be grasped as a life expression, but merely relates to what it says. Writing is the model of the abstract language. Thus, the meanings of everything written basically are “identifiable” and “repeatable.” What is identical in such a repetition is merely what is actually “deposited” in written record. This indicates that such a “repetition” could not be understood here in restricted comprehension. This is not meant that we must draw reference from the original sources, simply because the understanding of something written is not repetition of something in the past, but the process of sharing meanings in the present.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{13} Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 394.
As stated, in conversation the addressee could directly ask for clarification, but not in the texts. When the text is being written, it experiences the process of alienation. It is being alienated since, on the one hand, its connection to the author, together with author’s context, is broken, breaks off. This is obvious for many older literary texts produced in centuries long over. Hence, says Gadamer, the highest stage in the act of understanding in hermeneutics is to solve the problem of alienation.  

The texts, as well as the authors of course, have some contexts that give rise to the birth of the text. Modern readers also have some contexts when they read the text. For this reason, the text should not be considered as a “recorded speech,” but as an independent piece of language. The meaning of the text does not take place in inaccessible mental processes, but in the “subject matter” or the “thing meant,” the Sache, while both the author and reader share their independence. Therefore, the core of Gadamer’s hermeneutics is Luther’s dictum that: “Qui non intellegit res, non potest ex verbis sensum elicere.” The res, not the author, is the determiner of the meaning of the text.

Thus, to understand what people say in the text is to encounter an understanding of subject-matter, not to enter the world-life of others or relive their experiences. The exposure of meaning seen in the act of understanding is always verbal. It is because the problems of typical understanding and the attempt to conquer it as the art of hermeneutics traditionally belong to the grammar and rhetoric of

language. Language is a medium in which two people do substantive understanding and agreement.17

In our analysis in hermeneutical processes, we have seen that to obtain the horizon of interpretation requires a "fusion of horizons." Text is made to speak through interpretation. But, there is no single text or book that speaks without communicating through language with other people. Hence, the interpreter needs to find an appropriate language if he really wants to make the text speak. For this reason, says Gadamer, “there cannot be any single interpretation that is correct “in itself.” Every interpretation focuses on the text itself. The historical life of tradition depends on its constant process of being assimilated and interpreted. All interpretations must adapt themselves to their own hermeneutical situations.18

Apart from the methodological perspectives, Gadamer states that all interpretations are speculative as actually practiced. Since it is the interpreter who makes the interpretive words, such words of course are not the language from the interpreted texts. By this, he means that interpretation is not a reproductive activity nor is it a repetition of the original text. It constitutes a new creation and new understanding.19 Thus, it is regarded as a productive activity and always goes beyond the intention of the author. It must also be considered an endless process, for we can never get final words in order to achieve a true meaning.20

17 Gadamer, Truth and Method, p. 386.
3.1.2. The Fusion of Horizons

Written communication creates two very different situations, the former generating the birth of the text, and the latter affecting the act of reading. Each situation of course has its own limited possibilities of vision. In Gadamer’s hermeneutics, the concept is developed and called a “horizon.” He defines the word “horizon” as “the range of vision that includes everything that can be seen from a particular vantage point.” By this, according to Phillipe Eberhard, Gadamer discloses the historical consciousness, that is the attitude by which we consciously realize that it is determined historically. The concept of the “fusion of horizon” constitutes the core of Gadamer’s thought in his magnum opus, *Truth and Method.*

Men without a horizon do not have good vision and tend to have *over-values* to what is close to, underestimating what is far from them. On the other hand, “to have a horizon” means that a person is not restricted by everything that is close and tangible, but goes beyond it. Someone who has horizon will be capable of viewing things of relevant importance on everything in this horizon, whether it is near or far. Similarly, to deal with the hermeneutical situation means that we reach an exact investigation of horizon, towards which the questions that might arise are caused by these encounters with tradition.

---

In the realm of historical understanding, we also think of horizons, especially when we refer to the claim of historical consciousness to look at the past in its own context, not in the contemporary situation and not by our prejudices, but in its own historical horizon. As a result, the task of historical understanding involves the accomplishment of a proper historical horizon, so that what we are attempting to grasp can be seen to its full extent. If we fail to transfer ourselves to the historical horizons out of which the traditional texts speak, we will mistakenly understand the significance of what the text really says to us. In this extent, Gadamer proposes a legitimate hermeneutical requirement: “we must place ourselves in the other situation in order to understand it.”

Historical consciousness could give us the flexibility to behave so that we share a space for any understanding that might be contradictory to our own. In this regard, the historical consciousness definitely works in any way similar to when someone transposes himself to a situation in the past, and is therefore alleged to have found perspectives and horizons of other people. Their ideas could be “intelligible” without necessarily going with them. Thus, when someone thinks historically, he begins to comprehend the given meanings without standing in the same opinion or viewing himself in it.

Indeed, the awareness of historical consciousness prevents us from not being hasty. We judge we grasp when looking at the past from a historical perspective—that is, transposing ourselves to its historical situation and attempting to reconstruct

its historical horizon. As a matter of fact, we surrender the assertion to find in the past whatever the truth might be. To acknowledge “the otherness of the other” in this manner, considering it the object of objective knowledge, enables us to be deliberate in determining the truth.\(^{26}\)

The concept of horizons indicates that men, in their limited existence, have access to an interpretive understanding that is limited to the reality in given time. In the process of fusion, the nature of horizon in which the act of interpretation happens is transformed by the encounter. The historical movement of human life provides the fact that it can never be bound by any single perspective and, therefore, can never get a truly closed horizon. Thus, the horizons of the past, out of which all humans live, exist in the form of tradition and are always in motion. “The surrounding horizon,” says Gadamer then, “is not set in motion by historical consciousness. But in it this motion becomes aware of itself.”\(^{27}\)

When the historical consciousness transforms ourselves to the historical horizons, it would not make us passing through the inaccessible alien worlds to our own worlds. Instead, all the horizons move from inside and, while going beyond the limits of the present, help to conceive our deep historical consciousness. In fact, everything contained in the historical consciousness could be understood by a single historical horizon. Our and others’ lives in the past to which our historical consciousness is addressed contribute to create this moving horizon out of which


\(^{27}\) Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, p. 303.
human life always exists. Then, this horizon becomes “heritage” and “tradition.”

Lastly, Gadamer thinks that the understanding of tradition undoubtedly requires a historical horizon. But, it does not mean that we could get the horizon through the transposing of ourselves to the historical situation. Rather, we need to already have the horizon in order to be able to transfer ourselves to the situation.29

As a matter of fact, the horizon of the present is continuously in the “process of being formed” because we constantly investigate our all prejudices. The important part of such investigation occurs in the encounter with the past and in the understanding of tradition from which we come into existence. Therefore, affirms Gadamer, “the horizon of the present cannot be formed without the past. Rather, understanding is always the fusion of these horizons supposedly existing by themselves.”30

Finally, as explained by James Dicenso, there is a tension that adheres to the historical hermeneutics accelerating the “ongoing disclosure” and the transformation of its horizon. The text, considered “the embodiment of tradition” on which Gadamer focuses, is somehow the other which could not be fully comprehended from one interpretative perspective only. The text will be only disclosing itself in the hermeneutical action, only in the horizon of the interpreter, and thus through a fusion. There, the fusion process continuously goes on.31

30 Gadamer, Truth and Method, p. 305.
3.1.3. Prejudice

Gadamer notices, the history of ideas shows that since the Enlightenment the word prejudice has been negatively understood. As a matter of fact, prejudice means a judgment interpreted before all related and determinant elements are already examined. In German terminology, Vorurteil, prejudice constitutes a temporal verdict before a final judgment is achieved. Because someone gets involved in the controversy over the law, this kind of judgment negatively affects the chances he has. For this reason, préjudice in French, as well as in Latin, praejudicium, simply means “adverse effect,” “disadvantage,” and “harm.” The negative meanings are only derivative on the one hand. The negative effects, on the other hand, exactly depend on the positive validity, the value of the temporal decision that is to be regarded as prejudgment.32

Having considered the factual usage of the term prejudice in the age of Enlightenment, we need to make fundamental distinction between prejudice due to “human authority” and due to “overhastiness.” This distinction is based on the origins of prejudice in those who judge it. Prejudice due to the former (human authority) is known as the principle promoted by Kant in 1784: “Have the courage to make use of your own understanding.”33

Prejudices are divided into those of “authority” and those of “overhastiness.” Such division clearly refers to the basic assumption of the Enlightenment, namely that

33 Gadamer, Truth and Method, p. 274.
the use of reason that is methodologically disciplined can prevent us from all mistakes. Descartes pioneered this method. Overhastiness is defined as the origins of all mistakes that arise in the use of one’s own reason. Authority, on the other hand, takes charge of someone who does not utilize his own reason at all. Therefore, the division depends on a shared exclusive antithesis between authority and reason.\(^{34}\)

Thus, argues Gadamer, the term prejudice is not certainly conceived as a false judgment, but a part of ideas that might give us positive or negative values. Clearly, this is due to the influence of the word in Latin, “praecjudicium,” which is negatively understood. In its German term, Vorurteil, just as its English one, “prejudice,” and even more in its French terminology, préjugé, seems to have been restricted in its meaning with the criticism of religion in the Enlightenment era, which tends to mean “unfounded judgment.”\(^{35}\)

3.1.4. The Rehabilitation of Authority and Tradition

If we like to do justice for human limits and weaknesses, considered the mode of historical beings, we need to fundamentally rehabilitate the concept of prejudice and recognize the fact that there are “legitimate prejudices.” Demetrius Teigas regards the idea of tradition as the basis of all prejudices and for all things transmitted to us. As to the clarification and evaluation of our prejudices, it is essential that we grasp tradition in which we live. Similarly, while interpreting the text, the interpreter must visit and understand the past. He needs to be aware of the influence of tradition

\(^{34}\) Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, p. 279.

toward himself and the communality that exists between himself and tradition. Yet, if these statements simply underline the cognitive significance of tradition in our attempt to understand ourselves and the past, we should assert that “tradition is part of us: we live in it.” If we regard ourselves as historical beings, our efforts should not be intended to avoid tradition, which constitutes our side of historicity, but instead to *advance* tradition back to full strength in order to appreciate its significance. Such demands illustrate the positive attitude that Gadamer holds towards tradition and “the space” that we allowed for hermeneutical analysis.\(^{36}\)

Gadamer believes that, as Teigas argues, the absolute position that the Enlightenment created between authority and reason is thought to be a misconception. Authority does not always give rise to the implausible use of power and hegemony. “Authority,” says Gadamer, “is not always wrong.” Rather, the key relation to authority relies on whether we accept or not. If we acknowledge the “superiority in knowledge” and insight in authority (just as the example that is explicated by the teacher or expert), thus we accept “authority of our own accord.” If not, any other acceptance will base on the force which needs to be differentiated from “fee acceptance” and “recognition.”\(^{37}\)

Along with tradition, the philosophy of Enlightenment has discredited the concept of “prejudices.”\(^{38}\) Gadamer already rehabilitated much importance of prejudices that constantly go together with us. Teigas reveals that, according to

\(^{36}\) Quoted from Teigas, *Knowledge and Hermeneutic Understanding*., p. 122.

\(^{37}\) Teigas, *Knowledge and Hermeneutic Understanding*., p. 122.

