



## Is Allah the Shangdi, the Supreme God?

著者	Sato Minoru
journal or publication title	Cultural Reproduction on its Interface: From the Perspectives of Text, Diplomacy, Otherness, and Tea in East Asia
page range	139-164
year	2010-03-31
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10112/3383">http://hdl.handle.net/10112/3383</a>

# Is Allah the Shangdi, the Supreme God?

SATO Minoru

Translated: UMEKAWA Sumiyo

## Introduction

This paper will investigate the meaning of what could be called “the idea of the equation of Islam with Confucianism”, in which the Islamic thoughts and Confucian ideas were conceived as the same. The investigation will be done through measuring the gap between the Islamic God and *tian* 天 or *Shangdi* 上帝, the Supreme God in Confucianism on the basis of the transliterations of God within Islamic manuscripts written in Chinese. By so doing, the paper will also examine the attitudes of Chinese Muslim literati toward the translation.

It was Muslims living in Nanjing and Yunnan who were central figures during pre-modern periods to cover themselves with the production of Islamic materials in Chinese. They spoke Chinese as their mother tongues and believed Islam. It was certainly Chinese society where they lived, in which Muslim was minority. What sorts of problems they faced when they tried to express their own belief in Chinese amongst such circumstances? How the confrontation of Confucianism and Islam within a self evolved? Through this investigation, we will keep these questions in mind, too.

Chinese Muslims started to write Islamic ideas in Chinese from the middle of seventeenth century. *Zhengjiao Zhenquan* 正教真詮 (The Real Commentary on True Teaching; 1642, Nanjing) by Wang Daiyu 王岱輿, which this paper will deal with, is one of the earliest material of the kind. About forty years prior to the compilation of the text, Matteo Ricci (利瑪竇), belonging to the Society of Jesus, wrote *Tianzhu Shiyi* 天主實義 (The True Meaning of Lord of Heaven). In order to make matters clearer, the paper firstly surveys on the translation by Ricci and its problems.

*The True Meaning of Lord of Heaven* by Ricci renders the Creator, or the Dominator of heaven and earth, and all things as “*Tianzhu* 天主”. One of the earliest usage of this particular term can be found in *Shiji* 史記 (Records of the Historian), as one of the “*bashen* 八神, eight deities”. However, it is too underestimating to adopt this term indicating one of the eight deities for the Creator who should be only and sole existence. Moreover, the term had seemingly not used as an ordinary word after the *Records of Historian*. Under these circumstances, the term *Tianzhu* in Ricci’s translation could have been newly created to indicate “Lord which art in heaven”, rather than following the instance in the *Records of Historian*<sup>1)</sup>. It can be considered that generating a new term *Tianzhu* would have acted as a manifestation of the idea which had not existed in China. However, in order to make a nonexistent new idea understood, one has to explain it through existent concepts. Thus, *The True Meaning of Lord of Heaven* gives *tian* 天 (Heaven, Nature) and *Shangdi* 上帝 (Lord of High) as instances, and explains that the *tian* here is not the visible one indicating the sky in terms of heaven and earth, but that it corresponds with Chinese *Shangdi*. The text claims that it is the *Shangdi* seen in classics such as *Shijing* 詩經 (Classic of poetry), *Zhouyi* 周易 (Classic of changes), *Liji* 禮記 (Records of ritual) and *Shangshu* 尚書 (Venerated documents) and thus nothing to do with *Taiji* 太極 (Great Ultimate) or *li* 理 (principle) in Neo-Confucianism. After all, Christianity was identified to be a teaching close to Confucianism (Chapter 2 in *The True Meaning of Lord of Heaven*).

Nonetheless, there are some gaps between *Tianzhu* in the usage of Ricci and *Shangdi* and *tian* in Chinese usages. Firstly, *Shangdi* and *tian* rarely have nature of being the Creator. Secondly, the Creator and the created creatures are unmistakably distinguished in Christianity. Meanwhile, *Shangdi* and *tian* are undistinguishable from the created beings, since it is on one hand a cosmic order and an activity principle, on the other hand, however, it is also an internal command existed within the all beings. Concerning inseparability, it is the third gap that Chinese did not conceive the visible sky and the *tian* as the cosmic order and the

---

1) It is also said that this is an influence from Japanese translation. See Chen Yin 陳贇, “*Kirisuto Kyō Yōgo “Tenshu” ni Tuite—Sono Seiritu ni tuite no Kōsatu* 基督教用語「天主」について—その成立についての考察 (About the Term “*Tianzhu*” for Christianity—The Survey on Its Formation”. In *Kokubungaku* 国文学 (Japanese Literature). Vol.90号, 2006). In either case, the term could not have been familiar to the ears of current Chinese.

activity principle differently, because both of them were expressed identically as *tian*. Fourthly, *tian* is *wuxin* 無心 (without heart) and thus it does not attempt to do anything intentionally. Meanwhile, the Creator in Christianity does have clear will. Finally, *Shangdi* is not the sole being, although it is the highest being. On the other hand, the Creator in Christianity is the only and sole being. Confucians who tried to keep out the Christianity tilted with the above mentioned points. Similarly, Yunqi Zhuhong 雲棲祿宏, a Buddhist monk, criticized the Christianity by saying that if *Tianzhu* were the *Shangdi*, there is no need to mission the Christianity in China again, since it would indicate that the Christian Creator had already been recognized in China in the old days.

### 1. How to transliterate and how to interpret the God in Islam?

Meanwhile *The True Meaning of Lord of Heaven* puts *Tianzhu* for the Creator, Chinese materials on Islam transliterate the God as “*Zhenzhu* 真主 (True Lord)”, “*Zhenzai* 真宰 (True Ruler)”, “*Zhuzai* 主宰 (Lord Ruler)” or “*zhu* 主 (Lord)”. Amongst these, the one which is used the most is *Zhenzhu*, the True Lord. In terms of the meanings in dictionary, *Zhenzhu* is a common noun to designate a wise lord or the emperor. Thus, it is apparently an Islamic characteristic to employ this particular term for the implication of the god at the highest rank. Meanwhile, *Zhenzai* of which fountainhead is in *Zhuangzi* 莊子 and *Zhuzai* which is originated in *Xunzi* 荀子 are the terms to indicate the ruler of the heaven and the earth or the administer of all the things and beings. Differently from *Tianzhu* or *Zhenzhu*, *Zhenzai* and *Zhuzai* originally contained nuances of ruler-ship. In addition, Islamic people do not use a word meaning the sky, when they indicate their God. After all, God in Islam was originally not connected with the sky.

Now, we will take *Zhenjiao Zhenquan* 正教真詮 (The Real Commentaries on the True Teachings; 1642. Nanjing) by Wang Daiyu 王岱輿, *Qingzhen Zhinan* 清真指南 (The Islamic Compass; 1683. Yunnan) by Ma Zhu 馬注 and *Tianfang Dianli* 天方典禮 (The Rites of Islam; 1709. Nanjing) by Liu Zhi 劉智, amongst the representative writings by Chinese Muslims. The paper will outline how they explained the god and how they understood the Chinese traditional ideas such as *tian* and *Shangdi*.

