

ATATÜRK SUPREME COUNCIL FOR CULTURE, LANGUAGE AND HISTORY
PUBLICATIONS OF THE TURKISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
XXX. Serial - No. 3^a

sufism and sufis
in ottoman society

sources-doctrine-rituals-turuq-architecture
literature and fine arts-modernism

Edited by
Ahmet Yaşar Ocak

ANKARA - 2005

A NEW LOOK AT THE RISE AND EXPANSION OF THE KHĀLIDI SUB-ORDER

B. ABU-MANNEH

Introduction

The Khālidiya is a Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi suborder carried from India into the Ottoman lands of Western Asia early in the nineteenth century by Sheikh Khālīd of Shāhrizūr in Iraqi Kurdistan¹. Within sixteen years, from the time of his return from India until his death in 1242/1827, he succeeded in expanding the order into many towns and cities of the region, into the Caucasus and even took initial steps for its expansion into South East Asia. This was an unprecedented expansion of a suborder. The question is how can we explain the success of this movement as far as the Ottoman lands were concerned?

This paper suggests giving priority to the internal over the external reasons for the expansion of the Khālidiya in its earlier phase. It was above all the socio-political situation in the Ottoman lands that provided a favourable atmosphere for its rise and expansion. However the "increasingly powerful presence of European powers and their intervention in Ottoman affairs"² to which Prof. Algar attributed its expansion, should be regarded as a cause in the later phase of the history of the Khālidiya.

1-The Early Life of Sheikh Khālīd

Our knowledge of the early life of Sheikh Ḍiyā' al-dīn Khālīd of Shāhrizūr in Iraqi Kurdistan, is based on a treatise entitled *al-Hādīqa al-Nadīya fī Adāb al-Tarīqa al-Naqshbandīya wa'l Bahdja al-Khālidiya* which was written in 1233/1817-1818, about seven years after the commencement of

¹ See my article "The Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya in the Ottoman Lands in the Early 19th Century" in *Die Welt des Islams* Vol. 22, (1982-84), pp.1-36.

² Hamid Algar "Political Aspects of Naqshbandi History" in Marc Gaborieau et. al., *Naqshbandis*, (Istanbul-Paris, 1990), pp.123-152. See p.138; see also *Idem*. "A Brief History of the Naqshbandi Order" p.30 "Militant opposition to the imperialism of Christian states became one of the dominant themes of the Khālidi branch of the Naqshbandi Order". Prof. Algar means perhaps after Sheikh Khālīd.

Khālīd's mission. The author, Muḥammad ibn Suleymān of Baghdad was a disciple of his³. It is partly a polemic that defends the Sufi path and emphasizes the characteristics of the Naqshbandī order. It also projects Khālīd as a distinguished Sufi guide who from a modest origin became the leading Sufi master in Kurdistan and Baghdad. There is some evidence that Khālīd was involved in the drafting of the treatise. The author refers to "*aḥad al-ikhwān*" as a source for his material⁴, and sometime quotes Khālīd in the first person⁵. Moreover, Muḥammad al-Khānī, Khālīd's senior Syrian deputy recalled that on a certain occasion the Sheikh referred to the treatise and told him that "*kulluhā min 'ibārati*" (it is all my briefing!)⁶.

In other words this treatise should be regarded as a semi-official publication and it apparently came to launch the Khālīdī suborder⁷. This occurred after a *zāwiya* was established for the Sheikh in Baghdad as we shall see below. The importance of the treatise lies, in addition, in the fact that it became the basis of all the other accounts on Sheikh Khālīd and the Khālīdī suborder as far as the early phase was concerned⁸.

Thus, according to it, Khālīd was born in the township of Qaradagh near Suleymāniya "approximately in 1190/ [1776],"⁹ to a family that belonged to the Jāf, a large tribe in Shāhrizūr that claimed descent from the third Caliph 'Uthmān. There was nothing unusual in his early life and

³ Abbas al-Azzawī, *Tarikh al-Adab al-'Arabī fī al-'Iraq*, 2 vols. (Baghdad, 1380/1960-1382/1962), II, 221.

⁴ Muḥammad ibn Suleymān, *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya fī Ādāb al-Tāriqa al-Naqshbandiya wa'l-Bahdja al-Khālidiya*, on the margin of 'Uthman ibn Sanad al-Wa'ili, *Afa al-Māwarid min Silsilat al-Imām Khālīd* (Cairo, A.H. 1313); see p. 29; hereafter, *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*.

⁵ *Ibid.* pp. 33f.

⁶ Abd al-Majid al-Khani, *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya fī Haqai'q Adjilla' al-Naqshbandiya*, (Cairo, A.H. 1308), p. 264. Hereafter, *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*.

⁷ *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, p. 16.

⁸ In addition to Ibn Suleymān see about Sheikh Khālīd: Muḥammad al-Khani, *al-Bahdja al-Saniya fī Ādāb al-Tāriqa al-'Aliya al-Khālidiya* (Cairo, A.H. 1303), pp. 82-99; [hereafter, *al-Bahdja al-Saniya*]; Abdulmajid al-Khani, *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*, pp. 223-261.; Ibrahim Fasih al-Haidari, *al-Madjd al-Tālid fī Manāqib al-Sheikh Khālīd* (Istanbul, A.H. 1292) [hereafter, *al-Madjd al-Tālid*]; Hasan Şukri, *Menakib-i Şems eş-Şumūs* [in Ottoman Turkish], (Istanbul, A.H. 1302). *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya* was moreover translated into ottoman Turkish by Khālīd's deputy Abdullah b. Mehmed el-Ferdi under the title *Semerat-i Silsileyi Halidiye Tercume-yi Hadika Nediye*. 9-91yk., a copy in Atatürk Library, Istanbul, (Osman Ergin, 234/2).

⁹ *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, p. 30.; *al-Madjd al-Tālid*, p. 27; *al-Bahdja al-Saniya*, p. 82. But he comments on the margin that after investigating the matter he found the year A.H. 1193/[1779] is more correct.

studies. He evidently belonged to a new generation of young Kurds who sought social mobility through learning. But he acquired almost all his learning at the hands of local instructors in Kurdistan, first in his home town, then in Suleymāniya and in other places. He ventured only once to travel to Baghdad to study a summary of *al-Muntahā* a *shāfi'i* book of law. However, he did not confine himself to religious subjects but he chose to study in addition some arithmetic, geometry, logic and astronomy, which were taught by Kurdish ulama at the time. He evidently excelled in his studies to the extent that when his teacher, the locally well known scholar 'Abd al-Karīm al-Barzinjī of Suleymāniya, died of the plague in 1213/[1798-9] he was appointed in his place to teach at his school¹⁰.

Islam enjoins its believers to perform the *Ḥadjj* if they were able to. Socially however, such an accomplishment contributes to the respectability of the believer in his own community. Thus, after serving as an instructor for seven years in a central town in Kurdistan, and reaching the prime age of thirty, Khālid decided in 1220/[1805-6] to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca. It is not clear whether he was looking for a Sufi guide at that stage, but his arrival at Mecca which has just been occupied by the Wahhabis (1806) who, as recalled, had destroyed all domes and sacred tombs in the city, seems to have bewildered him, though Ibn Suleymān is silent about that. He relates however, that at the Kaaba, Khālid met a certain holy man "disguised as a common man" who advised him to seek guidance in India, and added "a sign will reach you from there".¹¹ The fact that this episode was described as having taken place at the Kaaba, shows that it was intended perhaps to give it a sense of sanctity. In other words it was meant to show that Khālid's path into the Naqshbandī-Mudjaddidī order was inspired at the holiest place of Islam at the moment the Wahhabis were imposing their doctrine upon it. Whether this episode had actually taken place or not is of a secondary importance. What is important is the effect it meant to produce upon Khālidī followers.

After performing the pilgrimage Khālid returned to Suleymāniya via Damascus and resumed his work as a *medresse* instructor. About three years after that, an Indian Muslim called Mirza Raḥīm Allah Bek passed through the town on his way from Istanbul to India. Mirza Raḥīm Allah was a disciple

¹⁰ *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, pp. 30-32.

¹¹ *Ibid.* p. 33; *al-Madjd al-Tālid*, p. 29.

of the Indian Sufi master Shāh Ghulām 'Alī (or Sheikh 'Abd Allah al-Dihlawī) who was the head of the Naqshbandī-Mujaddidī zāwiya in Delhi.

There is a degree of discrepancy between the version of Ibn Suleymān and that of Ḥaydarī in *al-Madjd al-Tālid* concerning what happened next. Ḥaydarī, who wrote his book almost fifty years after the death of Sheikh Khālīd, claims that Shāh Ghulām 'Alī dispatched Mirza Raḥīm to Khālīd to call upon him to go to Delhi for initiation into the Naqshbandī-Mujaddidī order by him¹². This claim implies that Khālīd, though still an obscure and a minor 'Alīm, had become known even in such a remote place as Delhi, which is unlikely. Ibn Suleymān puts it differently. His description is perhaps closer to the truth. He states that Mirza Raḥīm passed through Suleymāniya, but it was Khālīd who called upon him first and inquired from him about a Sufi guide. Then Mirza Raḥīm told him about his sheikh in Delhi. After meeting him several times and after having long discussions with him, Khālīd decided to accompany him to Delhi to be initiated by Shāh Ghulām 'Alī into the Naqshbandī-Mujaddidī order¹³.

It was a decisive decision and a turning point in the life of Khālīd. There was no other order in Suleymāniya or Iraqi Kurdistan except the Qādiriya, the sheikhs of which came from the Barzindji family. Those sheikhs, enjoying the blessing of the Baban rulers, passed the *Tarīqa* from father to son¹⁴. Apparently, they initiated no deputies outside the circle of their family. Thus the fact that Khālīd sought to be initiated and trained as a Sufi guide and into another order, was in itself a challenge for the existing norms in his community. At any rate, some time in 1224/1809 he left Suleymāniya with Mirza Raḥīm and went on foot through Iran and Afghanistan to India. The journey to Delhi seems to have lasted about a year¹⁵.

Shāh Ghulām 'Alī (1156/1743-1240/1824) was the most prominent disciple of Djān-i Djānan¹⁶ and perhaps the leading Naqshbandī-Mujaddidī sheikh of his time, yet little is known about him. There is a short biography of his in *Nuzhat al-Khawātir* of the Indian Muslim author 'Abd al-Ḥayy al-

¹² *Ibid.* p.29.

¹³ *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, p.34; *al-Ḥada'iq al-Wardiya*, pp.221&226.

¹⁴ Martin van Bruinessen, *Agha, Sheikh, and State: The Social and Political Structures of Kurdistan*. (London, 1992), p.219.

¹⁵ *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, p.36; *al-Ḥada'iq al-Wardiya*, p.227.

¹⁶ Athar Abbas Rizvi, *A History of Sufism in India*, 2 vols. (New Delhi, 1983), II, 248.

Ḥasani¹⁷ and another one in *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardīya*¹⁸ of 'Abd al-Madīd al-Khānī. He was very close to Djānan in his last years and after the assassination of the latter by an Indian Shiite in 1781, he inherited his place as the head of the *Khanqah* (i.e. Sufi lodge) in Delhi and stayed in this post for over forty years, until his death in 1824. Throughout these years Shāh Ghulām 'Alī succeeded in expanding the order far and wide not only in India but, apparently, in many other Muslim countries. He attracted many disciples "from remote places, from al-Rum [i.e. the Ottoman-Turkish lands], from al-Sham, Iraq, Hidjaz, Khorasan [!] and Transoxania, indeed from China to the Maghrib" stated Khani perhaps with a certain degree of exaggeration¹⁹. Both Khānī and Ḥasani presented him as the guardian of Mudjaddidī teachings. What distinguished him, in their view, was his strong attachment to the *Qur'an* and the *Sunna* and his dedication to the cause of the *shari'a* and for its implementation in word and spirit. Above all his persistence in emulating the Prophet in his acts and deeds indicated his faithfulness to the teachings of Sirhindī²⁰. And Rizvi described him as having been "a forceful defender of the teachings of the Mudjaddid" meaning Sheikh Aḥmad al-Sirhindī²¹. However, he followed Sirhindī in another aspect and that is in his attitude towards non-Muslims and unbelievers.

