Samenige

Jalookstait Nulode 35, 55;

Harizmi 25

Hari

Sümeniyye

L18 MART 1991

Mataridi, Kitaburt-teuhid, 5.157,155-

609 CALVERLEY, E. E. Sümaniyyah.

MW 54 (1964), pp. 200-202

The state of the state

Berahime - Sumeniyye

11 (\$20)g(x1)y(1

Haber: bilpi kaynapi olarak almanaktadula Sümeniyye akti de reddediyar Berahine ise akting bilpi kaynapi olduğunu ikran ediyor.
Nesefi, Medarik, Rasid Ef. 5 a/14.18

tenting the control of the first tenting of the control of the con

10 12000

Berahime VSumeniye

Risaleti inkar edigorlar

Nesefi) Tabsira, R.Ep. 138 a/

symentyge

DIT

Bapdoidi, Kitabu usül-i ed-din s. 11 DIA Ktp. 297-4 ABD. U

Sumaniyye.

Doniel Gimoret
Bouddhar et les Bouddhhistes dons
La tradition Musulmane 5.288.

J.A. CCLVII. 1969

Budizm posetinde

Sûmenigge Maldisi, el-Bed 4/19-

amenique

bell Dit

Naplado, KHabirumli'd-don 5. 320 DIA-KAP. 297-4 ABD.U

- MANDE
- (27) Ficus glomerata Roxb.
 (28) Flacourtia sapida Roxb.
- (20) VGS, VII, 19; cf. aussi MSS, IV, 7. Nous avouons ne pas comprendre la trad. van Gelder a by day he shall stand (or) sit crosslegged a (c'est nous qui soulignons).
 - (30) Le sū. est peu cleir et paraît corrompu (sens de saha?).
 (31) C'est-à-dire ceinture, vêtement, etc. (voir supra, sū. 2).
 - (32) Cf. VGS, VII, 22: samvatsaravarah pravargyo bhavati.
 - (88) Cf. MSS, IV, 7, 8.
- (34) Ceci est sans doute en rapport avec le cycle duodénaire de Brhaspati (sur lequel voir J. Filliozat, in L'Inde classique, t. II, p. 725).

journal Asiatique, 257, 1969 Paris - Sumening ye

BOUDDHA ET LES BOUDDHISTES DANS LA TRADITION MUSULMANE

PAR

DANIEL GIMARET*

L'étude du Kitâb Bilawhar wa Bûdâsf nous a conduit à nous demander ce que, d'une façon générale, la tradition musulmane a connu, ou cru connaître, de Bouddha et du bouddhisme.

Il existe, dans la littérature musulmane, un exposé détaillé de la religion bouddhique: c'est celui qu'en a fait l'historien persan Rašîd ad-dîn Fadl Allah (m. 718/1318) dans son Čâmi' at-tawârîh (1). Contemporain des Îlhâns bouddhistes, vizir de Gâzân Hân qui, avant sa conversion à l'Islam, pratiquait la religion bouddhique, Rašîd ad-dîn a bénéficié sur ce sujet d'informations de première main, qui lui ont été fournies par un bahšt (2) probablement originaire du Kašmîr, du nom de Kamâla Śrî. Ce texte important pour la connaissance du bouddhisme mongol a été résumé et commenté par Karl Jahn (3).

Mais ce texte est unique. L'histoire de l'Inde d'al-Bîrûnî, si riche de renseignements sur l'hindouisme, ne dit pratiquement rien du bouddhisme. Sans valoir, du reste, le livre d'al-Bîrûnî, l'exposé de Rašîd ad-dîn lui est comparable en tant qu'il est resté, comme lui, sans exemple et sans conséquence dans la tradition musulmane. Bien après al-Bîrûnî, les hérésiographes et les historiens continuent de répéter, à propos des religions de l'Inde, ce qu'en ont dit, un ou deux siècles avant, Abû 'Abdallah al-Ğayhânî, al-Hasan b. Mûsâ an-Nawbaḥtî, Abû l-Qâsim al-Balhî, etc. (4). En ce qui concerne le bouddhisme, le livre de Rašîd ad-dîn n'a pas eu

* Cette étude a été faite conformément au programme de recherche du Centre d'Études islamiques et orientales d'Histoire comparée (E.R.A. 206 du C.N.R.S.)

