

Maluku. After two years in Ambon, he was finally moved to Lotak, a small village in a Christian area of North Sulawesi, where he died, in 1864.

In the midst of the civil war, Tuanku Imam Bonjol began to wonder whether violent confrontation was, in fact, the only way to establish a religiously guided society. He and his followers finally decided to send four emissaries to Mecca. When the mission arrived in Mecca in 1811, Wahhābī power was already on the wane there. Four years later the four emissaries came home and reported that force and coercion were no longer the accepted methods for advancing religious teaching. On learning of this new view, Imam Bonjol immediately changed the basic foundation of the Padris' struggle and returned political power to the *adat* leaders. War booty was returned to its original owners. Imam Bonjol nevertheless remained the most influential *tuanku* in Minangkabau.

During the height of their power the Padris expanded their influence to South Tapanuli, the home of the Batak ethnic group. The Islamisation of that region thus began during this time, chiefly through the activity of Tuanku Tambusai, one of Imam Bonjol's assistants who had been sent to Mecca. Until the present time Tuanku Tambusai is still well remembered and recognised as a local hero.

The Padri religious movement was responsible for the formulation of the Minangkabau dictum, "*Adat* is based on the *syariah* (religious law); *syariah* is based on *kitabullah* (the Qur'ān)". The dictum has since then been taken as the foundation of every local social and religious movement. From that time the Minangkabau people gradually began to think of the ideal pattern of leadership as consisting of three elements: the *adat*-leaders (*ninik-mamak*),

the religious leaders (*alim-ulama*), and the "intellectuals" (*cadiak-panda*).

The Padri episode (1803–37) is a true watershed in the history of Minangkabau, and Tuanku Imam Bonjol was central to it. Despite the matrilinear structure of Minangkabau society, he has always been seen as the ideal Minangkabau hero.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Taufik Abdullah, *Adat and Islam. An examination of conflict in Minangkabau, Indonesia* 2 (1966), 1–24; Christine Dobbin, *Islamic revivalism in a changing peasant economy. Central Sumatra, 1784–1847*, London and Malmo 1983, repr. 1987; Christine Dobbin, *Kebangkitan Islam dalam ekonomi petani yang sedang berubah, Sumatra Tengah, 1784–1847*, Jakarta 1992; Christine Dobbin, Tuanku Imam Bondjol (1772–1864), *Indonesia* 13 (1972), 5–36; Dawis Datuk Madjolelo and Ahmad Marzoeki, *Tuanku Imam Bondjol. Perintis djalan ke kemerdekaan*, Jakarta and Amsterdam 1951.

TAUFIK ABDULLAH

## Breath and breathing

The concepts of **breath** and the vitalising process of **breathing** (Ar. *nafas*) are not mentioned as such in the Qur'ānic revelation but have, since the very beginning, been central to Šūfī cosmology. *Nafas* is relevant from a theoretical (i.e., doctrinal) point of view and with respect to spiritual self-realisation in the context of an organised methodology (*ṭarīqa*, Šūfī order, lit. "path").

Since the time of the Khurāsānian Šūfī Abū Yazīd al-Biṣṭāmī (d. 260/874), the term *nafas* has been used by Šūfīs as a technical term to indicate the necessity of being aware of and thus able to control one's breath (Pers. *pās-i anjās*). The tech-

niques that developed around this basic concept of cultivating the inner consciousness often resemble closely the Indian yogi practices of *prāṇāyama* (Sanskrit, lit. “breath discipline”), although they probably developed independently.

More speculatively, the great mystic of Andalusian origin Ibn ‘Arabī (d. 638/1240) interprets the well-known *ḥadīth qudsī* (sacred Tradition), “I was a hidden treasure and I desired to be known; therefore I created the World in order that I might be known,” by asserting that it is the very “breath of the Merciful” (*nafas al-Rahmān*) that constitutes the source of the universe created out of his pure love (*ḥubb*). God is essentially merciful and, as He reveals Himself, He pours forth His breath. This breath signifies the will of the divine to express itself and become known, thereby realising fully the potentialities corresponding to His undifferentiated essence (*al-dhāt*). Hence, *al-ḥaqq* (the “Truth”, one of the names most commonly used by Ṣūfīs for God) qualifies itself, revealing the hidden potentialities of its divine being. As to the origin of the divine names and archetypes, they yearned to be known, and accordingly God, in His compassion, brought them into existence by uttering a sigh, and it is this sigh that preserves the universe by recreating it continually.

The renowned Persian Ṣūfī author ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Qāshānī (d. 730/1329–30), a fervent adherent to the school of Ibn ‘Arabī, asserts that knowledge of the divine breath is closely associated with knowledge of the universe, since the latter is nothing but the coming into existence and taking shape of the permanent archetypes (*al-a’yān al-thābita*), which are co-substantial with His breath. The breath of compassion (*al-nafas al-Rahmān*) is thus closely related to the concept of *tanfīs* (lit.

“exhalation”) and bears in it the meaning of the overflow of the divine potentialities into the realm of existence. Creation is thus nothing but the exhalation of the divine knowledge in the desire to make it expand through breath, and this breath is the means by which God releases (*nafusa*) the divine names from the absence of manifestation of their effects.