\(^{38}\) See Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, p. 273-278
Gadamer, the force that read the correction for the attitude of the Enlightenment towards tradition is the Romanticism. The encouragement of the Romanticism to tradition allowed the recognition of the development of a legitimate authority by tradition. For example, the recognition of moral validity, put forward along with tradition, demonstrates the truth of the Romanticism at this point.³⁹

However, Gadamer disassociates himself from the Enlightenment and Romantic schools on tradition. Romanticism regards tradition as given and natural in which reason must keep silent.⁴⁰ As opposed to both the Romanticism and Enlightenment, there are no absolute anti-thesis and unconditional things between tradition and reason, which elicit the conclusion that tradition is constantly considered in its own free and historical element, an argument that challenges the beliefs of the Enlightenment. By this, he means that the act of preserving tradition is also the act of reason.⁴¹ He argues that, even in the period of the revolution, the old is always preserved and combined with the new, which certainly creates new values. Accordingly, as Teigas explains, Gadamer concludes that the criticisms of the Enlightenment era towards tradition and the rehabilitation of tradition by the Romanticism are incorrect.⁴²

Eventually, Teigas informs us that one of the most important conclusions that might be derived from the Gadamer’s thought on tradition is that we could not think of ourselves beyond tradition. Instead, says Teigas, we must accept the fact that we

³⁹ Teigas, *Knowledge and Hermeneutic Understanding*, p. 122.
⁴² Teigas, *Knowledge and Hermeneutic Understanding*, p. 123.
have been constructed by tradition and, through it, everything from the past is transmitted to us.\textsuperscript{43}

3.2. Gadamer’s “Hermeneutics of Translation”\textsuperscript{44}

If we see the pages of Gadamer’s \textit{Truth and Method}, more than six-hundred pages, his explanation on the theory of translation is very short and only spends about twenty pages in total. However, there are at least two occasions in which Gadamer clearly asserts the act of translation as basically an act of interpretation. Hence, those who do translation can be regarded as the interpreters.\textsuperscript{45}

Such a statement no doubt generates a significant theoretical basis. For example, all aspects that Gadamer proposed to be the theory of interpretation can be also applied to his theory of translation. Here, we need to ask a question about whether Gadamer really regards both activities as the same in all aspects. I have strong reasons to ask this question, since Gadamer in fact intentionally (or unintentionally perhaps) makes a distinction between translation and interpretation and describes the characteristics of translation. He, for instance, states that translation lies in the culmination of interpretation, in which the translator chooses the

\textsuperscript{43} Teigas, \textit{Knowledge and Hermeneutic Understanding.}, p. 123.

\textsuperscript{44} This term is inspired from the title of John Sallis’s article, “The Hermeneutics of Translation,” in Lawrence K. Schmidt, (ed.), \textit{Language and Linguisticality in Gadamer’s Hermeneutics}. (Boston: Lexington Books, 2000), p. 67-76.

\textsuperscript{45} In page 386, Gadamer says: “Thus, every translation is at the same time an interpretation;” and page 389: “For every translator is an interpreter.”
appropriate words. Then, it is alleged that translation is not isomorphic to ordinary interpretation.46

To answer this question, the elaboration of Gadamer’s theory of interpretation above shows its significance. Thus, we need the elaboration to measure to what extent we can find similarities [and also differences] between these two activities in Gadamer’s hermeneutics. In his theory of interpretation, I formulate four aspects: the indeterminacy of meaning, the fusion of horizons, prejudice, and the rehabilitation of authority and tradition, as have already been elaborated. Yet, since Gadamer very briefly describes the act of translation, I would only like to divide Gadamer’s theory of translation into two aspects: the indeterminacy of meaning and the historicity of understanding.

3.2.1. The Indeterminacy of Meaning

Translation is thought to be the same as interpretation. Yet, translation basically faces more dilemmatic problems. Translation makes us aware that language as the medium of understanding must be consciously created through an explicit mediation. Undoubtedly, such an explicit process is not a norm in a conversation. However, translation is also not a norm of how we approach a foreign language. In this regard, Gadamer argues that translation is actually equivalent to two people that surrender their independent authorities. Accordingly, when we are in need of translation, there will be a gulf between the essential meanings of the original and of

translated words, which needs to be considered. Moreover, this gap can never be closely linked in a perfect manner.\footnote{Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 386.}

Nevertheless, understanding cannot absolutely take a position between the partners of a conversation, but between the interpreters who might have the encounters with a common world of understanding. As for the communication via translation, it is well-known that there is nothing more difficult than a dialogue conducted in two different languages in which one speaks something [word] and the other speaks another one. As if they are forced by the higher power, one language always comes to be superior to the other as a medium of understanding.\footnote{Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 386.}

Gadamer asks us to initially consider taking an extreme case of one foreign language. In this regard, no one doubts that the translation of the text cannot be simply considered as an attempt to re-awaken the original process in the writer’s mind, regardless of how serious the translator might be in dealing with the intention of the author. Yet, it must be a re-creation of the texts addressed to the way the translator grasps what it really says. No one can doubt that what we are dealing with here is the act of interpretation, and not merely reproductive activity. In this regard, Gadamer says, “a new light falls on the text from the other language and for the reader of it”.\footnote{Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 387.} Therefore, just like interpretation, translation is a productive activity.

Furthermore, although it could give a certainty of belief, translation cannot solve a fundamental gulf between two languages. We are therefore trapped into
making a difficult decision, although we do the best to increase our beliefs. In translation, to him, if we like to emphasize “the feature of the original” that is significant to us, we could do so through the restriction of other features. Again, the act of translation is exactly regarded as the act of interpretation. Just as all acts of interpretation, translation is also the act of emphasizing. The translator must realize that emphasizing is one part of his task. For sure, it is not allowed for him to tolerate everything that is unclear.\textsuperscript{50}

Nevertheless, we found, reveals Gadamer, the borderline cases in the original language and readers where things are in fact ambiguous. Yet, such hermeneutical borderline cases point out the narrowness in which the translator constantly finds himself. Here, the translator should quit. He should clearly affirm the way he does "understanding." Yet, since he is always in the position of being not really capable of expressing all dimensions of the text, he needs to make a constant renunciation. Every translation that seriously takes its responsibility will be clearer and flatter than the original. Even if it is thought to be a re-creation, it must lack the essential things found in the original words. Nevertheless, we could also suggest that its weaknesses, such as the gain and or lost of information during the act of translation, could be considered good or even an accomplishment. Gadamer gives us an example of how \textit{Les fleurs du mal} of Baudelaire seems to have gotten a new vitality in its translated version made by Stefan George.\textsuperscript{51}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{50} Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 387.
\item \textsuperscript{51} Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 387-8.
\end{itemize}
Similarly, continues Gadamer, the translator should keep his own linguistic character, the language in which he will do translation, while recognizing the values of the “alien” [read: foreign] languages, even the hostile texts and their expressions. But, the description of the translator's activities is also to be shortened. Even in the extreme situations in which we need to translate from one language to another, its subject-matter could not be frequently separated from its original language. It is only the translator who can really recreate those who bring the subject-matter to the given language. Nevertheless, it could be regarded as the invention of language, which not only belongs to the translator but is also proportional to the original. The situations of both interpreter and translator are fundamentally the same. Having affirmed the similarities of the situation faced by both actors, Gadamer repeatedly asserts the correspondence of both activities.

In bridging a big gap between the languages, the translator points out the reciprocal relations existing between the interpreter and the text, and corresponds with the reciprocity involved in the achievement of understanding in conversation. Thus, says Gadamer, “every translator is an interpreter.” The fact that the foreign language that is being translated means that this is simply the extreme case of the difficulties of hermeneutical experience—such as the unfamiliarity and defeat. As a matter of fact, all objects that the traditional hermeneutics deals with are aliens in meaning. The task of the re-creation by the translator is somewhat different in level, though not in variety, from the task of hermeneutics in general. Yet, just like the

---

translator translating a conversation, he undoubtedly could make a possible mutual understanding if he gets involved in the discussion of the meant material. Thus, in his relation to the text, it is essential that the interpreter [and of course the translator] plays his role in creating the meanings.53

Finally, as someone lives and speaks in the language, he has been constructed by the “sense of the unsuppassable appropriateness of the words” as to the material which he is using and dealing with. It seems implausible that the other words could equally call these things. The proper words seem to be owned in the translation and unique in their own right. Ultimately, the difficulties in translation lie in the fact that the original words seem not to be separated from the things they address. Then, to make the text intelligible, one should frequently give interpretive restatements towards it than translations. When we are more aware of our historical consciousness, it seems that the implausibility of the translation of the “un-translatability of the unfamiliar” is getting more realized. One thing that should be considered, is how we could grasp everything written in foreign languages if we are trapped in our own language?54

3.2.2. The Historicity of Understanding

54 Gadamer, Truth and Method, p. 403.
In many situations where understanding is interrupted, we initially become aware of the conditions of all understandings. Such a process, thought to be verbal,\textsuperscript{55} which make conversation in two different languages possible through translation is characterized as informative. Here, the translator should translate the meaning in the period when the intended audiences live. Certainly, it does not mean that he freely digresses from what the audience says. Thus, its meaning must be preserved. Since it must be understood in its new world, the translator should advance the validity in a new way in it.\textsuperscript{56} This is one of affirmations that the act of translation is also the productive activity.

Nevertheless, Gadamer tends to play down the importance of translation as one of the key acts of understanding. To understanding the foreign language means that we are not in need of translating it into our own language. Furthermore, Gadamer states that “when we really master a language, then no translation is necessary—in fact, any translation seems impossible.”\textsuperscript{57} In this regard, it seems that he tries to distinguish the act of interpretation in general meaning from the act of translation which is more specific. There is no longer the impossibility of interpretation although it just produces an uncertainty of meaning. The impossibility, on the other hand, is the most difficult problem in the act of understanding, for which the translator must be

\textsuperscript{55} Formerly, Gadamer states that the understanding of what someone says is the encounter with the understanding of the subject matter which is being discussed, not the transferring to another person and relive his experiences (Erlebnisse). We insist that the experience (Erfahrung) of the meaning which occurs in the act of understanding include the application. Gadamer call the whole process as verbal. See Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 385.

\textsuperscript{56} Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 386.

\textsuperscript{57} Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 386.
responsible. Consequently, the mastery of language as the most important qualification the translator is required of could only make himself, not the others [read: the readers], understand the meanings of the translated words and, therefore, translation is not necessary since the translator already understood the original. The readers of the translated work seem to have undergone much larger effects. The impossibility of translation points out that the readers who do not understand the original language [and/or do not draw on the original work] can never achieve the true meanings of the original via translation. Therefore, I conclude that every work considered a translation is actually a work of interpretation.