#### 1 In the case of Wang Daiyu 王岱輿

Wang Daiyu’s *The Real Commentaries on the True Teachings* translates God

as *Zhenzhu* 真主 in the chapter of *zhenyi* 真一 at the beginning<sup>2)</sup>. The text begins by stating as follows: “*Zhenzhu* is the only sole [beings] and there is nothing comparable. It does not have the beginning, it originally existed and it exists without commands.” In comparison with the fact that *Zhenzhu* is *zhiyi* 止一 (which indicates the sole being completely transcendent over this whole world), the later part of the chapter further mentions as follows; “Although it is said that *Taiji* 太極 engendered *liangyi* 兩儀 (i.e. *yin* 陰 and *yang* 陽), and *liangyi* engendered *sixiang* 四象 (four forms), this *Taiji* is countable number, one. Although it is also said that the foundation which is one brings about many other phenomena and many rules result in one foundation, this foundation which is one is also countable number, one. It is also said that *wuming* 無名 (the nameless) is the beginning of the heaven and the earth while *yuming* 有名 (the named) is a mother of all things and beings. Yet, these are also countable number, ones.” It indicates that the conception for the origin of all the things and beings seen in *Zhouyi* 周易 (The Book of Change), *songxue* 宋学 (Song Learning), Buddhism and Daoism is the one in terms of number (i.e. the countable one which is the being still linked with this world). It further designates that such traditional concept is inferior to the idea of *Zhenzhu*.

Moreover, Wang Daiyu confutes in the chapter for *sizhen* 似真 (Similar with Islam) by taking the ideas of Confucianism as a similar teachings with Islam. First, he criticizes *tian* and *Shangdi*. He claims that it is strange that the two rulers exist, by taking *Shangshu* 尚書 (The Book of Documents) and the Book of Change. (The following paragraphs are made by the author.)

*The Book of Documents* states “[one has to] respectfully follow the *haotian* 昊天 (the Great *tian*) and properly serve for *Shangdi* everyday”. But what would be answered if one asks where that great *tian* emerges from and where *Shangdi* comes from. There is yet no generally accepted opinion. Probably, classics would have been ruined at the event of burning

---

2) There is another term to indicate the god in *The Real Commentaries on the True Teachings*, which is *zhenyi* 真一. According to Jin Yijiu 金宜久. *Wang Daiyu Sixiang Yanjiu* 王岱輿思想研究 (The Study of the Thoughts of Wang Daiyu). *Minzu Chubanshe* 民族出版社, 2008年, *Zhenzhu* is the god as the object of belief, whereas *Zhenyi* is the god as the object of ideology. Thus, when the text discusses about the attributes of the god, it is *Zhenyi* to be used. Also, while the god as a Creator is represented by the term *Zhenzhu*, the god manifests itself is called *Zhenyi*. *Ibid.* pp262~271. Although this paper did not deal with this matter, it is the point we should discuss.

books on the Chinese classics and burying Confucian scholars alive carried out by Qin dynasty. Although Confucians during the Song dynasty made a great effort at collecting the remained classics, they seemingly cut and added onto texts. Perhaps, the whole pictures of Xiao 堯, Shun 舜, Zhou Gong 周公 Zhou Gong and Kongzi 孔子 had not become clear.

In addition, people in the East region regard *the Book of Change* as the ancestor of literature and make use of its theory when they observe a person, which, however, does not theorem neither. This is the reason people who study it often have different theories. For instance, [*Qiangua* 乾卦 (Hexagram Qian) means] “the Great Qian supervises the *tian*” and [*Shuoguzhuan* 說卦傳 (Remarks on certain trigrams) explains this hexagram as] “the sovereign and the father”. On the other hand, [the same *Remarks*] also says “*di* comes from *Zhengua* 震卦 (Hexagram Zhen)”. For this statement, Ziyangshi 紫陽氏 (i.e. Zhu xi 朱熹) interprets as “*di* is the Ruler of the heaven and the earth”. After all, there is no collective view on this part, although this is an important section. The truth is only one. If there are two truths, one of them is not right. If the understandings mentioned above were both right, it would mean that there are two rulers. Which on earth is right?

The first paragraph inquires the indistinctness of origin of *Haitian* and *Shangdi*, which apparently links with the statement “The truth is only one. If there are two truths, one of them is not right.” in the following paragraph. In other words, it is a criticism against the existence of two ideas of *Haitian* and *Shangdi*. It is, however, noteworthy that this part only points out that *tian* and *Shangdi* cannot stand in row. *Tian* and *Shangdi* themselves are not denied here. The focus of disapproval in this paragraph is put on the disagreement of opinions. In connection with this matter, Wang Daiyu’s view on history is important. He considers that thoughts of so-called Chinese sages were not clear. He thinks it is directly because *The Book of Documents* (Or *Shijing* 詩經 (Book of Poetry) were burned at the event of burning Chinese classics and burying Confucian scholars alive, and is indirectly due to these classics were biased by the scholars on Song Studies. Such concept of his can be understood further understood as follows: If there had not been the event of burning Chinese classics and burying Confucian scholars alive, or if Confucians during the Song dynasty could have restored the teachings of ancient sages into original state, there would not have been “two”

“rulers”, at least. It seems that Wang Daiyu does not conceive the event of burying books and burying Confucians important. This assumption can be carried out by the instance mentioned in the second paragraph for *The Book of Change*. According to him, the problem of whether the Ruler is Qian (as Qian represents the *tian*) or *di* comes from the comments by Zhuxi who interpreted and stated that “*di* is the ruler of the heaven and the earth”, rather than from the internal inconsistency in *The Book of Change* it self. After all, through the relationship between *Taiji* 太極 (the term appears in *Jicizhuan* 繫辭傳 (Appended Remarks) in *The Book of Change*) regarded as the source of universe and the *Shangdi*, Wang Daiyu points his critical spear on the cosmic theory amongst the Song studies in which they regard the *Taiji* as *li* 理. In the following parts, he states as such;

If *Shangdi* was delivered from *Taiji*, it indicates that *Taiji* is ranked superior to *Shangdi*.

Then, why we should serve for *Shangdi*, instead of for *Taiji*? And if one says that *Shangdi* is the *Taiji*, what is the source of the idea? Could it be possible that ancient people hid such theory and did not transmit?

Also, there are many people who regard *Taiji* as *li*, and the comments on *Taijitu* 太極圖 (Figure of *Taiji*) says “*li* is not a material”. Without *li*, there would be no materials. This is why Zhou Dunyi 周敦頤 believed *li* is the source of materials<sup>3</sup>). *Li* indeed exists in advance of materials. However, it cannot be independent and invariably depends on something. It is as if the meaning and concepts of writings have already existed in one’s mind before they are written on the paper, but a person who completes the composition of the meanings and concepts by imagining them is always necessary. Thus, *Taiji* is the *li* of the heaven and earth and all the things created by the *Zhenzhu*, the True Ruler, and after its creation, the heaven and earth and all the things started to form their shapes.

Firstly, he proves *Taiji* and *Shangdi* cannot stand in row. The shift of themes from *tian* to *Taiji* parallels with historical changes in theories, from Cheng Mingdao 程

---

3) It is seemingly that this discourse does not directly indicate Zhou Dunyi. These two phrases, however, are found in the second chapter of *The True Meaning of Lord of Heaven* by Ricci. Here, Ricci criticizes the idea of the Song Studies which regards *taiji* which is equivalent with *li* is the source of every being. Moreover, he also makes the same criticism with Wang Daiyu about *Shangdi*. Therefore, it is highly possible that Wang Daiyu has read *The True Meaning of Lord of Heaven*.

明道's idea of "tian is li" to Zhu Shi's "Taiji is li". The beginning part saying "Shangdi is delivered from Taiji" comes from *Appended Remarks of The Book of Change*, which says "therefore, Change (易) contains Taiji, which engenders Liangyi, which engenders sixiang, which engenders Bagua 八卦 (Eight Trigrams)". Since Eight Trigrams (one of which is Hexagram Zhen) is delivered from Taiji after several steps, that the Hexagram Zhen engenders Shangdi surely indicates that Shangdi comes out from Taiji. And if so, it is strange to serve for Shangdi instead of Taiji. Here, Wang Daiyu denies the existence of the supreme beings in relationship with Shangdi and Taiji. It is, however, the denial of the supremeness of Shangdi, but not the existence of Shangdi itself. The following statements do not deny the existence of Taiji itself, either. Here, he refuses to understand Taiji as li and to conceive the idea to see the li as the source of every thing. To say more strictly, he does approve to see Taiji as li, but opposes to view li as the ruler of everything.

