

## NOTES ON IBN AL-ʿARABĪ'S INFLUENCE IN THE SUBCONTINENT

Few Muslim thinkers have been as pervasively influential as Ibn al-ʿArabī, known among Sufis as the Greatest Master (*al-shaykh al-akbar*). Michel Chodkiewicz has expressed clearly one of the main reasons for his popularity: "His work, in distinction to all that preceded it... has a distinguishing feature: ...it has an answer for everything."<sup>1</sup> Many Muslims in the Indian subcontinent, like other Muslims elsewhere, have continued to seek out these answers down into modern times. The secondary literature on Islam in India attests to the fact that Ibn al-ʿArabī was widely known and often controversial. But few if any of the modern scholars who have studied Indian Sufism have been familiar with his works or those of his immediate disciples. The judgment that there has been influence has been based largely on the references in the texts both to Ibn al-ʿArabī and to the well-known teaching usually ascribed to him, *wahdat-wujūd* or the "Oneness of Being."<sup>2</sup> It was with the aim of looking closely at the actual nature of this influence and the routes whereby it became established that I applied to the Indo-American Subcommission on Education for a grant to study the spread of Ibn al-ʿArabī's teachings in the subcontinent. As a result of having been given the generous support of the subcommission, I was able to spend eight months in India, from May 1988 to January 1989, looking at Persian and Arabic manuscripts. The ten libraries at which I spent significant lengths of time are located in Aligarh, Hyderabad, Lucknow, New Delhi, Patna, and Srinagar.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Chodkiewicz, "The Diffusion of Ibn ʿArabī's Doctrine," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn ʿArabī Society* 9 (1991) 51.

<sup>2</sup> Concerning the problems that arise by ascribing this doctrine to Ibn al-ʿArabī without qualification, see Chittick, "Rūmī and *Wahdat al-Wujūd*," in *The Heritage of Rūmī*, ed. Amin Banani and Georges Sabagh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), forthcoming.

<sup>3</sup> The libraries that I visited, with the abbreviations that are employed below in referring to them, are as follows: Aligarh: The Maulana Azad Library of Aligarh Muslim University (AMU). Hyderabad: The Andhra Pradesh State Oriental Manuscripts Library (AP), The Salar Jang Museum (SJ) Osmania University (OU), and the Abul Kalām Azad Oriental Research Institute (HARL). Lucknow: Nadwat al-Ulamā (LK). New Delhi: The Institute of Islamic Studies, Hamdard Nagar (IIS). Patna: The Khudabakhsh Library (KH). Srinagar: Kashmir University (KU) and The Research and Publication Department, Jammu and Kashmir Government (KOR).

I attempted to survey all Sufi manuscripts in these libraries with a doctrinal and theoretical orientation.<sup>4</sup> I focused on works dealing with metaphysics, theology, cosmology, and psychology. My aim was to determine the extent to which such works reflect the teachings of Ibn al-ʿArabī and how these teachings reached the Indian authors. Did they learn of them directly through Ibn al-ʿArabī's own works, or through the intermediary of the works of his followers in the central Islamic lands? At the same time, I was trying to determine who the most outstanding Indian representatives of this school of thought might be, judging the works in terms of the authors' mastery of terminology and concepts, depth of understanding, clarity of expression, and original formulations. My standard of comparison was my own familiarity with Ibn al-ʿArabī's writings and those of his well-known and relatively early followers, such as his stepson Ṣadr al-Dīn Qūnawī (d. 673/1274); Qūnawī's disciples Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī (688/1289), Saʿīd al-Dīn Faṛghānī (d. 695/1295), and Muʿayyid al-Dīn Jandī (d. ca. 700/1300); the *Fuṣūṣ* commentators ʿAbd al-Razzāq Kāshānī (d. 736/1335) and Sharaf al-Dīn Dāwūd Qayṣarī (751/1350); the Persian poets Maḥmūd Shabistarī (d. ca. 720/1320) and Shams al-Dīn Maghribī (d. 809/1406-7); ʿAbd al-Karīm Jīlī (d. ca. 832/1428), and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (d. 898/1492).

Given my limited time, I had to be selective in my approach. By investigating theoretical works that tend by their nature toward an elite rather than a popular expression of Sufi teachings, I could make little attempt to judge the extent to which this influence may have filtered down to the Muslim masses who made up the bulk of the membership of the Sufi orders. As Chodkiewicz has pointed out, a thorough assessment of Ibn al-ʿArabī's influence must take into account a wide variety of sources, including what he calls second-rate literature, meaning elementary manuals for beginners, regional chronicles, collections of *qasāʾid* used in Sufi meetings, the *mawālid* composed in honor of local saints, and the *ijāzas* and the *silsilas* of local shaykhs. All such works stress the practice and stages of the Sufi way rather than doctrinal principles, whereas it is doctrinal principles to which I directed my attention in my survey.<sup>5</sup>

If, on the one hand, I was interested in assessing the extent of Ibn al-ʿArabī's influence on Indian authors, on the other, I was concerned to specify the mode of influence. For example, it is possible to discern a broad range of

---

<sup>4</sup> There are of course manuscripts on Sufism in Urdu and various other local languages, but in the libraries that I visited, Arabic manuscripts outnumber Urdu works by at least two to one, and Persian outnumber Arabic by about the same ratio. Moreover, I did look at several Urdu manuscripts that were clearly related to this school of thought; they were invariably late and, to the extent I could tell from my limited knowledge of Urdu, derivative. My general impression was that Urdu plays an important role in disseminating Ibn al-ʿArabī's teachings on the more popular level through poetry, but much less of a role through prose writings.

