

JOURNAL OF TURKISH STUDIES
TÜRKLÜK BİLGİSİ ARAŞTIRMALARI

VOLUME 26/1
2002

Edited by
Şinasi TEKİN . Gönül A. TEKİN

ESSAYS IN HONOUR OF
BARBARA FLEMMING
I

Guest Editor
Jan SCHMIDT

Published at the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations
Harvard University
2002

"WONDROUS CARAVAN LEADERS WHO TAKE THE CARAVAN TO THE
SANCTUARY THROUGH A HIDDEN PATH"
THE NAQSHBANDĪ ORDER ACCORDING TO 'ABD AL-RAḤMĀN JĀMĪ

Johan G.J. ter HAAR*

The Naqshbandī order is usually considered to be the most orthodox of all Muslims brotherhoods. M. Molé has characterised the Naqshbandīs as "fidèles à la grandeur austère de l'islam sunnite" and "champions de son orthodoxie".¹ And H. Algar in his overview of the history of this order time and again stresses this characteristic, e.g. when he argues that "The sociopolitical role of the Naqshbandīya was generally marked by a concern with the cultivation of the religious sciences and often, too, by a desire to assert the supremacy of the *sharī'a* as sole basis of the Muslim state."² In order to demonstrate this orthodox character of this order, it is pointed out, first of all that the Naqshbandīs proudly present themselves as strictly adhering to the doctrine and practice of Sunnī Islam and as carefully avoiding innovation (*bid'at*) in any shape or form. A Naqshbandī, therefore, acts with 'determination' (*'azīmat*) and does not avail himself of any 'dispensation' (*rukḥṣat*). These twin concepts are used by the Naqshbandīs to explain why they prefer to remain aloof from certain rites or customs, which, to a varying extent, are common to most other orders. E.g. bringing oneself into trance by way of dance (*raqṣ*) or by listening to music and song (*samā'*) is not done in an order that bases its conduct on *'azīmat*. And so one can find in the Naqshbandī literature quite a few passages in which *raqṣ*, *samā'* or other, more or less related phenomena, that play an important part in other orders, are harshly rejected and condemned. Secondly, the orthodox character of the Naqshbandīs manifests itself also in the so-called 'Bakrī *silsila*', which means that they trace their origin back to Abū Bakr, whereas in almost all other orders 'Alī is the first link, after the Prophet of course, in the spiritual line of descent (*silsila*). It is because of this second aspect in particular that the Naqshbandīs are usually considered to have strained relations with Shī'ī muslims, to phrase it mildly. Hamid Algar does not hesitate to write: "We may even say that the Naqshbandīya is unique among the Sufi orders in its hostility to Shī'ism."³

* Leiden University

¹ M. Molé, "Autour de Daré Mansour: l'apprentissage mystique de Bahṣī al-Dīn Naqshband", *Revue des Études Islamiques* XXVII (1959), 66.

² "A Brief History of the Naqshbandī Order", in M. Gaborieau, e.a. (eds), *Naqshbandis. Cheminements et situations actuelle d'une ordre mystique musulman/Historical Developments and Present Situation of a Muslim Mystical Order*, Istanbul-Paris 1990 [Varia Turcica XVIII], 42.

³ Algar, "A Brief History", 5.

In raising the question to what extent this sober and even austere character of the Naqshbandī order is confirmed by Nūr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (1414-1492), in his *Nafahāt al-uns min hazarāt al-quds*, this article will argue that the prevailing image, outlined above, does not take into account sufficiently the development the order underwent, and that it in particular does not do justice to the order in Jāmī's time.

Not only is the *Nafahāt al-uns min hazarāt al-quds*⁴ an important source of information for the history of the Naqshbandī brotherhood, its author was himself a member of the order. However, his first acquaintance with mystical life he made when Mawlānā Fakhr al-Dīn Luristānī⁵, who was not a Naqshbandī, visited his parents. Jāmī recalls, so he writes, that during this visit the seed of love for and devotion to mystical life was sown in his heart and that since that day it grew stronger every day.⁶ When Jāmī was not yet five years of age, he informs us in another passage, Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā happened to pass by his birthplace. His father went out to see him and took his son with him. When Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā noticed the boy, who was seated on the shoulders of one of his father's friends, he gave him a sugar candy (*yik sar nabāt-i kirmānī*). And more than sixty years later, he has vivid memories of that meeting which took place at the end of the month Jumādā I or the beginning of Jumādā II of the year 822 (July 1419). It marks the beginning of his devotion to the family of the Masters (*khāndān-i khwājagān*).⁷ His formal affiliation to Khwājagān-Naqshandiyya is reported to have taken place when he became a novice of Sa'd al-Dīn Kāshgharī. Although Jāmī has an entry on this Naqshbandī mystic in his *Nafahāt*⁸, he does not mention in any detail his becoming a novice of Sa'd al-Dīn. He mentions it only implicitly, when he in dealing with a certain aspect of his guide's mysticism, notes almost in passing: "in the beginning when I had entered [as a novice] his company" (*dar awā'il ki bi ṣuḥbat-i īshān rasīdam*).⁹ According to a recently published biography this initiation took place in 857/1453, when Jāmī was exactly 40 years of age, shortly after he had returned to Herat after a stay of some 14 or 25 years in Samarqand where he had studied.¹⁰ When Sa'd al-Dīn Kāshgharī died a few years later (in the month Jumādā al-Ukhrā 860/ May 1453), Jāmī succeeded him as the main spiritual guide of the Khwājagān-Naqshbandī order. After a few years, however, the same biography goes on to say, a spiritual change occurred in Jāmī as a result of which he withdrew from his position as shaykh in the Naqshbandī brotherhood, and, instead of guiding novices, he concentrated on the theoretical aspects of mystical life on a more personal level. This did not prevent him from keeping close contacts with fellow Naqshbandīs, even very prominent Naqshbandīs like the famous Khwāja 'Ubayd Allāh Aḥrār. In his entry on the latter, however, Jāmī does not

⁴ In this article Maḥmūd 'Ābidī's edition of this work (Tih-rān: Intiṣārāt-i Iṭtilā'āt 1370) is used.

