

ground, a situation which, in both cases, had consequences for the development of the practice of mystical doctrines. It was only in the 1950s, with a relaxation of state anti-religious measures, that some Şūfis were able to publish their writings. In general, Nakşbandīs remained faithful to their orthodox line. This was set forth by Mehmed Zâhid Kotku (1897-1980) and his son-in-law Mehmed Esat Coşan, who today directs the "İskenderpaşa community" in Istanbul (it inherits the *tekke* of Gümüşkhānawī Ahmed Dīyā); by Abdülhekim Hüseyinî (1902-72) and his son Mehmed Reşid Erol (1929-96), founder of the "community of Menzil Köyü" at Açıyaman in Anatolia; and by several other *şeykh*s stemming from the eastern parts of Anatolia (H. Algar, *The Naqshbandi order in Republican Turkey*, in *The pendulum swings back*, London 1996). It is important to note that many of these maintained unofficial *medreses* in which Şūfism had a major part. 'Abd ūl-Hakīm Arwāsī/Abdülhakim Arvasi (1864-1943), another Nakşbandī, vigorously brought into prominence the teachings of Aḥmad Sirhindī [q.v.], the founder in India of the Nakşbandiyya Muḥjaddidiyya, and proponent of al-Gḥazālī and his Şūfism, at the same time combatting the Şhī'a and the radical Wahhābiyya [q.v.]. His pupils and successors, the main ones being the writer Necip Fazıl Kısakürek (1905-83), with his *O ve ben*, 6th ed. Istanbul 1990, and Hüseyin Hilmi Işık (b. 1911), founder of the Işıkçı movement, remained faithful to his thought but broke with several minor Nakşbandī practices and the system of *tekkes*.

Already in existence at the end of the Ottoman period, the Nürdju movement of Sa'īd Nürsī, a former Nakşbandī, can be classed as a crypto-Şūfi movement, despite its rejection of the *ṭarīka* and the *şeykh*'s authority, since it continues to venerate and to follow the teachings of such grand masters of Şūfism as 'Abd al-Kādir al-Djīlānī and Aḥmad Sirhindī and since it describes itself as a return to pure Şūfism. This aspect had been reinforced by the Nurcu Fethullah Gülen, who fiercely defends a revolutionary view of instruction, proposing a harmonisation of the old *medrese* system with that of the secular schools. (Lâtif Erdoğan, *Fethullah Gülen Hocaefendi "Küçük dünyam"*, Istanbul 1995; Eyüp Can, *Ufuk tur*, *Fethullah Gülen Hocaefendi ile*, Istanbul 1996 or 1997). On the other hand, in the last decade, certain Nurcus, called Aczmenđi, have considered that it is time to re-establish the *tekke* system (*Risale-i Nur'da usül ve program. Aczmenđilik*, Istanbul n.d. [1996 or 1997]).

Şūfis linked with other currents have contributed to the development of an Islamic mysticism during the time of the Republic, like the *Khalwatī* Muzaffer Ozak (1916-85), who attached central importance to music and dance movements. Like the Kādirīyya and Rifā'iyya, he kept up the link between mystical doctrine and dancing, a link which became lost amongst the Mawlawiyya. Other Şūfis, already only very loosely attached to the *ṭarīka* system, adapted immediately to the situation under the Republic, such as the Melāmīs, who kept up, at Istanbul, the tradition of Muḥammad Nūr al-'Arabī: Hādjdjī Maḥsūd Kḥulūsī (d. 1929), Hasan Luṭfī Susut and Mahmud Sadettin Bilginer (1909-83), Kḥulūsī's son. Alevī doctrines were favoured by the Kemalist régime, and the Alevīs took over Bektāshī *tekkes* and for many years caused a grave confusion by identifying the Şūfi doctrine and practices of the Bektāshīyya with their own system, this despite the protests of a small group of Bektāshīs led by Bedri Noyan (1912-97), one of whose chief members was Turgut Koca (1921-97), who incarnated this tradition. Amongst the Alevīs, Bektāshī doctrine

enjoyed a popularisation and acquired a folkloric nature which has profoundly deprived it of its real nature. Having almost totally disappeared within Turkey itself, the tradition of commentaries on the *Mathnawī* and on Ibn al-'Arabī had a brilliant representative in Sarajevo in the person of Fayḍ Allāh/Fejzulah Hadžibajrić (d. 1990), who gave life to the last *dār ūl-methnawī* of the Ottoman world.