<sup>5</sup> Chodkiewicz, "The Diffusion," pp. 41-42.

approaches to Ibn al-ʿArabī's doctrinal teachings. On one extreme, certain works reflect concerns that are mainly philosophical and theological, showing mastery of the learned discourse of the *madrāsas* and relatively little attention to the unveiling (*kashf*) of the unseen world and the direct vision of God in His self-disclosures that forms the ground on which Ibn al-ʿArabī stands. These sorts of works tend toward dryness and logical exactitude and are more likely to be written in Arabic than in Persian. On the other extreme, many works reflect visionary experience and appeal more to heart-knowledge and "tasting" (*dhawq*) than to logical exposition of philosophical concepts. These works are more often in Persian and expressed in poetry rather than prose. But many sorts of writings fill in the middle ground between these two extremes and provide a great variety of permutations. Thus we have poetical Arabic works written in visionary prose and prosaic works of Persian poetry dominated by the concern for rational exactitude. The task of evaluating the works was made more difficult by a variety of imponderables connected with each individual text and the fact that my time was extremely limited. My conclusions, in short, depend a great deal on my own subjective appraisal. Nevertheless, I hope that some of the information that I gathered may be useful to scholars concerned with Islamic intellectual history in India.

During the eight months that I stayed in India, I looked at several hundred manuscripts, grading them on a scale from I to VII (the Roman numeral mentioned after works mentioned below refers to this scale): I. Of no relevance to the school; noted simply to avoid repetition. II. Little relationship with theoretical Sufism; mainly concerned with practical matters. III. Intrinsically important for theoretical discussions, but not directly related to Ibn al-ʿArabī's school. IV. Containing intellectual content especially worth noting, but again not connected to Ibn al-ʿArabī's school. V. Displaying important instances of influence from the writings of Ibn al-ʿArabī and/or his followers. VI. An important text in Ibn al-ʿArabī's school; or deals in some detail with the debate between the supporters of *waḥdat al-wujūd* and *waḥdat al-shuhūd* (the position of Shaykh Aḥmad Sirḥindī). VII. An outstanding work, offering fresh and original contributions to Ibn al-ʿArabī's school of thought.

When going over my notes, I was able to separate out about fifty figures who wrote works in the V to VII categories, along with a dozen or so individual works in the same categories by unidentified authors. In what follows, I mention about thirty of these authors, without attempting in every case to describe all the works I saw. I also refer to other figures in order to help situate the authors in their historical context. All works are in Persian unless otherwise noted.



Before entering into details, let me set down here some of my general conclusions and observations: The received wisdom is correct in telling us that Ibn al-ʿArabī was widely known in the subcontinent. As a rule, the later the text, the more thoroughly it reflects the world view elaborated by Ibn al-ʿArabī and his immediate followers. However, relatively few authors were familiar with Ibn al-ʿArabī's own writings, even if most had some acquaintance with the *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* through one of its numerous commentaries. The major lines of influence were not Ibn al-ʿArabī's own works, but those of such authors as Farghānī and ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (both of whom, let it be noted, have major works in both Arabic and Persian).

A good deal of the writing that I studied was of exceptionally high quality, reflecting the authors' thorough assimilation of the teachings and practices of Sufism and their ability to express the world view of Ibn al-ʿArabī's school in a fresh and original manner. Many other works were written by authors who were simply compilers or popularizers, interpreting the received teachings of Sufism for their contemporaries or disciples. I paid less attention to these popular works, since their content was familiar to me and I was especially interested in discovering the more sophisticated masters of the school. But the large number of popular works of this sort is a sign that Ibn al-ʿArabī's influence extended into all levels of the Sufi orders and Islamic society.

The vast majority of texts that I looked at have not been studied with a view toward content by scholars trained in modern methods (though some of these texts are no doubt still being read in *khānaqāhs* or private homes). Scholars such as S.A.A. Rizvi, author of *A History of Sufism in India*, have pointed to an enormous amount of intellectual activity over the centuries, but most contemporary authors have remained oblivious to the issues discussed in these works, and what Rizvi himself has to say about their content is drawn largely from Western secondary sources. It does not seem to have occurred to the specialists, especially not to natives of the subcontinent, that we may be dealing here with an intellectual tradition that is inherently interesting, innovative, and relevant to contemporary concerns. Most scholars trained in modern methods seem to hold the conviction that the significant elements of Islamic civilization are those that have an immediate connection to social context and political events; to the extent these texts have been read, scholars have been hunting for details unrelated to the primary concerns of the authors.

A glance at the books and articles being published (both in the West and in Islamic countries) on the great Sufis of Islamic history, such as Ḥallāj, Rūmī, and especially Ibn al-ʿArabī, makes it clear that Sufism has been recognized by a significant contemporary audience as a repository of spiritual and religious teachings that still have value in our own age. The Indian libraries hold a

particularly rich collection of original works that constantly reinterpret Sufi doctrine while maintaining a clear focus on its unchanging ground. These works reconfirm the universal preoccupation of Muslim intellectuals classical with the real and the essential as opposed to the accidental and the historical. I was struck in the works by the unanimity of the voices down into the nineteenth century despite a great diversity of styles and approaches. By and large the literature is infused with the values that are omnipresent in the writings of Ibn al-ʿArabī or Rūmī. The authors attempt to bring out the relevance of *tawḥīd* for life and practice. They perceive the world and human affairs as theaters in which the divine signs (*āyāt*) become manifest in ever-changing patterns of multiplicity. They see the purpose of human life to lie in bringing the soul into harmony with the self-manifestation of God on the basis of the *Shariʿa*. These concerns were of course also present in works written before Ibn al-ʿArabī. What differentiates these works from the earlier works is the use of specific technical terminology and concepts deriving from Ibn al-ʿArabī's writings and refined and systematized by Ṣadr al-Dīn Qūnawī and his followers. Many of the works written over the five hundred year period that I surveyed could have been written at any time during the period. There are relatively few references to contemporary events or specifically local concerns. But this does not mean that all these works say the same thing in the same way.

In short, the Indian libraries contain writings by important Sufi philosophers, theologians, and sages who remain practically unknown and are eminently worthy of study. A number of the following authors can be ranked as first-rank representatives of the Islamic intellectual tradition, yet they remain almost completely unstudied.

Let me also record here my sense of tragedy at what is occurring through widespread neglect of Indian libraries. I would not be surprised if many of the manuscripts I mention below are soon unavailable because of the rapid deterioration of resources that is taking place. The present political problems of the subcontinent make the situation much worse than it was in the past, when the climate was always an enemy of books (never before in studying manuscripts have I been so annoyed by wormholes and disintegrating pages). Most of the libraries I visited are directed by well-meaning people, but the resources for long-term preservation are often not available. I heard of several important libraries that have been or have recently become inaccessible. Recent fires in two of these libraries, one of which was caused by communal violence and the other simply by neglect, destroyed many manuscripts that may well have been irreplaceable.