Those were years of weakness and decline of the Mughal Sultanate of Delhi and the constant expansion of British power in the subcontinent. Such circumstances seem to have affected his attitude towards western ways and norms and perhaps towards non-Muslims altogether. When a distinguished Indian Muslim dignitary came to see him wearing a "Christian hat" (*qalansawat al-naṣārā*) he became angry, spoke harshly to him and prevented him from attending his presence. The visitor then went out, took off the hat and reentered²². And when Ismā'il al-Madanī came to his *Khanqah* to seek initiation, he brought with him some relics of the Prophet to have them deposited in the main mosque in Delhi. The Sheikh expressed his

¹⁷ Abd al-Ḥayy al-Ḥasani *Nuzhat al-Khawāṭir wa Bahdjat al-Masāmi'* wa 'l-Nawāzīr, 7 vols. 2nd. ed. vol. 7 (Haidar Abad, 1399/1979), pp. 365-7.

¹⁸ *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardīya*, pp. 209-223.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* p. 210.

²⁰ al-Ḥasani, vol. 7, pp. 366-7; *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardīya*, pp. 209&212; M. Zāhid al-Kawthari, *Irgḥām al-Murīd*, (Istanbul, A.H. 1328) pp. 77-78; Christian Troll, *Sayyid Ahmad Khan* (New Delhi, 1978), pp. 30-31.

²¹ Rizvi, II, 248.

²² *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardīya*, p. 211.

displeasure by saying that there were "objects of heresy" in the mosque and when it was searched some pictures of former dignitaries were found in it and were consequently removed²³. These anecdotes and others, demonstrate the strictness of the Sheikh in observing tradition and Islamic values in face of the penetration of Western values.

Khālīd spent about a year at the *Khanqah* of Shāh Ghulām 'Alī throughout which he was subjected to extensive training in the rites and practices of the Naqshbandī-Mudjaddidī order. Following that the Shāh ordained him as his deputy and according to Ibn Suleymān, bestowed upon him "full deputyship"²⁴ (*khilafāh tāmmah*). He then instructed him to spread the order in his country (*awṭān*), meaning most probably Kurdistan, but Ḥaydarī specified by saying "in his country and in Baghdad".²⁵ But Khālīd as we shall see, took the order much beyond that. Along with the Naqshbandī teachings and rites the Sheikh initiated him in four other orders practiced in India namely the Qādiriya, Suhrawardiya, Kubrawiya, and the Chishtiya, all of which he received from his master Djān-i Djānan.²⁶ But he was a deputy in the Naqshbandiya-Mudjaddidiya only.

The existing sources about Shāh Ghulām 'Alī presented him as an extremely pious Sufi guide who lived modestly and contented himself with little food and coarse clothes and who spent his days in prayer, training his disciples and in learning. Sayyid Aḥmad Khan whose parents were members of the *khanqah* confirmed this image as he is quoted in Ḥasanī.²⁷ But this was only one side of the picture. Aḥmad Khan added that the *khanqah* was very active and several hundred people attended it, which explains why the Shāh planned to enlarge it.²⁸

Sheikh Khālīd returned to Suleymāniya in 1226/1811. What he carried with him from Delhi apart from the teachings and rites of the Naqshbandī-Mudjaddidī order is an open question. Sufi sheikhs usually impart to their deputies privately or in a closed session instructions that they were required

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.* p.229; *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, p.38; but Haidari in *al-Madaj al-Tālid*, p.32 added the adjective "muṭlaqa" i.e. absolute which is not found in the earlier works.

²⁵ *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, p.39; *al-Madaj al-Tālid*, p.33.

²⁶ *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*, pp.229-230.

²⁷ *al-Ḥasanī*, *Nuzhat al-Khawāṭir*, vol.7, p.366; see also *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*, p.211; Troll, p.30.

²⁸ *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*, p.217.

to follow. Ibn Suleymān gives the impression that the Shāh had high expectations of Khālid. Indeed his mission represents an impact of Indian Islam on the Ottoman lands in the nineteenth century.

At any rate, Ibn Suleymān claims that he was well received by the *a'yan* of Suleymāniya.²⁹ But the fact that after a short while he left for Baghdad and stayed for five months at the shrine of Sheikh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Kilānī "by instructions of his Sheikh"³⁰ indicates that he encountered difficulties there. As mentioned above, there was already an established Qādirī sheikh and a *zāwiya* at Suleymāniya at the head of which stood a member of the Barzinji family, Sheikh Ma'rūf al-Nodahī (1752-1838) who was regarded as the chief religious dignitary in the town and who enjoyed the backing of the Baban rulers³¹. The advent of a new order carried by a young, well educated sheikh whose teachings were characterized with activism as we shall see, contrary to the quietism of the Qādirī order and who was of a dynamic and commanding character, was undoubtedly a challenge to Sheikh Ma'rūf and to his moral authority and influence in Suliamaniya.

After Sheikh Khālid returned from Baghdad, he started expanding the Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi order and many people asked to be initiated into it, especially from among the young and educated generation, from Suleymāniya and other townships in the district³². Many of these *murīds* he trained to become his deputies (*khalifas*). Among his followers we find even some members of the Barzinji family³³. One of his first deputies was 'Uthmān Ṭawīla a young man from the village of Ṭawīla in southern Shāhrizūr and many others. When Claudius Rich, the British Resident in Baghdad, visited Suleymāniya in 1820 he was impressed by the popularity and very many followers of Khālid³⁴.

²⁹ *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, p.39; *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*, p.230.

³⁰ *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, p.39.

³¹ Halkot Hakim, "Mawlāna Khālid et les Pouvoirs" pp.361-370 in M. Gaborieau et al. *Naqshbandis*, pp.363-4.

³² Abbas al-Azzawī, "Mawlāna Khālid al-Naqshabandi" in *Madjallat al-Madjma' al-'Ilmi al-Kurdi* vol.1, (Baghdad, 1974), pp.696-727. See p. 702.

³³ Abbas al-Azzawī, "Khulafa' Mawlāna Khālid" in *Madjallat al-Madjma' al-'Ilmi al-Kurdi*, vol.2, (Baghdad, 1974), see p. 204; *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, p.47 & 69. I am deeply grateful to Prof. Michel Chodkiewicz of Paris who was kind enough to provide me with a photocopy of these two articles of Azzawī.

³⁴ Claudius Rich, *Narrative of a Residence in Koordistan*, 2 vols. (London, 1836), vol.1 p.140; H.Hakim, p.362.

It was a great controversy that involved many ulama from Baghdad and Mosul, and at a certain stage even the Governor General of Baghdad and the Baban rulers interfered in it. Sheikh Ma'rūf, a provincial sheikh who acquired his learning and training in Shāhrizūr³⁵, raised serious allegations against Khālīd. The fact that he trained deputies and sent them to various places to spread the order was a novelty in the eyes of Sheikh Ma'rūf and he seems to have interpreted it as a means to seek "fame and leadership"³⁶ (*al-shuhra wa'l riyāsa*). He moreover accused Sheikh Khālīd of heresy and of ambition "to control the land"³⁷. Indeed in a letter from the ulama of Suleymāniya to a senior and highly respected Kurdish 'ālim, Yaḥya al-Mazzurī, Khālīd was accused of spreading *ḍalāl* (unbelief) in the land. Such accusations made it very difficult for Khālīd to stay in Suleymāniya. Consequently he left the town for the second time and settled in Baghdad (1228/1813)³⁸. It is not the place here to expound on this controversy. All that is necessary to say is that the first accusation was perhaps the result of lack of understanding of Naqshbandī-Mudjaddidī teachings. As to the second we shall refer to it in the course of this paper.

In Baghdad, Khālīd found a more sympathetic audience. The Haydari family, who was of Kurdish origin and the head of whom, As'ad Ṣadr al-Dīn served as the ḥanafī Muftī, took him under its auspices. 'Ubayd Allāh, the elder son of the muftī, became the first of Khālīd's deputies in Baghdad. According to his nephew, Ibrāhīm Faṣīḥ al-Haydarī, it was with the initiative of the Haydaris along with other dignitaries in the City and with the help of the Governor General Sa'īd Pasha that an old and neglected school, al-Madrassa Aḥsā'iya was restored and turned into a zāwiya for him (1230/1815/6)³⁹. And one of his disciples, Mulla Rasūl endowed much property in Baghdad for its expenses⁴⁰. It was Khālīd's first zāwiya, and came to be known hereafter as *al-Takiya al-Khālīdiya*. It was composed of a lodging for the Sheikh and his family, a meeting hall, a mosque and small rooms for the *murīds* and for students. Following that he started to work intensively on

³⁵ On Sheikh Ma'rūf see : Muhammad al-Khal, *al-Sheikh Ma'rūf al-Nodahi* (Baghdad, 1961), pp.51&60.

³⁶ *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, pp.115-116.

³⁷ *al-Ḥadai'q al-Wardiya*, p.231; Azzawi, "Mawlāna Khālīd", pp.710ff.

³⁸ *al-Madjd al-Tālid*, p.41; H.Hakim, p.365; van Bruinessen, pp. 224ff.

³⁹ *al-Madjd al-Tālid*, pp.34-35.

⁴⁰ Ibrāhīm al-Durūbi, *al-Baghdadiyyun Akhbāruhum wa Madjalisuhum*, (Baghdad, 1958), p.324.

spreading the teachings of the order and on training adepts. In fact, following the practice at the *khanqah* of Shāh Ghulām 'Alī in Delhi, the Khālidi *zāwiya* served both as a place of initiation and retreat as well as of learning. Indeed his conflict with Sheikh Ma'rūf and his distancing himself from Suleymāniya, turned to be a blessing for him, as we shall see hereafter.

2-The Emergence of the Khālidi Suborder

The expansion of the Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi order into Baghdad and the Kurdish regions at the hands of Sheikh Khālīd resulted in a Sufi revival there. The Mamluk governors of the city since Suleymān Pasha the elder (1779-1802) seem to have given priority to the establishment of mosques and *medresses* more than to support Sufi *zāwiyas* or their sheikhs⁴¹. Consequently, the activity of the two local Sufi orders, namely the Qādirī and the Rifā'i was at a low ebb especially during the first decades of the 19th century. But Sheikh Khālīd aroused the interest in Sufism again. Indeed he turned his newly acquired *zāwiya* into a very active centre for expanding the order as well as for the study of Islamic subjects. Contrary to Suleymāniya where his disciples (*murīds*) came largely from a semi-rural background, in Baghdad they came on the whole from among the ulama and other urban elite elements. Many ulama of the city especially of Kurdish origin became his disciples and followers⁴². In this he was in line with the Mudjaddidi tradition of expanding the order among the upper and the educated classes. It is said that even 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Naqīb, the head of the Qādirī shrine in the city became a disciple of his⁴³. It appears then that the success which Sheikh Khālīd met with in Baghdad seems to have emboldened him to establish a suborder after his name. Ibn Suleymān stated in his treatise that "it was agreed among the brethren to call it as of him *Khālidiya*."⁴⁴

After this success in Baghdad, the attitude of the new Baban ruler, Maḥmūd Pasha and of Sheikh Ma'rūf towards Khālīd changed. Khālidi

⁴¹ On Mamluk Policy in Iraq see: Thabit, [pseudonym] *Bagdatta Kōlemen Hukümetinin Teşkilile İnqiradına Dair Risaledir*, (Istanbul, A.H. 1292), The real name of the author was Suleymān Fa'iq. See 'Imad 'Abd al-Salam Ra'ūf, *al-Tarikh wal-Mu'arrikhūn al-'Iraqiyyūn fi al-'Asr al-'Uthmani* (Baghdad, 1983), see pp.57-8 & 238-9; see also A. al-Azzawī, *Tarikh al-'Iraq bain-a Ihṭilalayn*, vol.6, (Baghdad, 1372/1954).