⁵ Jāmī has an entry on him in his *Nafahāt* (454-455), in which he tells us that Fakhr al-Dīn took his first steps on the mystical path when studying in Egypt. After the death of his first master, his search for an other spiritual guide brought him to Khurāsān, where he became one of the most popular and respected shaykhs of his time. After the year 820 he left Khurāsān to make the pilgrimage to Mecca, after which he went back to Egypt, where he died.

⁶ *Nafahāt* 455.

⁷ *Nafahāt* 397-98.

⁸ *Nafahāt* 408-410, where he concerns Sa'd al-Dīn Kāshgharī's position the Khwājagān-Naqshbandī *silṣila* mentions only that he was a pupil of Nizām al-Dīn [Khāmūš]. According to other entries the latter was a pupil of Khwāja 'Alā' al-Dīn ['Attār], who in turn was a pupil of Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband.

⁹ *Nafahāt* 409.

¹⁰ A'lākhān Afṣahzād, *Naqd wa barrasi-yi āthār wa sharḥ-i aḥwāl-i jāmī*. Tehrān 1378, 128-29. That Jāmī became a pupil of Sa'd al-Dīn Kāshgharī is confirmed by Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī in his *Rashahāt 'ayn al-ḥayāt* (Ed. 'Alī Aṣghar Mu'iniyān, Vol. I, Tehrān 2536, 239), who a.o. adds that his initiation in the order went very quick.

mention his personal acquaintance with Aḥrār at all. In stead, he starts by acknowledging the prominence of Aḥrār, since the succes of the Kh^wajagān order is due to him. His prominence is such that it would be impertinent for onesome like the present writer [Jāmī] to elaborate on this. On the other hand Jāmī realizes that 'Ubayd Allāh cannot be left out. And therefore he confines himself to quoting a number of Aḥrār's sayings. The entry concludes with a passage, which is, as he explicitly writes, is meant as a summary of what he in his book has to say on the Kh^wajagān and their spiritual path.¹¹

Both Jāmī's stepping down from his position as spiritual guide and his contacts with Aḥrār are mentioned, to a certain extent even in detail, in the *Rashaḥāt 'ayn al-ḥayāt*. Concerning the contact between Jāmī and Aḥrār this source informs us that the two met in total four times¹², and that they also exchanged many letters. As far as Jāmī's acting as shaykh is concerned Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī shows that Jāmī, although he was formally authorized (*mujāz*) by Sa'd al-Dīn Kāshgharī to initiate novices into the Naqshbandī order, did not make use of this authorization. He tells us e.g. that when he one day visited Aḥrār the latter asked him whether it was true that Jāmī "did not accept novices" (*murīd nimīgīrand*). When Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī answered that this was indeed the case, Aḥrār quoted 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī's saying "[Either] close the door of acting as shaykh [and] open the door of friendship [with God?], [or] close the door of solitude [and] open the door of companionship [with novices] (*dar-i shaykhī rā band dar-i yārī rā gushāy, dar-i khalwat rā band, dar-i suḥbat rā gushāy*). Aḥrār seems to suggest that Jāmī's decision not to act as a shaykh is fully justified. Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī also mentions not only that according to Mawlānā 'Abd al-Ghaffūr Lārī, the author of a supplement to the *Nafaḥāt al-uns*, Jāmī "instructed no one [into the *ẓikr* of the Naqshbandī path] (*kasī rā talqīn nimīkardand*), but also that Jāmī himself has admitted not to have the stamina to act as shaykh (*taḥammul-i bār-i shaykhī nadārīm*).¹³ According to this same source, however, Jāmī never turned down any request to share his intimate knowledge of the Naqshbandī path with others. So the obvious conclusion is that Jāmī although himself initiated in the Naqshbandī path, and possibly even to the degree of having received the formal authorization to initiate others, preferred not to act publicly as a Naqshbandī shaykh. At the same time his works clearly display his lifelong devotion to this brotherhood and its mystical path.¹⁴ A short analysis of the way Naqshbandīs are treated in his *Nafaḥāt al-Uns* will help us to understand how Jāmī viewed this order.

In the preface to this work¹⁵ Jāmī explicitly situates his work in a biographical tradition that started with the *Ṭabaqāt aṣ-ṣūfiyya* by Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn al-Sulamī (d. 412/1021).¹⁶ Later Abū Ismā'il 'Abd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī al-Harawī

¹¹ *Nafaḥāt* 410-417.

¹² The first two times they met in Samarqand, the third time in Herat, when Aḥrār in the time of Mirzā Sulṭān Abū Sa'id visited Khurāsān from Transoxania, and the fourth time in Marw, when Aḥrār visited that city on request of Abū Sa'id (*Rashaḥāt* I, 247). As far as their first meeting is concerned this source mentions that Jāmī left for Samarqand on 8 Muḥarram 870/August 30 1467 (*Rashaḥāt* I 249), and for the second meeting Jāmī left for Samarqand on 1 Rabi' I 884/May 23 1479 (*Rashaḥāt* I 250).