## Eighth/Fourteenth Century

Sayyid Ashraf Jahāngīr Simnānī (d. probably in 829/1425) studied in his youth with ‘Alā’ al-Dawla Simnānī (d. 736/1337), who is famous for his critical views of Ibn al-‘Arabī expressed in his correspondence with the *Fuṣūṣ* commentator, ‘Abd al-Razzāq Kāshānī. Sayyid Ashraf was not completely satisfied with ‘Alā’ al-Dawla and went to Kāshān at about the age of twenty-three to study with ‘Abd al-Razzāq, leaving after the latter’s death in 730/1330. He is said to have become a traveling companion of Sayyid ‘Alī Hamadānī (d. 786/1385). He visited and corresponded with Gīsū Darāz, became the disciple of a shaykh in Bengal, and eventually settled down in Jaunpur.<sup>6</sup> *Laṭā’if-i Ashrafī*<sup>7</sup> (VI) is a work of some 850 pages compiled by his student Nizām Hājji al-Yamīnī, in sixty *laṭīfas*, explaining Sayyid Ashraf’s views on a variety of topics. The twenty-eighth *laṭīfa* is particularly important since it is dedicated to “*waḥdat al-wujūd*.” This is probably Jāmī’s source in *Nafaḥāt al-uns* for the text of the correspondence between Simnānī and Kāshānī and also for the idea that this debate concerns *waḥdat al-wujūd*, since this term is not mentioned by the two principles. Sayyid Ashraf offers several arguments to show that Simnānī had misunderstood Ibn al-‘Arabī’s position and that his criticisms are unjustified.

I saw two of Sayyid Ashraf’s works having no special relevance to the school: *Irshād a-ikhwān*<sup>8</sup> (III) and *Tanbīh al-Ikwān*<sup>9</sup> (II). Rizvi tells us that Sayyid Ashraf wrote *Mir’āt al-ḥaqā’iq* and *Kanz al-daqa’iq* “for the benefit of specialists,”<sup>10</sup> and these may deal with advanced technical discussions. His *Maktūbāt*<sup>11</sup> (VI) are certainly of importance, and these along with the *Laṭā’if* are enough to show that he was a major conduit for Ibn al-‘Arabī’s influence.

Another important channel of influence was the above-mentioned Kubrawī shaykh Sayyid ‘Alī Hamadānī, the patron saint of Kashmir. He is the author of at least forty works, most of which are short *rasā’il*. He is probably the author of the commentary on Ibn al-‘Arabī’s *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam* known as *Hall-i Fuṣūṣ*.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Cf. S.A.A. Rizvi, *A History of Sufism in India* (hereafter HSI), I, pp. 267-268; B.B. Lawrence, *An Overview of Sufi Literature in the Sultanate Period* (Patna: Khuda Bakhsh Oriental Public Library, n.d.) 68.

<sup>7</sup> (Delhi: Nuṣrat al-Maṭābī, 1295). Manuscripts are rather common.

<sup>8</sup> AMU Univ. Pers. Tas. 263.

<sup>9</sup> AMU Univ. Pers. Tas. 265.

<sup>10</sup> HSI I 268.

<sup>11</sup> LK Tas. Pers. 81; cf. Lawrence, *Sufi Literature*, pp. 33-34.

<sup>12</sup> This work was recently published in Tehran by J. Misgarnizhād but attributed to Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā. The editor shows that much of it is taken from Jandī’s commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ*. N. Māyil Hirawī offers a number of reasons supporting Hamadānī’s authorship (Danish [Islamabad] 11, 1366/1987, pp. 101-108). Manuscripts include IIS 3179, KOR 905, AP 780, LK 2, and LK 82. A copy is found in a collection of Hamadānī’s works in Istanbul, Şehid Ali Pawsa 2794, ff. 508-684, dated 901. In that collection, his treatise *Wujūdiyya*, which is identical to the introduction to *Hall al-fuṣūṣ* (Māyil Hirawī, pp. 106-107), is called *İstīlāḥāt* (ff. 478-481).

Among his *rasā'il* is the Arabic *Asrār al-nuqṭa*,<sup>13</sup> which shows his mastery of the technical terminology of Qūnawī and his followers. Bruce Lawrence remarks that Hamadānī, like Sayyid Ashraf, "taught the principles of *waḥdat al-wujūd* with contagious zeal."<sup>14</sup>

One of the most prolific Sufis of this period was the Chistī shaykh, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusaynī, known as Gīsū Darāz, who died at the age of over 100 in 825/1422. Many of his works were published in Hyderabad and Gulbarga by Sayyid 'Aṭā' Ḥusayn in the first half of this century. Perhaps Gīsū Darāz's work that shows the most indebtedness to Ibn al-ʿArabī's school is *Asmār al-asrār*,<sup>15</sup> in which he criticizes Ibn al-ʿArabī and some of his followers, such as Fakhr al-Dīn 'Irāqī, on several occasions. In one of the chapters of *Tabsīrat al-iṣtilāḥāt al-ṣūfiyya* (VI), Gīsū Darāz's eldest son, Sayyid Akbar Ḥusaynī, gathers together all these criticisms and adds his own commentary.<sup>16</sup> In general, Gīsū Darāz employs the terminology of Ibn al-ʿArabī's school, though he is more inclined to the ecstatic mode of expression, as exemplified by 'Irāqī's *Lama'āt*, than the more philosophical and logical, as exemplified by most of the *Fuṣūṣ* commentators.<sup>17</sup>

According to Rizvi, "The pioneer of Delhi's *Waḥdat al-Wujūd* movement was Mas'ūd Bak,"<sup>18</sup> who probably died in 789/1387.<sup>19</sup> He was a disciple of Niẓām al-Dīn Awliyā' and authored a number of interesting Persian works. He tends towards an ecstatic expression of ideas, but shows little or no influence from the writings of Ibn al-ʿArabī and his followers. He can only be considered a proponent of *waḥdat al-wujūd* if we take the term in the most general sense, i.e. to indicate the expression of *tawḥīd* in a Sufi mode, but not in the more particular sense of representing the position of Ibn al-ʿArabī. In *Mir'āt al-ʿarifīn* (IV)<sup>20</sup> Mas'ūd Bak may be reflecting some influence from 'Irāqī's *Lama'āt*, but for the most part he expresses himself in modes much more reminiscent of 'Ayn al-Quḍāt Hamadānī's *Tamhīdāt*. The work is divided into fourteen *kashfs*. It begins by discussing the reality of *wujūd*, and in a second section, on *tawḥīd*, the author quotes the expression *māfi'l-wujūd illa'llāh* ("There is nothing in

<sup>13</sup> (Shiraz: Maṭba' al-Aḥmadī, 1343/1925).