SŪMANIYYAH

SŪMANIYYAH. The Sūmaniyyah are mentioned under one of the transliterations of their Sanskrit names, as Garmanes, along with the Brahmans by Strabo (died after 21 A.D.). (Loeb Classical Library, Vol. vii, p. 99). Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-220 A.D.) mentions them, as Sumaniyyah, also along with the Brahmans. He says they were Buddhists of the Indian Gymnosophist (philologically 'naked devotee') class, practising mental and physical exercises as religious activities. (Ante-Nicene Fathers, Clement, Stromata, I. xv. 7, Vol. ii, p. 316. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1956).

Before and during the early Christian centuries Buddhism had spread northwards from India into Iran and northeast into Central Asia and later into China, as well as north-west into Mesopotamia and Asia Minor. Except in Buddhism's area of origin in India, its expansion and influence in these other lands were soon largely overcome by Iran's then rising indigenous Zoroastrianism.

After Muhammad's death (9 A.H./632 A.D.), Islam's political power extended westward and also eastward from Iraq into Iran and Central Asia, and later southward into India. The Muslim Persians and Turks became acquainted with the lands and rulers of the Indian peoples, including the sects, beliefs and practices of their religions. During this period there was no expansion of Arab Muslim military power into India, but the long-established commercial contacts continued to be maintained.

The first reports in Arabic about India were provided by these Arab traders. Later, after the military and political expansion of Islam into Sind and Hind, not by Arabian Muslims but by Muslim Persians and Turks, fuller accounts of the geography, history and sociology of the lands, rulers and peoples of northern and western India were written in both Arabic and Persian by Muslim and Turkish authors.

These early records and books are presented in extensive English translation in the eight volumes of The History of India, by Sir H. Elliot and Prof. J. Dowson (London, 1867-77). These volumes contain the first information from Arabic and other Muslim sources about the Sumaniyyah.

The Elliot History states that the name Sümaniyyah is derived from the Sanskrit Sramana, "a religious mendicant, an ascetic, especially one of the Buddhist faith" (Vol. I, p. 506). A note on the same page lists the various early Greek and later Arabic transliterations of the Sanskrit, as Sarmanes, Sarmanae, Garmanae, Samanaei and Semnoi and gives thirteen references for further study and information.

It is al-Bīrūnī (d. 440/1048) who first mentions the Sūmaniyyah under the term 'Samanis' for that class of Buddhists whose idol, temple and town were all called Somnat, (other spellings are Somnath and Somnatha) on the Arabian sea coast of Gujatat. Somnat was "the name of the idol, the temple and place of worship for the people of all parts of Hind, and Hindu idolators came to it from great distances" (Elliot, History, i, 67). in Vol. ii, p. 476, he quotes from another source, "Somnath was in fact a linga, a nath, or deity ascribed to Soma, the moon, as having been erected by him in honour of Siva." On the same page he says, "The resemblance which the Muhammadan authors wish to establish between this lignam and the Arabian Lat seems to be a mere fancy, for though there was doubtless at one time considerable connection between these parts of India and Arabia, it does not appear to have been exemplified in this particular instance."

The idol itself was a thick stone, five yards long, erected with two yards in the ground, with three above. This idol had the most worshippers, (a hundred thousand, and more than that number at special times), the most priests, the most female attendants and the largest endowment of precious jewels and other ornaments of gold and silver, as well as stores of minted wealth. In Vol. II, the Elliot-Dowson History, (pp. 468 ff.) presents the earliest and fullest description by Ibn Asir (Ibn Athir) (d. 630/1234), of the conquest of Somant, the destruction of the idol and the slaughter of tens of thousands of the worshippers by the Muslim army under Mahmud of Ghazna in 416/1025.