How can we understand his point of view from the history of thought? Owing to the proclamation by the Song studies to regard tian or Taiji as li, features of ruler-ship, absoluteness and transcendent-ness surrounding tian or Taiji were removed. Thus, the ground of existence was established within individual self. According to Mizoguchi Yuzo, "that tian is li means that cosmic natural phenomena which include events in the human world exist in a certain rules, which is a new concept of cosmic nature recognized by human rationalism<sup>4)</sup>". He further states its significance as "to have made an aspect of ruler-ship in tian, in other words the idea of law, come to the fore by avoiding its aspects of "authority", "commanding", "transcendent" and "absoluteness".<sup>5)</sup>" Meanwhile that Wang Daiyu acknowledges Taiji as li indicates that he further sets up an absolute being with law, although he regards the law is by itself immanent in each self. Before the Song dynasty, tian was surely considered as ruling, absolute and transcendent being. This is why Wang Daiyu criticized Confucians during the Song dynasty, by recalling the ideas of sages, such as Yao and Shun. Nonetheless, the tian before the Song dynasty and what Wang Daiyu calls God have decisive differences. If human rulers do not govern righteously, tian reprimands them by causing the

---

4) Mizoguchi Yuzo 溝口雄三, Ito Takayuki 伊東貴之, Murata Yujiro 村田雄二郎. *Chūgoku toiuShiza* 中国という視座 (The Viewpoint called China). Heibonsha 平凡社, 1995. p. 11.

5) *Ibid.* p.44.



natural disasters and so forth so that they can inspect their policies and change them for the better. In other worlds, *tian* concerns about this human world. On the other hand, what Wang Daiyu calls the god does not have anything to do with this world, as having been mentioned. Here, we come across with his delicate matters. Wang Daiyu does not fully deny the supreme beings like *Haitian* and *Shangdi* respected by ancient sages, though he refuses to see them identical with the god. This is the reason he does not employ the word “*tian*” for the transliteration of the god, differently from Christian translators.

## 2 In the case of Ma Zhu

Now we will see the Ma Zhu’s case. First of all, it should be noted that Ma Zhu also transliterate the god as “*Zhenzhu* 真主” in his *The Islamic Compass*<sup>6)</sup>. He also uses the term *Zhuzai* which, however, is used to mean “to preside over”. Citing the poem of Muslim knowledgeable man in the first *juan* 卷, *The Islamic Compass* starts its main arguments from the second *juan*. At the beginning of the second *juan*, the text explains the teachings of Islam. The thirteenth passage in the explanation shows an interesting dialogue. Heard that the human beings started from Adam, a man asks a question; Why people has been divided into *hui* 回 (Islam) and *Han* 漢 (Chinese teachings), although the origin of human beings was one? For this question, the text answers as follows.

Since the creation of the heaven and the earth, along with the growth of population, teaching has spread over the four directions. The farther it spread, the more differently it was understood. Thus, people were divided into those who follow and those who go against. It depends on if those people are wise or not. Wise men always act righteously and in a dignified manner, whereas unwise men are unfair and vulgar. As this place is located several ten thousands *li* East from Tianfang 天房 (Mecca), it was eight thousands years after the Adam when Fu Xi 伏羲 started to educate people. Why should we suppose that people before the Fu Xi were all ignorant and that it is only after Fu Xi that people here started to establish teachings? Although before the birth of Fu Xi, the right teaching had become unclear, there had been a teaching to serve for *Shangdi*, which is similar to Islam. Nonetheless, due to the emergence of *xuan* 玄 (Daoism)

---

6) The number of usages is as follow; *Zhenzhu* (27), *Zhenzai* (2), and *Zhuzai* (7).

and *shi* 稊 (Buddhism), *Shangdi* became not to be considered. Then, Buddhist started to call their Buddha as *zun* 尊 (noble).

Although it is unclear the situation in which if at the time of Fu Xi there had been a teaching to serve for *Shangdi* which is similar to Islam by chance, or if the teaching had been transmitted from Islam, there had been a teaching analogous to Islam, which is equivalent with *sizhen* mentioned in *The Real Commentaries on the True Teachings* by Wang Daiyu. Ma Zhu, however, puts the two lined commentary for this term *Shangdi* to say that *Shangdi* in Daoism and Buddhism share the same name with *Shangdi* in *The Book of Poetry* and *The Book of Documents*, although they are different in contents. Identical with Wang Daiyu, Ma Zhu points out that the act to serve for *Shangdi* is resemble to Islamic teaching, however, he seemingly values Confucian ideas of *Shangdi* affirmatively, by denying Daoist and Buddhist ideas of it. It is, nonetheless, unclear how Ma Zhu understood *Shangdi*. This matter will be revealed in details in the following third *juan*. According to *Xiaojing* 孝經 (Classic of Filial Piety), Zhou Gong 周公 respected the progenitor of the state Zhou, Houji 后稷, and thus he worshipped Houji along with *tian*, at the same time, he worshipped his father Wen Wang along with *Shangdi* in Mingtang 明堂. For this statement in the classic, Ma Zhu mentions as follows.

On one hand, the text says *tian*, while on the other hand, it says *Shangdi*. However, *tian* and *Shangdi* are not the same. *Tian* is what is created and what is created belongs to *youxing* 有形 (what has a form). *Di* is who create (which is said 行造之主 in the original text) and the Creator is *wusheng* 無聲 (the soundless). The soundless is *you* 有 (being) without start, whereas what has a form is being with start. Being without start can create being with start, while being with start cannot create what does not have start. I suppose that being without start can create all the things amongst the heaven and the earth, and the heaven and the earth are stabilized by those what does not have start. It can make all the things under a realm changed, and a nation decays and rises because of it. It is also capable to nourish every animal, and animals are able to perceive owing to it. It also holds a power of life and death over every being, and life exists and vanishes because of it. It also rewards and punishes over every goodness and badness, and right and wrong are praised and looked down upon due to it.

Here, Ma Zhu regards *Shangdi* as something without the beginning, which one cannot grasp with sense or consciousness. Furthermore, this passage shows that he supposes it to have created the heaven and the earth, control the fate of the state, nourish the animals, hold the power of human nature and life, and reward and punish human activities. It is, at a glance, the god<sup>7)</sup>. On the other hand, he understands *tian* as something to have been created. Yet, Ma Zhu explores further. Conceiving *Shangdi* as the Creator, he additionally examines its relationship with *tian* by taking *The Book of Change*, which is also referred by Wang Daiyu, as an instance. The content of Ma's investigation is almost the same with Wang Daiyu's criticism. In brief, the hexagram Zhen is a part of *Taiji*. Since the *Shangdi* is born from this very hexagram, *Shangdi* should be positioned after the *tian* (i.e. *houtian* 後天) and it cannot have anything to do with the change from *wuji* 無極 to *Taiji*, which precedes the hexagram Zhen. Thus, who on earth is able to make this change happen, is his conclusion for this matter<sup>8)</sup>. As seen above, *Shangdi* cannot be the *Zhuzai*, the Lord Ruler, when we understand it in the context of *The Book of Change*. This is why Ma Zhu investigates about *tian* again.

At the beginning of this third *juan*, Ma Zhu claims that if one reads *Zhongyong* 中庸 (The Doctrine of the Mean), one can think *ming* 命 over from

---

7) In the edition made from the wooden carved, two letters to form *Shangdi* stick out, which are dealt with as equally as *zhenzhu*.