¹³ *Rashaḥāt*, I, 251-52.

¹⁴ A fairly detailed overview of Jāmī's oeuvre is to be found in the introduction by Maḥmūd 'Ābidī to his edition of Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt* (XI-XX).

¹⁵ *Nafaḥāt*, 1-3.

¹⁶ *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition., s.v. al-SULAMCE

(396/1006-481/1089) commented upon this work and expanded it during the "sessions" (*mağālis*) he held with his pupils.¹⁷ These comments and additions were subsequently committed to writing. And when the *Ṭabaqāt aṣ-ṣūfiyya* in this form reached Jāmī, he in turn conceived the plan to comment upon and add to the work of the shaykh al-Islām from Herat, as he invariably calls 'Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī. Not only because Anṣārī's Persian -"the old Herati language" (*zabān-i harawī-yi qadīm*)-- was not always easily understood in Jāmī's time, but also to update the work and include the generations of Ṣūfī's after Anṣārī up to his own time. However, because of his many engagements Jāmī was able to realize his intention only in the year 881/1476-7, when Amīr Nizām al-Dīn Shīr [Nawā'ī] urged him to execute what he had planned long before. He finished the work in 883/1478-9, as he himself writes at the end of the book.¹⁸

Before dealing with the individual mystics *Nafahāt al-uns* starts with a introductory chapter, divided in eight sections, each dedicated to a particular Ṣūfī key concept or groups of related concepts.¹⁹ The core of the book consists of biographical notes on in total 618 Ṣūfis, starting with Abū Hāshim, the first one to be given the name Ṣūfī, a contemporary of Sufyān al-Thawrī, who died in 701. The last biographical note of the book is dedicated to the famous poet Ḥāfiẓ.²⁰ To be more precise, he is the last male ṣūfī to be dealt with, since the entry on him is followed by entries of in total 33 female Ṣūfis, starting of course with Rābi'a 'Adawiyya.

The way in which the biographical notes are arranged in the *Nafahāt* reflects the motive behind the book, i.e. adapting and updating Anṣārī's *Ṭabaqāt*. If therefore in the first part of the book, based as it is on the latter work, a particular criterion is applied in the arrangement of the entries, it is a criterion devised by Anṣārī. As far as the additions to the original work (s) are concerned, the arrangement applied by Jāmī is not chronological, but at most based on a kind of shared affiliation. This affiliation is usually a mystical one, which means that the Ṣūfis involved belong to the same *silṣila*. But the entry on Ḥāfiẓ concludes a number of biographical notes all dedicated to poets.

At the heart of the book, in the literal sense of the word, i.e. almost exactly in the middle of the book, are the entries of the Ṣūfis belonging to the line of the "Masters" (*khwājagān*). This name refers to a group of Central Asian shaykh's who together constitute the formative period in the history of the Naqshbandī order, that is the period starting with Khwāja 'Abd al-Khālīq Ghujduwānī and ending with Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband. Appreciation for the latter's

¹⁷ A recent book on this famous shaykh, with translations from his works, is A.G. Ravan Farhadi, 'Abdullāh Anṣārī of Herāt (1006-1089 C.E.) *An Early Ṣūfī Master*. Richmond: Curzon Press 1996 ([Curzon Sufi Series, ed. by Ian Richard Netton]. The best study on Anṣārī is still Serge de Laugier de Beaurecueil, *Khwāja Abdullāh Anṣārī (396-481 H./1006-1089), Mystique Hanbalite* (Beirut 1965)

¹⁸ *Nafahāt*, 634.

¹⁹ *Nafahāt*, 3-25. The first section deals with the concepts *wilāyat* and *walī*, and in the last one the question is raised since when the term *ṣūfī* was applied. Other concepts dealt with are *ma'rifat* ('*arif*, *muta'arrif*) and *ṣūfī* (*mutaṣawwif*, *malāmatī*, *faqīr*). The different stages of *tawhīd* are analysed, as well as the different categories of miracles (*karāmāt*, *mu'jizāt*, *khawāriq*, *istidrājāt*)

²⁰ Jāmī justifies the inclusion of Ḥāfiẓ in his book by pointing out that although the latter may not have been a Ṣūfī in the strict sense of the word, since he is not known to have been initiated by a spiritual guide, the impact of his poetry on Ṣūfism was second to none. In an obvious attempt to show that this is not just his own personal opinion Jāmī a member of the Khwājagān order (*yikī az 'azīzān-i silṣila-yi khwājagān*) who has said that for a Ṣūfī there is no better poetry than Ḥāfiẓ' (*Nafahāt* 612).

impact has led to the use in the sources of the designation Naqshbandī, according to a recent study "from the middle of the 15th century on (in Herat)".²¹ In the *Nafahāt*, however, Jāmī holds on to the name Khwājagān. The word Naqshbandiya is used by him only once, in a poem that concludes his description of the "family of the Masters" (*khānwāda-yi khwājagān*).²²

Between 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī (d. 617/1220) and Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband (d. 791/1389) the line of the Masters consists of successively 'Arif Rīwgarawī, Khwāja Maḥmūd Anjīr Faghnaawī, Khwāja 'Alī Rāmītanī, Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī, and Sayyid Amīr Kulāl, to all of who Jāmī dedicated an entry.²³ For the period after Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband, first his disciples Khwāja 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Aṭṭār, Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā, Mawlānā Ya'qūb Āarkhī and Khwāja 'Alā' al-Dīn Ghujduwānī are dealt with, followed by the sons of the first two, Khwāja Ḥasan 'Aṭṭār and Khwāja Abū Naṣr Pārsā respectively. Next there are entries on Mawlānā Nizām al-Dīn Khāmūsh and Khwāja 'Abd Allāh Imāmī Iṣfahānī, both companions of Khwāja 'Alā' al-Dīn. Then follows Mawlānā Sa'd al-Dīn Kāshgharī, who was a disciple of Khwāja 'Abd Allāh Imāmī Iṣfahānī, and the last Naqshbandī to be allotted an entry is Khwāja 'Ubayd Allāh (d. 895/1490).