This description of the conquest was used by other authors such as al-Bīrūnī (d. 448/1048) and al-Kazwini (640/1283). To the latter account Elliot appends a note: The enormous treasures found at Somnat have been a theme of wonder for all who have written on that conquest (Vol. 1, p. 98). It has also given the Sumaniyyah, however the name is spelled, a permanent place in the historical and religious literature of Islam, including encyclopaedias, Arabic dictionaries and histories of religion.

Of the many books on comparative religion the four most important are those of al-Ash arī (d. 324/935), al-Baghdādī (d. 429/1037), Ibn Hazm (d. 456/1064). Arabic ed., En. Isl, Cairo, 1933, i, 143) and al-Shahrastānī (548/1183).

'Abd al-Kāhir b. Tāhir al-Baghdādī gives the fullest but still incomplete list of the doctrines of the Sumaniyyah. His book, al-Fark Bayn al-Firak (Cairo, 1328/1910), p. 253) says their beliefs included the eternity of the world. The invalidity of logic and inference, only physical senses yield knowledge, the denial of the resurrection and the reality of metempsychosis, with this transmigration to be punishment or reward.

Al-Ghazālī (d. 505/1111) in his Iḥyā 'Ulām al-Dīn, has additional information about the Sümaniyyah: they are idolators who disbelieve in the supernatural world (al-jabarat) and deny the validity of tradition. His commentator, Sayyid Muhammad Murtadā al-Zabīdī (d. 1205/1791) (En. Isl. iii, 691) adds from al-Misbāh of al-Fayūmī

in the story of the death of Kṛṣṇa (Krishna) in the Mahābhārata. In the 8th century A.D. Somnāth was ruled by the Cavada Radjputs, vassals of the Cawlukyas. Its fame in Islamic history arises from the famous attack on its temple, mounted from Multan, by Maḥmūd of Ghazna [q.v.] in 416-17/1015-16. The sultan desecrated the shrine and destroyed its idol, pieces of which were reputedly sent to Mecca and Medina to be trodden underfoot by the true believers; the whole event vastly enhanced Mahmūd's reputation in Islam as the hammer of infidels. This was nevertheless essentially a plunder raid, and Kāthīāwāŕ reverted to Hindu control in the persons of the Vadja Rādiputs. In 697/1298, in the reign of the Dihlī Sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn Khaldjī, the shrine was again sacked by the commander Ulugh Beg, but only came under prolonged Muslim control in 875/1470 when the sultan of Gudjarāt, Maḥmūd I, conquered Djunāgarh or Girnār from its Rādjā [see MAḤMŪD I, SAYF AL-DĪN, BEGARHA]. It was eventually conquered by the Nawwabs of Djunagarh, and in British Indian times it fell within their princely state.

The modern port of Pātan-Somnāth or Somnāth-Pātan (lat. 20° 58' N., long. 70° 28' E.), on the old town site, is in Junagadh District of the Gujarat State in the Indian Union, and in 1971 had a population of 64,618, but it is now overshadowed by the adjacent port of Verāval.

Bibliography: Imperial gazetteer of India², xxiii, 74-5; Sir T.W. Haig, in Camb. hist. of India, iii, 23-6; M. Nāzim, The life and times of Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghazna, Cambridge 1931, 115-21, 208-24; Mohammad Habib, Sultan Mahmud of Ghaznin², Delhi 1952, 51-8. (C.E. Bosworth)

SUMANIYYA, the name given to the Buddhists by several Muslim authors. In this survey, first the Arabic word will be examined, then the doctrines of the *sumaniyya* according to Muslims will be discussed, and finally the Buddhist heritage in Persia and references to Buddhists in Muslim writings will be presented.

The Arabic word is here given in its usual vocalisation, though it sometimes appears as samaniyya, and this is based on the information spelt out literally by al-Djawharī, Siḥāḥ, Būlāķ 1282/1865, ii, 283, and cited by Ibn Manzūr (LA, xiii, 220a). It is now generally acknowledged that the first origins of this term are to be found in Sanskrit śramana, which with some phonetic modification has come to mean a Buddhist monk in the languages of Central Asia (particularly in Sogdian); it is from there that it passed into Arabic.