⁴² Azzawī, "Khulafa' Mawlāna Khālīd" pp.182ff., p.189, p.199; *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, pp.69-70.

⁴³ As'ad Sāhib (ed.), *Bughyat al-Wādjid fi Maktūbāt Ḥaḍrat Mawlāna Khālīd*, (Damascus, A.H.1334), hereafter: *Bughyat al-Wādjid*. See pp.191-2.

⁴⁴ *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, p.16.

sources claim that Ma'rūf sent two emissaries to Baghdad to mediate between him and Khālīd. Their mission was successful and Khālīd wrote a conciliatory letter to Sheikh Ma'rūf in which he wrote he had forgiven him for what he had done to him.⁴⁵ Following that, Maḥmūd Pasha built in Suleymāniya a *zāwiya* for Sheikh Khālīd "to be a centre for both learning and Sufi initiation" and assigned allowances for students and *murīds* as well as endowments in the town and its vicinity for its expenses⁴⁶. Following that, Khālīd returned to Suleymāniya along with a number of his deputies and disciples and resided in his newly founded second *zāwiya*.

3-The Teachings of the Khālīdī Suborder

After recounting how the suborder was established and the place of Khālīd was recognized by the local authorities in Baghdad and Suleymāniya, we should now perhaps discuss his views and teachings. We shall refer briefly first to some teachings of Sheikh Aḥmad Sirhindī the founder of the Mudjaddidī branch of the Naqshbandiyya and find to what degree these teachings influenced Sheikh Khālīd.

Sirhindī was a religious thinker who left many writings, especially a collection of 534 letters in three volumes. Sheikh Khālīd on the other hand, was a Sufi guide gifted with organizational ability and a commanding presence rather than a thinker or a theologian. It is possible however to learn of his views from a collection of 106 letters published by his nephew As'ad Ṣāḥib⁴⁷. These letters are all in Arabic and were sent to his deputies and disciples. They were concerned with the affairs of the order except for two short treatises. (His Persian letters were not used for this article and they exist in manuscript form- Ms. no. AY728 at the Istanbul University Library, fols.53-192. In fols. 1-52 of the same ms. there are 50 letters in Arabic most of which were published in the collection.)

Three themes which recur in the collection of Sirhindī's letters can be traced in the letters of Sheikh Khālīd and show that his basic views were largely rooted in the teachings of Sirhindī. The first was the call to rectify

⁴⁵ A copy of the letter in *Bughyat al-Wādjīd*, pp.207ff. ; see also *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*, p.231.

⁴⁶ *al-Ḥadīqa al-Nadiya*, p.41; *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*, p.234.

⁴⁷ See note 43.

belief (*taṣḥīḥ al-i'tiqād*) according to the views of the *sunni ulama*.⁴⁸ Secondly, the duty of rulers to promote the *sharī'a* and to guarantee its prevalence in community and state (*tarwīdj al-sharī'a*).⁴⁹ And thirdly, the strict application of *sharī'a* rules to the non-Muslims⁵⁰.

Khālīd was of the belief that the *Umma* (the Muslim community) had gone astray, and that it should be restored to the right path. Consequently, in his correspondence he exhorted his deputies "to rectify the beliefs (*taṣḥīḥ al-i'tiqād*) according to the principles of *ahl al-sunna*"⁵¹ (i.e. Orthodox Muslims). He called, moreover, for the revival (*iḥyā'*) of the *sunna*, the Prophetic usage. And thirdly, he ceaselessly exhorted his deputies and disciples to promote the *sharī'a* (*tarwīdj al-sharī'a*). Thus he wrote to his emissary in Damascus that he should occupy himself in "reviving the exalted *sunna* and in checking [bad] innovation".⁵² And to his deputy in Malatya, he wrote that he should "promote the exalted *sunna* unrelentingly".⁵³ The Naqshbandī path, wrote Khālīd to his deputy in Madina is "to hold strongly to the *sharī'a* and to revive the *sunna* and to avoid bad innovations [and added] the ways to God are closed except for those who follow the footsteps of the Prophet".⁵⁴ Indeed, emulating the Prophet was a central call in Naqshbandī teaching. In this way they made the early period of Islam an ideal that should be recaptured by Sunni Muslims. The way of the Naqshbandis, wrote Sirhindī, "is absolutely identical with that of the Companions (of the Prophet) and they have the same rank"⁵⁵. In this sense Khālīd declared that his belief "is exactly the belief of the *salaf* and his *Ṭarīqa* is *al-Ṣiddīqiya* [i.e. of the first Caliph Abū Bakr] which is the same as the *Ṭarīqa* of the Companions and the leading *tābi'ūn*".⁵⁶

His call to adhere fully to the *sharī'a* was also a basic principle in Naqshbandī thought. Thus according to Sirhindī "on the day of

⁴⁸ Ahmad Sirhindī, *Maktūbāt* [the Arabic translation of Muḥammad Murād al-Qazānī al-Manzilawī] vol. 1, letters: 75, 91, 94, pp.87,94, 99 respectively. [hereafter, *Maktūbāt*].

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* letters 47,81, 165, 195, pp.63,94, 146, and 166 respectively.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.* vol. 1, letter 165, pp.145-146, letter,193 p.165.

⁵¹ *Bughyat al-Wādjid*, pp.159-160.

⁵² *Ibid.* p.267.

⁵³ *Ibid.* p.133.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* p.81.

⁵⁵ Y. Friedmann, *Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī: an Outline of his Thought and a Study of his Image in the Eyes of Posterity*. (Montreal, 1971) p. 68.

⁵⁶ *Bughyat al-Wādjid*, p. 96.

Resurrection people will be asked about [their adherence to] the *sharī'a* not about *taṣawwuf*⁵⁷. He was not interested in the legal injunction of the *sharī'a*, noted Friedmann, but "to incorporate it in the comprehensive Sufi world view"⁵⁸. For him the *sharī'a* "comprehends all the goods of this world and the next" wrote Anṣārī⁵⁹. Sheikh Khālīd however, despite his being a dedicated adherent of Sirhindī's views, put emphasis on the role that the *sharī'a* should play in society and state, which reminds us of the way it was regarded by Sheikh 'Ubayd Allah Aḥrār.⁶⁰ In other words, it was not only the duty of the believer to follow *sharī'a* rules in his daily life, but it was the duty of Muslim rulers as well to abide by these rules and to be guided by them in the affairs of their government. In this sense we find Sheikh Khālīd writing to Dāwūd Pasha, the Governor General of Baghdad (1817-1831) to say that "it is compulsory to obey the orders of Muslim viziers as long as these (orders) do not contradict the *sharī'a*"⁶¹. Similarly, to 'Abd Allah Pasha, the Governor General of Acre (1819-1832) who asked for Khālīd's prayer (*du'a*'), he wrote that "he would pray for him to the extent that he [i.e. the Pasha] cares for the observance of the *sharī'a*"⁶². And after Sirhindī, he added in another letter to Dāwūd Pasha that "the virtuousness of kings is the virtuousness of the subjects, their corruption is the corruption of all the subjects"⁶³, meaning that a virtuous ruler is the one who abides by the *sharī'a*.

But the call to adhere fully to the *sharī'a* carried with it the implicit demand to have it applied on two levels. First it implied a call for the supremacy of law in society and state which meant a call for the protection of the subjects against arbitrary government as the Gülhāne Rescript introduced⁶⁴. Secondly, it implied the application of the sumptuary laws on the non-Muslims. This latter point was a central theme in Sirhindī's letters to certain state functionaries at the Mughal court early in the 17th century. "It

⁵⁷ *Maktūbāt*, vol. 1, letter, 48, p.64; Friedmann, p. 41.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* p. 45.

⁵⁹ Muhammad Abdul Haq Ansari, *Sufism and Sharī'a: a Study of Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī's Effort to Reform Sufism* (London, 1986), p.71; *Maktūbāt* vol.1, let

⁶⁰ Algar, "A Brief History", p. 30.ter 3, p.50.

⁶¹ *Bughyat al-Wādjīd*, p. 109.

⁶² *Ibid.* p.245.

⁶³ *Ibid.* p.188, cf. also p.245; *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardīya*, p.255. *Maktūbāt*, vol. 1, letter 47, p.63.

⁶⁴ See my article "The Islamic Roots of the Gülhane Rescript", in *Die Welt des Islams*, vol. 34, (1994) pp. 173-203.

is necessary [he wrote], to do one's utmost to apply the rules of the *sharī'a* and to be hostile towards unbelievers who are the enemies of God and his Messenger"⁶⁵. What Sirhindī meant by unbelievers in this context, were the Hindus who were experiencing at that stage a rise in terms of economic and social power at the expense of the Muslims. He exhorted his friends and disciples at the Mughal court to combat this phenomenon and ensure Muslim supremacy in the land⁶⁶.

Sheikh Khālīd, though he lived in a different time and place, took a similarly strict attitude towards the non-Muslims and towards the Shiites which became apparent at a later phase of his mission. In a letter to a follower, Ibrāhīm Ismetbuli, whom he authorized to read the *Khatm al-Khwādjagan*, the prayer which followed the *dhikr* session in Khālīdī practice, he instructed him to end the prayer by a *du'ā'* for God "to annihilate (*ahlik*) the Jews, Christians, Fire Worshipers (*Madjūs*) and Persian Shiites (*rawāfiq al-A'djām*)"⁶⁷. In a letter to his followers in Āmid (Diyarbakir) he wrote, after exhorting them to hold fast to the exalted *sunna* and to avoid innovation, that "they should pray for the success of the Muslims and the failure of the Christians and the Persians"⁶⁸. Moreover, Khālīd ended his treatise on *al-Rābi'a* (link) by instructing his followers to "pray for the survival of the exalted Ottoman state which is the pivot of Islam and for its victory over the enemies of religion, the cursed Christians and the despicable Persians"⁶⁹.

This *Risāla* of Khālīd was written to his followers in Istanbul on the occasion of his conflict with his emissary there, 'Abd al-Wahhāb Sūsī at about mid 1820s, over the attempt of the latter to have his disciples link with him⁷⁰. At that time the Greek Revolution was at its height. This revolution was seen as a betrayal by the Greeks of the Ottomans after centuries of cooperation and living together. Consequently, it aroused much antagonism against

⁶⁵ *Maktūbāt* vol. 1 letter 165, pp.145-6, letter, 193, p. 165, cf. letter 81, p.94.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, letter 33, p.47.

⁶⁷ From a letter to his adherent in Istanbul, Ibrāhīm Ismetbuli in AY728, fol. 52a. The same letter to the same addressee is published by As'ad Sahib in *Bughyat al-Wādjid* pp.166ff., but the sentence quoted here was omitted apparently by the editor. An exactly similar prayer is repeated in full in the collection of Khālīdī treatises, AY2404, fol.153a.