8) In comparison with the criticism of *The Book of Change* by Wang Daiyu we have discussed above, it becomes clear that Ma Zhu's arguments develops and explores that of Wang Daiyu. However, different from Wang Daiyu, Ma Zhu thinks highly of the Song Studies at the point that they revived Confucianism. The ninth passage in the second *juan* points out that Buddhism and Daoism have gained power because Confucianism has never explained about the pre and posthumous matters. It further criticizes Buddhism and Daoism (on the points, for instance, that they renounce the world and do not render the filial piety for their parents), while states about the Song Studies as follows.

It was a great occurrence that Neo-Confucianism during the Song dynasty emerged to make the supreme way clear and to keep ignorant teachings away. Unfortunately, however, *Mingming* 明命 (Bright Order) of *Zhenzhu* (i.e. the god) nor the truth revealed by *Zhisheng* 至聖 (The Supreme Sage, i.e. Muhammad) have not been transmitted yet.

The point which should be valued for the Song Studies is that they have kept the Buddhism and Daoism, which are ignorant teachings, away, at the first place. Then what does "to make the supreme way clear" indicate? Although there would be several possibilities, one amongst it could be that the idea of "*Tian* is *li*", of which phrase is quoted in the following discussion.

the point of *xing* 性, understand *tian* from *ming*, and think about *zhu*, because of the *tian*. This claim of his comes from the following statements seen in the classics; Confucius at the age of fifty knew his “*tianming* 天命 (Providence) and said “it is no use for praying once one received a sin from *tian*” (*Lunyu* 論語 (Analects)); Zi Si 子思, the grandson of Confucius mentions in *The Doctrine of the Mean* that “It is called *xing* 性 which is an command from *tian*”, “[The way of the heaven and the earth...] can engender all the beings endlessly, only because it is the one”. In other words, Ma Zhu has a premise that one can recognize *zhu*, on the ground of *tian*, although it is not equivalent with the Lord. On the basis of such premise, he examines the idea of *Shangdi* which is similar with that of *tian* and concludes it is a “*zhu* to create”. Yet, it is still not the God, as there are inconsistencies when we understand *Shangdi* in different contexts. This is what we can interpret from the flow of Ma Zhu’s arguments so far.

It should be noted, however, that the term *zhu* appeared above is not the term to indicate the god. The god is persistently referred by the term *Zhenzhu* and the term *zhu* without the term *zhen* merely specifies to rule or to control, or something that rules or controls. That is to say, “think about *zhu*, because of the *tian*” means that something rules this world owing to *tian* or to conjecture the existence of such being. Therefore, “*zhu* to create” is, in the first place, not equal with the god.

Now, Ma Zhu takes up *tian* for discussion again. He says as follows;

Any of above mentioned statements does not understand the *tian* in Confucius’s word. What he called *tian* is not the one which hangs over all the beings, but the one which creates the heaven and the earth and every being. This is what Confucius said “it is no use for praying once one received a sin from *tian*”.

*Tian* in Confucius’s saying of “it is no use for praying once one received a sin from *tian*” and that in the term *tianming* which he finally understood at the age of fifty are also the one which creates the heaven and the earth and the all the beings<sup>9)</sup>. Ma Zhu further says as follows:

I suppose that there is nothing more sacred than *tian* amongst the beings that control the all the beings. There will be nothing better than *li* when it

---

9) Might “*tian* what is created” quoted above from *The Book of Filial Piety* be the *tian* in brackets which indicates that it is understood so in the context of this particular classic? The arguments around here are rather difficult to understand.

reaches the extreme. Otherwise, nothing would start even if we talked about the *ming* or *xing*, and *tainming* cannot be *xing*.

The idea of “*tian* is *li* 天者理” is an important theme which was originated in Chen Mingdao of the Northern Song dynasty, which was inherited by Zhu Xi and evaluated into that of “*xing* is *li* 性即理”. Meanwhile Wang Daiyu only accepts the theme of *Taiji* is *li*, Ma Zhu affirmatively agree with the idea of nature emerged in the Song studies. He considers that there is nothing more sacred than *tian* and higher than *li*, though *tian* is not the most supreme beings. He further states as follows;

I suppose that *Taiji* is engendered from *wuji* and thus *Taiji* is based on *wuji*. *Wuji* is a great ability while *Taiji* is the original seed for every being. The idea of “*Taiji* which is *wuji*” has become the fundamental being and *li*, after the emergence of the Song studies. Here, however, the *wuji* and *Taiji* are interpreted individually and understood as that *wuji* is “the great ability” which indicates the power of the god while the *Taiji* is the seed for everything which is created by the power. Being the power of “the god”, both the *wuji* and *Taiji* are included within the god. The structure to place the god upon *wuji* and *Taiji* and to regard *wuji* as the power of the god while doing *Taiji* as every being is indeed parallels with that of Wang Daiyu<sup>10)</sup>. After all, Ma Zhu conceives *tian* as the creator of every thing and *li* which is the rule, but he also regards the rule inferior to the god.

Having observed the arguments in the third *juan*, Ma Zhu also considers *Shangdi* as “*zhu* to create and *tian* as “*zhu* of every being” which “create the heaven and the earth and every being”. Yet, neither of *Shangdi* or *tian* is not the true *zhu*, which might be because of they have relation with this world, as Wang Daiyu suggests. Statements in this third *juan*, however, does not clearly deny that *tian* is “the true *zhu*”. On the contrary, both *Shandi* and *tian* can be interpreted as the god, if we read this without protesting.

---

10) For details, see Hori'ike Nobuo 堀池信夫. “*Mukyoku to Taikyoku—Ou Taiyo to “Muhanmado noShin-sei” 無極と太極—王岱輿と「ムハンマドの神性」—(Wuji and Taiji—Wang Daiyu and “the Numinousness of Muhammad”)*”. In *Sōgaku Seizan—Isuramu karaYōroppa made 宋学西漸—イスラムからヨーロッパまで—* (Gradual Shift of the Song Studies toward West). Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research for the periods of sixteenth to nineteenth year of Heisei. (Fundamental Studies B. Reports for the Outcome from the Research).

Then, what intentions does Ma Zhu have to bring about *Shangdi* and *tian* here?

In this third *juan*, *qiuli* 窮理 (extreme *li*), Ma Zhu assesses Confucianism and says that “Confucianism understands the reasons, but their discourses are confused”. The reasons that Confucianism understand would indicate their idea that there is a transcendent and absolute being which rules the heaven and the earth and every being. Then what Ma Zhu designates by saying “their discourses are confused”? It would indicate that Confucianism has several the ideas paralleling to the god, such as *Shangdi* and *tian*, and these are not unified. On this very point of solo and only state, *Shangdi* and *tian* are inferior to the god. That *Shangdi* and *tian* are not the god would be because of the plural existence of applicable ideas, but not of the connection with non-metaphysical realistic world of everything<sup>11</sup>.

If so, Confucianism and Islam should be understood the same if Confucians would have thought of either *Shangdi* or *tian*. In terms what “Confucianism understands the reasons, but their discourses are confused” would indicate, the distance between Islam and Confucianism is quite close.

### 3 In the case of Liu Zhi

Finally, the paper will look into the case of Liu Zhi 劉智. There are two characteristics concerning this person. Firstly, the rendition of the god, which had almost always been described as *Zhenzhu*, becomes multiple including *Zhenzai* and *Zhuzai* besides *Zhenzhu*. Secondly, he compares the god to *Shangdi* and *tian*. It is these two points that should be taken out attentions.

Concerning about the first point, *Tianfang Xingli* 天方性理 (The philosophy of Islam; 1709) employs the terms *Zhenzai* and *Zhuzai*, instead of *Zhenzhu*<sup>12</sup>. The usages of *Zhenzai* and *Zhuzai* are different in this text. While the former indicates “the situation in which the god manifests himself”, the latter signifies “the situation in which the world has not yet emerged or the god has not manifested himself”<sup>13</sup>. The usage of *Zhuzai* is thus a distinctive treatment to be used

---

11) It further indicates that it stands on the same line with the discourse to see the *Taiji* cannot be stand in a row with *Shangdi*, which is disapproved by Wang Daiyu.