Bibliography (in addition to references in the article): Abdūlbaki Gölpınarlı, *Melāmīlik ve melāmiler*, Istanbul 1931; J.K. Birge, *The Bektashi order of dervishes*, London 1937; Mustafa Kara, *Din, hayat sanat açısında, tekkeler ve zaviyeler*, Istanbul 1980; Yaşar Nuri Öztürk, *Kuşadalı İbrāhīm Halveti*, Istanbul 1982; İrfan Gündüz, *Gümüşhanevi Ahmed Ziyāüddin. Hayatı, eserleri, tarikat anlayışı ve Hâlidîyye tarikatı*, Istanbul 1984; B. Abu-Manneh, *The Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya in the Ottoman lands in the early 19th century*, in *WI*, xxii (1984); İsmail Kara, *Türkiye'de islamcılık düşüncesi*, 3 vols. Istanbul 1986-94; Şerif Mardin, *Religion and social change in modern Turkey. The case of Bediüzzaman Said Nursi*, Albany 1989; Abu-Manneh, *Şaykh Ahmed Ziyā'üddin el-Gümüşhanevi and the Ziyā-i Khâlidî sub-order*, in F. de Jong (ed.), *Shī'a Islam, sects and Sufism*, Utrecht 1992; Süleyman Hayri Bolay, *Türkiye'de ruhcu ve maddeci görüşün mücadelesi*, Ankara n.d.; H. Algar, *Devotional practices of the Khalidi Nakshibendi of Ottoman Turkey*, in R. Lifchez (ed.), *The Dervish Lodge. Architecture, art and Sufism in Ottoman Turkey*, Berkeley etc. 1992; Samiha Ayverdi et alii, *Kenan Rifā'i ve yirminci asrı Işığında müslümanlık*, 2nd ed. Ankara 1993; Th. Zarccone, *Les Nakshibendi et la République turque: de la persécution au repositionnement théologique, politique et social (1925-1991)*, in *Turcica*, xxiv (1992); idem, *Mystiques, philosophes et franc-maçons en Islam, Rizā Teyfik, penseur ottoman (1868-1949), du soufisme à la confrérie*, Paris 1993; Hilmi Ziya Ülken, *Türkiye'de çağdaş düşünce tarihi*, 4th ed. Istanbul 1994; A. Popovic and G. Veinstein (eds.), *Etudes sur l'ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant de Hadji Bektach*, Istanbul 1995; Ferit Aydın, *Tarikat'ta vâbîta ve nakşibendilik*, Istanbul 1996; Zarccone, *Mehmet Ali Aynî et les cercles melâmî d'Istanbul au début du XX^e siècle*, in N. Clayer et alii, *Melâmî et Bayramî*, Istanbul 1998; idem, *The transformation of the Sufi orders in the Turkish Republic and the question of crypto-Sufism*, in P. Chelkowski and J.L. Warner (eds.), *Talat Halman Festschrift*, forthcoming New York. (TH. ZARCONE)

7. In Muslim India.

(a) The pre-1800 period. See *TARİKA*. II. 7.

(b) In the 19th and 20th centuries.

i. *The study of Şūfism in colonial and post-colonial South Asia.*

The term and category "Şūfism" was first coined for European languages by British Orientalists based in India, particularly Sir William Jones (*The sixth discourse, on the Persians*, and *On the mystical poetry of the Persians and Hindus*, in *Works*, London 1807). While European travellers had previously remarked upon "dervishes" and "fakirs" only as exotic curiosities, Orientalists applied the term "Şūfi" largely to the literary phase of Şūfism, particularly as expressed in Persian poetry. These European scholars were persuaded that the elegant poems of Hāfiz and Djālāl al-Dīn Rūmī [q.v.] could have nothing to do with the Islamic ("Mahometan") religion, and therefore they unanimously believed it to be derived from Indian sources; this position was reinforced by the anti-Şūfi attitudes of Şhī'ī *muđtahids* in Persia (Sir J. Malcolm, *History of Persia*, London 1815, II, 382-3; Lt. J.W. Graham, *A treatise on Sufism, or Mahomedan mysticism*,