⁶⁸ AY728, fol.19b. at Istanbul University Library.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.* fol. 7a; *al-Ḥada'iq al-Wardiya*, p.297.

⁷⁰ see *Bughyat al-Wādjid*, pp.72-79; see my article "Khalwa and Rābi'a in the Khālīdī Suborder" in M. Gaborieau et al. *Naqshbandis*, pp.289-302.

them throughout the Ottoman lands. Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi and Khālidi followers seem to have used this opportunity to exhort the Muslim community, not the least in Istanbul, to be more dedicated in practicing their religious duties. Moreover, it was used to rally Muslim public opinion behind the Sultan as we shall see below⁷¹.

But in the light of the fact that such calls were voiced by Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi and especially by the Khālidi orders and by no other Ottoman order, shows unequivocally the influence of Sirhindi's teachings in this matter. In addition, we should take into consideration the influences which Khālidi imbibed at the *khanqah* of his preceptor in Delhi, Shāh Ghulām 'Alī. The same could be said about Khālidi's attitude towards the Shiites which had its impact on the abolishing of the Bektashi Order in Istanbul in 1826⁷². Indeed, contrary to other orders which were on the whole politically quietist, this stance characterized the Khālidiya as an activist and even a militant suborder. Such characteristics manifested themselves on several occasions throughout the 19th century wherever the Khālidi suborder struck root.

Despite these signs of intolerance, there were besides positive aspects in the teachings of the Khālidiya. Indeed, the teachings of Sheikh Khālidi carried with them a call for the virtuous behavior of the Muslim believer and of the community. Thus in his letters to his deputies and disciples we find moral and religious exhortations which in this sense were also shared by other orders. Khālidi brings the *Ḥadīth* "the love of this world is the height of all evil"⁷³. He called upon Rāghib Pasha, his disciple in Istanbul to be "very careful not to be occupied in worldly matters."⁷⁴ To his deputy Kozani he wrote that "he should be "generous, forgiving, avoiding disputation and greed.[and added] there is no way of salvation except by truthfulness."⁷⁵ To Agribozi, his deputy in Smyrna he wrote that he should "be contented and avoid occupying [himself] in desires and sensuality."⁷⁶ Indeed he kept repeating this theme: "this world is transitory follow the *sunna* shun the

⁷¹ See study three in my book, *Studies On Islam And the Ottoman Empire in the 19th Century*, (Istanbul, 2001).

⁷² *Ibid.* study four "The Naqshbandi-Mujaddidi and the Bektashi Orders in 1826" pp.59-71.

⁷³ *Bughyat al-Wādjid*, p.119.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* p. 192.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* p.159.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.* p.160.

vanity of this world".⁷⁷ Or "do not be deluded by this world because it is the net of the Satan".⁷⁸ But "be pious and obey God and avoid what has been forbidden by Him, and make savings of good acts for the Day of Judgment"⁷⁹. These and other similar exhortations showed Sheikh Khālīd's concern for the virtue and righteousness of the Muslim believers.

But his teachings were not directed at the salvation of the individual believer only, but at the Muslim community as a whole. The above mentioned exhortations coupled with the emphasis on following the *shari'a* and on leading a life according to the tenets of Sunni-Orthodox Islam were Khālīd's call to the Sunni-Muslim community and was apparently aimed at bringing regeneration to this community. Such an aim underlined the revivalist vocation of the Khālidiya.

4-Sheikh Khālīd and the Local Authorities

Three main factors helped to define the attitude of the local authorities in Kurdistan and Baghdad towards Sheikh Khālīd: his teachings, his success in gaining a large number of followers, and his independence of them. As stated above, Khālīd appealed to a younger generation from Kurdish towns and townships mainly, who acquired a basic education in Islamic learning at schools which Kurdish rulers had founded in their domains⁸⁰. They represented a new emerging class among the Kurds which stood above tribal formations. His mission was basically directed towards them. Within a short time, he succeeded in establishing a network of deputies and followers all over the Kurdish regions loyal to him personally as a distinguished Sufi guide. Though it was an achievement on his part to be commended for, it was at the same time a novelty in the Kurdish districts and aroused allegations against him, as mentioned above, such as cherishing "ambition for fame and for leadership"⁸¹. Or in the words of the British Consul, Claudius Rich, who paid a lengthy visit to the Baban ruler in Suleymāniya in 1820, to make "himself temporal as well as spiritual lord of the country."⁸²

⁷⁷ *Ibid.* p.231.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.* p. 144.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.* p.282.

⁸⁰ M. al-Khal, pp.11,14,15,34.

⁸¹ *Ibid.* p.41; *al-Hadīqa al-Nadiya*, 116.

⁸² C. Rich, pp.320-1.

Secondly, chieftains and rulers of mountainous regions on the whole followed customary law and ruled in an arbitrary manner. Thus, the teachings of Khālid, especially his call to abide by *sharī'a* rules, must have been regarded with uneasiness by them, because it was an ideal that necessarily puts limits to their power. On the other hand, Sheikh Khālid succeeded in avoiding to fall under the protection of any ruler, and thus he was not dependent upon the authorities and free from their control, which added to their uneasiness concerning this new movement. Indeed rulers in general looked at Sufi orders with mistrust when they could not bring them under their control. It is related about the Amīr Muḥammad of Rawandūz, (d.1834) who was a contemporary, as having said that "I want people to spend their time in learning, I have no need for *Ṭarīqa*"⁸³ meaning that he preferred ulama over Sufi sheikhs and their followers. Indeed, the ulama were on the whole dependent on the authorities for their livelihood as functionaries in mosques, *medresses* or in the legal system. Sufi sheikhs, on the other hand, drew much moral authority from their direct contact with the Muslim believers and their concern for the piety of their followers. Besides, Khālid commanded very many followers who held him in high esteem and even regarded him according to Rich, as a saint⁸⁴. No wonder then that he was looked upon with a feeling of uneasiness by Kurdish rulers and chieftains.

In other words, there was a basic contradiction between what Khālid stood for and the political environment of the Kurdish regions. Thus, after staying for about three years in Suleymāniya during which, according to Rich, he was well treated by the Baban ruler, Maḥmūd Pasha, Khālid, all of a sudden, left for Baghdad (October 1820), apparently without taking his leave from the Pasha⁸⁵. He never returned to Suleymāniya after that. It was a sign that he could not accommodate himself to the existing socio-political order in Kurdistan.

Even in Baghdad Sheikh Khālid found it difficult to accommodate himself to the existing order. His sojourn in Baghdad at this time lasted a little less than two years, during which he took up his residence at his *zāwiya* (al-Takiya al-Khālidiya). According to Khālidi sources, many followers

⁸³ *al-Madjd al-Tālid* p. 64.

⁸⁴ C. Rich, pp. 140-1; Azzawi, "Mawlāna Khālid", pp.702,719.

⁸⁵ C. Rich, pp.320-1; al-Khal, p.42.

attended his presence or asked to be initiated into the order. But it does not seem that Baghdad was this time as hospitable as before for him⁸⁶. After a while, he sent a trusted deputy of his, 'Abd al-Rahman al-'Aqri to Damascus to find out whether he could move to that city. A little later he sent another deputy, Ahmad al-Khaṭīb al-Irbili to prepare the grounds for his coming there. Upon his recommendation, Sheikh Khālīd left Baghdad for Damascus in the late Summer of 1822⁸⁷, accompanied by many of his close deputies. Despite the fact that this move was planned long in advance, again there is no evidence that he took his leave from the Governor, Dāwūd Pasha, before leaving.

Khālīdī literature is silent about the reason of his departure from Baghdad. But two reasons may have stood behind Khālīd's decision to immigrate from Iraq altogether. Firstly, the attitude of the Governor General, Dāwūd Pasha towards Sufism. As we are told by the Iraqi historian Sulaymān Fā'iq whose father was a *kethuda* of Dāwūd Pasha that the latter who was learned in Islamic sciences, gave preference to them and "had no inclination to Sufi orders"⁸⁸, which reminds us of the attitude of the Amīr of Rawandūz towards Sufis referred to above. Thus, during his fourteen years of government in Baghdad he supported Islamic learning and established mosques and medresses and founded endowments for their upkeep⁸⁹, but no support was given to sufi sheikhs or their *zāwīyas*. Undoubtedly, Khālīd was aware of this attitude of Dāwūd Pasha and he, it seems, had never applied to him for help. But when he left Baghdad for Damascus, he was in debt for merchants and money lenders of about thirty thousand golden pieces. He apparently had left without settling the payment of this debt. It was paid on his behalf by Dāwūd Pasha from the public treasury⁹⁰, which Khālīd indirectly acknowledged in a letter to the Pasha: "I shall pray on your behalf due to your benefaction [towards me]"⁹¹.

⁸⁶ cf. *al-Maḥjīd al-Tālid*, p.39.

⁸⁷ It took place in 1822 and not in 1823 as often stated (as in my article in n.1, section two). See Khālīd's letter to an unnamed deputy in Baghdad in *Bughyat al-Wāḥid*, p.250; see also H.Hakim, p.368; Azzawī, "Mawlāna Khālīd" p.703.

⁸⁸ Azzawī, in *Ibid.* p. 720, referring to, *Mīr'at al-Zawra'* of the Baghdadi Historian Sulaymān Fa'iq.

⁸⁹ 'Ala' Mūsā Kāzīm Nawras, *Hukm al-Mamalik fi al-'Iraq 1750-1830* (Baghdad, 1975), pp.133ff.

⁹⁰ M. Amin al-Halawani, *Mukhtasar Maṭlā' al-Su'ūd bi Ṭibi Akhbar al-Wali Dawud* (Bombay, A.H.1304/1887), p.57.

⁹¹ *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya* pp.255-6.

The second reason that stood behind his leaving Baghdad was his desire to expand the order into other parts of the Ottoman lands. Baghdad offered him a limited scope only. Damascus, on the other hand, due to its geographical position offered him wider possibilities for his cause as we shall see below.

5-Sheikh Khālīd in Damascus

As mentioned above, Khālīd sent a deputy of his, Aḥmad al-Khaṭīb al-Irbilī before hand to prepare the ground for his immigration to Damascus. Irbilī, without much hesitation, recommended it to his master. Khālīd took his advice and arrived at Damascus in early 1238/ fall of 1822 with many of his deputies and stayed in al-Mu'allaq Mosque (known also as al-Djāmi' al-Djadīd) where Irbilī was lodging⁹². Initially however, the upper ulama of the city were cautious about him. A group of twelve of them headed by the two senior ulama, 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Kuzbarī and 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ṭībī called upon him and discussed with him "questions of various sciences to verify what he stood for"⁹³. Moreover, Ismā'il al-Ghazzī, the mufti of the Shafi'is in Damascus took him under his aegis (Khālīd himself was a Shafi'i), gave him his sister in marriage and became his confident⁹⁴. On his part Khālīd seems to have preferred to keep a distance from the religious community of Damascus and, at least at the beginning, he appeared to have been disappointed and dissatisfied with the place. Two letters which he wrote to two deputies of his shed light on his mood at that stage. To 'Abd al-Ghafūr a deputy of his in Baghdad, he wrote that he "inclines for seclusion much more than you have known me"⁹⁵. Damascus was full of corruption and bad innovations, he wrote to 'Abd Allah al-Djalī, his deputy in Koysanjaq and added "had I known that the Holy Land [meaning Damascus] is as such I would have not immigrated to it[and continued] if I find a place where I can rest I would immigrate [there]". He advised al-Djalī, who asked his permission to come and see him, against coming because the length of "my sojourn in al-Sham is not known"⁹⁶.

⁹² *al-Ḥadīqa al-Nadiya*, p.47; for al-Mu'allaq Mosque see 'Abd al-Qādir Badran, *Munādamat al-Alāl wa Musamarat al-Khayāl* (Damascus, 1960), p.371.