That all entries on members of the Khwājagān-Naqshbandī order are situated literally in the heart of the *Nafahāt*, as was already mentioned, can hardly be called coincidental. It illustrates aptly both the importance Jāmī attached to this order and his personal devotion to it. However, as far as the size of the entries is concerned, members of this order are not given a preferential treatment compared to other Ṣūfis. On the contrary, an entry on an member of this order can be very small indeed, as e.g. in the case of Khwāja Maḥmūd Anjīr Faghnaawī, where Jāmī confines himself to the statement that he is "one of the *khulafā* of Khwāja 'Arif". On the other end of the spectrum are the entries in particular on Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband and 'Ubayd Allāh Ahrār, but even they are not singled out significantly in this respect compared to non-Naqshbandīs like Anṣārī, Aḥmad al-Nāmaqī al-Jāmī or Najm al-Dīn al-Kubrā. Moreover, as far as approach and contents are concerned, there is no marked difference between entries on the Khwājagān and entries on other Ṣūfis. The same approach is applied throughout the whole book, an approach that is characterised by an emphasis on quoting sayings of the Ṣūfī involved and telling stories about him.

Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that in the eyes of Jāmī the Khwājagān-Naqshbandīs constitute a order with an identity of its own. The entries on these Ṣūfī's show clearly what Jāmī considers to be the core element in this identity. In the entries on both the first and the last of the "Masters", 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī and Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband, the emphasis is on their strict adherence to the *sunna* of the Prophet and their aspiration to keep away from any form of "innovation" (*bid'a*); in a mystical revelation 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī urged Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband emphatically (*farmūdand wa mubālagha namūdand*), so we read, to act with "determination" (*'azīmat*) and to avoid "dispensations and innovations" (*rukḥṣathā wa bid'athā*). And when concluding his discussion of this order, in the entry on Khwāja 'Ubayd Allāh, Jāmī writes that the mystical path of the "Masters" is based on the creed of orthodox

21 Jürgen Paul, *Organization and doctrine: the Khwājagān/Naqshbandiya in the first generation after Bahā' uddīn*. Halle/Berlin 1998, 2 n. 1).

22 *Nafahāt* 416-17. For the poem see infra.

23 The sequence is somewhat interrupted by entries on successively Qutham Shaykh and Khalīl Ātā, both members of the Yasawī order.

islam (*i'tiqād-i ahl-i sunnat wa jamā'at*), the prescripts of the shari'a (*aḥkām-i shari'at*) and the examples (*sunnan*) set by the Prophet.²⁴

As far as rites and customs are concerned that are characteristic for this order, Jāmī mentions that the "Masters" perform the *ẓekr* in silence and that this practice dates back to the time of first "Master", 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī.²⁵ It is only natural to suppose that practising this form of *ẓekr* - Jāmī calls it "*ẓekr* of the heart" - is direct connected with the just mentioned core element of path of the "Masters". The seemingly logical conclusion, however, that mystical orders in which the *ẓekr* is performed aloud, are less strict in their adherence to the *shari'a* or are even guilty of *bid'a*, is nowhere drawn. Jāmī mentions that Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband when asked whether performing the *ẓekr* aloud (*ẓekr-i jahr*), seclusion (*khalwat*) or listening to music (*samā'*) was part of his mystical path, simply answered "No." This comes close to an other remark by Bahā' al-Dīn, quoted by Aḥmad Sirhindī, in connection with the same subject, i.e. "We neither do it nor disapprove of it [when others do it]" (*mā in kār rā nimikunīm wa inkār nimikunīm*).²⁶

According to the *Nafahāt al-uns*, however, Bahā' al-Dīn did not confine himself to the short answer, just mentioned, but went on to explain that the basis of his path consisted of "Solitude in society, i.e. outwardly being among the people, and inwardly being with God" (*khalwat dar anjuman, bi zāhir bā khalq, bi bāṭin bā haqq*).²⁷ This is an other element in the identity of the "Masters", in the eyes of Jāmī of almost equal importance as the first one. *Khalwat* is usually understood as more or less complete seclusion. Fritz Meier, who translates *khalwa* as "Klausur", equates it with *arba'iniyya* or *Älle*, (forty day seclusion, vierzig-tägige Klausur) and writes that the Nashbandī's, starting with the first of the "Masters", 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī, are among the opponents of "Klausur". This is clearly reflected, he continues, in the two first two lines of a poem by Jāmī, that have become popular in Naqshbandī literature. With this poem, the first line of which is included in the title of the present article, the author of the *Nafahāt* concludes his discussion of the "Masters". The second line reads as follows: *The path of attraction via companionship with them removes from the heart of the novice the temptation of seclusion and the thought of a forty-day clausura*.²⁸ If this second line is to be understood as an elaboration of the first line, *the hidden path* of the latter refers to *the path of attraction via companionship*. Moreover, the second line clearly indicates that the temptation of leading a life in total seclusion is to be resisted only by means of companionship with a spiritual guide, which implies that, at least in this context, *khalwat*

²⁴ *Nafahāt*, 416-17.