<sup>14</sup> *Sufi Literature*, p. 55.

<sup>15</sup> The work was printed in Hyderabad, ed. by Ḥāfiz 'Aṭā' Ḥusayn, 1350. Manuscripts include AMU J.F. 921, AP 1321, AP 1582, SJ Tas. 8. There is also a commentary on this work, AP 1464 (482ff., 1911).

<sup>16</sup> Ed. by Sayyid 'Aṭā' Ḥusayn (Gulbarga: Kutubkhāna-yi Rawḍatayn, 1365/1946) 67-94.

<sup>17</sup> Though Gīsū Darāz criticizes 'Irāqī, he also paraphrases parts of the *Lama'āt* (without acknowledging the source), as in the first *samar*, which is taken from Flash 3 (ed. J. Nūrbakhsh [Tehran: Khānaqāh-i Ni'matullāhī, 1353/1974], p. 10; trans. Chittick and Wilson [New York: Paulist Press, 1982], p. 78, first paragraph). Note that in both the *Asmār* and the *Lama'āt*, the passage concludes with the same two lines of poetry by the *Fuṣūṣ* commentator Mu'ayyid al-Dīn Jandī.

<sup>18</sup> HSI I 241.

<sup>19</sup> Lawrence, *Sufi Literature*, p. 27.

<sup>20</sup> Published in the Deccan: Maṭba'-'i Mufid, 1310, 184 pp. For an appraisal of the contents, cf. Lawrence, *Sufi Literature*, pp. 27-29.

existence but God"), often employed by Ibn al-ʿArabī. But his mode of explaining the meaning of this idea shows no sign of being dependent on Ibn al-ʿArabī's school. The rest of the work deals mainly with various stations of the Sufi path. A second work, *Umm al-ṣahā'if fī ʿayn al-mā ʿarif* (IV),<sup>21</sup> is an important and fascinating discussion of the symbolism of the Arabic letters.

Finally, I should mention Shams al-Dīn ibn Sharaf al-Dīn Dihlawī, about whom I know nothing except that he wrote an Arabic commentary on Ibn al-ʿArabī's *Naqsh al-fuṣūṣ*<sup>22</sup> dated 795/1392-93, which is sixty-eight years before the composition of Jāmi's well-known *Naqd al-nuṣūṣ fī sharḥ naqsh al-fuṣūṣ*. One manuscript indicates that the work was written at the request of Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm. Much of the text, like that of *Naqd al-nuṣūṣ* seems to be based upon the well known *Fuṣūṣ* commentaries.

### Ninth/Fifteenth Century

The works of the famous Firdawsī shaykh Sharaf al-Dīn Yaḥyā Manērī (d. 782/1381) are not completely free of the influence of Ibn al-ʿArabī's school, even though he is said to have been one of those who spoke against Ibn al-ʿArabī's theories of the "Unity of Being" as they became increasing popular in the Indian subcontinent.<sup>23</sup> His successors were directly familiar with some of the writings of the school. Thus some of the works of Ḥusayn ibn Muʿizz Balkhī Nawshah-i Tawḥīd (d. 1440 A.D.), the nephew and successor of Manērī's immediate successor, Muẓaffar ibn Shams Balkhī, touch on well known discussions, Most interesting is *Kāshif al-asrār*<sup>24</sup> (V) by Ḥusayn's son and successor Ḥasan, a Persian commentary on Ḥusayn's Arabic *Ḥaḍarāt al-khams*. I have never before come across its scheme for the Five Divine Presences: 1. The Presence of Divinity, which is the reality of all things. 2. The Presence of Final Sanctity, which is the presence of belovedhood (*ḥaḍrat al-maḥbūbiyya*). 3. The Presence of Middle Sanctity, which is the presence of the sanctity of loverhood. 4. The Presence of Beginning Sanctity, which is the presence of prophecy, vicegerency, summoning, and guidance. 5. The Presence of Misguiding (*iqḍāl*) and Misleading (*iqḥwā*), which is the presence of imprisoning multiplicity.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>21</sup> AP 1444 (p. 133ff.); this is probably the same as *Umm al-naṣā'ih*, of which Lawrence tells us, "the medieval hagiographers make mention but which does not appear in any of the published catalogues" (*Sufi Literature*, p. 67).

<sup>22</sup> AP 39 (38ff.), AP 211 (51ff.).

<sup>23</sup> A. Schimmel, in the foreword to Manērī's *Khawān-i Pur Niʿmat*, (Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyat-i Delhi, 1986) xiii.

<sup>24</sup> KH Pers. 4049 (45ff.), KH Acc. 1826/3 (24ff.). The work was printed in Bankipore (KH 6543 and 9862).

<sup>25</sup> For the more standard schemes, see Chittick, "The Five Divine Presences: From al-Qūnawī to al-Qayṣarī," *Muslim World* 72 (1982), pp. 107-128.