⁹³ *al-Ḥadīqa al-Nadiya*, p.48.

⁹⁴ *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*, p.242; Ismā'il al-Ghazzī, *Ḥuṣūl al-Uns fi Intiqāl Ḥaḍratī Mawlānā Khālīd ilā Ḥaḍrat al-Quds*. Edited by M.Usama al-Takriti, (Damascus, n.d.).

⁹⁵ *Bughyat al-Wājid*, p.250.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.* and Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, AY728, fols. 20b-21a.

Nevertheless, Khālīd soon bought himself a mansion in the quarter of al-Qanawāt which became his dwelling and part of which he turned into a *zāwiya* and a mosque. Some of the deputies who accompanied him settled in mosques in the city⁹⁷. Others he sent back to their posts⁹⁸. Despite his feelings, it appears that he had no better place and stayed on in Damascus until his death about five years later, (Summer of 1827.)

On the other hand, Khālīdī literature tells us that Khālīd was well received in the city. Indeed, as someone who called for following the *sharī'a* and upholding Sunni- orthodox ideals, Damascus could not have been but hospitable towards him. When he resumed his mission many of the younger ulama like M. Amīn 'Abidīn (or Ibn 'Ābidīn), Ḥasan al-Bīṭar, and 'Umar al-Ghazzī became his disciples. Many others he passed on to his deputies for initiation into the order. Ibn 'Ābidīn tells us that many ulama and other dignitaries were initiated into the Khālīdī suborder. He added moreover that Sheikh Khālīd had "revived many mosques in Damascus which had fallen into negligence and destruction by performing prayer and *dhikr* in them"⁹⁹. In other words the advent of Sheikh Khālīd to Damascus had a degree of a revivalist impact on the city¹⁰⁰. But, strangely enough, Khālīd did not ordain any deputy (*khalifa*) from Damascus. And except for Muḥammad al-Khānī who came from a village near Hamat there is no agreement among Khālīd's biographers that he had ordained any other Syrian Arab as a deputy¹⁰¹. However, As'ad Ṣāhib claimed that Khālīd ordained Aḥmad ibn Suleymān al-Arwadī of Tripoli and he was his last deputy. But neither Khānī nor Ḥaydarī include Arwadī among Khālīd's deputies, which casts a certain doubt on Ṣāhib's claim.

However, Damascus was not the real target of Khālīd nor indeed Syria. His primary objective for immigrating to that city seems to have been his intention to spread the order outside Kurdistan or Iraq. Damascus was an assembling station where pilgrims from Anatolia and Istanbul and beyond

⁹⁷ Kasım Kufralı, *Nakşibendiliğin Kuruluş ve Yayılışı*, Dissertation, University of Istanbul, Türkiye Enstitüsü, No.T.337, see pp.107-108.

⁹⁸ A list in *Bughyat al-Wādjid*, p.251.

⁹⁹ M.A. Ibn 'Abidīn "Sall al-Ḥusām al-Hindī fī Nusrat Khālīd al-Naqshbandī" in *Madjmū'at Rasā'il Ibn 'Ābidīn*, 2 vols (Istanbul, A.H.1325), see pp. 284& 324; *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*, p.244.

¹⁰⁰ Itzhak Weismann, *Taste of Modernity Sufism, Salafiya and Arabism in Late Ottoman Damascus*, (Leiden,2001) pp.68ff.

¹⁰¹ See my article "Shaykh Ahmed Ziya'uddin el-Gümüşhanevi and the Ziyā'i-Khālīdī Sub-order" pp. 105-117 in Fred de Jong (ed.), *Shi'a Islam, Sects and Sufism*, see pp.107ff.

gathered every year on their way to and from Mecca and Medina. As such, it was an excellent junction to attract new followers and expand the order especially in the Turkish regions¹⁰². Thus, he sent deputies from there to Istanbul, to central and western Anatolia and many *murīds* from these regions reached him in Damascus to seek initiation. In addition, he sent deputies to Medina and Mecca to establish themselves there and to expand the order both in the Holy Cities and among the pilgrims as we shall see below. It appears, then, that by shifting his seat to Damascus, Sheikh Khālīd succeeded in turning the order from a local Iraqi order into a pan-Ottoman and even an inter-Islamic order. On the other hand, the Khālīdī presence in Damascus itself took root. The city became an important centre of the Khālīdī suborder throughout the nineteenth century and the first decades of the twentieth century and a branch of it is still active there until this very day. When Khālīd died in 1827 struck by the plague he was buried there and in the early 1840s a mausoleum and a *zāwiya* were built over his tomb by the order of Sultan 'Abd al-Mad̲jīd and at his expense¹⁰³. Through this Damascus became a place of pilgrimage for the followers of the Khālīdī suborder¹⁰⁴.

6- Sheikh Khālīd and the Ottoman Sultanate

As we have seen above, one of the major aims of Sheikh Khālīd was to bring revival and regeneration to the Sunni-Muslim community. But this could not have been achieved as long as the suborder remained a provincial movement among the Kurds. To have a wider application or to become a pan-Ottoman movement, required first of all to leave Baghdad as we have seen above, and secondly, to define his attitude towards the Sultanate. We find in some of Khālīd's letters published in *Bughyat al-Wād̲jīd* and in his treatise on *al-Rābiṭa* sent to his followers in Istanbul around 1825, instructions and exhortations that shed a light on his viewpoint regarding this matter. And despite the fact that these letters, or those still in manuscript form, carry no date and it is not always easy to find out from the contents the approximate date of their writing, it has been suggested to attribute these letters in which his attitude to the Sultanate was voiced, to the

¹⁰² Kufrahi, p.106; On the *Ḥad̲j̲d̲j* see Suraiya Faroqi, *Pilgrims and Sultans The Hajj Under the Ottomans 1517-1683*, (London, 1994), see pp.32ff. & 166ff.; see also TDVİA "Hac" vol.14, pp.400-405.

¹⁰³ For the study of the Khālīdīya in Damascus in the 19th century see I. Weismann, *op. cit.* pp.56-140.

¹⁰⁴ H. Algar, "A Brief History" in *Naqshbandis*, p.29.

Damascene phase of his life. Indeed, during the eleven years between his return from India and immigration to Damascus we have no evidence that he openly expressed his attitude towards the central authorities nor that he voiced support for any local chieftain or Emir or governor.

Khālīd regarded the Ottoman State as the last bastion of Islam. In his *Risāla fi al-Rābiṭa* sent, as mentioned above, from Damascus to his followers in Istanbul, he instructed them "to pray morning and evening for [divine] support for the exalted Ottoman state which is the axis of Islam and for its triumph over the enemies of religion"¹⁰⁵. His second emissary to Istanbul, 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sūsī was exhorted "to bring high and low to pray for granting victory for the Caliph of Islam, the Commander of the Faithful [sic.], over the enemies of religion"¹⁰⁶. In his *idjāza* to his disciple, Ibrāhīm Ismetbuli, authorizing him to read the *Khatm al-Khwādjagān*, he instructed him to end the session by the following prayer: "May God preserve our Lord the Sultan and help him to protect the domain of Islam and grant victory for his armies in land and sea and may the exalted *sunna* be revived and the banner of the *sharī'a* of the Prophet be raised by him and by his Ministers and men and bring defeat upon his enemies because his enemies are the enemies of Islam"¹⁰⁷. And in a message to his follower, Mekki-zāda Muṣṭafa 'Āṣim, one of the leading ulama of Istanbul in the second quarter of the century, he called the Sultan "the Supreme Caliph"¹⁰⁸ (*al-Khalīfa al-A'zam*). "It is a duty for us", he wrote to other disciples in Istanbul, "to pray day and night for the [divine] support and victory for our Lord the Sultan and for the destruction of the enemies of religion the heretics and the infidels"¹⁰⁹.

These and other exhortations were not simply expressions of loyalty for the Ottoman Sultan but above all they represented a call for the Muslim community to stand firm and unite behind the Sultan /Caliph. Along with the other teachings of Sheikh Khālīd, which were discussed in Section Three above and in which he put emphasis upon the duty of Muslim believers to follow the *sharī'a* strictly, revive the *sunna* and rectify belief, the impact that they left upon all classes in Istanbul in a crucial phase of Ottoman history, seems to have been extremely important. But before getting down to discuss

¹⁰⁵ *Bughyat al-Wādjīd*, p.79.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.* p.123 n.1.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.* pp.169-170.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* pp.252-253.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.* pp.222-223.

this, it is necessary to discuss the expansion of the Khālidi suborder into Istanbul.

7- The Expansion of the Khālidiya into Istanbul

It was not the first time that the Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi order reached Istanbul. Already towards the end of the 17th century a first wave carried by Sheikh Murād al-Bukhārī spread among the upper classes in the city. A second wave was carried to the city by Mehmed Amīn Tokatī who was initiated into the order by Sheikh Aḥmad Joryani known as Yakdast at Mecca and became his deputy. Bukhārī and Joryani, both came from Central Asia and were trained by Sheikh Muḥammad Ma'sūm, Sirhindi's son and successor¹¹⁰. While the branch of Murad al-Bukhārī spread on the whole among the ulema of Istanbul, the branch of Joryani, through the chain of Tokati, found many adherents among the litterateurs and civil servants. Among its followers we find the famous poet Nadjdjar-zāda Mustafa Riḍā, and the prolific writer and historian Mustaqīm-zāda Suleyman Sa'd al-dīn. It was one of the prominent deputies of this chain of Tokati, Sheikh Bursali Mehmed Emīn, who became, during the early years of Sultan 'Abd al-Ḥamīd I (1774-1789), famous as a Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi sheikh and a *Mathnawīkhwān*. In 1779 however, he was exiled to Bursa. But after the rise of Sultan Selim III (1789-1807), he was allowed to return to Istanbul and resume his mission¹¹¹. Mehmed Amīn seems to have been a major public figure behind those civil servants dedicated to the cause of modernization under Selim III, a matter which incurred upon him and his disciples the wrath of the Janissaries. During the events that led to the deposition of the Sultan in 1807, many of these civil servants were put to death and the Sheikh himself was exiled to Bursa for the second time in his life. He died there a few years later, as I have shown in a previous study¹¹².

¹¹⁰ On Murad al-Bukhārī and Aḥmad Joryani see H.Algar, "A Brief History" in *Naqshbandis*, pp.27-28; See also my book *Studies on Islam and the Ottoman Empire in the 19th Century (1826-1876)*, (Istanbul, 2001) pp.41-42.

¹¹¹ On Bursali Mehmed Amīn, see M. Shams al-Din *Yādigār-i Shamsī* (Bursa, A.H. 1332), pp.172-177; Mehmed Süreyya, *Sicill-i Osmani*, vol.1 pp.420-421; Mehmed Tawfiq, *Madjmū'at al-Tarādjim*, (Istanbul Universitesi Kutuphanesi) TY192, fol.140a.; and M.A.Zaki, *Mashāhir al-Kurd wa Kurdistan*, vol.1, p.121.

¹¹² See my book *Studies on Islam and the Ottoman Empire*. pp.41-46. Aḥmad 'Āṣim, *Tārīkh*, 2 vols. (Istanbul, n.d.), vol.2, pp.83 & 92.

Those events of 1807-8 in which Sultan Selim III was deposed and the *Nizām-i Djadid* was disbanded, indicated that there existed a socio-political cleavage in the city. Broadly speaking, there stood on the one hand many members of the upper classes represented by higher ulema and civil servants, many of whom were followers of the Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi order¹¹³. On the other, there was the Bektashī order which was allied with the Janissaries. Both the Bektashis and the Janissaries encompassed among them many of the lower classes in the city. The tension between those two socio-political formations seem to have underlined the political life in the city in the few decades that preceded the events of 1807-08.