in *Transactions of the Literary Society of Bombay*, i [1819], 89-119). British colonial officials, who were the main source of European studies of Sūfism in the 19th century, thus maintained a double attitude toward Sūfism: its literary classics (part of the Persian curriculum required by the British East India Company until the 1830s) were admired, but its contemporary social manifestations were considered corrupt and degenerate in relation to what was perceived as orthodox Islam (R.F. Burton, *Sindh*, London 1851, 198-231). This "golden age" ambivalence toward Sūfism was soon mirrored by the attitudes of Muslim reformists and fundamentalists (see below), creating a situation in which Sūfism quickly became a contested term, the meaning of which remains hotly disputed today. In Urdu, *taşawwuf* still generally means a prescriptive ethical and spiritual ideal as it did in early Islamic texts, though sometimes it functions as a generic equivalent of mysticism. The English word "Sūfism" describes a variety of practices and doctrines with a debatable relationship to Islam (C. Ernst, *The Shambhala guide to Sufism*, Boston 1997).

Colonial officials encountered contemporary Sūfism primarily in the context of government regulation of the many shrines and saints' tombs found in India; under their administration, active Sūfī circles were no longer attached to major shrines, though *khānqāhs* continued to function, particularly in the Panjāb and Sind. British officials settled disputes over the administration of shrines as *wakf* properties under Anglo-Mohammedan law (cf. G. Kozłowski, *Muslim endowments and society in British India*, Cambridge 1985). This was an issue particularly for large shrines, such as the tomb of Khwājā Mu'īn al-Dīn Čištī at Adīmēr, or that of Bābā Farid al-Dīn Gandj-i Šhakkar at Pakpattan [q.v.] (D. Gilmartin, *Shrines, succession and sources of moral authority in the Punjab, in Pakistan. The social sciences' perspective*, ed. A.S. Ahmed, Karachi 1990, 146-64). Some Sūfīs, e.g. the Čištī leader Hādjī Imdād Allāh (d. 1899), fought against the British during the 1857-8 uprising, and groups such as the Hurr (followers of the Pīr Pagārō in Sind) continued resistance up to 1947 (H.T. Lambrick, *The terrorist*, London 1970). But colonial policy reinforced the position of many hereditary *sādīqdāda-nishāns* as rural landlords and notables, particularly in the Panjāb. The process of legal regulation and dispute resolution of Sūfī shrines has continued in post-colonial India and Pakistan (S.K. Rashid, *Wakf administration in India*, New Delhi 1978).

There is considerable proto-anthropological material on Sūfī saints and shrines compiled by colonial officials in the Indian district gazetteers and surveys of the "castes and tribes" variety, often drawn from local oral tradition; most of these accounts regard Indian Sūfī practice as a Hinduised deviation from a supposedly pristine Islam (T.W. Arnold, art. *Saints and martyrs, Muhammadan, in India*, in *ERE*, xi, 68-73). Some Hindu scholars went so far as to interpret Sūfism in terms of Vedānta (L. Ramakrishna, *Panjabi Sufi poets*, London 1938). Politically-oriented studies of Sūfī saints and orders have focussed upon their relationship with the colonial government (Sarah Ansari, *Sufi saints and state power. The Pirs of Sind, 1843-1947*, Cambridge 1992) and the Pakistan movement (D. Gilmartin, *Empire and Islam. Punjab and the making of Pakistan*, Berkeley 1988). There is an increasing body of anthropological literature on Sūfī practice in Pakistan and India, both on the part of government officials (Census of India, *Beliefs and practices associated with Muslim pirs in two cities of India [Delhi and Lucknow]*, New Delhi 1966) and Euro-American researchers (K.P. Ewing,

Sufism and desire in Pakistan, Durham 1997).

Post-colonial governments in Pakistan, under the impulse of modern nationalism, have promoted publications that focus on Sūfī literature (especially poetry in local languages) as the manifestation of national identity. The Folk Heritage Institute in Islamabad (*Lok Wirtha*) publishes a "Sufi Poets Series" consisting of editions and Urdu translations of prominent Sūfīs who wrote poetry in the regional languages of Pakistan (Pashtō, Panjābī, Balōčī, Brāhūī, Hindkō, Sindhī). The Department of Charitable Trusts (*Maḥkama-i Awkāf*), which controls the revenue of major shrines, publishes officially sanctioned biographies of Sūfī saints in Urdu that accord with the Islamic "Pakistan ideology," and high-ranking provincial and national officials regularly preside at the *urs* anniversaries of Sūfī saints (Ewing, *The politics of Sufism: redefining the saints of Pakistan*, in *Journal of Asian Studies*, lii [1983], 251-68). Hagiographies organised along provincial or all-Pakistan lines also receive official sponsorship. The Government of India, in contrast, sponsors literature and films that identify Sūfīs as "secular nationalists" having more in common with Hindu bhakti than with Islam (M. Jotwani, *Sufis of Sindh*, New Delhi 1986).