One of the most outstanding representatives of the philosophical type of interpretation of Ibn al-ʿArabī typified by Ṣadr al-Dīn Qūnawī is ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAlī ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿAlī ibn Aḥmad Mahāʾimī (d. 835/1432), who, according to *Akḥbār al-akhyār*, was from Gujrāt. Rizvi tells us that Mahāʾimī is the same as Konkan, a region in west Deccan.<sup>26</sup> Among Mahāʾimī's works, all of which seem to be in Arabic, are a commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ, Khuṣūs al-niʿam fī sharḥ fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*,<sup>27</sup> a commentary on Maghribī's *Jām-i jahān-numāy* called *Mirʾāt al-daqaʾiq*,<sup>28</sup> and another on Qūnawī's *Nuṣūṣ, Mashraʾ al-khusūs ilā ma ʿānu al-nuṣūṣ*<sup>29</sup> (VI+). Mahāʾimī is also the author of a *tafsīr, Tafsīr al-raḥmān*, which has been published, and a commentary on Suhrawardī's *ʿAwārif al-maʿārif* called *Dhawārif al-laṭāʾif* (VI-),<sup>30</sup> completed in 319/1416. The latter shows its indebtedness to Ibn al-ʿArabī already in the *khutba*, which employs the terms *fuṣūṣ* and *futūḥāt* in their literal senses. *Ajillat al-taʿyīd fī sharḥ adillat al-tawḥīd*<sup>31</sup> (VI) comments on one of the author's own short treatises. *Amḥād al-nasīhat al-ṣaḥīḥa*<sup>32</sup> (VI+) answers a letter by Jamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Mizjājī [?] from Zabīd in Yemen and defends Ibn al-ʿArabī and his school in the style of *Kalām* polemics.

Mahāʾimī's Arabic commentary on Maghribī's *Jām-jahān-numāy* is particularly significant in that it points to the widespread popularity of this treatise. Maghribī quotes most of his work, without ascription, from the introduction of *Mashāriq al-darārī* by Farḡānī, who in turn based his book on notes taken at Qūnawī's lectures on Ibn al-Fārīdī's *Nazm al-sulūk*. Maghribī provides three diagrams illustrating various important technical terms of the school; these seem to have inspired many similar diagrams by later authors. Commentaries on *Jām-i jahān-numāy* normally reflect thorough acquaintance with the writings of Qūnawī and his immediate followers. Typical is *Dawāʾ ir-ī Rashīdī*<sup>33</sup> (VII), by the Kubrawī shaykh Rashīd al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī Bīdāwāzī.<sup>34</sup> The author tells us that after reading Maghribī's treatise in the

<sup>26</sup> HSI II 336

<sup>27</sup> O Yahia, *Historie et classification de l'oeuvre d' Ibn ʿArabī* (Damascus Institut Francais de Damas, 1964), p. 246, no. 22, a copy (not seen) is also found in Deoband, 460/6

<sup>28</sup> Brockelmann, *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, S II 311, this commentary was translated into Persian with the title *Daqaʾiq-numāy* by ʿAbd al-Nabī Shattārī (KH Acc 801), who is said in the Khuda Bakhsh handlist, on the authority of *Tadhakīra-yi ʿulamā Hind* to have died in 1020

<sup>29</sup> AP 55 (82 ff.)

<sup>30</sup> AP 1478 (410ff.)

<sup>31</sup> AP *Kalām* 1553

<sup>32</sup> KH 2579/25 (25ff., incomplete)

<sup>33</sup> SJ Tas 62 (131ff.), copied in 960/1553

<sup>34</sup> The author is not identified in the manuscript, except through the *takhallus* Rashīd Bīdāwāzī is known to have written a commentary on Shabistārī's *Gulshan-i rāz* and, in the year 852/1448-49, a *mathnawī* called *Misbāh-i Rashīdī*. He was the successor of ʿAbd Allāh Barzishābādī (d. 872/1467-68), a Kubrawī shaykh who was a disciple of Khwāja Ishāq Khuttalānī, the successor of Sayyīd ʿAlī Hamadānī. See D. Deweese, "The Eclipse of the Kubrawīyah in Central Asia," *Iranian Studies* 21 (1988) pp. 66-67

year 871/1467, he had a vision of the Prophet in a form within which the ninety-nine names of God were inscribed. He sent a description of the vision to his *murshid* in Mashhad, "Amīr Shihāb al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh" Barzishābādī, who wrote back telling him that this was a sign of his firm rootedness and constancy in the *Shariʿa* and the *Tariqa*. The work includes several diagrams of the divine names and their interrelationships. This work, which was certainly read in the subcontinent, displays a high level of discussion of the technical terms of the school, especially those related to the writings of Qūnawī and Farghānī. It is laced with the author's own poetry, ending with a *qasida* of about 100 lines. I suspect that there may be a good deal of original reformulation of the teachings of the school. Like many other Sufi works in the periods being discussed here, the text begins with a discussion of the famous *ḥadith qudsi*, "I was a hidden treasure...."

The most influential author of this period, and probably the most influential author of the school of Ibn al-ʿArabī after the Shaykh himself, is ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī, whose numerous works in Arabic and Persian were widely studied and frequently quoted on all levels of discussion.

## Tenth/Sixteenth Century

Perhaps the most influential master of this school in the tenth/sixteenth century is Abu'l-Muʿayyad Muḥammad ibn Khaṭīr al-Dīn al-Shaṭṭārī, known as Muḥammad Ghawth (d. 970/1563). He was the younger brother of Shaykh Phūl and along with him a *khalifa* of Shaykh Zuhūr Ḥājji Ḥamid. According to Rizvi, the two brothers were the most influential Shaṭṭārīs of their time. Humāyūn was a disciple of Shaykh Phūl, and the latter was killed by Humāyūn's rebellious brother. Muḥammad Ghawth settled in Gwalior and helped Bābur's army seize the Gwalior fort. His support of Bābur led to his being declared an unbeliever by Shēr Shāh the Afghan, though this was ostensibly for his conversations with God described in his *Risālayi miʿrālīyya*.<sup>35</sup> Rizvi says that the most significant of his works is *Jawāhir-i khamṣa*; others include *Zamaʿir*, *Basāʿir*, and *Kanz al-waḥdat*.<sup>36</sup> His *Baḥr al-ḥayāt* (III), which has been printed,<sup>37</sup> is a Persian translation of the Sanskrit *Amritkund*. I saw three manuscripts of his *Kalid-i makhāzin* (VII),<sup>38</sup> each of which is written in a large bold hand with about seven lines per page and copious interlinear commentary, no doubt by the author. In the introduction, Muḥammad Ghawth tells us that in the year 942/1035-36, when he was looking for a name for the

<sup>35</sup> HSI II 156-157.