The advent of the Khālidiya to Istanbul represented the third Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi wave to reach the city. According to the Ottoman historian Süleymān Fā'iq Efendi¹¹⁴ (d.1837), an eyewitness to the events, the first emissary of Sheikh Khālīd reached Istanbul in A.H.1235/[1819-20]¹¹⁵. This took place it seems in the last year of Khālīd's sojourn in Süleymāniya. But this first emissary, called Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ¹¹⁶ of Süleymāniya, was not successful and Khālīd had to dispatch several others after him the most capable of whom was perhaps 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sūsī. Moreover, he himself immigrated to Damascus as mentioned, which enabled him to direct in a better way the affairs of the order in Istanbul. Several contemporary sources have witnessed the fast expansion of the Khālidiya in the city. According to an eyewitness, the aforementioned historian Süleymān Fā'iq, "many people of high rank and of good fortune from among the dignitaries (ridjal) and ulema of our time" joined Khālīd's emissaries¹¹⁷. The official historiographer of the period Aḥmad Luṭfi Efendi confirmed this view. "Many dignitaries and ulema of Istanbul, [he wrote] joined these deputies and the number of the brethren (*ikhwān*) started to multiply"¹¹⁸. Apparently, the ulama who joined the Khālidiya or showed tendency towards it, did so because of its emphasis upon following the *sharī'a*. The prevalence of the *sharī'a*, they believed, would lead to the checking of arbitrary government, restore

¹¹³ See my book (in n.112), pp.9f.

¹¹⁴ On Süleymān Fa'ik see *Osmanlı Müellifleri*, vol.3, pp.70-1; A. Djawdat, *Tārīkh*, (Istanbul, A.H. 1301) vol.12, p.150. He should be distinguished from his namesake, the Iraqi historian of the Mamluks in Baghdad who lived a generation later.

¹¹⁵ Süleymān Fa'ik *Mecmuasi*, (Istanbul Üniversitesi Kutuphanesi, TY 9577) fol.4a.

¹¹⁶ *Bughyat al-Wādjid*, p.123n.

¹¹⁷ Süleymān Fa'ik, fol. 4b.

¹¹⁸ Aḥmad Luṭfi, *Tārīkh*, vol.1 p.286.

security to the subjects and would strengthen the foundations of the state. However, the Khālidi deputies seem to have found adherents among lower classes as well. Thus, Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı was of the belief that the Khālidiya "spread in particular among Shāfi'is of Eastern [Anatolian] districts"¹¹⁹, meaning perhaps among the Kurdish immigrants to Istanbul. In other words, at a time of great anxiety in Istanbul, due, on the one hand, to the fear and resentment caused by the Greek Revolution, and on the other, to the unruliness of the Janissaries, the circumstances seem to have been opportune for the expansion of such a highly Sunni-Orthodox movement as the Khālidi suborder.

Among the high ulema who became dedicated Khālidi followers we find Mekki-zāda Muṣṭafa 'Āṣim who, by the mid 1820s had already served twice as sheikuliṣlām and who later on was to serve in the same capacity for about fourteen successive years (between 1833 and 1846)¹²⁰. Coming from a Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi family, as his father and his father-in-law were both adherents of the order¹²¹, Muṣṭafa 'Āṣim Efendi was, it seems, not an ordinary adherent but a dedicated one. He, for instance, corresponded with Khālidi in Damascus and once even sent him a present¹²². In answer to one of his letters, Khālidi wrote to thank him for "your concern for the promotion of our order" in Istanbul¹²³. Another high 'ālim who became about the same time a Khālidi adept was Keçeci-zāda 'Izzet Molla, who served as qādi of Istanbul. Being a well-known poet he praised Sheikh Khālidi and the Khālidiya in a long poem in which he declared his affiliation to the order¹²⁴. In 1828 Keçeci-zāda was to suffer exile to Sivas by the Sultan along with another Khālidi follower, 'Umar Rāsim Efendi¹²⁵. A third dignitary, who served in the highest military and civil positions was Khusraw Pasha, for a long time the right hand man of Sultan Maḥmūd. Khusrev built in

¹¹⁹ Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *100 Soruda Türkiye'de Mezhepler ve Tarikatlar*, (Istanbul, 1969), pp.220-1.

¹²⁰ On Mekki-zāda Muṣṭafa 'Āṣim see: *İlmiyye Salnāmesi*, p.580. ; see also *Dawḥat al-Mashāyikh*, pp.124-5.

¹²¹ On Mekki Efendi see *Dawḥat al-Mashāyikh*, p.112; and on Sammani-zāda 'Umar Khulūṣi Efendi see *Ibid.* 119; and Djawdat, *Tārīkh*, vol.8, p.201.

¹²² *Bughyat al-Wādjid*, p.255.

¹²³ *Ibid.* p.105.

¹²⁴ Ḥasan Shukri, *Menāqib-i Shams al-Shumūs*, pp.146-8.

¹²⁵ 'Abd al-Raḥmān Sharaf, *Tārīkh Muṣāḥabaları* (Istanbul, A.H.1339), p.47; Şerif Mardin, *The Genesis of Young Ottoman Thought* (Princeton, 1962), p.172; TDV *İA*, vol.23, pp.561-563.

1255/1839 a *tekke* in Eyüp which he assigned for the Khālidi suborder and established an endowment for its upkeep¹²⁶. These examples indicate to which degree the Khālidiya penetrated the elite of Istanbul.

But the call of Sheikh Khālīd, to revive the sunna, to rectify belief and to follow *sharī'a* rules strictly, meant a strong adherence to Sunni- orthodox Islam. This call was spread over-zealously in the City by Khālidi emissaries. Coupled with that there came the proclamations issued in the name of the Sultan following the outbreak of the Greek Revolution which called upon Muslims "to unite and bind themselves (together) in accordance with Islamic brotherhood"¹²⁷. The result was that Islamic communal solidarity and cohesion was being felt in Istanbul much more than before. In other words, the expansion of the Khālidi suborder into Istanbul at this junction had a far reaching impact on the religious and political life in the city, because communal solidarity of Sunni-Orthodox Muslims would invariably distance them from believers of other religions, especially from heterodox Muslims whom Khālīd denounced and reviled¹²⁸. In Istanbul, such heterodox beliefs were carried by the Bektashi order, which was allied with the Janissaries and upon whom it exercised much influence. Moreover, the exhortations of Khālīd to his followers in Istanbul to pray for the divine support for the Sultan/Caliph, and for his "triumph over his enemies because his enemies are the enemies of Islam"¹²⁹ should be understood as a call to rally behind the Sultan in his struggle against his enemies whether internal or external. Indeed, such exhortations proved to be of extreme importance on the day of the destruction of the Janissaries.

Thus, in June 1826 when the forces loyal to the Sultan encountered the Janissaries, the latter found themselves isolated and cut off from their traditional power base, namely the lower classes. On the day of the destruction of the Janissaries (mid June, 1826), public criers were sent to call "that all Muslims, all men loyal to the faith, [should] carry arms and assemble under the *sandjaq-i sherif* at Sultan Ahmet" wrote Andreossy, an

¹²⁶ Halil İnalcık, "Hüsrev Paşa" in *İA*, vol.5/1, pp.609-616; see also TDV *İA*, vol. 19, pp.41-45.

¹²⁷ For these proclamations see Şanizade, *Tarih*, vol. 4, pp.78f.; Djawdat, *Tārīkh*, vol.11, pp.143,167f., 271f.

¹²⁸ See study four in my book [n. 71] "The Naqshbandi- Mujaddidi and the Bektashi Orders in 1826" pp.59-71.

¹²⁹ *Bughyat al-Wādjīd*, p.170.

eyewitness, and added "an immense crowd all armed" flowed into the Hippodrome on that day¹³⁰. The historian of the event Mehmed Es'ad tells us that "the softas along with their instructors, the people (*ahali*) of the quarters accompanied by their Imams, and the people of the three towns (i.e. the satellite towns of Istanbul) with their kadis, all arrived ...in groups to the *Saray Meydani*," meaning the Hippodrome¹³¹, to where the forces loyal to the Sultan assembled. Such a popular unity behind the Sultan was not seen in Istanbul for many generations. There is no doubt then, that the destruction of the Janissaries and the abolition of the Bektashī order that followed three weeks later, was made possible due considerably to the fact that the Muslim community of Istanbul was influenced by the preaching of highly Sunni orthodox ideals of Khālidi and other Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi sheikhs. These Sufi sheikhs succeeded in carrying along with them much of the population of Istanbul and in uniting them in communal solidarity for the cause.

What distinguished these exhortations was their militant tone. Khālidi was not calling simply for a socio-religious activism for the sake of the application of the *shari'a* and following the tenets of *Sunni* Islam only. But he regarded these ideals as prerequisite for a virtuous and strong Muslim community. Beside that, however, the implication of this call was to reinforce the sultanate internally vis-a-vis such forces that challenged its authority in Istanbul and in the provinces.

8- The Khālidi Deputies and the Expansion of the Suborder

It was stated above that Sheikh Khālidi represented a new class of young Kurds many of whom studied at medresses in the Kurdish districts and stood above tribal formations. Once he became known as a Sufi guide, many of these young men came to him in Suleymāniya or Baghdad to be initiated into the new order. We should differentiate here between *murīd* or *sālik* and *khalifa*: the former is a disciple in general and very many such disciples were initiated into the order by Sheikh Khālidi himself or by his deputies. These followers were trained to practice the rites such as *dhikr* and were required to behave according to the *ādāb* (rules) of the Order. The latter, were those whom Khālidi continued training, ordained them as his deputies, and

¹³⁰ M. Le Comte Andreossy, *Constantinople et le Bosphore de Thrace Pendant les Annees 1812, 1813 et 1814 et Pendant L'Annee 1826*, (Paris, MDCCCXXVIII) [1828] pp.65-66.

¹³¹ Sahhaflar Sheikhizāda Mehmed As'ad, *Uss-i Zafer*, (Istanbul, A.H.1241), p.80.

entrusted them to spread the order. In a span of sixteen years between his return from India and his untimely death in 1242 / [1827] he succeeded in ordaining no less than seventy deputies, a large number by any standard¹³². Khālid sent these deputies to towns and cities in Iraq, Kurdistan, Eastern Anatolia, the Caucasus, Mecca, Medina, Damascus, Istanbul and other places, normally not sending two deputies to one and the same place at the same time. In this way the order became widely spread in a short time.

His first deputy (*khalifa*) was it seems, 'Uthmān Ṭawīla, nicknamed Sirajuddin from a village in southern Shahrizūr, in the district of Suleymāniya. After his ordination as a deputy he returned to his village and established a *zāwiya* there. A well respected deputy, his *silsila* was, until recently, active in those regions¹³³. It was Muḥammad Amīn al-Kurdī, a deputy of 'Uthmān's son, 'Umar, who took the Khālidīya into Egypt at the beginning of the 20th century¹³⁴.

Another of Khālid's first deputies was Ismā'il Kurdemiri better known as Shirvani of Shirvan in the eastern Caucasus. In 1813 he was on his way to India to seek initiation into the Naqshbandī-Mudjaddidī order by Shāh Ghulām 'Alī when he heard in Basra of Sheikh Khālid. He returned to Baghdad where he met him and when he returned to Suleymāniya Ismā'il accompanied him. For four years he kept in the company of Khālid during which time he was subjected both to study Islamic subjects and to be trained in the order. After his ordination as Khālid's deputy he was sent to his home country, Daghistān and Shirvan, to spread the order there. It was deputies from his line (*silsilah*) from among the Daghistānis and Chechens who established the *murīd* movement in the Northern Caucasus and combated Russian invasion of their homeland for three decades in the 19th century (until 1859)¹³⁵. Before the establishment of this movement however, Sheikh

¹³² I have compiled a list from various Khālidī sources. See also Halkawt Hakim "Mawlāna Khālid et les Pouvoirs" pp.361-370, in M. Gaborieau et al. (eds.) *Naqshbandis*, see p.362.