²⁵ *Nafahāt*, 383.

²⁶ J.G.J. ter Haar, *Follower and Heir of the Prophet. Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindī (1564-1624) as Mystic*. Leiden 1992, 82.

²⁷ *Nafahāt*, 391.

²⁸ Fritz Meier, *Zwei Abhandlungen über die Naqshbandiyya*. (Istanbul, 1994), 33, 37; *Nafahāt*, 417:

naqshbandiyya 'aḡab qāfila-sālārānd * *ki barānd az rah-i pinhān bi ḥaram qāfila rā*

az dīl-i sālik rah-i ḡāziba-ye ṣuḥbatishān * *mī barād waswasa-yi khalwat -o fikr-i Āilla rā*

The phrase *rah-e ḡāziba-yi ṣuḥbatishān* can also be translated as "the attractive path of their companionship". Meier translates (37):

Die Naqshbandiyya sind wunderbare Karawanenführer:

Sie bringen auf verborgenem Weg die Karawane zum Heiligtum.

Die Anziehungskraft ihres Umgangs reisst aus dem Herzen des Wanderers

Die Einflüsterung der Klausur und den Gedanken an die Vierzig-tägige

refers not just to a mystical life in complete seclusion, without any contact with other people, but as much to a mystical life without *ṣuḥbat*, direct contact with a spiritual guide. In other words, the emphasis is on the importance of such a guide and of *ṣuḥbat* with him. After all, the subject-matter of the Jāmī's poem are the Naqshbandīs in their capacity of leaders, guides. He also quotes a saying of Bahā' al-Dīn, in which the path of the "Masters" is equated with *ṣuḥbat* and contrasted with *khalwat*. "Our path consists of companionship, [for] in solitude there is fame and in fame there is calamity" (*ṭarīqa-yi mā ṣuḥbat ast, wa dar khalwat shuhrat ast wa dar shuhrat āfat*).²⁹ This is not to refute the interpretation of *khalwat*, held by Fritz Meier, who, by the way, explicitly acknowledges that the opposition against strict seclusion in the Naqshbandī order is to a certain extent counterbalanced by their insistence on *khalwat dar anjuman*, as was already referred to. This is only to suggest that in the approach of Jāmī the emphasis is on the guide. The indispensability of his guidance is reflected in a phenomenon that plays a prominent part among the Naqshbandīs, although it is not confined to this order, i.e. the *rābiṭa*, the personal bond with the guide. Fritz Meier, who has thoroughly studied this phenomenon, which he translates as "Herzensbindung", defines it summarizing as follows: "Die naqshbandische *rābiṭa* ist jedoch in dem Sinne Bindung an den Meister, dass man dessen Gestalt betrachtet, sich sein Bild einprägt und es möglichst oft und besonders bei Konzentrations- und Meditationsübungen liebend vergegenwärtigt. Das Bild des Meisters wird so einerseits zum Anknüpfungspunkt für das Denken an seine Vorgänger bis auf den Propheten zurück und andererseits zum Vorbild für eine direkte Annäherung an Gott, wie sie der Meister durchgemacht haben soll."³⁰ According to the author of the *Nafahāt* Bahā' al-Dīn Nashband once said that even a small amount of *rābiṭa* is very effective.³¹ Moreover, in the autobiographical passage in the entry on Muḥammad Pārsā, in which the latter's encounter with the five-year old Jāmī is related, twice the term *rābiṭa* is used.³²

To sum up, in Jāmī's view of the essential characteristics of the Naqshbandī order, as reflected in his *Nafahāt*, the focus is to a very large extent on the spiritual guide. To be sure, he points regularly to their strict adhering to the *sharī'a* and to their closely following the *sunna* of the Prophet. But this is not used to argue that this order is precisely for this reason to be preferred above others. Neither does it affect his appreciation for Ibn 'Arabī. On the contrary, in his entry on Abū Naṣr Pārsā, son of the well-known Muḥammad Pārsā, he relates that one day in a meeting (*majlis*) Ibn 'Arabī and his writings came up. Abū Naṣr on that occasion said, quoting his father, that Ibn 'Arabī's *Fuṣūṣ* were the soul and his *Fuṭūḥāt* the heart, and added: "Whoever knows the *Fuṣūṣ* well, feels a strong urge to follow in the footsteps of the Prophet."³³ Both Jāmī himself and Muḥammad Pārsā, on whom there is a fairly lengthy entry in the *Nafahāt*, are known to have written a commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ*.

In depicting the attitude of the Naqshbandīs toward Ibn 'Arabī, Fritz Meier starts by stating -rather mildly, or is to be read as a German understatement? -that "Manche [Naqshbandīs] konnten sich nicht befreunden mit Ibn al-'Arabī (gest. 638/1240) und seine

²⁹ *Nafahāt*, 392. Dihkhodā in his *Lughatnāme* (s.v. shuhrat) quotes Ghazālī's *Kimīyā-e sa'ādat*: "Fame means calamity, and [yet] everybody wants it; being unknown means tranquillity, and [yet] everybody evades it."

³⁰ *Zwei Abhandlungen über die Naqshbandiyya*, 233.

³¹ *Nafahāt*, 393.

³² *Nafahāt*, 398.

³³ *Nafahāt*, 401.