12) There are three examples in the commentaries by Hei Mingfeng 黑鳴鳳 (all in the forth *juan*).

13) For details, see Aoki Takashi, Sato Minoru, Nigo Toshiharu ed. “*Yakuchū Tenhō Seili Maki no Yon*

at the matter if the god exposes himself or not. Therefore, it is uncertain if Liu Zhi's other composition than *The Principles and Nature of Islam* (including books written by other authors than Liu Zhi) also employ this particular term, *Zhuzai*, in such accord. Indeed, this term tends to be used to indicate to control, as we will see below.

In *The Rites of Islam* (1710), all the terms of *Zhenzai*, *Zhenzhu* and *Zhuzai* are employed. There are, however, differences in usages, when we examine closely. Firstly, *Zhuzai* is generally used as a verb to indicate “to control” or a noun to signify “something which controls”, as seen, for instance, in “there invariably exists *Zhenzhu* who controle (i.e. *Zhuzai*) the world” (the fifth *juan*). This term appears only once in the main text<sup>14</sup>. After all, the term *Zhuzai* is never used in a sense it contained in *The Principles and Nature of Islam* in this very text. It would be more appropriate to say that *The Rites of Islam* rarely takes the situation in which the god has not yet manifested himself into account, as this text attaches the importance on the explanations of rites, whereas *The Principles and Nature of Islam* emphasizes philosophies.

Then, what are the differences between *Zhenzai* and *Zhenzhu*? The first *juan* of *The Rites of Islam* starts with the statements which says there is only *Zhenzhu* without a form or a shape which does not occupy any place at the very beginning of the world when any of the being has not appeared. The second *juan* of the text, which is named the chapter of *Zhenzai*, explains about *Zhenzai*. The term *Zhenzhu* first appears only once in the commentary in the first *juan*, and it reappears in the double lined commentaries at the end of the second *juan* five times. From the third *juan*, the term starts to appear also in the main text which gradually takes over *Zhenzai* in terms of frequency in usage<sup>15</sup>. After the fourth *juan* on, the term

---

訳注天方性理卷四 (The Commentary on The fourth *juan* of *The Principles and Nature of Islam*). In *Chūgoku Isuramu Shisō Kenkyū* 中国伊斯兰思想研究 (Studies in Chinese Islamic Thought). Vol. 1, 2005. pp. 70~72.

14) It appears only in the third *juan*. There are two instances in the fifth and sixth *juan* in the meaning of “to control”.

15) There are three instances of *Zhenzhu* while none of *Zhenzai* in the main text. Meanwhile, there are four instances of *Zhenzhu* whereas three of *Zhenzai* in commentaries. Regardless of the contents as well as not distinguishing whether the terms appear in the main text, commentaries or double lined commentaries, the number of usages of each term can be summed up as the following graphs.

*Zhenzai* hardly appears and it becomes the term *Zhenzhu* which generally indicates the god. The first *juan* of the book talks about the origin of Islam, while the second *juan* exemplifies attributes of the god. Both *juan* can be understood as accounts from the standpoint of the god. In other words, these *juan* account the world which can be formed no matter if human beings exist or not. Meanwhile, the third *juan* deals with matters of cognition when human beings recognize the god, and the fourth *juan* explains confession of the faith by human beings. In other words, these *juan* stand on human side and concern how human view the god. The remaining *juan* after the fifth *juan* discuss the various ways of various rites, which certainly talked from the standpoint of human world. After all, it can be said that *Zhenzai* is a metaphysical rendition at the situations which are separated mainly from human, whereas *Zhenzhu* is a name in the human world where we live.

In his *Tianfang Zhesheng Shilü* 天方至聖實錄 (The Real Records of Supreme Sages of Islam: 1724), *Zhenzhu* appears the most (as the sentence such as “*Zhenzhu* remonstrates and says” appears frequently). The term *Zhenzai* is employed a little in a usage concerning about metaphysics, while *Zhuzai* hardly appears and if it appears, it indicates “to control”. Also, *Zhenjing Zhaowe* 真境昭微 (Displaying the Concealment of the Real Realm; the date of composition is unknown), which is the translation of *Lawā’ih* composed by Jāmī (d.1492) shows twelve instances of *Zhenzhu*, one example of *Zhuzai* and no *Zhenzai*.

In short, *The Principles and Nature of the Islam* uses the term *Zhuzai* and *Zhenzai* to indicate the god before and after his manifestation, when it argues about the god in the metaphysic world. It does not employ the term *Zhenzhu*. On

	卷1	卷2	卷3	卷4	卷5	卷6	卷7	卷8	卷9	卷10
<i>Zhenzai</i> 真宰	10	36	4	1	3					
<i>Zhenzhu</i> 真主	2	2	24	14	9	4	1	1	1	1
<i>Zhuzai</i> 主宰	5	1	56	13	2	1		1	1	
	卷11	卷12	卷13	卷14	卷15	卷16	卷17	卷18	卷19	卷20
真宰								5		
真主	7	9	1	13			1	6		3
主宰										

In addition, there are eleven instances of *Zhenzhu* in the latter chapter.



the other hand, the god is generally rendered as *Zhenzhu* in *The Rites of Islams* which explains rituals and other books of Liu Zhi. *Zhenzhu* is a term to indicate the god in ordinary usage, whereas *Zhenzai* is the word used in the arguments concerning about the property of the god. At the time of compilation of *The Principles and Nature of the Islam*, *Zhenzhu* has lighter connotation than *Zhenzai* which has lighter connotation than *Zhuzai*, in terms of the heaviness of nuance. In this sense, *The Rites of Islam* which relatively deals with the non-metaphysical real world is enough only with *zhenhu* and *Zhenzai*. Yet, the term *Zhuzai* is used as a general verb to mean “to control”, it indicates that Liu Zhi himself does not often use the very term as the same connotation as the word has in *The Principles and Nature of Islam*. Or perhaps, he signifies the god who does not have anything to do with this world with the term *Zhenzai*, expresses the ability of *Zhenzai* as *Zhuzai* and employs *Zhenzhu* for the manifestation of “zhen”zai’s “zhu”zai in our human world, by taking the characters from both words.

Now, we will see the second point. The third *juan* of *The Rites of Islam* starts by saying that Just like a craft work always made by craftsmen, there should be the lord creator who created this world. This *juan* investigates what or who the lord is, by comparing the Chinese ideas. The text claims that any of Laozi, Buddha, *tian* or *li* is not “true” “zhu”, although people like to compare them with it. First of all, *Zhenzhu* is not a human being. Human beings are what is created and cannot avoid life and death. *Tian* is also a created object being a companion to *di*, the earth. *Li* is the meaning attached to what is created. *Zhenzhu* surely exists, although it does not have a form or a shape, which creates the heaven and humans, and makes *li* and *qi* 气 circulated. Therefore, Laozi, Buddha, *tian* and *li* cannot be *Zhenzhu*.

Nonetheless, in the commentary at the end of the main text, Liu Zhi says as follows, by giving seventeen instances of the usage of *Shangdi* in Confucian classics such as *The Book of Document*, *The Book of Poetry*, *The Book of Change* and *Chunqiu* 春秋 (Spring and Autumn Annals), and also quoting comments by Confucians during the Song dynasty.

I suppose what *The Book of Poetry* and *The Book of Documents* call *Shangdi* could have been what Islam calls *Zhuzai* and [as written in these Confucian classics] *sanhuang wudi* 三皇五帝 (Three Augusts and Five Thearchs) hold *Shandi* in hearty awe. *Shangdi* used to have been rendered as *tian*... *Tian* would indicate *di* 帝. It does not mean the blue sky.