Although British historians largely ignored Sūfī writings, the post-colonial era has seen the growth of new scholarship in South Asia, initially at Aligarh Muslim University, focused on the history and literature of Sūfism of the "medieval" period. The studies of the Čištī order by K.A. Nizami have demonstrated how it is possible to follow the continuities in a *silsila* through the oral discourses (*mafūzāt*) and letters (*maktūbāt*) that continued to be written in Persian up to the 20th century (Nizami, *Tārīkh-i mashāyikh-i Čištī*, Delhi 1953; see also C. Ernst and B. Lawrence, *Burnt hearts. The Chishti Sufi order*, London 1998). Biographical and historical studies of particular Sūfī saints and orders have been written in the history departments of South Asian universities, while Persian and occasionally Arabic text editions of Sūfī writings have been produced in language and literature departments. Particularly prized Persian writings by famous *shaykhs* of the Čištī and Naqšbandī orders have been printed for devotional use in Pakistan as recently as the 1960s. "Classical" Sūfī works in Arabic and Persian, from the 13th up to the 19th centuries, are widely available for popular use through modern Urdu translations in India and Pakistan, and occasionally in other languages as well. The vast majority of South Asian Sūfī texts in Persian still remains in manuscript, however (for a comprehensive list, see Ahmad Munzawī, *Fihrist-i mushṭarak-i nuskhahā-yi khattī-yi Fārsī-i Pākistān*, Islamabad 1984-, esp. vols. iii [*ʿIrḡān*] and xi [*Ẓindagi-nāma-yi pīrān*]). Only rarely have contemporary Sūfī writings in Indian languages been translated (C. Shackle (tr.), *The teachings of Khwaja Farid*, Multan 1978; idem (tr.), *Fifty poems of Khwaja Farid*, Multan 1983).

ii. Sūfism and modern ideologies.

Sūfī pīrs of the 20th century, despite their entrenched positions as landholders in the colonial system, were crucial to the support of the Pakistan nationalist movement because of their large followings, and Sūfī leaders have generally found nationalism to be a congenial doctrine. But the ideological proponents of modernism and Islamic fundamentalism have both seen Sūfism as a major opponent. Modernists like Iḳbāl [q.v.], in a critique similar to that of Orientalists, denounced institutional Sūfism for fatalism, passivity, and a false notion of the absorption of humanity in unity with God. Although Iḳbāl's writings invoke Sūfī figures such as Hallādj and Rūmī [q.v.], his concepts of terms

such as *khudī* and *ṣūfī* [q.v.] owe as much to Bergson and Nietzsche. Secularised intellectuals and Muslim modernists alike saw Ṣūfī practice as mediaeval superstition and as a drug that stupefies the masses. Ṣūfī apologists have responded to this criticism by appropriating the rhetoric of science and announcing that Ṣūfism attains the goal of truth that science can only dream of (Wāhid Bakhsh Siyāl, *Mushāhada-i haḳk: islāmī rūhānī s̄ā'ins* [science], Karachi 1974).

Fundamentalists (echoing Orientalists and colonial officials) criticised Ṣūfism as Hindu-influenced idolatry of human beings, amounting to abandonment of "pure" Islam. Reformers like Hādīdī Shari'at Allāh (d. 1840), founder of the Farā'īdī movement in Bengal, and Sayyid Ahmad Brēlwī (d. 1831 [q.v.]) in the Panjāb, were militantly opposed to certain forms of Ṣūfism, Shī'ism, and local adaptations of Islam; for this reason, the British regarded them as "Wahhābīs," although some reformers were trained in Ṣūfī orders. Abu 'l-'Alā' Mawdūdī (d. 1979), founder of the fundamentalist Djamā'at-i Islāmī, rejected Ṣūfī practice despite his upbringing in a Čishtī family, though his authoritarian leadership style has been interpreted as an extension of the master-disciple relationship (S.V. Nasr, *Mawdūdī and the making of Islamic revivalism*, Oxford 1996). Defenders of Ṣūfism argue that Ṣūfism is the spiritual essence of Islam, and at the same time they refute earlier Orientalist theories of the non-Islamic origins of Ṣūfism (W.B. Sial Rabbani, *Islamic Sufism. The science of flight in God, with God, by God, and union and communion with God, also showing the tremendous Sufi influence on Christian and Hindu mystics and mysticism*, Lahore 1984. Nakshbandī groups concerned about Islamisation have apparently de-emphasised meditation practices like the *laṭā'if*) but have redefined discipleship as a basic Islamic religious duty (A. Buehler, *Masters of the heart. Naqshbandī Sufism in colonial India*, Columbia, S.C. 1997).