¹³³ *al-Ḥadiqa al-Nadiya*, p.75; Azzawi, "Khulafa' Mawlāna Khālid" p.199; van Bruinessen, p.241 & p.310.

¹³⁴ On Sheikh Muḥammad Amīn al-Kurdī see Muḥammad Amīn Zaki, *Mashāhīr al-Kurd wa Kurdistān*, 2 vols. (vol.1, Baghdad, 1364/1945 & vol.2, Cairo, 1366/1947), see vol.2 pp.143-145; Muḥammad Amīn al-Kurdī, *Tanwīr al-Qulūb fī Mu'āmalāt 'Allām al-Ghuyūb*, (Cairo, A.H.1384), see Introduction pp.1-56 by Salame al-Azzami.

¹³⁵ M. Gammer, *Muslim Resistance to the Tsar: Shamil and the Conquest of Chechnia and Daghistān*. (London, 1994), pp.111ff.

Ismā'il was forced by the Russians to immigrate to neighbouring Anatolia where he settled in Amasya never to return to Daghistān¹³⁶.

Another of the early deputies was Seyyid Ṭāhā al-Nehrī of Hakkari, perhaps the most politically minded of Khālīd's deputies. Originally, he belonged to the Qādirī order, hence he was known as al-Kilānī. But when his uncle 'Abd Allah who was a Qādirī sheikh became a follower of Khālīd (1229/1814)¹³⁷, Ṭāhā followed his steps and was trained by the Sheikh and became his deputy. Seyyid Ṭāhā who was the leading Khālīdī sheikh in the district of Hakkari, exerted much influence upon its Amīr, Nūr Allah Beg, as well as on the ally of the latter the Amīr of Botan, Bedir Khan. When a conflict emerged with the Christian inhabitants, the Nestorians (Assyrians), the two Amīr launched an attack on them in 1843 in which many Nestorians were killed. Following this, Seyyid Ṭāhā was accused of inciting the Emirs against them¹³⁸. When the Porte sent a punitive task force that brought the deposition of the two Emirs and their exile, Seyyid Ṭāhā escaped to Nehrī in the emirate of Shamdinan on the Ottoman Persian border¹³⁹. Henceforth, he came to be called al-Nahrī. With the fall of the local rulers Seyyid Ṭāhā became the most powerful and influential sheikh in that region. It was his son 'Ubayd Allah who led in 1880-1882 the first Kurdish movement¹⁴⁰. Moreover, the spiritual *silsilah* of the Barazanīs, the leaders of the Kurdish nationalist movement in Iraqi Kurdistan goes back to Seyyid Ṭāhā¹⁴¹.

In the case of Seyyid Ṭāhā and his heirs, the fall of the Kurdish Emirs of the region provided them with the opportunity to translate their spiritual influence into temporal power. Another example of such transformation took place in Daghistān and Chechniya when the Khālīdī sheikhs organized the *murīd* movement, and established their rule in the region. But this was

¹³⁶ On the life of Ismail al-Shirvani see my forthcoming article, "The Role of Ismail al-Shirvani in the Khālīdī Suborder" forthcoming in M. Gammer, (ed.); see also Anna Zelkina, *In Quest for God and Freedom The Sufi Response to the Russian Advance in the North Caucasus*, (London, 2000), see chap.14, pp.100-107.

¹³⁷ *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardīya*, p.259.

¹³⁸ Joyce Blau, "Le Rôle des Cheikhs Naqshbandi dans le Mouvement National Kurde" pp.371-377 in *Naqshbandis*, see p.373.

¹³⁹ van Bruinessen, pp.230-1.

¹⁴⁰ on the Revolution of Sheikh 'Ubayd Allah see Blau, pp.373-4. See also Halkawt Hakim, *Confrérie des Naqshbandis au Kurdistan au XIX Siècle*, Thèse de Doctorat de 3e cycle, Université de Paris IV (Paris, 1983) see fols. 255ff.

¹⁴¹ van Bruinessen, pp.231-2.

an exception in the Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi or Khālidi tradition. The masters of the order enjoined their followers to seek influence with rulers for the sake of the welfare of the Muslim community as 'Ubayd Allah Aḥrār did in Central Asia in the fifteenth century, but not to take their place or exercise political power themselves. Indeed it did not happen in other places where Khālidi sheikhs established themselves.

We mentioned, so far, several of Khālīd's prominent and capable deputies of the first generation. But before we turn to speak of the suborder after the death of Sheikh Khālīd, it is necessary to speak of a most successful yet modest and unassuming of his deputies, namely Sheikh 'Abd Allah al-Fardī[!] of Erzinjan whom Khālīd sent first to Jerusalem then to Mecca, hence he is known as al-Makkī¹⁴².

As we know, Mecca was a meeting place not only for the annual pilgrimage but for scholars from all over the Muslim world. In this sense Sheikh Abdullah occupied a privileged position. Indeed his influence extended on the one hand to Istanbul and on the other to the East Indian Archipelago. In this context we are interested in two of his disciples in Istanbul. The first Shehri Hafiz, was a member of the ulama corps and an instructor at the mosque of Bayezid, who after performing the Ḥadj, stayed behind and was initiated into the Khālidiya by Sheikh 'Abd Allah and became his deputy. Later on, after he returned to Istanbul, he became one of the tutors of Prince 'Abd al-Madjdī¹⁴³. The second was Sheikh Muṣṭafa Ismet who spent many years in Mecca and became a deputy of the same Sheikh. He returned to Istanbul in the early 1850s and established a Khālidi zāwiya in the Fatih quarter. Muṣṭafa 'İsmet was held in high esteem by Sultan 'Abd al-Madjdī who visited the zāwiya from time to time¹⁴⁴.

A little known fact about Mecca, however, is that among its inhabitants there were residents from other Muslim countries. One of the large communities there was from the East Indian Archipelago commonly called the Jawah (i.e. of Java in present day Indonesia). According to Snouck-

¹⁴² *Bughyat al-Wādjīd*, pp.173-4; Suleymān al-Zuhdi, *Madjmū'at al-Rasā'il 'alā Usūl al-Khālidiya*, (Istanbul, A.H.1305 ?), pp.34-5 on the margin.

¹⁴³ On Şehri Hafiz see: Aḥmad 'Atā, *Tārīkh*, vol. 3, p.119; M.Z. al-Kawthari, *Irghām al-Murīd*, (Istanbul, A.H.1328), pp.91-2; *Sicill-i Osmani*, vol. 1, p.433 & vol. 4, p.718.

¹⁴⁴ On Sheikh Mustafa Ismet see Hüseyin Vaşşaf, *Safina-i Awliyā*, vol. 2, Hazırlayanlar: 'Ali Yılmaz (ve) Mehmet Akkus, (Istanbul, 1999), p.133.

Hurgronje who spent six months in Mecca in 1884-5, their number was large and he described them as the "Jawah colony"¹⁴⁵. Sixty years earlier when he performed the Hadjdj in 1241/1826, Sheikh Khālīd was aware of the importance of Mecca for the expansion of the order in the Muslim periphery. Thus, while there he organized the affairs of the order in the Holy City entrusting Sheikh 'Abdullah to be his main deputy there and instructing all the other adherents of the order to follow him¹⁴⁶. He instructed Sheikh 'Abdullah moreover, not to take presents from anybody and promised to send him his needs annually from Damascus¹⁴⁷. Sheikh 'Abdullah, on his part, recognized the potential importance of his post especially as far as the Jawi community was concerned. His most important disciple from among this community, was Ismā'il Minangkabawi from a township in West Sumatra (known in Mecca as Ismā'il al-Jāwī) who stayed in Mecca during the second quarter of the century studying Islamic sciences and practicing the rites of the Khālīdī suborder¹⁴⁸. After his return from there in the early 1850s he succeeded in spreading the Khālīdiya in the Archipelago¹⁴⁹. Another deputy of the line of Makki was Sheikh Suleymān al-Zuhdī, also from the Archipelago. Suleymān Efendi established a Khālīdī *zāwiya* on Mount Abu Qubais in Mecca which was apparently attended by many Jawis. Thus his contribution for the expansion of the Khālīdiya and its teaching in East India Archipelago in the last decades of the 19th century was perhaps not less important than that of Minangkabawi a generation earlier¹⁵⁰. In other words the contribution of Sheikh 'Abd Allah al-Makki for the expansion of the Khālīdiya beyond the Ottoman lands was remarkable indeed.

¹⁴⁵ C. Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka in the later Part of the Nineteenth Century*, translated by J.H. Monahan, (Leiden & London, 1931), see pp.232,254.; van Bruinessen "The Origins and Development of the Naqshbandi Order in Indonesia" in *Der Islam*, Band 67, Heft 1 (1990), pp.164-5.

¹⁴⁶ Suleymān al-Zuhdī, p. 20.

¹⁴⁷ M. Murad al-Qazani al-Manzilawī, *al-Nafā'is al-Sāniḥāt fi Dhayl al-Rashahāt*, on the margin of *Rashahāt 'Ain al-Hayah* (Mecca, A.H.1307), see pp.178-9.

¹⁴⁸ Suleymān al-Zuhdī, p.20; van Bruinessen, "The Origins and Development of the Naqshbandi Order in Indonesia" in *Der Islam*, Band 67, Heft, 1 (1990), p.161; Werner Kraus "Some Notes on the Introduction of the Naqshbandiya-Khālīdiya into Indonesia" pp.691-706, in M. Gaborieau et al. (eds.) *Naqshbandis*, pp.693ff.

¹⁴⁹ van Bruinessen, *Ibid.* pp.161 ff.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.* pp.164f; Snouck Hurgronje, *Mekka*, pp.205-6.

Another of Khālid's first deputies was Ismā'il al-Anarāni who, after his ordination as a deputy was not sent away like the others to spread the order in a certain place, but was kept beside the Sheikh and became his confidant and closest deputy. "He served him for fifteen years"¹⁵¹ wrote Khāni. Khālid used to refer *murīds* to him for guidance before he took them over in the final stages. Because of that, his authority among the deputies of Khālid was widely accepted. At his death bed Khālid nominated him as his successor at the head of the order, but Anarāni died seventeen days after his master, struck by the plague like him¹⁵². Following his death no other deputy could command the respect of the other deputies and be recognized by them as the head of the suborder.

This is only a glance at the expansion of the Khāliidiya and at some of Khālid's first deputies. It is clear that Khālid had a gift for choosing capable and dedicated deputies. But their success in expanding the order did not depend on their dedication only. 'Abbas al-'Azzāwi, the historian of Ottoman Iraq wrote in an article about Khālid's deputies that "his followers and deputies were naturally disposed for piety and righteousness. They were moreover educated and urged [their followers] to acquire learning and be pious. In this way they saved people from ignorant sheikhs of other orders."¹⁵³ In other words the Khāliidiya spread out because it was above all a reformatory order. Due to that, the premature death of Khālid did not hinder his deputies from furthering his mission and making it the leading order in the Ottoman lands and in other lands of the Muslim periphery in Asia.