Schule, wonach sich Gott und die Welt für viele nicht mehr richtig auseinander halten liessen." A little later he specifies that both Jāmī and 'Ubayd Allāh Aḥrār were on Ibn 'Arabī's side, as he puts it, and then goes on to explain that the turn came with Muḥammad al-Bāqī [bi'llāh] and his pupil Aḥmad Sirhindī, who herald a new phase in the history of the Naqshbandī order, in which, at least in the Mujaddidī branch, the attitude toward Ibn 'Arabī was much less positive.³⁴ Whether this may be taken to imply, or at least to suggest, that in the pre-Mujaddidī era of the Naqshbandī history the majority of the Naqshbandīs were friends of Ibn 'Arabī, is an object for further discussion. For now it can be said that in addition to those mentioned by Fritz Meier, Muḥammad Pārsā and his son Abū Naṣr are to be reckoned among this group. The important point is that Fritz Meier rightly postulated a development and evolution in the history of the Naqshbandīs in this respect.

The author of the present article would like to argue that the idea of development and evolution is also helpful in trying to understand the relationship between Naqshbandīs and Shī'is. The prevailing opinion is that they are at loggerheads with one another. According to H. Algar, as was already mentioned, the Naqshbandīs in their hostility to Shī'i Islam are even unique among the Ṣūfī orders. However, in the way Jāmī deals with the Naqshbandī order in his *Nafahāt*, there is nothing to support this. The "Bakrī silsila", which is usually considered to be the doctrinal basis for such a hostility, is not mentioned at all. In the eyes of Jāmī it is obviously not an essential element in the identity of this order.

However, in Iran, Jāmī's own attitude towards Shī'ites is often brought up as a slur on his otherwise impeccable reputation as one of the highlights in the history of Persian poetry. He is accused of having deliberately omitted any reference to Shī'ite mystics in his *Nafahāt*. Qāzī Nūr al-Dīn Shushtarī (d. 1610) appears to have been the first to bring this charge against Jāmī. In his *Majālis al-mu'minīn* we are told that the author of the *Nafahāt* in his fanaticism and his hostility towards Sayyid Ni'mat Allāh Walī decided not to mention the latter's famous pupil, Hamza Āzarī Iṣfārā'īnī, commonly known as Shaykh Āzarī.³⁵ Later Muḥammad Bāqir Maḡlisī (d. 1698-9 or 1699-1700) - according to E.G. Browne "perhaps the most notable and powerful doctor of the Shī'a who ever lived" - added that Jāmī had not included in his work Ṣafī al-Dīn Ardabilī, the eponym of the Ṣafawid dynasty, whereas, on the other hand, several Naqshbandīs are mentioned, no one ever heard of except "stupid Uzbegs".³⁶

Although it is true that there is no entry on shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn in the *Nafahāt*, yet his name as well as the name of his son and successor, shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn, are mentioned, albeit in passing. Both are reported to have been among the shaykh's of Khwāja Quṭb al-Dīn Yaḥyā Jāmī Nayshāpurī, who died in 740/ and was buried in Herat.³⁷ Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn is mentioned also as the spiritual guide of Amīr Qāsim Tabrīzī, better known as Qāsim-i Anwār. According to Iskandar Munshī Beg's chronicle, *Tārīkh-ālamārā-yi 'abbāsī*, the author of the *Nafahāt* says in regard to Qāsim-i Anwār, "that is a matter for debate whether anyone after the immaculate Imams attained the eminence of Seyyed Qāsem, and he states that Qasūm-e Anwār

³⁴ F. Meier, *Zwei Abhandlungen*, 28 ff.

³⁵ *Majālis al-mu'minīn*. Tehrān 1365, vol. 2, 131.

³⁶ *Al-Masā'il al-thalāth*, as quoted in the introduction of Jāmī's *Shawāhid al-nubuwwa*, ed. Sayyid Ḥasan Amīn, Tehrān/Qum 1379/2000, 34.

³⁷ *Nafahāt*, 575-6.

was a disciple of Shaikh Sadr al-Dīn Ardabilī.³⁸ Since the first part of this statement cannot be traced back to the available text of the *Nafahāt*, it is perhaps an attempt to emendate Jāmī. As far as Qāsim-i Anwār's discipleship of Ṣadr al-Dīn is concerned, this is confirmed by Jāmī, but also qualified. Qāsim-i Anwār was a disciple of Ṣadr al-Dīn Ardabilī, but only in the beginning, afterwards he went over to shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Alī Yamanī. Jāmī even adds that he himself has seen a document in which only Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Alī Yamanī is mentioned, and not the Safawid shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn.³⁹ Roger M. Savory has argued that this "curious passage" in the *Nafahāt* is a deliberate attempt [on the part of Jāmī] to discredit the Ṣafavid shaykhs and, in particular, Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Mūsā, head of the Ṣafavid Order from 735/1334 to 794/1391-2.⁴⁰ He questions the authenticity of the document, Jāmī claims to have seen, and also points to the obscurity of shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn 'Alī Yamanī, who is not mentioned in sources prior to the *Nafahāt*. Moreover, Qāsim-e Anwār was in all probability a Safawid "propagandist" (*da'i*). In view of the fact that the *Nafahāt* was written when the Safawids "had entered the final phase of their preparations for revolution", Jāmī, the "official spokesman of Tīmūrid Sunnism" wished "to show the Ṣafavid propagandist in the most unfavorable light."⁴¹ This is not very convincing. To begin with, there is the fact that Jāmī's entry on Amīr Qāsim Tabrīzī is very positive; he criticizes some of the latter's disciples because of their un-Islamic behaviour, but he acquits the shaykh himself explicitly from these things. Furthermore, if Jāmī's motive was to discredit the Safawid shaykhs because of the danger they were constituted in his time, shaykhs like Junayd or Ḥaydar would have been a much more obvious target. After all, Ṣadr al-Dīn headed the order in a period in which when the first phase of "their preparations for revolution" had yet to begin. Jāmī's attitude towards this form of Shī'ism will be dealt with later on this article.