The debate over Ṣūfī doctrine and practice in South Asia has crystallised around two North Indian *madrasas* founded in the colonial period, the *hadīth*-oriented Deoband school [q.v.] and the devotional Barēlwī school. Although the founders of Deoband were largely drawn from the Šābirī branch of the Čishtīyya, they rejected practices such as *samā'* [q.v.], and *ziyārat* as well as excessive veneration of the Prophet or Ṣūfī masters (Barbara Metcalf, *Islamic revival in British India. Deoband, 1860-1900*, Princeton 1982). The Barēlwīs, followers of Sayyid Ahmad Riḍā Khān (d. 1921) of Ray Bareilly, emphasise the necessity of intercession by the Prophet and, secondarily, the Ṣūfī *shaykh*; as in other Muslim regions, the issue of saintly mediation has thus become highly controversial (U. Sanyal, *Devotional Islam and politics in British India. Ahmad Riza Khan Bareilwi and his movement, 1870-1920*, Oxford 1996). Pietistic missionary groups such as the Tablīghī Djamā'at [q.v.] founded by Muḥammad Ilyās (d. 1944) have appropriated the ethical emphasis of Ṣūfism while rejecting ritual, metaphysics, and sainthood (M.A. Haq, *The faith movement of Maulana Muhammad Ilyas*, London 1972). Polemics and apologetics from these different perspectives dominate modern discussions of Ṣūfism in Urdu and in English.

iii. *Ṣūfism in print.*

Probably the greatest social transformation in modern Ṣūfism derives from the introduction of print to South Asia early in the 19th century, principally in the form of calligraphed lithography (movable Arabic type was preferred by the British). As in other regions, Ṣūfī orders were among the first to make use of the new technology to distribute teachings of contempo-

rary teachers and to preserve the classical texts of the past. The revolution entailed by printing Ṣūfī texts lay in the possibility of mass distribution of inexpensive books to the middle-class public, in place of the restricted access to manuscripts and oral teachings among a privileged few. Printing of Ṣūfī texts in India was carried out principally in the northern cities of Dihlī, Kānpūr, and Lak'hnaū, often at presses (such as Nawāl Kishōr in Lak'hnaū) run by Hindu *munshīs*. The number of Persian texts printed in India in the 19th century was considerably higher than the total printed in Persia or Central Asia. Leaders of Ṣūfī orders such as the Čishtīyya, Nakshbandīyya, Kādirīyya and Suhrawardīyya orders [q.v.] commissioned publication of both early and contemporary Ṣūfī texts, initially in Persian but increasingly in Urdu translation (C. Ernst, *The study of Sufism in Pakistan*, unpubl. paper for American Institute for Pakistan Studies Workshop, 1996). Their publications included periodicals, and *shaykhs* like the Nakshbandī leader Djamā'at 'Alī Shāh (d. 1951) sometimes required their disciples to subscribe (Buehler). Some Ṣūfīs (the Čishtī leaders Dhawḳī Shāh, d. 1951, and Ḥasan Nizāmī, d. 1955) were trained in modern universities and made use of the press and European literary genres such as the novel to communicate their insights in Urdu and English to wider audiences.