<sup>36</sup> HSI II 159.

<sup>37</sup> HSI II 12.

<sup>38</sup> AP 880 (87ff.; copied in 951); LK 69 (100ff.); KH 1376 (107ff.). Another copy (not seen) is found in the Reza Library in Rampur (912, 80ff.).

completed book, he had a vision of Abū Bakr, who gave him the key to the treasuries. The work is divided into an introduction, three *daqīqas*, and a conclusion. The introduction discusses the mystery of the divine Essence or "Heiness" (*huwiyya*), and the first *daqīqa* the intelligible quiddities that come from the Treasury of nonexistence into existence. The text comments in detail on a large cosmological diagram in the form of several concentric circles. The second *daqīqa* discusses the spirit (*rūh*), the third prophecy (*nubuwwāt*) and sanctity (*walāyat*), and the conclusion the resurrection (*qiyāmat*).

Wajīh al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Naṣr Allāh ḲAlawī Gujrātī Aḥmadabādī Shaṭṭārī (d. 997/1539) was a disciple of Muḥammad Ghawth.<sup>39</sup> His disciple Mīr Sayyid Šibghat Allāh ibn Rūh Allāh was prominent in spreading Muḥammad Ghawth's teachings in Medina.<sup>40</sup> According to Rizvi, Wajīh al-Dīn's *malfūzāt* "are exceedingly frank and militant in the assertion of the superiority of *Waḥdat al-Wujūd*."<sup>41</sup> Among his works is a widely-read commentary on *Jām-i Jahān-numā*,<sup>42</sup> and a short Arabic summary of Ibn al-ḲArabī's metaphysics and typology of the saints called al-Ḥaqīqat al-Muḥammadiyya<sup>43</sup> (VI+). The latter seems usually to have been read along with its Persian translation and commentary by Wajīh al-Dīn's *khalīfa*, ḲAzīz al-Dīn.<sup>44</sup>

Ibrāhīm Shaṭṭārī Jannatābādī (d. 991/1583) was a disciple of Muḥammad Ghawth.<sup>45</sup> Rizvi tells us that for about eighteen years Ibrāhīm was Muḥammad Ghawth's prayer leader.<sup>45</sup> He is the author of an important commentary on *Jam-i jahān-numā* called *Ā'ina-yi ḥaqā'iq-numā* (VI) (or *Ā'ina-yi ḥaqq-numā*),<sup>47</sup> The work shows a great deal of influence from Jāmī, Farghānī, and Ibn al-ḲArabī's *Futūḥāt*.

Another important author of the same period is Khūb Muḥammad Chishtī, who composed *Amwāj-i Khūbī* (VII) in 990/1583.<sup>48</sup> He also calls his work *Sharh-i khūb turang*, *Kkūb turang* being a Gujrati *mathnawī* he composed

<sup>39</sup> HSI II 158.

<sup>40</sup> HSI II 329-30.

<sup>41</sup> HSI II 11.

<sup>42</sup> AMU Habibganj 21/366 (92ff.), 21/207 (41ff.); AMU Ḍamīma Taṣawwuf Fārsī 59; IIIS 2395 (16ff.); AP 470 (37ff.), 474 (36ff.), 1332 (58ff.), 1817, 1975; SJ Tas. 98, Tas. 232/1; KH P1576; LK 225.

<sup>43</sup> SJ Tas 232/8 (6ff.); KH 1346/1 (10ff.).

<sup>44</sup> HSI II 13; AP 1713 (54ff.), 1841 (50ff.), SJ Tas. 100 (32ff.), KH 1346/2 (69ff.).

<sup>45</sup> According to Rizvi, he was a disciple of Shaykh-i Lashkar Muḥammad ḲArif (d. 993/1583), himself a disciple of Muḥammad Ghawth, but Ibrāhīm refers to Muḥammad Ghawth as his *murshid* in *Ā'ina-yi ḥaqā'iq-numā* (Hyderabad: Maṭba' Abu'l-ḲAlā'ī, n.d.), p. 3.

<sup>46</sup> HSI II 169.

<sup>47</sup> Published in Hyderabad: Maṭba' Abu'l-ḲAlā'ī, n.d., 100 pp.; AP 1452, SJ Tas. 23, AMU Sulaiman 157/58, Reza handlist 872.

<sup>48</sup> AP 496 (117ff.), SJ Tas, 14, KU 93700. There is a *mathnawī* version of the same work by ḲĀsim written in 1166; the manuscript (AP 1527) was copied in the same year by Muḥammad Yaḥyā Qādīrī.

<sup>49</sup> According to the *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the Salar Jung Museum & Library*, vol. VIII, Hyderabad, 1983, p. 178, this is Kamāl Muḥammad Sistānī, d. 979/1571.

in 986/1578. The author says the work is derived from passages quoted from Shaykh Kamāl Muḥammad.<sup>49</sup> It offers simple yet profound discussions of many of the basic concepts of the school, showing obvious influence from Jāmī and Farḡhānī. It is poetical and full of original analogies that are offered in place of the more common philosophical expositions. It has a number of diagrams. The author wrote a second work *Ṣirāṭ al-mustaḡīm*<sup>50</sup> (VI), in 981, the *abjad* value of the title. The style is similar to *Amwāj-i khūbī*, poetical with detailed discussions of such basic ideas as *wujūd*, the immutable entities, levels of existence, etc. He quotes from Ibn al-ʿArabī in several passages. A third work, *Miftāḥ al-tawḥīd*<sup>51</sup> (V) is a commentary, perhaps by a disciple, on a *qasīda* by Khūb Muḥammad dealing with the levels of existence.