In twentieth-century Iran the view of Shustarī and Majlisī is reiterated by 'Alī Aṣghar Ḥikmat in his scholarly monography on Jāmī.⁴² Maḥmūd 'Abidī, in the introduction to his critical edition of the *Nafahāt*, not only quotes Ḥikmat with obvious approval, but then goes on to suggest that Jāmī's unkindness (*bī-mihri*) towards Shāh Ni'matullāh Walī had to do with an incident dating back to the time of Tīmūr, when Shāh Ni'matullāh Walī was travelling around in Khurāsān and attracting many followers. The Nashbandī shaykh, Amīr Kulāl, managed to convince Tīmūr that this success undermined the stability of his rule, whereupon Shāh Ni'matullāh Walī was banned from Khurāsān.⁴³

Quite recently, Sayyid Ḥasan Amīn, in the introduction to his edition of Jāmī's *Shawāhid al-nubuwwa*, took it upon him to defend the author of the *Nafahāt*, not just against the accusation mentioned above, but also against two other charges.⁴⁴ We are told that Jāmī was also accused of having played a leading part in squashing the rumour that, according to a book written in Saljūq time, 'Alī's grave was to be found in the vicinity of Balkh. Sayyid Ḥasan

³⁸ R.M. Savory (trans.), *History of Shah 'Abbas the Great*. Vol. I, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press 1978, 26

³⁹ *Nafahāt*, 590.

⁴⁰ R.M. Savory, "A 15th century Ṣafavid propagandist at Harāt", *American Oriental Society (Middle West Branch) Semi Centennial Volume*, Indiana University Press 1969, 194.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 192, 194.

⁴² This book -unfortunately not available to the present writer- was first published in 1320/1941.

⁴³ *Nafahāt*, XXXI. Cf. *El*, new edition, s.v. NI'MAT ALLĀHIYYA.

⁴⁴ In the introduction to his edition of Jāmī's *Shawāhid al-nubuwwa*, published in 1379/2000, he enters at length (pp. 20-45) into this question.

Amīn argues that the works of Jāmī clearly reflect the conviction that 'Alī was buried in Najaf, and that he therefore -contrary to what, curiously enough, even Yann Richard appears to have postulated⁴⁵ -cannot have accepted this rumour, the memory of which lingers on in the name Mazār-e sharīf. Jāmī therefore rightly opposed an attempt by some people -extremist Shī'ites or *ghulāt*-- to transfer 'Alī's remains to Herat.⁴⁶

The second charge against Jāmī was at centre of what E.G. Browne called "the only unpleasant incident recorded as having befallen Jāmī."⁴⁷ When he in 1472, returning from the pilgrimage to Mecca, visited Baghdad, he was brought to account for a passage in his *Silsilat al-ḡahab*, in which he, in no uncertain terms, blamed 'Alī's father Abū Ṭālib for having remained unbeliever all his life and not having profited from his kinship with the Prophet. A careful reading of the sources makes it quite clear, according to Sayyid Ḥasan Amīn, that the commotion, which ended in court, was in reality a quarrel between members of different Ṣūfī orders. Moreover, the verses in question were taken out of their proper context. When the true text of the *Silsilat al-ḡahab* was consulted, Jāmī, in the words of E.G. Browne, "easily succeeded in refuting the accusation and turning the tables on his detractors". He is reported to have said: "When I in the *Silsilat al-ḡahab* praised 'Alī and his descendants, I was afraid that the Sunnīs of Khurāsān might blame me for being a Shī'ite (*rafḡ*). How was I to know that in Baghdad I would fall prey to the cruelty of the Shī'ites (*rawāfiḡ*)?"⁴⁸ Sayyid Ḥasan Amīn admits that Jāmī may very well have been of the opinion that 'Alī's father Abū Ṭālib never converted to Islam. Sunnīs and Shī'ites are diametrically opposed to each other in this question, and as a Sunnī Muslim Jāmī took the Sunnī position that Abū Ṭālib died as an unbeliever.

However -and this is the central point in Amīn's defence in all three of the charges - Jāmī was a Sunnī Muslim with an undeniable loyalty and attachment to 'Alī and his descendants. This is apparent in his poetry, but even more so in his *Shawāhid al-nubuwwa*, in which he refers, and quite extensively at that, not only to the words and deeds of 'Alī, but also to each of the twelve Shī'ite imāms individually. They are all introduced as imāms, and in regard of the twelfth imām Jāmī explains that among Shī'ites designations like *al-qā'im*, *al-mahdī* and *ṣāhib al-zamān* are commonly used.⁴⁹ Jāmī's attention for 'Alī and the other imāms is such, in respect of both quantity and quality, that according to Sayyid Ḥasan Amīn he must be called a *sunnī-yi tafḡīlī*, i.e. a Sunnī Muslim who, while acknowledging Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān as the first three rightly-guided caliphs, yet gives preference (*tafḡīl*) to 'Alī. Amīn also uses the terms *sunnī-yi muḥammadi* (Muḥammadan Sunnī) and *sunnī-yi dawāzdah imāmī* (Twelver Sunnī).⁵⁰

Here Sayyid Ḥasan Amīn seems to overplay his hand and to carry his defense of Jāmī too far. It is in the eyes of the present writer much more fruitful to elucidate Jāmī's attitude

⁴⁵ In his *Les Jaillissements de Lumière* (Paris 1982), an edition and translation of Jāmī's *Lawā'ih*, he mentions (p. 16-17) the discovery of the so-called grave of 'Alī in Mazār-e sharīf as an example of "certains glissements de sympathie chi'ite auxquels les soufis n'étaient probablement pas étrangers", Jāmī being no exception.