Beyond the Gangetic basin, the Panjāb, and the Urdu-speaking centres of the Deccan (U. Khālīdī and M. 'Aḳīl, *Dakan kā 'ahd-i islāmī, 1300 tā 1950, ek bun-yādī kitābīyyāt*, Watertown, Mass. 1993, 58-65), very little scholarly work has been done on Ṣūfī activities in the modern period, such as the transmission of Ṣūfī orders from Kerala [see MAPPILA] to Ceylon in the 19th century. While Urdu has been an important medium for disseminating the full range of Ṣūfī literature, Indian languages that employ non-Arabic scripts (Bengali, Tamil, Malayalam) have also been used for Ṣūfī publications. In the Tamil country, tombs like that of Shāh al-Hamid (d. 1558) at Nagore are still centres of pilgrimage for Muslims, Hindus, and Christians, and hagiographies in Tamil remain popular (V. Narayanan, *The Zamzam in Nagore: worshipping Shahul Hamid in a Tamil landscape*, unpubl. paper). The Mā'djībhandārī Ṣūfī order, founded in Chittagong by Sayyid Ahmad Allāh (1826-1906) with links to the Kādirīyya, has engaged in extensive proselytisation and publication of biographies and songs in Bengali, with support from the ruling circles of contemporary Bangladesh (M.A. Latif, letter of 1992). The tantric bards known as the Bāuls gained cultural respectability after the 1920s when Rabindranath Tagore popularised the Bengali songs of Lālan Fakir (d. 1890); despite their religious ambiguity, the presence of Ṣūfī symbolism in their writings is unmistakable (C. Solomon, *Bāul songs*, in D. Lopez, (ed.), *The religions of India in practice*, Princeton 1996, 187-208).

iv. *The internationalisation of South Asian Ṣūfism.*

Devotion to Indian Ṣūfī saints spread to the Malay peninsula, South Africa and the Caribbean in the 19th century as the British exported indentured laborers to those regions from India. In the 20th century, Europeans were exposed to visiting Indian Ṣūfī teachers such as 'Ināyat Khān (d. 1927), who was trained as a Čishtī but presented Ṣūfism as a universal religion detached from normative Islam. His teachings have been perpetuated by Americans (Rabi'a Martin, Samuel Lewis) as well as family members (Pir Vilayat Khan) in Europe and America. Bawa Muḥaiyaddeen (d. 1986), a Tamil Ṣūfī from Sri Lanka, acquired a significant following (both Muslim and non-Muslim),

after moving to the U.S.A. in 1971, and his tomb outside Philadelphia has now become a place of pilgrimage. South Asian Muslim immigrants and students in England, Canada, and the U.S.A. have established branches of the *Čishtiyya* and the *Nakshbandiyya* in their new homes along traditional lines. European and American converts to Islam have also joined South Asian *Šūfi* orders; the principal *khālifa* of *Dhawki Šahā* in Pakistan was *Shahid Allāh Farīdī* (d. 1978), an Englishman formerly named Lennard, whose Urdu writings have been published in Karachi. The principal ideological change for *Šūfism* in the modern period is the option of *Šūfism* without Islam, something barely conceivable before the 20th century. This new possibility is partly the result of the efforts of Western scholars and fundamentalists, both of whom regard *Šūfism* as separate from "pure" Islam, but it is partly the natural effect of ecumenism and the modern search for spirituality. *Šūfi* groups in Europe and America also give a much more prominent and public role to women than was previously customary in South Asia. Cultural products of *Šūfism* have attained great popularity in the West, from not only the Middle East (the Whirling Dervishes and *Rūmī's* poetry) but also South Asia (*kawwālī* music by the Sabri Brothers and *Nusrat Fateh Ali Khan*). At the end of the 20th century, South Asian *Šūfism* has found large new audiences through electronic communications on an international scale.

Bibliography: Given in the article.

(C. ERNST)

B. In Chinese Islam.

It is likely that the Muslims from the Middle East or Central Asia, drawn to China in the 13th-14th centuries by the Mongol emperors of the *Yüan* dynasty, brought with them *Šūfi* practices. But this is only a supposition since, in our present state of knowledge, we know nothing about the religious life of the Muslims of China before their complete sinicisation. We have to wait till the middle of the 17th century and the upheavals which mark the end of the native *Ming* dynasty and its replacement by the *Manchu* dynasty of the *Ch'ing* (or *Qing*) in order to find a specifically Islamic Chinese literature, which from then onwards is rich, mature and self-assured.

i. *Literary Šūfism.*

As a general rule, the great Muslim thinkers of the 17th-19th centuries adopted a uniform approach. They give an exposition for their coreligionists and compatriots, in Chinese, of the complete foundations of the faith, beginning with a sacred history which places the mystical and ancient past of China within the continuity of the unfolding of Biblical history. They continue with a dogmatic system of morality set out in Confucian terms and with the believer's obligations set forth in a clear language which is quasi-vernacular. Finally, they set forth a mysticism which is undeniably *Šūfi*.