He regards *Shangdi* in *The Book of Poetry* and *The Book of Documents* is something comparable to *Zhuzai* in Islam. It further designates *tian* is also identical with Islamic *Zhuzai*. However, the original statements of his uses the term *you* 猶 (like, similar, as if) which withholds the decisiveness. Also, these two Chinese ideas are compared with the expression of *Zhuzai* which would not indicate the god itself in accordance with its usage in *The Rites of Islam*. In short, Liu Zhi tries to distinguish Islamic god from Chinese *Shangdi* after all, through subtle expressions. Having mentioned earlier, this comments was put at the end of the third *juan*, in a form of double lined commentary. Since it is not stated either in the main text or the single lined commentary, he declares his opinion quietly.

It could be this point in which we can observe the discourses amongst Chinese Muslim intellectuals. Islamic god is different from *Shangdi* or *tian*. The more one learns Islam through reading the original texts, at the same time, becomes familiar with Chinese traditional thoughts, the clearer the differences between them would be. The relation between the god and *Shangdi* and *tian* has already been pointed out by preachers from the Society of Jesus. It has also been pointed out by Confucians and Buddhists through discussions that there would be problems if we regard the god in the same light with *Shangdi* or *tian*. It is highly possible that Muslim intellectuals also knew such circumstances. Nonetheless, the dogmatic god and *Shangdi* and *tian* as ethos would have been conceived similar or identical for ordinary Muslims living in China. Moreover, Muslim intellectuals might also have put themselves resident in such ideological climate. If so, the complete denial of the idea to see the Islamic god similar or equivalent with *Shangdi* or *tian* would have been the rejection of self or the community including the self.

It is probably because it is in *The Rites of Islam* that Liu Zhi asserts the similarity of the Islamic god and *Shangdi* and *tian*, despite that he does know their differences. This text is an article mainly explains the daily rites. Meanwhile *The Principles and Nature of Islam* exclusively discusses about the philosophy on the basis on the theory of creation of the all the beings. Therefore, close examination of the god is evolved in *The Principle and Nature of Islam*. Indeed, *The Principle and Nature of Islam* compiled almost spontaneously with *The Rites of Islam* does not bring up the similarity between the god and *Shangdi* and *tian*. In this aspect, *The Rites of Islam* is a book written to point to ordinary Muslims.

No matter what intentions Liu Zhi has, one whose mother tongue is Chinese

would understand that Islamic god is identical with what Confucians call *Shangdi* by reading above statements. He further states as follows.

However, the nature of *di* is not explained in details, and after the Confucius and Mencius, people only called it as *tian* rather than *di*. For this very reason, undistinguished and unwise people took it for granted that *tian* is real sky, without achieving the supreme height of reason of *di*...It was only the Song dynasty that the meaning of *tian* and *di* became clear when Chen Yichuan says “*di* is the *Zhuzai*, the ruler of *tian*. It is called as *tian* in regard of it having a shape, while it is called as *di* in terms that it rules.” Ma Zhu’s evaluation of Confucians in the Song dynasty, saying “[they had] made the supreme way clear<sup>16)</sup>” should have included Chen Yichuan’s view on *tian*.

What is important is that it was considered that China in ancient time represented by *The Book of Poetry* and *The Book of Documents* also had the idea of god similar to that in Islam. Ma Zhu also recognized this notion, but it was Liu Zhi who states it more clearly. This is extremely well expressed in this preface for *The Principle and Nature of Islam* in which he mentions “I was hit upon the fact that Islamic articles are the same with the teaching of Confucius and Mencius.”

## 2. The Discourse to See Islam and Confucianism Identical and That to See They Have the Same Origin

Although the indication of similarity between Islam and Confucianism has already existed at the time of Wang Daiyu, it was mainly concerned about the morality and ethics. For instance, Wang Daiyu says in the chapter for *Wenda Jiyan* 問答紀言 (Note of Words in Catechism) of his *The Real Commentaries on the True Teachings*, that “Since *xiushen* 修身 (moral training), *qijia* 齊家 (setting the household right) and *zhiguo* 治國 (ruling the state) in the way of Confucius and Mencius are the same with our teaching, there is no need to argue recklessly about the right and wrong of them”. Ma Zhu also states in the eighth *juan* of *The Islamic Compass*, that “There is no difference between the teachings of Islam and Confucianism. Although only five pillars consisted of *ren* 認 (Confession of faith), *li* 禮 (divine service), *zhai* 齋 (fasting), *ji* 濟 (donation) and *you* 遊 (pilgrimage) would have some Islamic tastes, others are identical. Both teachings do not make

---

16) See the footnote number 8 above.

practitioners not to get married to abandon the human ethics, let them to shave beard, moustache and hairs, or prohibit meat-eating, as Daoism and Buddhism do.” However, it is peculiar of Liu Zhi who clearly states that Islam and Confucianism share the similar ideas of god. Declared that not only the ideas of morality and ethics, but also the concept of god are almost equivalent, there would hardly be differences between Islam and Confucianism. Then, however, there would be no need to explain the Islamic thoughts in Chinese deliberately. Thus, the concept to see the Islam and Confucianism equivalent confronts Muslim the matter of their identities.

The foundation of this concept to regard the Islam and Confucianism equal is the idea that these two teachings had the same origin in which Islam and Confucianism are considered to have been the same at the very ancient time or at the periods of Confucius and Mencius. Such ideas to regard Islam and Confucianism sharing the same origin or to see them equal transmit to the later Muslims. For instance, in the preface written by Yu Jie 俞楷 for *The Principles and Nature of Islam* Yu Jie states “I only love the knowledge of Islam, of which studies are completely irreconcilable with the Buddhism, while of which philosophy agrees with Zhou Lianchi 周濂溪 in its depth.” Similarly, the preface by Lu You 鹿祐 for *The Rites of Islam* says “The teaching of Islam is not strange at all, which agrees with the teachings of Chinese sages in its reasons or ways for men to proceed”. Moreover, the preface by Ma Anli (1859) for *Sidian Yaohui* 四典要会 (Essence of Four Canons) mentions as follows.

In the first place, the great Dao, the Way has originally comes from *tian* and people have worshipped *tian* and associated with *tian* by following it since the age of Yao and Shun. ... [What this texts says] “the great ability is in perfect harmony” is just the same with [what *The Book of Poetry* and *The Doctrine of the Mean* say] “there is no sound or smell in the upper *tian*”. Also “angels represent” is equal with [that *The Doctrine of the Mean* states] “the labor of *guishen* 鬼神 (spiritual beings) act upon all the beings”, while “to respect and awe *Zhenzai*” is the same with [*The Book of Poetry*’s] “to serve for *Shangdi* visibly” and [*The Book of Documents*’s] “to reflect the [*tian*’s] clear order on oneself.”

Ma Anli (and probably his teacher, Ma Dexin 馬德新 as well) considers god identical with *tian* and *Shangdi*. Moreover, in the preface (1878) for *Zhutian Dazan jijie* 祝天大贊集解 (Variorum to the Great Compliment of Blessing *Tian*)

by A Rifu 阿日孚, he starts writing that “Confucianism and Islam are the different streams sharing the same origin, people have been regarding the respect for *tian* as the first principle, since the ages of Fu Xi, Yao and Shun”<sup>17</sup>). At the latter half of this preface, he exposes the grief of his teacher, Ma Dexin.

Incompetent scholars and people with less discernment stick to the form when they concern about *tian* and do not understand the ruler-ship when they concern about *li*. This is why they regard Islam as heresy, turn it away and take no notice of it. On the other hand, Muslim people often follow old and surface costumes, forget about the reasons of supreme height and call *Zhenzhu* by the name of *tian* in order to avoid the use of real name

---

17) Ma Anli goes on to mention as follows.