Moreover, Gadamer explains that the understanding of the way people speak is not a real understanding and thus, the act of interpretation does not function in it. Since we understand the language through living in it, a true statement as we realize not only awakes the language but also kills the others. Hence, the hermeneutical problems focus not only on the mastery of the language in the right manner, but also create a proper understanding on the subject matter. Every language can be perfectly learned. The user no longer does translation from or into one’s native language, but thinks in the meant language. Thus, the mastery of the language is a precondition in order to reach understanding in conversation, for instance. Every conversation clearly presumes that these two actors speak in the same language. In such a case, the problems of understanding could come up. Accordingly, the need of dependency on the translation of the translator is an extreme case that doubles the process of
hermeneutics: the conversation between the translator and the other, as well as between the translator and himself.\textsuperscript{58}

The translation is frequently painful due to the inevitable distance from the original. Coping with the text is similar to an attempt to come to an understanding in conversation that is not separated by distance. The act of translation is the “especially laborious process of understanding,” in which one sees the distance between each other and the conflict that happened there is regarded as something “ultimately unbridgeable.” As in conversation one attempts to transfer himself to the other for the sake of understanding the other’s view, the translator also must truly and fully transpose himself to the author. For this reason, the translator is able to find the best solution, something that can never be more than just a compromise.\textsuperscript{59}

However, by so doing, Gadamer warns, it does not automatically mean that understanding will be achieved in a conversation. Equally, such a transferring is not spontaneously successful in the bid for re-creating the meaning. The achievement of understanding in conversation postulates that the two partners are ready for it and try to acknowledge the full values towards whatever seem alien and contradictory. If it occurs mutually, and each partner concurrently holds out in their own stances, examining their arguments, as well as contradictory ones, it eventually becomes possible to reach the common articulation and principle.\textsuperscript{60}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{58} Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 386-7. \\
\textsuperscript{59} Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 388 \\
\textsuperscript{60} Gadamer, \textit{Truth and Method}, p. 388.
\end{flushright}
Eventually, the meaning of the text should not be juxtaposed with the obstinate view that just gives rise to the question addressed to those who are trying to do understanding. In this regard, understanding is certainly not focused on historical understanding, which is the reconstruction of the way the text comes into existence. Rather, one means to understand the text by himself. Nevertheless, it means that the interpreter’s (and also the translator’s) mind also moves to “re-awakening the text’s meaning.” In this case, the horizon of the interpreter himself is important, but not regarded as the personal perspective he holds out, but more considered the opinion and possibility that he brings to the game, places the consequences, and helps the others to make their own understanding to what the text really says.61

3.3. Is Translation Something Else Other Than Interpretation?

The elaboration on the hermeneutics of both interpretation and translation basically gives us insights into what is really happening when the act of translation [and interpretation] is being done. With regards to translation, if it is affirmed that the act of translation is difficult to do for literary works made by humans, then we will find it more difficult if we translate sacred texts that are believed to be revealed by God.

In the case of the Qur’ân, for instance, Ekmeleddin Ihsanoğlu argues that every work of Qur’ânic translation can be included in two categories, namely rendering the original text of the Qur’ân, which is Arabic, into any language with the original text

still included, and giving a whole new version of the Qur’ân in any other language without any Arabic. The second category has certainly led to controversies and debates among Moslems around the world while the first one has widespread acceptance.\textsuperscript{62} The controversies and debates about the second category of the translation occurred among Moslems, for instance, in the 1930s when the attempt of making another version of the Qur’ân in Turkish came up. The controversies and debates that were voiced came mainly from Egyptian Moslem Scholars.\textsuperscript{63}

The debates continued until the Assembly of the Grand ‘Ulamâ’ of al-Azhar issued fatwa in 1936 A.D., stating that the making an interpretative translation of the Qur’ân was possible. Conversely, the transformation of its meaning into another language is impossible. We, therefore, state that Moslems predominantly accept that the Qur’ân must be in its original form, which is Arabic, and all ritual ceremonies such as prayers are obliged to be performed in Arabic.

Since Islam is believed to be a universal religion for all humanity, it is seen as necessary to translate and create clear interpretations of the Qur’ân, as well as to clarify its purposes for all humankind though they all speak in different languages.


\textsuperscript{63} The ‘Ulamâ’ s who supported the possibility of the translation of the Qur’ân for the substitution of the original text that could be listed here are Shaykh Muhammad Musthafa al-Maraghî, the Shaykh of al-Azhar, and Muhammad Farîd Wajdi. The ‘Ulamâ’ s who opposed to this possibility are Shaykh al-İslâm of the Ottoman State Mustafa Şâbî Efendi, Shaykh Ahmâd Muḥammad Şâkıîr, dan Shaykh al-Taftazâni. For further explanation see Ihsanoğlu, (ed.), World Bibliography, p. xxv-xxvi.
Ihsanoğlu emphasizes that word-by-word translation is basically impossible, no matter how diligent the effort is. The Qur’ân is undoubtedly unlimited and infinite in terms of its content and structure. Nevertheless, literal translation as one of the types of the translation is much safer and of course causes less conflict, particularly in Southeast Asia.

Therefore, drawing upon Gadamer’s hermeneutics of translation, we conclude that translation is one of the acts of interpretation. Hence, the translators can be called the interpreters. Yet, the difficulties and dilemmas inherent to translation make Gadamer suggest that the act of translation seems impossible and, therefore, is not necessary. For those who are not capable of understanding the original are advised to realize how they understand the meanings of the sacred text via the receptor language by taking into account that they can never achieve a certain level of understanding just as someone who understands it via the source language.

The *Turjumân* of ‘Abdurra’uf could be the exact case to which we will consider it the work of interpretation or translation. Having elaborated Gadamer’s hermeneutics of translation, I argue that the *Turjumân*, of course together with all acts of interpreting and translating the Qur’ân implemented in the forms of independent writings, is also the work of interpretation. This is grounded in fact that the meanings of the receptor language can never perfectly transform the words of the source language. The next questions are what processes by which we could make sure that the translation of Qur’ânic words written in the *Turjumân* could not transfer the

---

original meanings. In the next chapter, I will investigate the facts that subsequently make us more aware of the Turjumân's status as a work of interpretation. Moreover, the Turjumân represents a process of—what Anthony H. Johns calls—vernacularization of the Qur’ânic meanings into a local language, Malay. In chapter four, I examine initially the nature of the Turjumân whether it is—in Abdullah Saeed’s book—tradition based on understanding or “textualism.”65 Then, I will continue to investigate the “[un]translatable” words of the Qur’ân and do a comparison with some other copies of the Turjumân and other religious texts to see the ideological aspects of the translated word. Thus, I focus on the two aspects; theology and eschatology. Basing this on the data, I will examine the problems that might come up due to the incongruous languages. Then we are expected to conclude that, as Gadamer says, all acts of interpretation, including of translation, are the endless productive activities that act to create the indeterminacy of meaning.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE PROBLEMS OF TRANSLATION IN THE TURJUMÂN:

A STUDY OF THEOLOGICAL AND ESCHATOLOGICAL ASPECTS

The Arabic Qur'ân is believed to be the most perfect Arabic language. For non-Arabic speaking people, the understanding of the literal meanings of the Qur'ân is possible through the activities of translation. Nevertheless, they could not be considered the definite words of God but are instead what God revealed to the Prophet Muhammad through the angel Gabriel. While the meanings of the Qur'ân could be fairly presented in non-Arabic languages, the original text is of course untranslatable. For this reason, as Woodward puts it, the Qur'ân is regarded as both oral and written texts.¹ Regardless of what language is used, the ideological aspects of the Arabic Qur'ân are not likely to be perfectly transmitted in any other language.

The language of the Qur'ân has never been introduced in a vacuum, due to the simple reality that everything coming from the outside world would certainly come

into contact with the local languages in which the local ideas have been established.\footnote{See Benjamin Zimmer, “Al-‘Arabiyyah and Basa Sunda: Ideologies of Translation and Interpretation among the Muslims of West Java,” \textit{Studia Islamika} 7:3 (2000), p. 38.} Throughout history, various ideological aspects of language are possible to communicate, and even compete with each other in certain communities. Such phenomena could be certainly seen in the use of the Arabic Qur'ân around the Muslim world, when the Arabic Qur'ân inevitably faces the established local ideas of certain cultures.

The Arabic Qur'ân came eventually into contact with the Archipelago cultures and languages, and particularly with the Malay culture. When 'Abdurra'ûf introduced the translated understanding of the Arabic Qur'ân to the Malay people, he consciously—or unconsciously—took the lead in the process of what A. H. Johns considers it the "Malay vernacularization of the Qur'ân."\footnote{Johns, "She Desired Him and He Desired Her (Quran 12:24): 'Abd al-Ra'ûf's Treatment of an Episode of the Joseph Story in Tarjuman al-Mustafid,” \textit{Archipel} 57, vol. 2, (1999), p. 109.} The possible result of such a process is that when one of the Qur'ânic words could not be translated into the local language, Malay, the transference of foreign words was inevitable. For the former, we could regard it as the \textit{act of translation}. But for the latter, we call it the \textit{act of transferring} the alien words into the local language, and therefore this transference is not the same as the act of translation.

If we move back to the concept of translation in Gadamer’s hermeneutics, the former case points out that the process of such a compromise [read: vernacularization] between the original words and the translated ones is evidently difficult and could not be perfectly successful. For the latter case, conversely, as
Gadamer affirms, the activity of translation is seemingly impossible and therefore the audiences need to understand the original texts or take them as their own vocabulary. Otherwise, they never get the true meanings of the texts. For the purpose of this thesis, I will investigate two important aspects explored in the Arabic Qurʾān. These are the aspects of theology and eschatology. In this regard, I will use some MS copies and printed editions of the *Turjumān*. They are ML 290 and ML 116 for the MSS and the publication of Mustafâ al-Bâbî al-Halabî in 1951 and Dār al-Fikr in 1990 [read: TM90]. With regards to the elaboration of theology and escathology, I will use Fazlur Rahman’s work, *The Major Themes of the Qurʾān*, as his thoughts mainly reflect the mainstream of Muslim beliefs on both aspects.

In Malay culture, both theology and eschatology have been established as the results of "Indianization"—the coming of Hinduism and Budhism to Archipelago—for about one thousand years before the birth of ʿAbdurraʿuf in the 17th century. Thus, I also examine how far Hindu has developed both aspects and their understanding in the local communities in Southeast Asia.

4.1. THEOLOGY

In Islam, together with the other two mass religions originating in the Middle East, which are Judaism and Christianity, the name of God, *Allâh*, was introduced a long time ago. It was the Prophet Abraham who is considered the father of those three great monotheistic traditions, and who purified the concept of God as the Unique and

---

Omnipotent God, with humankind as apostates from the teachings of the Prophet Noah. Regarding the Prophet Abraham, Jerald F. Dirks states that he is the central figure and played a significant role in the history of these three great religions. In the Jewish tradition, it was Abraham who received the religion and oath for the Hebrews from God. In the Christian tradition, Abraham became the most famous patriarch and receiver of the revelations that were continuously revealed to the Prophet Moses and then to Jesus. In the Islamic tradition, he is the best example of those who held on firmly to the true faith and monotheism, the prophet and messenger, and the receiver of the religious treatise and suhuf from the God. All these religions admit that Abraham is the prophet and messenger of God.⁵

In the pre-Islamic Arab communities, it has been evidently noted that the word Allâh had been known and worshipped.⁶ Nevertheless, the way they worshipped Him were considered heretical.⁷ In the first period of revelation, the Qur’ân evidently attempted to do the purification of the word Allâh as the One and only God by initially using the word rabb instead of Allâh, as Quraish Shihab, a prominent Muslim Indonesian scholar, noted. This fact can be seen from at least the first revelation to the


⁶ The Qur’ân basically does not negate that the pre-Islamic Arab people had known the so-called Allah as their God. This is mentioned in Q.S. Luqmân (31): 25: "wa-la‘in sa’altahum man khalaqa ’s-samâwâtî wa-l-ardâ la-yaqûlunna ’llâh quli-’l-hamdu lillâhi bal aktharuhum lâ ya’lamûn” (If thou ask them, who it is that created the heavens and the earth, they will certainly say, "Allah.” Say: "Praise be to Allah!” But most of them understand not.).