⁴⁶ *Shawāhid al-nubuwwa*, 30-32.

⁴⁷ *A Literary History of Persia*, Cambridge, repr. 1976, vol. III, 510-11.

⁴⁸ *Shawāhid al-nubuwwa*, 41. Cf Browne, *op. cit.* 510-11.

⁴⁹ *Shawāhid al-nubuwwa*, 324-409.

⁵⁰ *Shawāhid al-nubuwwa*, 38, 44.

towards Shī'ism, and that of his contemporaries for that matter, by means of the twin concepts *tawallā'* and *tabarrā'*, concepts also referred to by Amīn, by the way. *Tawallā'* denotes devotion or affection to 'Alī and his descendants, whereas *tabarrā'* means to dissociate oneself openly from the opponents of 'Alī and his descendants.⁵¹ *Tawallā'* does not necessarily have to go hand in hand with *tabarrā'*. Neither does it follow as a matter of course that a Muslim who is deeply devoted to 'Alī, can only be a Shī'ite in the doctrinal meaning of the word, i.e. someone who fully endorses all the teachings of Shī'ī Islam. The history of Islam, particularly the history of mystical Islam, has many examples of *tashayyū' ḥasan*, as this phenomenon is often called, literally "being a good shī'ite", i.e. exhibiting of pro-'Alid sentiments without being denominationally a Shī'ite.

In the Safawid period, however, this was to change. Shāh Ismā'il I imposed, through his ardent followers, the *qizilbāsh*, Shī'ī Islam in such a way that it was no longer possible to keep *tawallā'* and *tabarrā'* separate. On the contrary, people were expected, and even forced, to endorse and validate their *tawallā'* by engaging in deeds of *tabarrā'*, the most notorious of which was the ritual cursing of Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān. This development had of course an adverse effect on the relationship between Sunnī and Shī'ī Muslims. This is not to say that in pre-Safawid times their relationship was always a peaceful and harmonious one. On the contrary, instances of sectarian strife are easily to be detected. Through the religious policy of the Safawids, however, this strife was institutionalized, so to say, precisely because in the Shī'ī Islam they imposed, the emphasis was on ideas and rituals that were offensive for Sunnī Muslims. *Tabarrā'* became even a profession, in the sense that the Safawids employed people, called *tabarrā'ī*, who saw to it that the subjects of the Safawid kings did not back out from their obligation to participate in the public cursing of the first three rightly-guided caliphs.⁵²

This change did, of course, not occur overnight. It was the result of a gradual process that started many years before shaykh Ismā'il in 1501 became Shāh Ismā'il. Although it may have effected Herat relatively late, Jāmī personally experienced it in his trial in Baghdad, mentioned above. However, this appears to have been no more than an incident. Moreover, the use of the word *rafḡ* in his defense, quoted above -a word that is conspicuously absent when he in his *Shawāhid al-nubuwwa* deals with the Shī'ite imāms- shows that Jāmī differentiated between sectarian and non-sectarian Shī'ism.

To conclude, it was in Jāmī's time in Herat obviously still possible to exhibit *tawallā'* without resorting to *tabarrā'*, to be a Sunnī Muslim without being anti-Shī'ite.⁵³ That had to do with the religious and cultural climate of his time, a climate that Jean Calmard very concisely summarised as follows: "L'éthique dominante était alors le naqshbandisme accompagné d'un philo-alidisme largement diffus parmi les diverses couches sociales. Il y avait là un monde

⁵¹ For an analysis of these concepts and their development see Jean Calmard, "Les rituels shiites et le pouvoir. L'imposition du shiisme safavide: eulogies et malédictions canoniques", *Études Safavides*, Jean Calmard éd., Paris-Téhéran 1993, 117-121.

⁵² For a detailed analysis of these aspects of the imposition of Shī'ism by the Safawids, see Jean Calmard's "Les rituels shiites et le pouvoir".

⁵³ The author of the *Rashahāt 'ayn al-ḥayāt*, Fakhr al-Dīn 'Alī, who, like his father, the well-known Ḥusayn Wā'iz Kāshifī, was preacher in Herat, and who was also son-in-law of Jāmī is reported to have remarked: "Wenn ich von der Warte der Schi'iten aus predige, sind die Sunniten böse, wenn ich von der Warte der Sunniten aus spreche, quält das den Sinn der Zwölferschi'iten, deshalb bin ich weder Sunnit noch Schi'it." (E. Glassen, "Schah Ismā'il I. und die Theologen seiner Zeit", in *Der Islam*, 48/2 (1972), 264; cf also note 38).

intellectuel raffiné, à la limite de la décadence, ayant peu de points communs avec la rudesse tant des Uzbeks que des *qezelbaş*." ⁵⁴ In view of the important contribution of the Naqshbandi order to this climate, it is hardly appropriate to use phrases, mentioned in the beginning of the article, like "fidèles à la grandeur austère de l'islam sunnite", "champions de son orthodoxie" or "unique among the Sufi orders in its hostility to Shī'ism", to characterise this order and its members in this period.

⁵⁴ "Les rituels shiites et le pouvoir", 143.