9- Retreat and Restoration

Despite the successes of the Khāliidiya, it suffered setbacks in certain Ottoman cities, the first of which was in Suleymāniya, the cradle of the suborder. After Khālid left that town in 1820 never to set a foot there again, he kept his younger brother, Maḥmūd, nicknamed al-Šāḥib, in his place in the *zāwiya*. But Maḥmūd al-Šāḥib was not as learned and as capable as his older brother and lacked the moral authority that Khālid enjoyed. Consequently, Ma'rūf al-Nodahī, the rival sheikh of the Qādiri order, finally

¹⁵¹ *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*, p.260.

¹⁵² *Ibid.* pp.260-1; Ismail al-Ghazzi *Ḥuṣūl al-Uns fi Intiqāl Ḥaḍrat Mawlāna Khālid ila Haḍirat al-Quds*, p.48, pp.62f.

¹⁵³ Azzawi, "Khulafa' Mawlāna Khālid" p.182.; Idem, 'Asha'ir al-Iraq, vol., 2 pp.230-231.

prevailed. He succeeded in retaining the religious leadership in the town and passing it on to his descendants after him. As to Maḥmūd al-Ṣāḥib, he apparently found it difficult to maintain a presence in the town and after a while left for Damascus and established himself there as we shall see below.

Secondly, in Baghdad where Khālīd left behind several dedicated deputies, the suborder suffered a fatal blow especially in 1831. In the summer of that year, three of his leading deputies there as well as many other followers died, struck down by the plague¹⁵⁴. The only deputy that remained 'Alive was 'Abd al-Ghafūr al-Mashāhidī, who was not highly regarded even by Khālīd himself¹⁵⁵. Thus, after 1831 the Khālīdī suborder suffered a slow down in Baghdad. Moreover, 'Alī Ridā Pasha, the new Governor General that replaced Dāwūd Pasha in that year, was of Bektashī leanings and had no sympathy for the Khālīdīya. Consequently, his rule of eleven years in Baghdad added to the retreat of the Khālīdīya there¹⁵⁶. However his successor as Governor General, Gūrdjū Nadjīb Pasha (1842-1849), who himself was a follower of the Khālīdīya in Istanbul since the early 1820s, tried to revive the activity of the *zāwiya* in Baghdad but with limited success¹⁵⁷. In other words, after 1831 the Khālīdīya in Baghdad lost much of its former vigour.

Thirdly in Damascus. It has been said that Damascus was not the target of Sheikh Khālīd. In fact he ordained no deputy from the city itself, though he had a number of disciples through whom he left a certain mark on it¹⁵⁸. The local deputy that he left behind in Damascus, Muḥammad al-Khānī, came from a village near Hamat called Khan Sheikhun hence his family name. As such he was a stranger to the city and had no local roots or social network. Thus his impact on the city was marginal and all the deputies whom he trained and ordained during an active life of almost four decades, came from outside Damascus except his two sons and two residents of Ṣalīhiya, the Kurdish quarter of the city¹⁵⁹.

¹⁵⁴ *al-Madj al-Tālid*, p. 56.

¹⁵⁵ *Bughyat al-Wādjid*, p. 248.

¹⁵⁶ On the government of 'Alī Rida in Baghdad see: A. al-Azzawi, *Tarikh al-Iraq bain Ihṭilālāin*, vol. 7 pp. 10-63.

¹⁵⁷ On Nedjib Pasha and the Khālīdī suborder in Baghdad see a forthcoming study of mine.

¹⁵⁸ Weismann, p. 81.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.* pp. 82ff.

Khānī did not remain the only Khālidi sheikh in Damascus. Already in 1247/ 1831-2 Khālīd's brother Maḥmūd tried to settle there but for some reason he left for Mecca where he stayed for more than seven years, and did not return to Damascus until the early 1840s¹⁶⁰. A little afterwards, in 1259/1843, he was appointed by the government as the sheikh of *al-Takiya al-Suleymāniya*, which was a lodge built by Sultan Suleymān the Magnificent in the 16th century in Damascus. In this way a second Khālidi centre was established which soon emerged as a rival for Sheikh Muḥammad al-Khānī.¹⁶¹ Thirdly, due perhaps to the efforts of Gürdjü Nadjib Pasha who served as Governor General of Damascus for a year in 1841-42, and of Muḥammad al-Faraqī, a Khālidi deputy, a mausoleum was built over the tomb of Khālīd in the quarter of Ṣalihiya and a *zāwiya*, by the order of Sultan 'Abd al-Medjid and endowments were assigned for their upkeep.

Despite this weighty presence of the Khālidiya in Damascus, the premature death of Khālīd robbed the order of its most inspiring and charismatic leader and kept it on the margin of the religious landscape of the city. It remained so until the advent of Sheikh Issa al-Kurdi from south east Anatolia towards the end of the 1870s who succeeded in reviving the fortunes of the Khālidiya in Damascus in the following decades¹⁶².

In Istanbul the Khālidiya suffered ups and downs. Initially Sultan Maḥmud was suspicious. Two matters seem to have been disturbing him at the beginning. The question of closing the gates of the mosque during the *dhikr* session and during the prayer of *khatm al-khwādjagān* and of preventing strangers from entering which was an innovation in the Khālidi suborder. And secondly, Khālīd's emissaries were over-zealous in their proselytizing efforts which aroused the indignation of sheikhs of other orders who sometimes resorted to force to disperse their meetings and even to force them out of the city¹⁶³. In the early 1820s several Khālidi deputies were banished from the city but they kept coming back. Finally, added Süleyman Fa'ik, the Sultan himself changed his outfit and went in disguise to a Khālidi meeting place to see for himself. And Dāwūd Pasha of Baghdad

¹⁶⁰ *al-Hadiqa al-Nadiya*, p. 73.

¹⁶¹ Weismann, pp.93f.

¹⁶² On Sheikh Isa al-Kurdi see M. Muti' al-Hāfiẓ & Nizar Abaza, *Tārikh 'Ulama' Dimashq fi al-Qarn al-Rābi' 'Ashar al-Hidjri*, 2 vols. (Damascus, 1406/1986), see vol.1, pp.284-290; see also Weismann, pp.57, 110.

¹⁶³ Süleyman Fa'iq, *Mecmu'a*, fol.4b.

was asked about Sheikh Khālīd but he answered that the Sheikh was simply calling for the revival of the *sunna*.¹⁶⁴ Likewise, Khānī claimed that two secret agents were sent to Damascus to verify certain allegations and to report about Khālīd¹⁶⁵. However, the persistence of Khālīd's emissaries on the one hand, and the political circumstances referred to above on the other, worked in favour of the suborder as we have seen above.

But no autocratic ruler like Sultan Maḥmūd would tolerate a movement that called for the supremacy of the *sharī'a* in the state. Not that he was against the *sharī'a* but he was not ready to accept that his will be bound by any law. Besides, in a multi-denominational state like the Ottoman Empire the expansion of such a movement that called for Islamic communal solidarity may result in the 'alienation of the non-Muslim communities'¹⁶⁶. Against this background we can perhaps understand the declaration of Sultan Maḥmūd while on a tour of the European provinces in 1837 that "I henceforth recognize the Musulman only in his mosque, the Christian only in his church, the Jew only in his synagogue" which Ubicini described as "striking acts of liberality and toleration."¹⁶⁷

At any rate, due to these and other considerations, Sulṭān Maḥmūd decided in 1828 to banish the Khālīdī sheikhs and certain other adherents of the suborder from Istanbul. Prominent among the latter was the famous poet Keçeci-zāda 'Izzet Molla and 'Umar Rāsim Efendi who were both exiled to Sivas in central Anatolia¹⁶⁸. Moreover the Sultan at the same time, issued a *firman* to the Governor General of Damascus instructing him to expel from the city sheikh 'Abd Allah al-Harawī, the *qaymaqam* of Sheikh Khālīd and all the other foreigners (i.e. non-Damascene) who belonged to the order, to Baghdad and to Suleymāniya. The Governor General of Baghdad was also instructed not to allow those to return to Damascus or to let any deputy be sent to Istanbul or to any other place¹⁶⁹. The Sultan took these measures despite the attitude of the Khālīdiya towards the Sultanate referred to above. But he had soon to reverse this policy. The bitter conflict with Muḥammad

¹⁶⁴ Azzawī, "Mawlāna Khālīd" p.720.

¹⁶⁵ *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Wardiya*, 233.

¹⁶⁶ Abdolonyme Ubicini, *Letters on Turkey*, 2 vols. (London, 1856), see vol. 2 p. 112.

¹⁶⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁸ See n. 125 above.

¹⁶⁹ For this *firman* see *Mühimme Defterleri* no.243, fols.41-42; see also Azzawī, "Mawlāna Khālīd" p.721.

'Ali which took place three years after taking these measures, forced the Sultan to compromise and tolerate the Khālidiya who by then had strong presence in central and eastern Anatolia. Moreover he appointed to the post of sheikhulislām, Mekki-zāda Muṣṭafa 'Āṣim Efendi (1833) who as mentioned above was an adherent of Khālidi. Muṣṭafa 'Āṣim remained in this post for the next fourteen years until his death in 1846, despite the fact that he was not known for being highly learned in the Islamic sciences¹⁷⁰. His follower in the post, 'Ārif Hikmet-Bey was of similar outlook, though there is no evidence that he was an adherent of the order. This, among other signs leads us to believe that in the early Tanzimat period the Naqshbandiya-Mudjaddidiya and its branches, enjoyed prominence in the city which had manifested itself in the number of *tekkes* they occupied. Because, despite their late coming to Istanbul the number of Naqshbandi-Mudjaddidi *tekkes* combined exceeded any other order¹⁷¹.

Conclusion

The Khālidiya was perhaps the most important religious movement in 19th century Ottoman Empire in the sense that it left a lasting impact on both state and society. Its emergence and fast expansion should be understood against the general feeling of weakness of the state and degeneration of the Muslim community. The events of 1807-8 in Istanbul; the rise of the provincial rulers (Amirs, Pashas, A'yan and Derebeys) which were seen as a cause for the weakness of the Sultanate, coupled with the outbreak of the Greek Revolution which was a sign of the rise of the non-Muslim communities materially and culturally, all aggravated this feeling.

Combining Sufism with learning, the Khālidiya called for abiding by *shari'a* rules, rectifying belief, and following the *sunna*. These calls amounted to a call for a religious revival regarded as a prerequisite for the regeneration of the Muslim community. To guarantee such a revival, the role of the Sultan as head of the *umma* and as a "supreme Caliph" was emphasized and Muslim believers were called upon to rally behind him and pray for his victory over his enemies. This perhaps explains why a large section of the elite in Istanbul accepted the Khālidiya readily.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid *Ilmiyye Salnamesi* p.580.

¹⁷¹ see study 8 in my book: *Studies on Islam and the Ottoman Empire in the 19th Century*, (Istanbul, 2001).

Perhaps in contrast to local rulers, Ottoman sultans traditionally protected and helped Sufi orders. Many sultans, starting from Osman, the founder of the state, had a Sufi sheikh close to them. Sufi *tekkes* in Istanbul were spread out and served as socio-religious and often as cultural centres. Despite that, Maḥmūd II did not seem to have trusted the Khālidiya and as we have seen, he tried to expel them from Istanbul in 1828. But due to his conflict with Muḥammad 'Ali of Egypt he was, perhaps unwillingly, forced to compromise his attitude towards them. After him and until the rise of 'Āli and Fuad in the mid 1850s, the Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya and its branches, including the Khālidiya became the most preferred order in the City, and among the upper ulama and Government functionaries, and it came to occupy the largest number of *tekkes* more than any other order. In the provinces especially in Anatolia and the Kurdish regions, the Khālidiya became, within one generation after the death of Khālīd, the dominant and unrivaled order.