...Although there have been several books for our teachings so far, they were either knowing Islamic canon very well but not knowing Confucian reasons well, or having read Confucian texts but having read Islamic canons. About a thousand years after [the birth of Islam], the Liu Jielian in Jinliang 金陵 (today's Nanjing) has composed a book.. The content of ideas are subtle, the words contains expansion and it unifies the Islam and Confucianism into the one teaching. He is exactly the genius of East and West. There are also Wang Daiyu and Mazhu both of who have written books. However, their choices are not enough and their statements are not detailed. As for *Teachings on Keys of Slowness and Swiftiness* and its kinds, words and sentences are obscene and thus these are not adequately called books. As for *Huihui Yuanlai* 回回原来 (The Place Where Islam Come from) and *Qingzhen Zhengxue* 清真正学 (The True Study of Islam) and their kinds, these are merely reckless remarks based on the self-righteousness and they are nonsense without any ground...

Here, we can observe his claims that it is necessary to have the knowledge on Islam(Arabic and Persian languages) as well as that on Confucianism (Chinese language) as if they were pair of wheels; Liu Zhi's work is the best amongst successive works on Islam and Wang Daiyu and Ma Zhu's works follow his. (This can be an evidence that Ma Dexin and Ma Anli also value the creations of abridged editions of *The Real Commentary on True Teaching* and *The Islamic Compass*); Criticism on the circulation of books which are not able to call the books adequately and etc. This discourse of Ma Anli could have been a moment to make Wang Daiyu, Ma Zhu, Liu Zhi and Ma Anli's teacher, Ma Dexin called Four Great Chinese Muslim Intellectuals in the later periods.

It is Ma Boliang's *Teachings on Keys of Slowness and Swiftiness* which is disapproved here, though the book in question is the torchbearer for the activities of translation during the periods from the end of the Ming to the Early Qing, as the paper will discuss later. Also, Liu Zhi has visited Ma Boliang in Ji'nan to ask for teachings. Thus, he should have given certain influences on Liu Zhi concerning about the translation job. It is what Ma Boliang himself recognizes that “the words and sentences are obscene as criticized by Ma Anli. However, when we consider what this book and this person played in history, Ma Anli's disapproval is too cruel. Or was there any other elements that made Ma Anli to state “not being adequately called a book”?

of god. They do not know that *tian* is after all the *Zhenzhu* and *Zhenzhu* is after all *Shangdi*.

It is interesting that common Muslims avoid the real name of *Zhenzhu* and use the term *tian* instead. It not only shows that *Zhenzhu* has become established as the term to designate the god, but also indicates by the fact they employ the term *tian* for *Zhenzhu* that people do compare *Zhenzhu* with *tian*<sup>18)</sup>, no matter if Ma Anli (and Ma Dexin) do criticism and correction or not<sup>19)</sup>. It is apparent that such conception to regard Islam and Confucianism equivalent firmly permeated even after the start of the twentieth century<sup>20)</sup>.

Explanation of Islamic ideas in Chinese language started by distinguishing it from Confucianism like Wang Daiyu and Ma Zhu did. Especially in the case

---

18) The criticism by Ma Anli is probably for that people regard *Zhenzhu* as identical with blue sky. However, considering the multiple meaning contained in the letter *tian*(*tian* as the blue sky, as the Ruler and as the principles and rules), it could be greatly possible that *tian* representatively called by people for *zhenzhu* has contained the same meaning that what Ma Anli claims as *tian*.

19) Li Yuhua 李興華 and al. ed. *Zhongguo Isilan Jiaoshi* 中国伊斯兰教史 (The History of Chinese Islam). (Zhongguo Shehuixue Chubanshe 中国社会科学出版社. 1998年) explains this *Variorum to the Great Compliment of Blessing Tian* as follows.

The greatest characteristic of *Variorum to the Great Compliment of Blessing Tian* is to have transliterate what Islam calls *zhenzhu* into *tian*... It was only the scholars on Islam who obey the Qing government, such as Ma Fuchu 馬復初 and Ma Anli 馬安礼, to translate *Zhenzhu* as *tian*... *Zhenquan Yaolü* 真詮要錄 (The Pivotal Records on Real Commentaries) and *Zhinan Yaoyan* 指南要言 (The Pivotal Words for Compass) are the arrangement of the representative works by Wang Daiyu, Ma Zhu and Liu Zhi. Regardless of the matter how far these arranged books correspond with their originals, still we have to say that the aim of arrangements was related with political requirement to pander to Qing government. (*Ibid.*pp. 593 ~ 594.)

Although it would have been true that there were political requirements, it was an outcome of tendency started before or after Liu Zhi to regard the god as *tian* or *Shangdi*, and thus it was not an attitude quite unexpected. Moreover, it can be observed that at least by the time of the compilation of *Variorum to the Great Compliment of Blessing Tian*, such conception has rooted amongst people.

20) Matumoto Masumi 松本ますみ. ““Kindai” no Shōgeki to Unnan Musurimu Chishikijin—Sonzai Yisse Ron no Huhe Shisisō kara Kindai Kokka Kikaku no Esunikku Aidentitī he <近代>の衝撃と雲南ムスリム知識人—存在一性論の普遍思想から近代国家規格のエスニック・アイデンティティへ (The Impact of “Modern” and Muslim Intellectuals in Yunnan—From the Universal Thoughts of the Idea of Single Nature of Existence to the Ethnic Identity in Modern National Standard)”. In Reports of the Symposium for the Cooperative Studies of the Institutes for Human Culture. *Ūrashia to Nihon—Kyōkai no Keisei to Ninshiki* ユーラシアと日本—境界の形成と認識 (Eurasia and Japan—The Formation and Recognition of Borders). 2008.

of Wang Daiyu, it was the strict refusal of other teachings. When we consider the impact that he discourse which can be said to have been “discovered” by Liu Zhi to see Islam and Confucianism sharing the same origin or equivalent on later periods, what Liu Zhi has done could be “an incident” rather than “a discovery”.

### 3. The Viewpoint for Transliteration

What makes Liu Zhi to “discover” that Islam and Confucianism have the same origin? Now, we will think about the matter of translation. As well known, Qur’ān, the holy book of Islam is the revelation of god given to Muhammad, and it has been considered that it should not be translated as it was given in Arabic. Therefore, the translation of this holy book is done through an expedient that translation is a commentary<sup>21)</sup>. As the translation of Qur’ān has been dogmatically restricted, the statements about the Islamic thoughts in Chinese started in a form of writing depending on holy books such as Qur’ān and Hadīth. Most parts of Wang Daiyu and Ma Zhu’s works are their writings, although there are a few translated sentences. Meanwhile, Liu Zhi translates *Lawā’ih* by Jāmī (d.1492) under the title of *Displaying the Concealment of the Real Realm and The Real Records of Supreme Sages of Islam* is considered as the transliteration of the biography of Muhammad by Kāzarūnī. In addition, main texts of *The Rites of Islam* is also said to be the translation of “*Tianfang Lifa Shu* 天方礼法書 (The Book of Methods for Rites in Islam)”<sup>22)</sup>.

What would interest us is the view point of Liu Zhi toward transliteration. For instance, in the explanatory notes for *The Rites of Islam*<sup>23)</sup>, it says that “This

---

21) It was the sixteenth year of Minguo (1927) when the whole translation of Qur’ān was published in China. The translator is a Han Chinese named Tie Zheng 鉄铮 and the book is not directly translated from Arabic original but it was a secondhand translation, under the title of *Kelan Jing* 可蘭經, from Japanese translation by our Sakamoto Kenichi 坂本健一 (entitled as *Kōran Kyō* コーラン經 (Sutra of Coran)). Since Sakamoto’s translation itself is a secondhand translation from Rodwell’s English transliteration, Chinese version is indeed a third-hand translation. The genuine whole translation from Arabic original was *Gulan Jing Shijie* 古蘭經訳解 (Translation and Explanation for Coran) by Wang Jingzhai 王静齋, which was completed in the twenty first year of Minguo (1932). The title of Wang Jingzhai’s translation considers that this book is commented by Qur’ān.