⁷ Albeit they knew that Allah is their God, the Qur’ân evaluated their way of worshipping the God a heretical due to the use of media, that is the statue. The Qur’ân mentions this in Q.S. al-Zumar (39): 3: “Alâ li-llâhi ’l-dînu ’l-khâlis wa-l-’adhistâ takaḥdhû min dûni-hî awliyâ‘a mà na’budu-hum illâ li-yuqarribûnâ ilâ-llâhi zulfâ ...” (Is it not to Allah that sincere devotion is due? But those who take for protectors other than Allah (say): "We only serve them in order that they may bring us nearer to Allah, ...”).
sixth one, received by the Prophet Muhammad. It could be even extended to the 19th revelation, Q.S. al-Ikhlâs.8

This could certainly be evidence that for several years the Prophet Muhammad strived to teach and put more emphasis on the real substance of God by which the usage of the word Allâh begun to clearly describe His Holiness and Perfectness. The usage of the word Allâh by the Qur'ân containing a very different understanding contrasted to the local ideas could be the evidence of semantic change made by the Qur'ân. Albeit the word does not change, such a concept is clearly not derived from the worldview of the pre-Islamic Arabs.9

The learning of the religious principle, which is the description of Allâh, then emerged in Q.S. al-Ikhlâs (112): 1-4: "Say: He is Allâh, The One and Only. Allâh, the Eternal, Absolute. He begetteth not, Nor is He begotten. And there is none Like unto Him."10 Since then, the word Allâh emerged more frequently in the following revelations. According to Quraish Shihab, the word Allâh is mentioned in the Qur'ân 2.698 times in total. If the word Allâh is mentioned, such a word already includes all aspects of all His other names. This is of course different from the calling of His other names, for example, al-rahîm that only reflects His Mercifulness.11

---

9 Quraish Shihab, Tafsir Al-Amanah, p. 17-18.
Since monotheism is the most typical characteristic in Islam, the Qur’ân continuously describes the real substance of God. I do not intend to mention all related theological verses. For the purpose of study, I just take some examples to show how the word Allâh is transferred or translated by 'Abdurra’ûf. Some verses that can be mentioned here are Q.S. al-Naml (27): 60 and al-Hâsyr (59): 22-24. In Q.S. al-Naml (27): 60, the God says:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Amman khalaqa 's-samâwât' wa-'l-ardh wa-anzala la-kum mina-'s-samâ'i mâ'a' fa-anbatnâ bi-hi hadâ'iqâ dhâti bahjatîn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Ataw siapalah yang mënjadikan tujuh pêtala langit dan bumi dan têlah mënurunkân bagai kamu dari langit air maka kamu tambahkan dêngan dia bêbêrapa bustan yang baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA</td>
<td>Or, who has created the heaven and the earth, and who sends you down rain from the sky? Yea, with it We cause to grow well-planted orchards full of beauty and delight:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Mâ kâna la-kum an tanbutû shajarahâ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Tiada-da bagi kamu dapat mënumlahkan sêgala pohon kayunya karêna tiada kamu kuat atasnya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA</td>
<td>It is not in your power to cause the growth of the trees in them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>a-ilâhun ma'a-l-llâh bal hum qawmun ya’dilûn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Adalah sêrta Allâh ta’ala menolong dia atas yang dêmikian itu artinya tiada-da Tuhan sêrta-Nya têtapí mêreka itu kaum yang mënayekutukan Allâh ta’ala dêngan lain-Nya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA</td>
<td>(Can there be another) god besides Allâh? Nay, they are a people who swerve from justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These verses constitute the parts of the Qur’ân that affirms the true Creator of the universe and why the universe always works on the right path. Basing himself on other verses, Fazlur Rahman states that the Qur’ân basically recognizes the

---

availability of Causality. However, God neither takes rests in the aftermath of creating the universe, nor does God compete with humans in contradictory positions. Equally, God does not function in the side of humans and of the universe. Without the act of God, says Rahman, the acts of humans and of the universe are clearly useless.\textsuperscript{13}

The Qur'an frequently affirms the Almighty and Supreme of the God. Having rejected polytheism and affirmed monotheism, in Q.S. al-Hasyr (59): 22-24, God says:\textsuperscript{14}

Verse 22:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Huwa-'llâhu 'l-ladhî lâ ilâha illâ-l-llâ huwa 'âlimu 'l-ghaybi wa-'l-shahâdati huwa 'l-rahmânû 'l-rahîm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 290</td>
<td>Ia jua tuhan yang nama Allâh yang tiada tuhan hanya ia mengetahui gaib dan syahadah yang amat murah lagi amat mengasihani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Ia jua Tuhan yang bernama Allâh yang tiada Tuhan hanya ia yang mengetahui yang ghaib2 dan syahadah ia yang murah lagi yang amat mengasihi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA</td>
<td>Allâh is He, than Whom there is no other god;—who knows (all things) both secret and open. He, Most Gracious, Most Merciful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verse 23:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Huwa-'llâhu 'l-ladhî lâ ilâha illâ-l-llâ huwa 'l-maliku 'l-quddûsu s-salâmu 'l-mu'minu 'l-muhayminu 'l-'azîzu 'l-jabbâru 'l-mutakabbir.\textsuperscript{a}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 290</td>
<td>Ia jua tuhan yang bernama Allâh tiada tuhan hanya ia jua yang raja lagi suci daripada segala yang tiada patut dengan dia lagi yang sejahtera daripada segala kekurangan lagi membenarkan segala pesuruhnya lagi nak? siksa akan segala hambanya yang berbuat segala amal lagi kuat lagi [...] segala hal hambanya lagi membesarkan diri daripada segala pekerjaan yang tiada patut dengan dia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Ia jua Tuhan yang bernama Allâh tiada Tuhan hanya ia yang raja lagi yang suci daripada yang tiada patut dengan dia lagi yang sêjahtêra daripada sêgala kêkurangan lagi yang mêmêbnêrkan segala pesuruhnya lagi yang [...] syiksa akan segala hambanya yang [...] segala amal lagi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\textsuperscript{a} To mention all related theological verses. For the purpose of study, I just take some examples to show how the word *Allah* is transferred or translated by 'Abdurra’ûf. For further description of the Qur'anic verses on theology, see Rahman, *Tema Pokok Alquran*, p. 1-25.

\textsuperscript{13} Rahman, *Tema Pokok Alquran*, p. 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yang berbaik2 segala hal hambanya lagi membesarkan diri daripada segala pékérjaan yang tiada patut dengan Dia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AYA</td>
<td>Allâh is He, than whom there is no other god:— the Sovereign, the Holy One, the Source of Peace (and Perfection), the Guardian of Faith, the Preserver of Safety, the Exalted in Might, the Irresistible, the Supreme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verse 23 & 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 290</td>
<td>Telah ditanzihkan Allâh dirinya daripada yang disekutukan oleh mereka itu ia jua tuhan yang nama Allâh yang menjadikan daripada 'adam lagi merupakan baginya jua segala nama yang baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Telah tanzihkan Allâh ta‘ala dirinya daripada yang disekutukan oleh mereka itu ia jua Tuhan yang bernama Allâh ta‘ala yang menjadikan daripada ‘adam lagi yang merupakan baginya jua segala nama bernama yang baik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA</td>
<td>Glory to Allâh! (High is He) above the partners they attribute to Him. He is Allâh, the Creator, the Evolver, the Bestower of Forms (or Colours) to Him belong the Most Beautiful Names;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yusabbihi la-hû mâ fi‘s-samâwâti wa-‘l-ardî wa huwa-‘l-‘azîzu ‘l-ḥakîm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 290</td>
<td>Mengucap tasbih baginya barang yang dalam tujuh petala langit dan bumi dan ia jua tuhan yang amat kuat lagi hakim pada perbuatannya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Mengucap tasbih baginya barang yang di dalam tujuh petala langit dan bumi dan ia jua Tuhan yang amat kuat lagi yang hakim pada perbuatannya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA</td>
<td>Whatever is in the heavens and on earth, doth declare His Praises and Glory: and He is the Exalted in Might, the Wise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these verses, Allâh as God has many names regarded as the description of His attributes. Apart from the affirmation of One God, the Qur'an asserts that the God is Who knows all things both secret and open. He is also The Merciful and has given the welfare and all things that the creatures need for survival, especially the survival of humans life. Nevertheless, as Rahman reveals, the attribute of His

---

15 As can be seen, both English and Arabic are considered sexist languages. The God is always defined as "Male God." It is very contradictory when we look at the translated version of the pronoun Huwa in Arabic and He in English, that is Dia in Malay. Dia can definitely be attributed to both male and female.
Perfectness is not likely to create the infinite transcendence. He, therefore, is clearly closed to humans and even God is "nearer to him than (his) jugular vein."\(^{16}\)

With regards to the typical monotheism, according to Michael Angrosino, there are many facts that these three great religions together—Judaism, Christianity, and Islam—all of them have been developed in the desert areas. In this regard, the desert conditions reflect being alone. The desert is the place of the "One God" and here alone could a person directly perform contemplation in which they could feel free of the complexity of crowded lives in the towns and villages. Some comments are necessary to note here, that those three religions developed the monotheistic philosophy in the desert milieu, which is full of quietness, and in which the single power could be perceived through its farthest horizons. Conversely, the religious traditions established in the forest areas tend to be expressed with the concepts of polytheism, the belief in many supernatural beings.\(^{17}\)

The miscellaneous religious traditions have regarded certain natural forms as the elementary elements that they perceived as the sacred. The mountains have been commonly believed to be either home of gods or the places that emanate "supernatural" powers. Volcanoes are especially thought to possess a sacred status since they have been clearly produced by The Almighty far beyond any human ability to imitate or even understand. The rivers have been also understood as sacred things. Perhaps, it is due to the fact that they pick the water for the survival of living things,

\(^{16}\) See for example Q.S. Qâf (50): 16. For further see Rahman, *Tema Pokok Alquran*, p. 9.

or caused quite extensive damage due to flooding. For those who lived before the period of the scientific revolution, the rivers were taken for granted in coming from the unknown areas. They are thought to be unsolved mysteries, very powerful, and give many advantages while also holding many dangers. Like water, fire had been worshipped as sacred since it helps life (heats the foods and drinks), but at the same time can become a deadly threat. Apart from those, many other uncontrolled natural powers, such as hurricanes and thunderstorms, could be certainly regarded as the source of supernatural powers and black magic.18

Then, the question would be how far the local communities in Southeast Asia, especially the Malays, prior to the Islamization and of course vernacularization of the word Allāh as the God, have understood supernatural beings. We could state by and large that Southeast Asian societies have established religious systems based on animism and then adopted a concept of polytheism in Hinduism. In this regard, I would like to investigate how god has been perceived in Hinduism. Then, it is expected to answer the question why, unlike the eschatological aspects, such as svarga (heaven) and narake (hell), as we will discuss later, the Hinduistic name of god is unacceptable in the Turjumān, and of course in almost all other Islamic Malay MSS.

The highest god in Hinduism is Brahmā. In the mythology of Hindu, Brahmā is The Creator. Frequently, He is said to create a trimurti with Viṣnu as The Guardian and Śīva as The Destroyer. Yet, Brahmā does not play an important role as belonging

18 Angrosino, The Culture of the Sacred, p. 176.
to the other gods in the mythology, as well as His equality to Śiva or Visnu. Albeit Brahmā more frequently emerges in the myths rather than almost all Hinduistic gods, Brahmā has been hardly worshipped in India. The mythology of Brahmā is primarily derived from the mythology of the god Prajāpati in the Brāhmanas. Unlike Brahmā, however, Prajāpati was believed to be in the highest position and did creation in various manners. He practiced ascetism to heat himself up through which his children have been created. In this way, he initially created a fire, wind, sun, and time; then all gods and demons; the humans and animals; then all other creatures. In the épik and Purāṇas, when Brahmā took over the task of creation, he still used to use such ways. Yet he commonly did creation mentally so that when he was thinking of something, such a thing came to exist. While he was under the influence of darkness (tamas), he created Satans. Under the influence of goodness (sattva), he created gods.¹⁹

In falsafah upaniṣad,²⁰ we can find the elaboration that The Almighty is Brahman. In the Brāhmanas, Brahman points out the rite and is therefore regarded as having the secret effects. Those who understand Brahman are likely to understand and control the universe. Then, Brahman is understood as a virtue or Veda. Since the perception of divinity is used both to Veda and Brahman, both words are then used

²⁰ Radhakrishnan, Falsafah upaniṣad, tiga jilid, 1989 [unpublished work]. I find this unpublished text in the library of the Graduate School UIN Jakarta. Unfortunately, it has no title page in the first volume. Thus, the title and author of this text is based on the "Foreword" made by Rabindranath Tagore attached in the third volume in APPENDIX A p. 1104-1111 in the first paragraph. Based on the table of contents, pages 1-155 contain the elaboration on the philosophy of Upanishad. Then, from page 156 to the end of the text contains Brhad-āranyaka upaniṣad that is considered the most important, longest, and oldest text compared to other parts of the Upanishad. For the latter account, see Juan Mascaro, "Introduction," The Upanishads. Translations from the Sanskrit, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1965), p. 7. The second volume is entitled Chāndogya upaniṣad, while the third one is Mundaka upaniṣad.
for the same meaning. *Brahman* is then believed to be the first thing ever created. *(brahma prathamajam).*

The followers of Hinduism in Southeast Asia name the highest god *Sang Hyang Widhi Waça.* In *Pancha Çradha,* Oka Punyatmadja explains that *Hyang Widhi Wäca* is called *Hyang Tunggal* with *Triçakti.* In the Upaniṣads, the last part of Veda, presents the dictum:

"Ekam ewa adwityam Brahâ"

"Only one God (*Brahmâ*), there is no the Second One!"