If speculative theology shows itself as being consistent from the time of the first works composed, sc. the time of those of *Wang Tai-yü* (*Wang Daiyu*, ca. 1580-1658?), published between 1642 and 1657, this theology nevertheless evolves from one author to another over the course of the two succeeding centuries whilst remaining, so far as it seems, not rooted in any particular time and with no sectarian links. In order to acquire prestige, this theology often claims to stem from the translation of some Arabic or Persian work. Sometimes such originals are imaginary; but even when these actually exist and are as famed as the *Minād al-'ibād* of *Nadīm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya* [q.v.]

or the *Lawā'ih* of *Djāmī* [q.v.], works which were highly valued in Chinese Islam, the alleged translation implies a total re-writing and remodelling in order to translate the philosophical notions and concepts of *Šūfism* into an acceptable Chinese mode of thought. From this, an original literature has resulted, one unknown to Islamic specialists for want of being studied by Sinologists.

The great Chinese '*ulamā*' were actually forced to use as best they could the lexicographic and conceptual material at their disposal—Neo-Confucian, Taoist and Buddhist. The believer's journey towards "absorption" with the divine (*ho-hui, ho-ch'i*), which is a "return to origins" (*kuai-pen, fan-pen, hai-yüan*) is made, they explain, by "transformation" (*hun-hua*) through attaining the "Perfect Way" (*chih-tao*) or "Vehicle of the Truth" (*chen-ch'eng*, i.e. *hakika*)—*tao* being the basic concept of Taoism and *ch'eng* that of Buddhism. The postulant seeking illumination has first of all followed, at a lower level, the "Usual Way" (*ch'ang-tao*) or the "Vehicle of the Rites" (*li-ch'eng*) or "Vehicle for Religion" (*chiao-ch'eng*, i.e. the *Šharī'a*) in order to understand the letter of the "Five meritorious acts" (*wu-kung*, i.e. *al-arkān al-khamsa*); then he follows the "Middle way" (*chung-tao*) or "Vehicle of the Way" (*tao-ch'eng* or *tarikā*) which allows him to discover the spirit of the five meritorious acts, all this under the direction of a "Head of the Way" (*tao-chang* or *shaykh*), a "Ship of compassion on the sea of illusions", according to the Buddhist formula normally applied to *Kuan-yin*, the Chinese avatar of *Avalokiteśvara*. The journey of the believer is comparable to the search for "personal perfection" (*hsiu-shen*) recommended by Confucius and Mencius and set in the centre of the Neo-Confucian ethics of the 16th-17th centuries. For "he who knows himself knows his God" (*jen-chi jen-chu*). As a 19th-century author, *Ma K'ai-k'o* (*Ma Kaike*), from Yunnan, sets forth, by following the way of gradual attainment of perfection, the believer "acts as in Confucianism, but progresses to a supplementary degree" (*Ta-hua tung-kuei* "The general return [to God] of the great transformations", 1865, ed. Peking 1922-3, ii, 46). This supplementary degree is attained thanks to the ascetic practice of the thirty "levels" (*p'in*, the "stations", *maqāmāt*), described in detail by the *Chen-kung fa-wei* "The secret unveiled of truly meritorious acts" (whose author and date are problematical: the end of the 17th or the end of the 18th century?).

In the thread of written discourse, the Arabic terms—or more exactly, Arabo-Persian ones, since the influence of the great religious centres of Central Asia was strongly felt in Chinese Islam—are not only translated but also transliterated phonetically, so far as the Chinese characters allow. Thus *dhikr* is written phonetically as *ch'i-k'e-erh*, and the *shahāda* is written and recited as *lio-i-lia-he-ying-tan* (= *lā 'ilāhā illā 'llāh*) and, at the end of the formula, *Mu-han-me-te-lia-liu-lun* (= *Muhammad rasūl [Allāh]*). Since Chinese Muslims pronounce Arabic in a manner much deformed by Chinese phonetics, it is not surprising that, as pilgrims to Mecca, they have been looked down upon by Arabic-speakers and have had the reputation of following a bastardised form of religion. However, their literature proves that this is not the case: the use of a terminology and a juggling with images borrowed from Chinese culture has not resulted in a degenerate syncretism. The message, the *Šūfi* one in particular, has remained distinctively Muslim. According to a Chinese historian of world religions (*Li Xinhua*, 1983, 76), *Nakshbandiyya* adherents are said to be recognisable by their preference for Neo-