To all appearances it is the same word which in its form Σαμαναῖοι is found previously in Hellenistic Greek (Alexander Polyhistor, Porphyry) and as saman at the end of the 3rd century in the Middle Persian inscription of Kaʿba-yi Zardusht (Gignoux, 46, 69). However, "shamanism", despite the homonymy, is derived from the Tungus word saman/saman, which certainly does not come from an Indian language and has nothing to do with the sumaniyya.

Several doctrines have been attributed to the sumaniyya by the mutakallimūn, some of which are very vague. It was said that they were idolaters and that they believed the world was eternal. Moreover, they were accused of professing transmigration (tanāsukh). In this connection, al-Makdisī has two passages of great interest but which in reality describe a belief that is common to all Indians and not one distinctive of the sumaniyya. These last al-Māturīdī credits with a very remarkable theory, inasmuch as they claimed to know that the whole earth "is hurtling indefinitely

into the void" (Gimaret). Al-Nazzām is said to have objected to this theory when he observed that if a pebble is dropped it falls to the ground; but the earth is in contrast much heavier than a pebble and therefore it would fall faster than a pebble. The conclusion is that such a pebble would never be able to catch up with the earth if it really were falling.

However, Muslim theologians regularly associate the name sumaniyya with another thesis, which concerns a scepticism which "limits certain knowledge to perceptible knowledge". This is the general attitude but it is in fact presented in different ways. Sometimes it comes within the scope of a debate about our knowledge of God and sets out the controversy between Djahm b. Ṣafwān [q.v.] and the sumaniyya according to two accounts with diverging purposes. On other occasions it takes on a universal value but comprising two variants, the second of which seems to be a dialectical refinement of the first. The first takes its support from given facts derived only from the five senses and is said to deny the probative power of information (akhbār), including the khabar mutawātir. The second variant, which became a recognised subject of refutation by the Ash arīs, essentially sees in the scepticism of the sumaniyya the systematic denial of the value of speculative reasoning (nazar) and inference (istidlal). Any conclusion from a careful study of these bookish discussions is invariably restrictive. Like the doctrines of the barāhima which were contrasted with them, the doctrines of the sumaniyya which the theologians note are most often fictitious. The presumptions made about their proponents serve to give more substance and more shame to the positions rebutted by the mutakallimūn, or at least by some of them.

Any traces of Buddhism within Muslim culture must be sought elsewhere. The expansion of Buddhism towards the north-west of India is an acknowledged fact but its extent has not always been recognised. Modern archaeological discoveries and recent studies of toponyms in Zābulistān, Transoxiana and Khurāsan now seem to show clearly that Buddhism "largely embraced the eastern half of the Iranian world, even if it is improbable that it was ever the exclusive religion there" (A.S. Melikian-Chirvani, in Le Monde iranien et l'Islam, iii [Paris 1976], 3). This Buddhist presence, which varied in intensity with place and time, lasted for about a thousand years, from the 2nd century B.C. to the 8th century. From the end of the 3rd century it dwindled in the face of the vigorous influence of Mazdaism, the state religion of the Sāsānids, at the very time when Indian Buddhism was progressively losing its impetus under the Gupta dynasty. This double evolution explains why the Muslim empire was able to eliminate the Buddhist religion rapidly from its territory, and why Muslims had hardly any contact with it in India. But the Eastern Iranian world had been experiencing a long permeation of Buddhism which could not disappear so easily. The accepted ideals and established literary and plastic aspects of Buddhist art were for centuries incorporated into the poetry and arts of Islamic Persia.

Even the name bot that was given to the "idol" of the poet, by which is meant the object of his affection, the "moon-face" (māhrāy) which describes him, his physical type in pictorial art, many other recurring details as well as the compassionate sentiment which penetrates the epic of Firdawsī, can have no other origin. The Persian word naubahār, from Sanskrit nawa-vihāra, "the new monastery", is still today the name of several villages in the region of Nishāpūr, but it has chiefly remained associated with the memory of

1881 W. 24