### Eleventh/Seventeenth Century

A number of Sufis of the Bijāpūr region show the influence of Ibn al-ʿArabī's school, including Shāh Burhān al-Dīn ibn Mīrānījī Shams al-ʿUshshāq (d. 1005/1597), also known as Burhān al-Dīn Jānam.<sup>52</sup> His *Makhzan al-sālikīn wa māqṣad al-ʿarīfīn*<sup>53</sup> (VI+) describes the levels of existence in familiar style. Especially interesting is *Maʿrifat al-sulūk*<sup>54</sup> (VII-) by his *khalīfa* Maḥmūd Khwush-dahān Chishtī (d. 1026/1617), a work which classifies everything in existence in four broad categories, apparently as an aid to meditation. This work is said to summarize all the teachings of the Bijāpūrī school.<sup>55</sup> Though the terminology is instantly recognizable as belonging largely to Ibn al-ʿArabī's school, the explanations place the work off to the side of the main stream. The author notes that he wrote it in order to explain the meaning of the *ḥadīth*, "He who knows himself knows his Lord" as his shaykh explained it in "his own terminology" (*iṣṭilāḥ-i khwud*). The whole work is summed up in a single diagram, apparently drawn by Shaykh Burhān al-Dīn,

In the early eleventh/sixteenth century the Shaṭṭārī line is represented by ʿĪsā ibn Qāsim al-Jundī (d. 1031/1621-22)<sup>56</sup> called Shāh ʿĪsā Jund Allāh and sometimes ʿAyn al-ʿUrafāʾ, a disciple of Shaykh-i Lashkar Muḥammad ʿArif (d. 993/1583), himself a disciple of Muḥammad Gha wth (970/1563). Rizvi calls

<sup>50</sup> AP 920 (29ff.).

<sup>51</sup> AP 724 (10ff.), KU 93700.

<sup>52</sup> For biographical references, cf. Eaton, *Sufis of Bijapur* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978), passim.

<sup>53</sup> H-ARL 92/1 (26ff.), AP 556/3.

<sup>54</sup> Lithographed in Lucknow: Nawal Kishore, 1898; OU 752, 1047 (69ff.); SJ Tas. 232/5, Tas. 250; AP 30682.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Eaton, *Sufis of Bijapur*, pp. 146ff., where the contents of the book are briefly summarized. Eaton reports that "scores of later treatises" were based on the book.

<sup>56</sup> His full name is given as ʿĪsā ibn Qāsim ibn Yūsuf ibn Rukn al-Dīn... al-Maʿrūfī al-Shihābī al-Jundī al-Sindī al-Hindī al-Birārī al-ʿIshqī al-Shaṭṭārī al-Qādirī (HSI II 13; cf. his *ʿAyn al-maʿāni*, p. 3).

Īsā "a passionate devotee of *Waḥdat al-Wujūd*, having closely studied Ibn 'Arabi's works which he staunchly defended. Because of this Muḥammad bin Fazlu'llah Burhānpūrī," himself a well-known representative of Ibn al-'Arabi's school, especially due to his *Tuḥfat al-mursala*, "called him *ibahiyya* and *zindiq*." 57 Among Īsā's works is *Anwār al-asrār*, "a Qur'ānic exegesis which is designed to demonstrate that the seeds of the *Waḥdat al-Wujūd*... can be found in verses of the Qur'ān," a commentary on the *Insān al-kāmil* of Jili, and another on the *Jawāhir-i khamsa* of Muḥammad Ghawth. 58

Īsā's *'Ayn al-ma'ānī* 59 (VII), written in 997, is a commentary on his own *Rawḍat al-ḥusnā fī sharḥ asmā' Allāh al-ḥusnā* (written in 989) and displays a great amount of attention to the works of Jāmi and Farghānī. It begins with an introduction of the basic theoretical teachings of the school, then turns to a commentary on the ninety-nine names of God. In discussing each name, the author refers to the *mu'ammā* (puzzle), *ishāra* (allusion), *maẓāhir* (loci of manifestation), *waẓā'if* (duties), and *ashghāl* (occupations). Under *mu'ammā*, the work gives a single line of poetry with a brief explanation. The *ishāra* explains what the name tells us about God Himself. The section on *maẓāhir* lists the phenomena in the cosmos and the soul that manifest the properties of the name. In dealing with *waẓā'if* the author mentions practical duties that become increasingly inward as he moves down the list of most or all of the following: *ābid* (worshiper), *zāhid* (renouncer), *dā'i* (supplicator), *āshiq* (lover), *ārīf* (gnostic), *mutakhalliq* (the one who assumes the divine names as his own traits), *muwaḥḥid* (the one who professes God's Unity), *muḥaqqiq* (the Verifier). In the section on *ashghāl*, Īsā provides brief instructions concerning invocation of and meditation on the name.

Īsā's short *Barzakh* 60 (VI) describes various meditations on the basis of the teachings of the school and provides illustrations, which the manuscripts usually give in color, of human faces composed of divine names. His *Hawāss-i khamsa* 61 (VI) deals with the correspondences between the five descents of existence (*tanazzulāt-i wujūd*) and the five senses. It frequently employs material from Jāmi's *Naqd al-nuṣūṣ* without mentioning the source.

One of Īsā's important disciples was Shaykh Burhān al-Dīn Burhānpūrī (1083/1672-73), 62 sometimes called Rāz-i Ilāhī. He is the author of *Sharḥ-i āmantu billāh* 63 (V+), which quotes in detail, without ascription, from *Sharḥ-i*

57 HSI II 169.

58 HSI II 170.

59 Hyderabad: Maṭba' Fayḍ al-Karīm, n.d., 242 pp.; SJ Tas. 115, AP 418, KH 1363.

60 AP 617 (7ff.), AP 867 (8ff.), AP 186, SJ Tas. 66/2.

61 AP *Majmū'a* 68/4 (35ff.).

62 His death date is given so by Rizvi (HSI II 13), but he also gives it as 1678-79 (HSI II 171).

63 SJ Tas. 97 (10ff.), SJ Tas. 238/2 (8ff.), AMU Subhanullah 297.7/28 [1], AMU H.F. Tafsir 467, AMU Habibganj 21/329. The work is also given the titles *Risāla-yi waḥdat-i wujūd* (AP 717) and *Risāla dar 'ilm-i mā'rifāt-i lā adri* (AP 753).