22) In accordance with the self preface in *The Rites of Islam*.

23) *Lieyan* 例言 is today’s *Fanlie* 凡例, the explanatory notes. *The Principles and Nature of Islam* and *The Rites of Islam* contain *Lieyan*, whereas *The Real Records of Supreme Sages of Islam* is attached with *Fanlie*. These are not included in books by Wang Daiyu and Ma Zhu. Amongst the articles in

book is a translation into Chinese of what is originally written in Islamic language. However, there are some parts that cannot be transliterated. The parts where the original article states the facts and explains reasons can be allowed to be translated. On the other hands, personal names and location names cannot be translated”. That is to say, proper nouns such as human and location names are not possible to be transliterated, but narrations of things and events and explanations for truth are possible for translation. Similarly, the explanatory notes for *The Principles and Natures of Islam* states “All the meanings of words in this book based on Islamic canons. However, there are some parts difficult to transliterate into Chinese, and I had no choice to use different letters for those difficult parts. Although letters are different, their meanings are definitely correct”. Would that “to use different letters for those difficult parts” indicate to use different term in the case there is no one term for corresponding word in a sense of one-term-by-another-term? Still Liu Zhi claims even if he is forced to use different term, its meaning definitely matches with original meaning. It should be the following viewpoint for languages that enable such way of translation.

Letters in East and West are, although their shapes and sounds are different, the same in meaning and context. On translating, all the content will be clear by considering meaning on the basis of letters. Regardless of the differences in letters, there is no way that meanings would not match. (The explanatory notes for *The Principles and Natures of*

Meanings comes out from sentences which is piled up by letters can be the same, although the shape and sound of letters are different in East and West. After all, it is the idea that the *li* are the same despite of the alterations on surface, such as form or sound. We may find the influence from the Song Studies in this idea. Anyway, the statements in the explanatory notes for *the Rites in Islam* we have seen above are quoted as it is in *Zhengong Fawei* 真功發微 (Issuing the Subtlety of True Merit) by Yu Haozhou 余浩洲 with the preface by Yuan Guozuo 袁國祚 in 1793, and *Tianfang Zhengxue* 天方正學 (Right Study of Islam) by Lan Xu 藍煦 in 1852. Thus, Muslim intellectuals after Liu Zhi apparently consider that the

---

my hands, *Issuing the Subtlety of True Merit, The Vital Way to Returning the Truth, Right Study of Islam* are other examples attached with *Lieyan*. Expect for *Right Study of Islam*, the term *Lieyan* would possibly be employed more for the translated works. The survey on how the term *Lieyan* is used can be another interesting theme.



translation is fundamentally possible.

On the other hand, Liu Zhi himself admits in the explanatory notes for *The Real Records of Supreme Sages of Islam* that “I tried to transliterate into Chinese here. Nonetheless, for some parts where it is difficult to make Chinese correspond with original text, I forced the sentence at least to make sense.” He further confesses in the chapter for *Zhushushu* 著書述 (The Statements for Writing) in the same text that “The learning of Islam is difficult and its translation is far more difficult.” As he discloses, the operation of putting Arabic or Persian materials into Chinese is by no means an easy task. Reminiscing statements to tell us how difficult the transliteration can be found here and there amongst the translated works before Liu Zhi. For instance, Ma Boliang 馬伯良, the attributed teacher of Liu Zhi says in his preface for *Jiao Kuanjiejiao* 教款捷要 (Teachings on Keys of Slowness and Swiftness; 1678) as follows.

We live in the land of Han 漢, and our language is that of East land. We have different reasons and customs [from Arabic people]. This is why there are many those who lose [the meanings of] texts in canons while few those who know the dogma well... I have tried to compile an instructive book, which is also difficult. Without Chinese language, we cannot obtain the understandings from people at the first place, whereas articulating only in Chinese language, we cannot make it corresponding with Islamic dogma...I apologize that there are several transliterations that are vulgar, words that are inappropriate and terms that are incorrect. I request the readers to read this book not to harm the meaning of a phrase by being captured by a letter or the meaning of the whole by being taken by a phrase [as *Wanzhang shang* 万章上 (The upper chapter for ten thousands sentences) in *Mencius*.]

As he mentions that “there are different reasons” between Islam and China, here we cannot observe the idea to see the Islam and Confucianism equally. Here is the confession of incompetence, which would be too honest, on facing to a different language. Not to this extent, Sha Qiling 舍起靈 (around 1630–1710) who translates *Ashi* “at *al-Lama’āt* composed by Jāmi into *Zhaoyuan Mijue* 昭元秘訣 also states in its preface as follows.

I have just translated this book now, I couldn’t help remaining that transliterations of sentences are bad-mannered, translations of poems are artless. I tried to make the sounds of East and West corresponding and not

to make mistakes in contents. However, was I indeed able to have transmitted its words? Could I have really written for it?

“To make the sounds of East and West corresponding” would indicate transliteration of sounds. It does not seem to have only been modesty for his own translation. Also, Wu Zunqie 伍遵契 said that “I translate this into Chinese on the basis of the meanings and contents of the original text, but I did not make any rhetoric or embellishment” in the preface of his *Guizhen Yaodao* 歸真要道 (The Vital Way to Returning the Truth; 1672) which is a translation of *Mirsd al-ibād* by Najm al-din Razi (d.1256). He further states in an explanatory notes that “main texts are old-fashioned, profound and simple. Therefore, I focused myself to make the meanings clear. I dare not to use any rhetoric, but I would not like to be criticized for this point.” Thus, he defends himself not have made any rhetoric, which could be another testimony to tell us the difficulty of translation.

As we can observe from the distress of translators seen above, translation itself was not easy at all. Even the possibility of translation could have been doubted. We cannot find the idea to see the Islam and Confucianism equivalent there. Yet, there was a need to enlighten people those who have lost the teaching of Islam, through translation. Above mentioned Ma Boliang, after having confessed his inability, emphasizes that *Teachings on Keys of Slowness and Swiftiness* is a guide book for those who have lost the dogma, by stating in another preface that he writes again, entitled as “inevitably” that “I have written this now by forcing myself, but how could it be merry work? It is really inevitable.” The discovery of the idea of Islam and Confucianism are equal could have been happened when translators become to believe that translation are indeed possible which could have been turned out when the accumulation of such activities on translation have surpass a certain extent. That the translation is possible can only become possible with the presupposition that the words that correspond with the meaning and contents of original terms to be translated exist in the vocabulary. Thus, what Islam has should exist in China.

Without doubt, the Chinese Muslim translators have lived in the social and cultural context in China. As having been pointed out, the denial of *Shangdi* and *tian* signifies that of themselves. Thus, it was customary for common Muslims to use the term *tian* by avoiding the term *Zhenzhu* because of the awe. Islam and Confucianism are both internal for themselves. (although Liu Zhi tried to preserve his Muslim identity by stating that Islam and Confucianism are still different,

though they are both internal for himself.) It is not indicating that the belief in possibility for translation is only sole conditions which made the idea of Islam and Confucianism equivalent discovered. It just proposes that the activities of translation would have worked consciously to connect the Islam and Confucianism.

What guarantees this idea of Islam and Confucianism are the same was the conception to see that the Islam and Confucianism have the same origin in which it is believed that people of the east land worshipped the object similar to the god, such as *Shangdi* and *tian* in the ancient time. This conception itself would have been a fantasy, but it is factual that *Shangdi* and *tian* were worshipped in the east land which is, thus, grounded on the Chinese tradition. What further supports this conception is, however, the Islamic teaching to tell that all the human beings starts from Adam who was created by the god. Therefore, the claim observed in the idea to see Islam and Confucianism as the same can be lead by keeping Muslim identity.