Having considered such a dictum, it is clearly noted that there is only one power who does creation (*Utpatti*), guards (*Sthiti*), and brings everything to exist in the universe back to the origin (*Pralina,*).

For Balinese Hinduism, there is only One God. The adherents name Him *Sang Hyang Widhi Waça.* *Widhi* means "fate" (*takdir*) and *Waça,* "The Almighty" (*Yang Maha Kuasa*). *Widhi Waça* means The Almighty Who determines all destinies of live things. He is also called *Bhatâra Çiwa,* "The Noble Guardian" (*Pelindung Yang Termulia*), and *Sanghyang Mahâdewa,* "The Highest God" (*Dewa Yang Tertinggi*). They also attribute Him to many names, i.e. *Sang Hyang Parameswara,* "The Glory King" (*Raja Termulia*), *Parama Wiçesha,* "The Almighty" (*Maha Kuasa*), *Jagat*

---

21 Radhakrishnan, "Pendahuluan [Foreword]," *Falsafah Upanishad,* vol 1, p. 44.

22 It should be noted that this book is made in the first period of the New-Order. From the period of Old-Order to the New-Order, the clergymen from all religions should revise their religious teachings to meet the First principle of the Pancasila, *Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa.* To large extent, therefore, its socio-political context should be taken into consideration.

Kårana, "The Creator" (Pencipta alam), and so on. As The Creator, He is named Brahмâ (Utpatti) and symbolized with the letter "A." As The Guardian and Protector (Sthiti), He is called Visnu, symbolized with "U." As The God Who brings everything back to the origin (Pralina), He is named Çiwa Rudra. Çiwa Rudra is frequently called Igwara, the symbol is "M." In His manifestations as Brahмâ, Visnu, and Çiwa Rudra, He is called trimurti. As stated, trimurti is defined as the three manifestations, that is Triçakti that reflects Utpatti, Sthiti, and Pralina. The Çiwa Mahâdewa is then symbolized with "OM" (A.U.M) that is also called Omkāra or Prānawa.25

Taking the elaboration into account, we could seemingly conclude it through the analysis of R.C. Zaehner, who studied comparatively Muslim and Hinduistic mysticism. Compared to other religious mysticisms, Christianity, for instance, says Zaehner, Hindu mysticism is apparently unique since until the birth of the Upaniṣads, the ideas of a god who kept His distance from the universe was entirely unknown. In the Qurān, based on Islamic beliefs, the God sent the last revelation to humans. Then, the revelation itself becomes one of His transcendent attributes. The God has an infinite distance from humans. Thus, it is seemingly impossible for humans to hold any kind of contact except through the worship with—in AYA's words—"humility and in reverence." For this reason, the early Sufis believed that there would not be a relation with the God unless He, with His Merciful, calls humans to approach Him. It would be human obligation to purify himself before the God and regard himself as a

24 Punyatmadja, Pancha Çradha, p. 35
25 Punyatmadja, Pancha Çradha, p. 35.
slave. Hindu texts, on the other hand, do not give more clearance on a transcendent god. Hinduism is typically considered polytheism.\textsuperscript{26}

In Chapter Two, I pointed out that both Riddell and Harun proved 'Abdurra'ûf's dependency on the al-Jalâlayn in writing the *Turjumân*. While we know that 'Abdurra'ûf was the leader of the sufis order, that is the Syaththâriyyah order, he attempted to avoid using mysticism in the making of his Malay commentaries. This is seemingly due to the unfriendly socio-political situation in the aftermath of the long-term religious conflicts between the followers of Nûruddîn al-Ranîrî and of Hamzah Fansuri, and also of Syamsuddin al-Sumatra-î.

According to Riddell, al-Rânîrî possibly raised an objection to the freedom of expression from his rival group. As for the flexibility in the building of commentaries, the Arabic tafsîrs are likely to produce any kind of commentaries that in the next periods they would be the target for prohibition and burning. Instead of using such flexibility as the author of the Cambridge MS did, 'Abdurra'ûf merely translated the Jalâlayn and—by so doing—any kind of risk as to the writing of such a work would certainly not be directed to himself. This reflected the end result of the previous polemics. Innovation was forbidden, while the literal understanding was acceptable.\textsuperscript{27}

As for the introduction of the "Islamic God," 'Abdurra'ûf in the *Turjumân* consistently used the word *Allâh*. Such a word was transmitted to the Malay language, together with all Arabic words concerning either the religious matters or


\textsuperscript{27} Riddell, "Earliest Qur'ânic Exegetical Activities," p. 119.
other fields, and introduced during the Islamization of Malay world. In this regard, Teuku Iskandar reveals that the Islamization originating from Samudera-Pasai to all parts of Archipelago through the use of the Malay language as a medium has brought about the development of the Malay language as Islamic language instead of Arabic. The Malay had been the *lingua franca* since the period of the Črivijaya kingdom. The works on Islam in Arabic and Persian have been translated to Malay. Then, the Malay Islamic works have been produced by way of using both Arabic and Persian works as reference. During those periods, there are about 5000 Arabic and 1000 Persian words transmitted into the Malay vocabulary.

The struggle for introducing the word *Allâh* as The Only God was getting much harder in the Javanese culture. Focusing on the *suluk* of Siti Jenar, he notes that before the coming of Islam, the Javanese people had no idea about the name of *Allâh*. The 12th—13th centuries Javanese literary books already prove such facts. Even at that time, there was no single word derived from Arabic words in such books. Only Buddhism and Hinduism were recognized by the Javanese people. What turned out was that Buddhist-Hindu Syncretism developed, which is Buddha-Shiwa, an official religion in the Majapahit kingdom. Then, Muslim teachers and missionaries came in

28 This fact contributes to prove that the Malay culture apparently accepted the Islamization. To know, the Malay literature has well developed due to the Islamization as well as the Arabization. The phenomenon is different from Javanese culture in which all systems of its culture, formed from the influence of local beliefs and Hinduism-Budhism, is not easily Islamized or Arabized. Many scholars paid more attention to the study of these assimilations. One of the most important studies is written by Clifford Geertz, *The Religion of Java*, based on his fieldwork in the town, Modjokuto, in East-Java in the first decade of 1950s.


the end of 15th century to call for a new religious teaching (Islam). It is reasonable that the word Allâh merely exists in the mouth. Even in current days, there are many people who merely mouth the name of Allâh. It is not practically understood in daily life. At that time, the Javanese people are more fluent in spelling Hyang Manon than Allâh. Even now, there are many Javanese villagers who spell “Alah” (without double consonant “l”) instead of “Allâh.” And also, it has been usually called “Gusti Alah.”

For Siti Jenar, therefore, Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam are not far apart. It is different in image, but the same in reality. It is through different ways, but with the same goal. Siti Jenar’s teaching is like those of some Sufis, such as Rumi and Ibnul ‘Arabi. Thus, Siti Jenar was careless with the name for God. Even if the God name were continuously emphasized, it would be the same as a lie. To him, the belief in God is clearly not the struggle of naming it.⁴¹

Nevertheless, the Malay language transferred the word tuhan to identify supernatural beings. In Kamus Jawa Kuna Indonesia, the word tuhan means [1] tuan; majikan; pemimpin; kepala; [2] yang termulia; muliawan.⁴² Having been transmitted to the Malay and Indonesian languages, the word tuhan has changed semantically. In Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia, the word Tuhan (with T-capital) represents something believed and worshipped by humans as The Almighty regardless of what

---


the name is. In Kamus Dewan, on the other hand, the word Tuhan is more specifically understood as Allâh Who creates the universe. Then the word tuan emerged that means [1] orang tempat menghambakan diri [2] pemilik/kepala (pejabat perusahaan [3] orang laki-laki yang dihormati [4] panggilan bagi orang yang berpangkat yang patut dihormati, and so on.

4.2. ESCHATOLOGY

In the Qur’ân, the place that is full of joys and goods in which the good people live is called the jannah. Conversely, those who are sinful on the earthly realm will be arrested in the so-called the nâr. In the Qur’ân, the word al-jannah emerges in three forms, i.e. singular, mutsanna, and plural. In the singular form, it is mentioned seventy times, in mutsannâ one eight times, and in the plural sixty-nine times. Conversely, the Qur’ân uses the word al-nâr in its singular form only, which constitute 126 times. Like heaven, hell has seven levels, i.e. the jahannam, wayl, huţamah, sa‘îr, saqar, jahi‘m, and hâvi‘ah. The jahannam is the most frequent name repeated in the Qur’ân. It emerges seventy-seven times.

---

36 This and next calculations are based on the index made by Fu‘ād ʻAbd al-Bâqi. See ʻAbd al-Bâqi, Mu‘jam al-Mufahras, p. 229-232.
According to al-Râghib al-Isfahânî, such a happy place is named the \textit{jannah}.

Heaven and hell are basically the imitation of the worldly lives,\textsuperscript{38} albeit both have contradictory aspects and different kinds of levels of delight as reflected in Q.S. al-Sajdah (32): 17: \textit{fa-lâ ta'lamu nafsun mâ ukhfiya la-hum min qurrati a'yunin jazâ'an bimâ kânû ya'malûna} (Now no persons knows what delights of the eye are kept hidden (in reserve) for them—as a reward for their (good) Deeds). Ibn 'Abbâs states that, as quoted by al-Ishfahânî, the heaven in plural forms \textit{(jannâtin)} is to describe the various characteristics of the seven heavens, i.e. the \textit{Firdaus}, \textit{'Adn}, \textit{Na'îm}, \textit{Dâr al-Khuld}, \textit{Ma'wâ}, \textit{Dâr al-Salâm}, and \textit{'Illiyyîn}.\textsuperscript{39} Nevertheless, heaven is not believed to be the highest reward for good people. The highest reward for the best people is His bless and the encounter with Him in the hereafter.\textsuperscript{40}

As to the concepts of the heaven and hell, Rahman argues that heaven and hell are frequently repeated in the Qur'ân as by and large the reward and punishment, including His blessing and wrath. In the way people go to the heaven or hell, the accounts of their deeds will be the witness,\textsuperscript{41} and undoubtedly the accounts are likely to defend or ruin themselves. Apart from that, all people will know all our secrets and we will have no power to hide them, even the graves will take everything out.\textsuperscript{42}

\begin{small}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{38} Take as examples, see Q.S. \textit{Muḥammad} (47): 15; al-\textit{Rahmân} (55): 1-78; and al-\textit{Wâqi‘ah} (56): 1-96.