The spiritual practice of Ṣūfī orders (*turuq*, Ar. plur. of *ṭarīqa*) was based on the assumption that the sound of breathing reproduces the undifferentiated sound of the divine breath, from which came the seeds of this world. Ṣūfīs employ perpetual invocation and praise of God (*dhikr*, the repetition, individual or collective, aloud or silently, with or without movements, of a divine name or a litany) as a token of their constant awareness that God pervades everything created through the exhalation of His breath. Hence, mirroring this relationship between God’s breath and creation, everything created exists only for the invocation and praise of God by His most perfect creature, that is, the human being. Those endowed with wisdom (*ḥikma*) therefore perceive the *dhikr* in every sound—in the flowing stream, the waves of the sea, the cry of the eagle, and the rustling of leaves in the wind.

In the Persianate world the Persian term *dam* often replaces the Arabic *nafas*, as in the case of *hūsh dar dam* (awareness while breathing), a characteristic principle of the Naqshbandiyya Ṣūfī order.

In the process of gradual expansion and subsequent identification of the limited human individual with the macrocosmic level of the universe (a process that we could term as “universalization” of the individual) that eventually raises the initiate to the rank of “the Perfect Man” (*al-insān al-kāmil*), the phases of breath (i.e.,

inhalation and exhalation) are interpreted as a continuous interchange between the microcosm and the macrocosm: exhalation implies the release and therefore the expulsion of individual elements into the environment, whereas inhalation entails the assimilation of cosmic elements. Thus, through the alternating phases of breathing in a process of continuous contraction and expansion, the Şūfī practitioner symbolically imitates the divine acts of creating and reabsorbing the universe. In this context, the term *nafas* (breath) bears a close relationship to the wider notion of soul indicated by the word *naḥs*, so crucial in the methodology of Şūfī teachings, which emphasise the process of the “purification of the soul” (*tadhkiyat al-naḥs*) and are often based on discipline of the breath.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- William C. Chittick, *The self-disclosure of God. Principles of Ibn al-‘Arabī’s cosmology*, Albany 1998; William C. Chittick, *The Sufi path of knowledge. Ibn al-‘Arabī’s metaphysics of imagination*, Albany 1989; Henry Corbin, *L’imagination créatrice dans le soufisme d’Ibn ‘Arabī*, Paris 1977<sup>2</sup>; Abū l-Ḥasan Zayd Fārūqī, *Manāḥij al-sayr wa-madārij al-khayr*, Qandahar 1953; Ibn ‘Arabī, *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, trans. Ralph W. J. Austin, *The bezels of wisdom*, London and New York 1980; Nasrollah Pourjavady, The notion of the breath (*nafas*) in Hallāḡ, *Persica* 17 (2001), 85–90; ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Qāshānī, *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-karīm li-l-Shaykh al-Akbar al-‘Arīf bi-llāh al-‘allāma Muḥyī l-Dīn*, ed. Muṣṭafā Ghālib, Beirut 1399/1979; ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Qāshānī, *al-Istīlāḥāt al-Şūfiyya*, ed. Muḥammad Kamāl Ibrāhīm Ja’fār, Cairo 1981; Lodovico Zamboni, *La Sura di Maria nella sapienza Islamica*, Rome 2003.

THOMAS DÄHNHARDT

## Bridge

Historic **bridges** are found throughout the Islamic world. The most common

designations reflect varying etymologies: *kubrī*, *qaṇṭara*, or *jisr* (Arabic), *köprü* (Turkish), and *pul* (Persian and Urdu). Extant bridges are almost entirely arched masonry constructions. Cantilever or beam bridges made of timber survive only in the textual record and the use of suspension bridges never seems to have spread from China farther west than Afghanistan. The traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, writing in the eighth/fourteenth century, describes a remarkable timber drawbridge over the Nile at al-Ashmūnayn (al-Ushmūnayn), but a more ubiquitous, though equally ephemeral, system for crossing waterways was the pontoon bridge: at different periods of history, the Nile, Tigris, Euphrates, and Helmand Rivers were all crossed by this method. The history of the Galata Bridge, spanning the Golden Horn in Istanbul, illustrates both the longevity of the pontoon bridge as a method of bridge construction and the requirement that it be regularly replaced. During the 857/1453 siege of Constantinople, a pontoon bridge was used to facilitate the Ottoman assault. Although Leonardo da Vinci designed a fixed bridge to cross the Horn for Sulṭān Bāyezīd II in 908/1502, it was not executed and the next bridge at this site, built in 1836 by Sulṭān Maḥmūd II, was also made with pontoons. This structure was later complemented by another pontoon bridge built at the mouth of the waterway by the mother of Sulṭān ‘Abd al-Majīd I (‘Abdūlmecid I), in 1845. The latter was replaced by a second pontoon bridge in 1863, built at the order of Sulṭān ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (‘Abdūlazīz), a third in 1875, and a fourth in 1912. After the last bridge was damaged by fire in 1992 it was replaced by a concrete structure.

Descriptions of bridges, including accounts of their construction, are to be found in the works of mediaeval authors