\textsuperscript{40} See for examples Q.S. \textit{'Alî ‘Imrân} (3): 15 and al-\textit{Qiyâmah} (75): 23.

\textsuperscript{41} See Q.S. al-\textit{Mu‘minûn} (23): 62; 45; 29.

\textsuperscript{42} Q.S. al-\textit{‘Adiyât} (100): 9-10. See for further Rahman, \textit{Tema Pokok Alquran}, p. 154-159.
\end{small}
While we proved that the word Allâh is untranslatable in the Turjumân, both words al-jannâh and al-nâr are more easily replaceable with the translated words, syurgâ (شیر) and nĕraka (نارک). I would like to give some examples of Qur’ânic verses, together with their Malay commentaries, concerning this aspect, i.e. Q.S. Fushshilat (41): 19-24 and al-Zumar (39): 71-74.

In Q.S. Fushshilat (41): 19-24, the God says:

**Verse 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Wa yawma yuhsharu a'dâ'u-llâh ilâ al-nâr fahum yûza'ûn”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 116</td>
<td>Dan pada hari kami himpukan sêgala sêteru Allâh kepada nêraka padahal mërêka itu diaku?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Dan hari dihimpukan segala seteru Allâh ta'ala kepada neraka padahal mereka itu diaku?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AYA         | On the Day that the enemies of Allâh will be gathered together to the Fire, they will be marched in ranks.

**Verse 20**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Hattâ idhâ mâ jâ’ûhâ shahida ‘alayhim sam’uhum wa absâruhum wa julûduhum bimâ kânû ya’malûna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 116</td>
<td>Hingga apabila datanglah mërêka itu kepada nêraka naik? syaksilah atas mereka pen[d]engar mërêka dan sêgala pênglihat mëreka itu dan segala kulit mereka itu akan yang têlah dipèrbuat mërêka itu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Hingga apabila datanglah mereka itu kepada neraka naik? sakîs atas mereka itu pen[d]engar mereka itu dan penglihat mereka itu dan segala kulit mereka itu dengan barang yang telah dipèrbuat mereka itu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AYA         | At length, when they reach the (Fire), their hearing, their sight, and their skins will bear witness against them, as to (all) their deeds.

**Verse 21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Wa qâlû li-julûdihim lima shahidum ‘alaynâ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 116</td>
<td>Dan dikata mërêka itu bagi sêgala kulit mërêka itu karêna apa kamu naik? syaksi atas kamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Dan dikata mereka itu bagi segala kulit mereka itu karenâ apa kamu naik? saksti atas kamu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AYA         | They will say to their skins: "Why bear ye witness against us?"

43 It should be noted that in MS ML 116, the translation of the word yuhsharu, "dihimpukan" (are gathered), changes into kamî himpun (we gather) in the transitive verb form. This is due to the falsity of scribing the word. It should be yuhsharu, but it is written nahsyaru.
| Q | qâlû anţaqanâ-'llâhu 'l-ladhî anţaqa kullu shay'in wa huwa khalaqakum awwala marrat" wa ilayhi turja'un".
| ML 116 | Kata mèreka itu têlah dijadikan bêrkata kami oleh Allâh yang mënjadikan tiap2 sêsuatu bêrkata padahal [...] mënjadikan kamu pada mula pertamanya dan kepadanya jua kamu dikembalikan
| TM90 | Kata mereka itu yakni segala kulit telah dijadikan bêrkata kamu oleh Allâh ta'ala yang menjadikan tiap2 suatu itu bêrkata padahal ia jua menjadikan kamu mula2 pertamanya dan kepadanya kamu dikembalikan
| AYA | They will say: "Allâh hath given us speech,—(He) Who giveth speech to everything: He created you for the first time, and unto Him were ye to return.

Verse 22

| Q | Wa mâ kuntum tastatirûna an yashhada 'alaykum sam'ukum wa là absârumkum wa là julûdukum wa làkin zhanantum anna-'llâha là ya'lamu kathîran mimmâ ta'lamûna.
| ML 116 | Bahwasanya kamu tiada kuasa atas mematikan daripada segala ângkau kamu dan tiada kamu sangka bahwa naîk? saksi atas kamu pen[d]engar kamu dan tiada segala penglihat kamu dan tiada segala kulit kamu dan têtapi kamu sangka bahwasanya Allâh tiada mengetahui kebanyakan daripada yang kamu perbuat
| TM90 | Bahwasanya kamu tiada kuasa atas mematikan daripada segala anggota kamu dan tiada kamu sangka bahwasanya naîk? saksi atas kamu pen[d]engar kamu dan tiada segala penglihat kamu dan tiada segala kulit kamu dan tetapi kamu sangka bahwasanya Allâh ta'ala tiada tiada mengetahui kebanyakan daripada yang kamu perbuat
| AYA | "Ye did not seek to hide yourselves, lest your hearing, your sight, and your skins should bear witness against you! But ye did think that Allâh knew not many of the things that ye used to do!"

Verse 23

| Q | Wa dhâlikum ûnnukumu 'l-ladhî ûnanantum bi-raâbûkum ardâkum fa-âsbahtum mina 'l-khâsîrîn".
| ML 116 | Bermula sangka kamu yang telah kamu sangkakan tuhan kamu itu telah mem[b]inasakan kamu maka jadilah kamu daripada ûngal orang yang rugi
| TM90 | Bermula sangka kamu yang telah kamu sangka akan tuhan kamu itu membinasakan kamu maka jadilah kamu daripada segala orang yang rugi
| AYA | "But this thought of yours which ye did entertain concerning your Lord, hath brought you to destruction, and (now) have ye become of those utterly lost!"

Verse 24
The above verses describe that in the Judgement day there will be noisy conversations. The guardians of hell will ask those who go to the hell why they go to such a place, and God has sent messengers to the guardians to inform them of their religion, together with its reward and punishment.\textsuperscript{44}

In Q.S. al-Zumar (39): 71-74, the God says:

| Q | Wa-sîqa 'l-ladhîna kafarû ilâ jahannam\textsuperscript{m} zumar\textsuperscript{m} |
| ML 116 | Dan telah dihalau akan segala mereka yang kafir itu ke dalam neraka Jahannam beberapa jama'ah [...]| 
| TM90 | Dan di[h]alau kan segala mereka yang kafir kë dalam neraka Jahannam beberapa jama'ah [...]| 
| AYA | The Unbelievers will be led to Hell in crowds; |

| Q | hâttâ idhâ jâ'ûha futih | 
| ML 116 | Hingga apabila datanglah mereka itu kepada neraka Jahannam maka dibukakan segala pintunya dan telah berkata bagi mereka itu yang menunggu dia dengan hardik |
| TM90 | Hingga apabila datang mereka itu kepada neraka Jahannam maka dibukakan segala pintunya dan telah berkata bagi mereka itu yang menunggu dia dengan hardik |
| AYA | Until, when they arrive there, its gates will be opened, and its Keepers will say, |

\textsuperscript{44} Rahman, Tema Pokok Alquran, p. 160-161.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ML 116</th>
<th>Tiadakah sudah datang akan kamu segala pesuruh Allâh daripada jenis kamu dibacakan mereka itu segala ayat tuhan kamu dan diceriterakan mereka itu akan kamu pertemuan hingga dengan hari kamu ini kata mereka itu bahkan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Tiadakah sudah datang akan dikau segala pesuruh Allâh ta'ala daripada jenis kamu dibacakan mereka itu segala ayat tuhan kamu dan diceritakan mereka itu akan kamu pertemuan dengan hari kamu ini kata mereka itu bahkan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA</td>
<td>&quot;Did not apostles come to you from among yourselves, rehearsing to you the Signs of your Lord, and warning you of the Meeting of this Day of yours?&quot; The answer will be: &quot;True:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>wa-lâkin haqqat kalimat&quot;-l-'adhâbî 'alâ 'l-kâfirîna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 116</td>
<td>Dan tetapi telah wajib kalimat azab atas segala kafir dengan firman Allâh lagi akan kupenuhi Jahannam itu daripada segala jin dan manusia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Dan tetapi telah wajiblah kalimat azab itu atas segala kafir dengan firman Allâh ta'ala lagi akan kupenuhi neraka Jahannam itu daripada segala jin dan manusia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA</td>
<td>But the Decree of Punishment has been proved true against the Unbelievers!&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verse 72**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Qîla 'dkhulû abwâba jahannam&quot; khâlidîn&quot; fi-hâ fa-bi'sa mathwâ 'l-mutakabbîrîn&quot;.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 116</td>
<td>Dikata bagi mereka itu masuk oleh kamu segala pintu neraka Jahannam padahal kamu kekal dalamnya maka sejahat bertempat segala orang takabbur lah neraka Jahannam itu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM90</td>
<td>Dikata mereka itu masuk oleh kamu segala pintu neraka Jahannam padahal kamu kekal di dalamnya maka sejahat2 tempat segala orang yang takabburlah neraka Jahannam itu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AYA</td>
<td>(To them) will be said: &quot;Enter ye the gates of Hell, to dwell therein: and evil is (this) abode of the arrogant!&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verse 73**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Wa-sîqa 'l-ladhîna 'taqaw rabba-hum ilâ 'l-jannat zumarîm ḥattâ idhâ jâ'û-hâ wa-futihât abwâbu-hâ wa-qâla la-hum khazanatu-hâ salâmîm 'alaykum ťibûm fa-'dkhulû-hâ khâlidîn&quot;.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 116</td>
<td>Dan telah dihalau kan segala mereka yang takut akan Tuhan mereka itu dengan perlahan kepada surga berjama'ah2 padahal dibukakan bagi mereka itu segala pintunya dan berkata bagi mereka itu yang menunggu dia sejahtera atas kamu telah sucilah kamu daripada daku maksiat maka masuklah kamu ke dalamnya padahal kamu kekal dalamnya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And those who feared their Lord will be led to the Garden in crowds: until behold, they arrive there; its gates will be opened; and its Keepers will say: "Peace be upon you! Well have ye done! Enter ye here, to dwell therein."

They will say: 'Praise be to Allâh, Who has truly fulfilled His promise to us, and has given us (this) land in heritage: We can dwell in the Garden as we will: how excellent a reward for those who work (righteousness)!'"
"him/herself" and "themselves," while in certain contextually means "human," "human inner," or the reality of humanity—yet not disconnected from his/her body.

Actually, the body, together with its center of life and intelligentsia, constitutes its identity or the true human personality. Thus, says Fazlur Rahman, the Qur’ân does not accept heaven and hell that are merely spiritual in character. If the Qur’ân—repeatedly mentioned very beautiful styles and assertions—discusses the physical happiness and suffering in the hereafter, the meant thing is not solely what the Muslim philosophers believe albeit the sacred text basically attempted to explore both reward and punishment as the effects of feeling happy and sad physically and spiritually. The clear descriptions of the beautiful heaven and eerie hell are intended to explain these effects as the real physico-spiritual feelings and different from the psychological effects.

The words surga and neraka are derived from the Sanskrit language, i.e. swarga and narake. From the former, the word swargaloka emerges that means "the place in the heaven" (tempat di surga), and swargawarga, "the group in the heaven" (golongan di surga). In "Upasad Samkhya Yoga," Bhagawadgita, the word swargadwāram means "the heaven door" (pintu sorga) as follow:

\[
yadricchayā ca pañcanaṁ \\
swargadwāram apāṇṛtāṁ \\
sukhinah ksatriyah partha \\
labhante yuddham īdrisam\]

46 Rahman, Tema Pokok Alquran, p. 163.
47 Rahman, Tema Pokok Alquran, p. 164.
49 Bhagawadgita, p. 47.
Have a happy life O the true warrior
To have a chance to fight in this state
O Arjuna, because for them
The heaven door is open.

Conversely, the word *naraka* has also derivative words, such as "narakāyai wa" mentioned in "Arjuna Wisada Yoga," *Bhagawadgita* as follow:

\[\text{samkaro } \text{narakāyai wa} \]
\[\text{kulaghnānām kulasya ca} \]
\[\text{patanti pitaro hyesam} \]
\[\text{luptapindodakakriyāḥ} \]

the decadence leads
gayo family and the killers to the hell
the spirits of the ancestors fall (into hell)
all are surprised, no more food and water for them

Apart from that, the word *narake* is also available as follow:

\[\text{utsanna kuladharmānām} \]
\[\text{manusyānām janārdana} \]
\[\text{narake niyatam wāso} \]
\[\text{bhawati tyarusustuma}^{52}\]

We heard this
Oh Janārdana, the human
Whose civilization and law are destroyed
He will live in the hell forever

According to Linda M. Tober & F. Stanley Lusby, the symbolism of heaven and hell as reflected in the Indian religious traditions has different roles and significances when this is contrasted to the various meanings in the religious contexts in the West Asian and Western cultures. The Old Veda (1500—1200 BCE),

---

50 This translated version and all others are based on the Indonesian version contained in *Bhagawadgita* I use for the study.

51 *Bhagawadgita*, p. 24.

52 *Bhagawadgita*, p. 25.
especially *Rgveda* (a hymn collection associated with funereal rituals, illustrates the heaven as the realm of the fathers). God of fire, Agni, was appointed to provide the dead for purification since the cremation achieved conspicuousness. Yama, believed to be the god of the dead, supervises the heaven, which is connected to the sky. The deceased was then associated with the stars. There is one god, Varuna, in the heaven. He is thought to be a cause of the order in the worldly life. The welfare of people would be determined by their involvement in rituals, ceremonies, and offerings to the gods while on the worldly life.  

Good people enjoy the pleasures they have known on the earthly life, but in full measures. But, the classification of personal identity is maintained. The clergymen and combatants are classified among those who enter heaven. Nevertheless, the description of the heavenly communities is not clear enough. In the earliest Vedas, say Tober and Lusby, those who failed to enter the heavenly realm would be arrested in the realm of darkness, which is hell. In the *Brāhmanas*, containing the ritual performances of the clergymen, the clearer characterization of heaven as a place in which good people enjoy the goodness of worldly existence, but hugely increased and not limited as they are found on the earthly realm. The excellence of heavenly realm was believed to have correlation with the adequate ritual conduct. Equally, the suffering of bad people in hell is viewed as equal to the punishment due to the lack of ritual performances.  

---

By the third century B.C., explains Tober & Lusby, the Indian landscape had been dominated by a very different worldview, basically developed by the philosophy and religious perspectives of the *Upaniṣads* (sixth to first centuries B.C.). This was enriched by the cyclical worldview. Reincarnation, for instance, told an extensive perception of human existence as a sequence of lives, deaths, and rebirths. It also came to overshadow a thorough understanding of human beings.\(^{55}\)

Both heaven and hell are not believed to be a sight of supreme destiny. Yet, argue Tober & Lusby, both were regarded as the transitional stages occasional with a sequence of worldly life in a rotation of births and deaths (*samsāra*). *Karman* (or *kamma*), the store of the outcomes of thought and deeds accrued over the whole series of human existence, dictates the cosmos of soul’s transition from his worldly realm to another via one of the several stages of heaven or hell. These are the transitional conditions of different levels of suffering or happiness. In the old Hindu cosmology, three realms (*lokas*)—the heaven, earth, and sky—are extended by a sight of fourteen additional realms. The realms contain the seven spheres above the earth (*heavens*) and seven spheres under the earth (*hells*). It is similar to what we find in Islamic eschatology. The further goal of human sacred journey is releasement (*moksa*). Nirvāṇa is then variously thought to be the unification of soul (*Ātman*) with the highest deity, which is *brahman*.\(^{56}\)

### 4.3. SOME NOTES ON [UN]TRANSLATABLE WORDS

---


The powerful or powerless gods perceived greatly depend on the glory level of His communal adherents. Moreover, their "deaths" are actually due to the decline of the adherent glory or because they reform or even change their religious belief. Otherwise, the gods could be perceived in a new form as a result of assimilation. For centuries before the coming of Islam, the local communities in Southeast Asia have adhered to Hinduism and Budhism as the results of Indianization in addition to animism. Those old religious forms believe in the existence of the unseen worlds inhabited by the gods and demons and humans are believed to be capable of communicating with them. As for the sufferings due to the contact with the creatures from the unseen world, the established Islam in this region holds the belief that such torments are actually made by devils. This new religion, together with all things written in Arabic, has been of course accepted among the local communities, and the shamans themselves have taken many advantages of it. The Arabic mantras have been included in each religious rite.\textsuperscript{57} In many examples, the Arabic prayers have been officially adopted into Malay since the 17\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{58}

Snouck Hurgronje, for example, tells the legend of the way 'Abdurra'ûf al-Sinkilî did Islamic da'wah. He describes that as to the aspects of mysticism Islam became a part of a healing tradition. If the 'ulamâ' in the Arab world are commonly perceived as the one who strongly prohibits cockfighting and many other tings, this


Acehnese ulama conversely gave the mantra to the cockfighter to make his fighting
cock more powerful. The mantra was of course the *shahādah*.\(^{59}\) Shortly after that,
each cockfighter knew this secret mantra and imitated it by which their cocks also
won. Then the first cock fighter came back to the ulama to seek another mantra. At
the time, he was given the five times prayer. Through such a way, the ulama has
successfully spread Islam among the local communities, by way of using the spiritual
power of religion as the mantra necessarily belonged to those who would control the
unseen world.\(^{60}\)

With regards to the eschatology, the local communities have known the hell
and heaven realms long before the spreading of Islam. In the attempt to seek the
precise terms to transfer the values of Islam, the missionaries used the local ideas. In
almost all parts of Archipelago, they used such Sanskrit words as *swarga* (heaven)
and *narake* (hell).\(^{61}\)

The assimilation of spirits into Islamic genies and evil spirits was not too
difficult. Even, the educated ulamas do not deny the existence of the spirits, yet they
do not feel more threatened by their existence compared to the ordinary people. Islam
was, and is, also perceived as providing the protection against the spirits in certain
different realms. The pious Muslims would be protected by the God from what the

---

59 The *syahādah* contains the confession that there is no god but Allah and Muhammad is His
messenger. This confession is called the *jayyībah* sentence. The *syahādah* is considered the basic for
introducing the word Allah and His main attribute to the individual since before to be Moslem means
someone must initially recite the *shahādah*.

60 Quoted from Snouck Hurgronje, *The Achehnese*, translated by A.W.S. O'Sullivan, vol. 2,

61 Quoted from Vicente Rafael, *Contracting Colonialism*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press,
Christianization," in Reid (ed.), *Southeast Asia*, p. 172.
spirits could do and be rewarded with the heaven then. Also, those who were powerless would be rewarded if they took the right path. They all would be equal regardless of what their statuses are in worldly life. Such a new vision certainly led to the equality among the people. Then, the religion became more rational. For traders, this new worldview would be a basic and very important principle and would develop their trading companies to be more internationalized.

This moral realm primarily relied on the simple but consistent concept of the permanent reward and punishment. The old worldview did not provide such a concept with a level of certainty. Islam, on the contrary, promised people a heaven that is always safe and happy. There would not be death, but always happy life. There would not be any complaints and all things would be acceptable without feeling upset and sad. One of the Acehnese ulama who wrote the Judgment day is Nūr al-Dīn al-Raniri. His work is *Akhbâr al-Âkhirah*, written in 1636 A.D. In this work, he presents the explanation of the death, reward and punishment, heaven, hell, and Judgment day. The other ulamas also explain the heavenly reward for those who recited the *syahâdah*.

---


63 Before Islam came to introduce the equality, the local communities were certainly formed based on the caste system although this was not rigidly practiced as found in its origin in India.

64 Reid, *Dari Ekspansi hingga Krisis*, p. 211.


66 See for further, Reid, *Dari Ekspansi hingga Krisis*, p. 212; Cf. Reid, "Islamization and Christianization," in Reid (ed.), *Southwest Asia*, p. 170.
Hell, on the other hand, was believed to be more persuasive. In 1604, Chirino accounted that the local communities in the Philippines were greatly worried about what the Devil could do. The description of the hell led to the conversion of many Filipinos into Christians. Both Muslim and Christian missionaries used to tell the great suffering for those who gave preference to the worldly life instead of opting for their safety on Judgment day. It was also with the case of those who reject to live in the right religious path.67

Yet, a number of Malay and Javaese poetry questions the higher ecstatic unification with God in which both heaven and hell no longer exist. Reid points out that there is a Javanese Islamic text from the 16th century that talks about the people who served God with the hope of obtaining heaven or did not eat and sleep for days due to the fearness of suffering in the hell. Yet, they believe that the true reward is merely given to those who sincerely love God.68

The above description shows that it was not an easy task to introduce the religious terms and teachings to the local communities that have previously adopted other religious systems. As stated, the Qur’ân successfully made a transcendent God. Nevertheless, the local communities in Southeast Asia chose to perceive Him more immanently. The use of the word *gusti* attached in the word *Allâh* and of the word *Tuhan* [not the word *dewa*], for examples, is evidence of how powerful the Southeast Asian cultures it was as to their encounters with Islam. Since no translated local word

67 Rafael, Contracting Colonialism, p. 179-184. See also Reid, Dari Ekspansi hingga Krisis, p. 212; Cf. Reid, "Islamization and Christianization," in Reid (ed.), Southeast Asia, p. 170-172.

68 Reid, Dari Ekspansi hingga Krisis, p. 212.
was possible, almost all Islamic missionaries had no choice but to transfer the word *Allâh* into local languages. The perceived heaven in the Qur'ân certainly did not greatly affect the local eschatology. With the tropical forest and abundance of water resources, the Southeast Asian world was perceived as what the Qur'ân told about heaven. Thus, contrasted to the Arabic *jannah* and *nâr* that no body could imagine it, the *swarga* and *naraké* are close to, or even parts of, the worldly life.\(^{69}\) However, both Islam and Hinduism seemingly admit that all people would physically and mentally fell either the happiness of the heaven or the suffering of the hell. Accordingly, instead of transferring the word *jannah* and *nâr* into the local languages, the translation of both words was apparently believed to be the best alternative way though they would never reflect the original meanings.

CHAPTER FIVE
CONCLUSION

This study is meant to formulate and examine the hermeneutics of translation proposed by Gadamer. Then, I use the concept to analyse the first complete Malay commentary of the Qur'ân, which is the *Turjumân al-Mustafîd* by 'Abdurra'ûf al-Sinkîlî. Anthony Johns explicitly states that the *Turjumân* is not a translation, but a commentary. Hence, it reflects the vernacularization of the Qur'ân. Conversely, Peter Riddell, then Salman Harun, put more emphasize on the aspect of literal translation as identifying the *Turjumân*. According to Riddell, 'Abdurra'ûf perhaps preferred the safer way to free from the dispute over the prohibition of translating the Qur'ân into languages other than Arabic. The literal translation, as Ihsanoğlu points out, is of course more acceptable in almost all Islamic traditions. By working such a translation type, avoiding the fields of mysticism, albeit he is the leader of Shattâriyyah Sûfî order in the Malay-Indonesian world, and considering the *Jalâlayn* as his special reference, the *Turjumân* has been eventually acceptable and widely used by the Malay peoples for centuries. The *Turjumân* has been also regularly printed by the Middle-East and Malay publishers.
In order to arbitrate the disagreement, we need a basic question, that whether a translation could be regarded as a commentary and vice versa, and what criteria do we need to distinguish both activities. In this study, I show that translation is in the top position of all acts of understanding. Every act of understanding could be considered the act of translation if it at least meets two basic requirements. Firstly, it should involve two languages, the original and translated languages. Secondly, it requires the equality in meaning between both languages. Otherwise, or it just meet one of these two requirements, it could be merely called the act of interpretation.

Gadamer states that the act of translation is seemingly impossible. It is due to the fact that the meaning of the translated word never fully represents the original one. Equally, it is never equal to the original one. This fact certainly leads certain consequences. As the attempt is not successfully done and there is no alternative translated word that approaches the meaning of the original one, the transferring the foreign word to the local language, then being one of its vocabulary, is the most plausible way albeit it would inevitably causes the semantic change. It is with the case of the word Allâh. Undoubtedly, this is not the act of translation. Instead, this is called the act of interpretation since what was done is the registering of the foreign word at the local language. Therefore, this does not meet the first requirement. This does not also meet the second one because, despite temporal and partial in nature, the word semantically changes.

---

Secondly, every word certainly has its own cultural background. Both words *surga* and *neraka* are derived from Sanskrit language by which Hinduism has been widely communicated. On the other hand, both words *al-jannah* and *al-nâr* are two words of Arabic as the official language of Islam. As elaborated in Chapter 4, the replacement [read: translation] of the words *al-jannah* to the word *surga/sorga* (Sanskrit, *swarga*), together with *al-nâr* to *neraka* (Sanskrit, *narake*), in a level of certainty basically legitimize the eschatological aspects of Hinduism. For this reason, this is not the act of translation, but more precisely the act of interpretation since the two requirements are not fulfilled.

The Qur’ân is certainly rich in the elaboration of Islamic theology and eschatology. It has been proved that the attempt of understanding their exact meanings through the local perspectives could not be perfectly done. We call such an attempt interpretation. The *Turjumân* of ‘Abdurra’ûf could be the exact case to which we will consider it the work of interpretation or translation. Having elaborated Gadamer’s hermeneutics of translation, I argue that the *Turjumân*, of course together with all acts of interpreting and translating the Qur’ân implemented in the forms of independent writings, is also the work of interpretation.

The above statement definitely gives a great consequence. Since the act of translation is basically the act of interpretation, we will absolutely find more Qur’ânic commentaries contained in Archipelago MSS before the 20th century. The writing tradition of interlinear translation commonly done by both the authors and scribes of the Qur’ânic MSS, or the attempt of working the substitution of the Qur’ân in either local scripts or languages without its original Arabic is undoubtedly evidence that
basically the writing tradition of Qur’anic commentaries has been well established since the 17th century, and such a tradition has continuously developed in the following periods.² Such an argument is not as what almost all scholars understand.³ They mostly believe that the tradition of Qur’anic exegesis in Southeast Asia has been just well established since the early 20th century onwards since the data is not available. As to the Malay world, most scholars believe that it is almost three hundred years there was only one complete Malay commentary of the Qur’an available.⁴ In this regard, I state that it is only about one hundred year the Archipelago ‘ulamā’


³ For further elaboration of such scholars opinions, see Nurtawab, “Tradisi Klasik Penafsiran Alquran Nusantara dalam Perspektif Para Pengkaji,” [Unpublished work].

produced some complete Malay commentaries of the Qur'an as shown in some Bantenese Qur'anic MSS.\(^5\)

Uka Tjandrasasmita in his "Foreword" for my forthcoming book admits that Ervan Nurtawab attempted to fill this great gap and reveal that the Archipelago Qur'anic MSS containing Qur'anic commentaries were made not only for the medium of reciting the Qur'anic verses, but also of understanding its meanings in local languages. Then, Nurtawab regard them as the works of Qur'anic commentaries.

The efforts of either translating or interpreting the foreign texts through the local languages, Arabic and Malay in this regard, undeniably cause many effects. The most apparent one is that such cultural conversations ultimately affect the main characteristics of their languages and cultures. In many cases, the so-called translation is inherently not translation. Rather, it is solely the adoption of a new word in Arabic, such as the word \textit{Allâh}, and/or understands it by being back to Arabic, such as the words \textit{sû'} (evil) and \textit{fahshâ'} (disgrace). For the latter, ‘Abdurra’uf interpreted these two words and did not make any translations of them. He has got two contextualized meanings, namely \textit{khianat} (betrayal) and \textit{zina} (adultery). These two chosen words turn out to be derived from Arabic.

Secondly, the transferring of Arabic vocabulary into Malay language greatly contributed to the development of Malay literature. As for the understanding of the Qur'an, the Arabic words comprising some ideological aspects would not be certainly translated properly. For this reason, the preference to choose the translated word or

\footnote{See Nurtawab, "Further Data Concerning the History of Malay Qur'anic Exegesis," [forthcoming article].}
hold the original one demonstrates the strategy of the 'ulamâ's for spreading Islam in Southeast Asia. To large extent, this also becomes another important determinant of understanding the Arabic Qur'an in local languages. [Vannur]
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Haron, Muhammed, “Towards a Catalogue of Islamic Manuscripts in South Africa with Special Reference to the Melayu Manuscripts at the Cape,” in Hashim


Nurtawab, Ervan, "Further Data Concerning the History of Malay Qur'anic Exegesis," [forthcoming article]

Nurtawab, Ervan, "Galeri Tafsir Alquran Klasik Jawa dan Sunda," [forthcoming article in *Jurnal Lektur Keagamaan*, Puslitbang, MORAI.


Radhakrishnan, Falsafah Upanishad, tiga jilid, 1989 [unpublished work].


Rinkes, Abdoerraoef van Singkel: *Bijdrage tot de kennis van de mystiek op Sumatra en Java*, 1909


ABOUT THE WRITER

PERSONAL DATA

Name: Ervan Nurtawab
Birth: Jakarta, November 4, 1980
Sex: Male
Nationality: Indonesian
Address: Jl. Solo No. 8 Rt.004/04 Cempaka Putih
          Ciputat 15412 Jakarta INDONESIA
Mobile: (+62) 8158705886
e-mail: ervan_nur@yahoo.com

INTELLECTUAL CAREER

A. FORMAL EDUCATION

2005-2007 Interdisciplinary Islamic Studies Program, The Graduate School, Syarif
            Hidayatullah State Islamic University
1999-2003 Department of Qur’anic and Hadith Sciences, Faculty of Theology and
            Philosophy, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University
1996-1999 Islamic Senior High School [Madrasah Aliyah] Darussalam, Ciamis, West
            Java
            [Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University].

B. BACKGROUND OF ORGANIZATION

2004 - ... Member, Koninklijk Instituut voor taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde (KITLV).
2003 - ... Head, Centre for the Study of Archipelago Islamic MSS (PUSNIRA)
2001-2002 Head, Department of Intellectual Development, Student Association of
            Muhammadiyah, Faculty of Theology and Philosophy, UIN Jakarta.
2000-2002 General Secretary, the Lembaga Tahfiz dan Ta’lim Alquran (LTTQ), Jakarta

C. COURSES

Jul-Aug 2006 Summer Course, McGill University, Montréal, Canada. [organized by
            MORA RI & CIDA Canada]
Mar-Apr 2006 The International Course of Handling and Cataloguing MSS. [organized by
            the Furqan Heritage Foundation, London & IIUM Kuala Lumpur, held
            at the IIUM Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia]
Nov 2004 -
            June 2005 English for Academic Purposes (EAP), at IALF in Denpasar Bali.
            [organized by MORA RI & CIDA Canada]
1999 – 2000 Arabic Course, Ma’had al-Uiûm al-Islâmiyyah wa al-‘Arabiyyah
            (LIPIA), Jakarta.
1996 – 1999 Studying Islam and Arabic (Nyanti), Pondok Pesantren Darussalam,
            Ciamis, West Java


D. SEMINARS & RESEARCH & PUBLICATION

A. SEMINARS

Nov 2, 2007  Workshop on Islam in Southeast Asia, organized by SIAS group 1 & 2, at Sophia University, Tokyo-Japan.
[Resource Person]  Title: The PKS and the Future of Islamic State in Indonesia

Nov 22, 2007  Workshop on "Islamic Manuscript Tradition and Kitab in Southeast Asia," organized by Center for Islamic Area Studies, Graduate School of Asian and African Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto-Japan.
[Resource Person]  Title: The Writing Tradition of Qur'anic Commentaries in Classical Java and Sunda


Dec 8, 2007  Workshop organized by SIAS group 1, at Sophia University, Tokyo-Japan.
[Resource Person]  Title: The PKS and the Future of Islamic State in Indonesia

Dec 16, 2007  Workshop organized by the Research Institute for the Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (TUFS), at Tokyo-Japan.
[Resource Person]  Title: Notes on the Collection of Islamic MSS at the Tanoh Abee Islamic Boarding School, Aceh.

[Resource Person]

B. RESEARCH PROJECTS

2007  Visiting Research Fellowship, at Sophia University, Tokyo-Japan
2007  The Catalogue Project of Tanoh Abee MSS Collection, organized by CDATS-TUFS – PPIM UIN Jakarta – MANASSA
2006  The Catalogue Project of Ali Hasjmy MSS Collection, organized by CDATS-TUFS & PPIM UIN Jakarta – MANASSA

C. PUBLICATION
1. On Islamic Archipelago MSS

v Book[s]

v Article[s]

2007
"New Light on the Study of 'Abdurra'ûf's Turjuman al-Mustafid, presented in the Workshop on "Islamic Manuscript Tradition and Kitab in Southeast Asia," organized by SIAS group 2, at Nagoya University, Nagoya-Japan.

"Notes on the Collection of Islamic MSS at the Tanoh Abee Islamic Boarding School, Aceh," presented in the Workshop organized by the Research Institute for the Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (TUFs), at Tokyo-Japan.

"Further Data Concerning the History of Malay Qur'anic Exegesis," [Unpublished work].

"The Writing Tradition of Qur'anic Commentaries in Classical Java and Sunda," Workshop on "Islamic Manuscript Tradition and Kitab in Southeast Asia," organized by Center for Islamic Area Studies, Graduate School of Asian and African Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto-Japan.

"Galeri Tafsir Alquran Klasik Jawa dan Sunda," [forthcoming].

"Kitab 'Umdah al-M uhtâj în karya Syekh 'Abdurra'ûf al-Fansûrî al-Sinkîli," presented for the Serambi Publisher. [unpublished work].

"Tradisi Klasik Penafsiran Alquran Nusantara dalam Perspektif Para Pengkaji," [unpublished work].

2006

2005

2004


2003

"Senarai Tafsir dan Terjemah Alquran Klasik dalam Masyarakat Jawa dan Sunda sebelum Abad ke-20 M," Jurnal Refleksi 5:2 (2003), published by Faculty of Theology and Philosophy, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University.


2. Academic Works


3. On Other Fields

v Book[s]


v Article[s]

2007

"The PKS and the Future of Islamic State in Indonesia," presented in the Workshop on Islam in Southeast Asia, organized by SIAS group 1 & 2, at Sophia University, Tokyo-Japan.

2006

"Religion and Violence in Indonesia Today," IISEP Project, 2006. [unpublished work]


2005


2004

2003

2002

2001

1999

E. AWARD

v The Best Graduate of the Graduate School, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University, 2007/2008. [GPA: 3.59]

v The Best Graduate of the Fifty-Seventh Graduation, Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University, Odd Semester of 2003/2004. [GPA: 3.90]