*Gulshan-i rāz*, an important Persian compendium of Ibn al-‘Arabī’s teachings by Muḥammad Lāhijī (d. 912/1506). Burhān al-Dīn’s short *Daqā’iq al-ḥaqā’iq* or *Risālat al-daqiqa* <sup>64</sup> (VI) is attributed in some copies to ‘Īsā. Burhān al-Dīn’s disciple ‘Āqil Khān Rāzī<sup>65</sup> (d. 1108/1696) compiled his master’s *malḥūzāt* as *Thamarāt al-ḥayāt*.<sup>66</sup> Rāzī is himself the author of *Naghamāt al-‘ishq* <sup>67</sup> (VI-VII), a work inspired by ‘Irāqī’s *Lama‘āt*.

‘Abd al-Jalīl ibn Ṣadr al-Dīn Ilāhābādī may be identical with Shaykh ‘Abd al-Jalīl of Lucknow (d. 1043/1633-34), a Chishtī shaykh who showed great frankness in expressing his belief in the *Waḥdat al-Wujūd* and little concern for the strict observance of the *Shari‘a*.<sup>68</sup> Among his works are *Irshād al-sālikīn* (II), written because one Muḥammad Miyā Ṣāliḥ Muḥammad had complained that the shaykh had many theoretical works, but none dealing with the practices of the path. It describes in detail the invocations (*adhkār*) and spiritual practices (*ashghāl*) of the Chishtīyya and other orders. He may be the author of *Maktūbāt-i ‘Abd al-Jalīl* <sup>69</sup> (V), which contains forty letters, mostly simple and practical; the Reza Library (Rampur) list ascribes the work to ‘Abd al-Jalīl of Lucknow, while the Khuda Bakhsh catalogue says it is by ‘Abd al-Jalīl Ṣiddīqī.

By far the most relevant of ‘Abd al-Jalīl’s works for our concerns here are two visionary conversations, one between the spirit and the soul, and the other between ‘Abd al-Jalīl and Ibn al-‘Arabī. *Rūḥ wa nafs* or *‘Ubūdat al-tazyīr*<sup>70</sup> (VII) was written to show that belief in *waḥdat al-wujūd* in no sense contradicts the necessity of following the *Shari‘a*. One of the manuscripts was copied in the year “47 of the accession” presumably that of Akbar, i.e. 1010/1602.<sup>71</sup> The spirit introduces itself as the locus of manifestation for the names Allah and Guide, while the soul calls itself the locus of manifestation for the name Misguider (*muḍill*). The treatise exhibits a mastery of many of the subtle issues that are raised by Ibn al-‘Arabī’s teachings and a thorough familiarity with the philosophical mode of exposition. Though the soul is transformed into *nafs-i muṭmā‘inna* (the soul at peace with God) by the end of the treatise, in the first parts it skillfully describes the theory of *waḥdat al-wujūd* as it was presented by authors such as Awḥad al-Dīn Balyānī in *Risālat al-aḥadiyya*.<sup>72</sup>

<sup>64</sup> AP 1945, AP 1975, OU 178 (2-3ff.).

<sup>65</sup> More completely, ‘Ali ‘Askarī ibn Muḥammad Taqī ibn Muḥammad Qāsirn al-Khwāfi (HSI II 13).

<sup>66</sup> HSI II 13.

<sup>67</sup> Printed in Fathpur, 1265; AMU Subhanullah 297.7/56 [5] (14ff.). Reza handlist (Rampur) 980B.

<sup>68</sup> HSI II 289-290. However, Rizvi also refers to ‘Abd al-Jalīl I-lāhābādī, without any elaboration (HSI II 97).

<sup>69</sup> AP 1413 (33ff.); SJ Ad. 164/13, KH 1584, Reza handlist, 942, 965.

<sup>70</sup> LK Maj. 31/2 (10ff.); AMU Subhanullah 297.7/46 [4].

<sup>71</sup> Conceivably it could be the 47th year of Awrangzeb, in which case the year would be 1115/1704.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. M. Chodkiewicz, *Épître sur L’Unicité Absolue* (Paris: Les Deux Océans, 1982); Chittick, “Rūmī and *Waḥdat al-Wujūd*.” This work is attributed explicitly to Balyānī in its Persian translation (AP 450, SJ Tas. 72).

To those with only a superficial knowledge of Ibn al-ʿArabī's teachings, it may appear that the soul is defending *waḥdat al-wujūd* while the spirit is deceived by the perception of duality. "The spirit said, 'The levels are two.' The soul replied, 'The Reality is one in each place.'" But ʿAbd al-Jalīl's presentation is profound and shows a deep acquaintance with Ibn al-ʿArabī's own writings as well as those of followers such as Jāmī.

In *Suʿāl wa jawāb* <sup>73</sup> (VII) ʿAbd al-Jalīl recounts how he asked Ibn al-ʿArabī in a vision about the interpretation of various difficult ideas in his works. The work again displays a profound knowledge of Ibn al-ʿArabī's teachings. Among other things it places in Ibn al-ʿArabī's mouth a perceptive appraisal of the reasons that led Sufis such as Shaykh Aḥmad Sirḥindī (d. 1034/1634) to criticize his perceived position.

A good deal has been written about Sirḥindī and his concept of *waḥdat al-shuhūd* which he is supposed to have proposed as a corrective to *waḥdat al-wujūd*. It need only be pointed out here that Sirḥindī's writings are a major instance of the influence of Ibn al-ʿArabī's teachings, since, although he is critical of certain points that he perceived as being representative of the school, he himself is firmly grounded within it. Whether or not Sirḥindī's shaykh, Bāqī Billāh (d. 1012/1603), accepted his disciple's superiority to Ibn al-ʿArabī as the hagiographic literature maintains, Bāqī Billāh's two sons, Khwāja Khurd (b. 1010/1601) and Khwāja Kalān (b. four months earlier than his half-brother), continued to uphold the superiority of *waḥdat al-wujūd* even though their father had entrusted them to Sirḥindī for their upbringing.<sup>74</sup>

Kwāja Kalān is the author of *Mablagh al-rijāl* <sup>75</sup> (VI), a brief history of Islamic thought, dealing in four *wasls* with philosophy; *Kalām* and the ancient Sufis; the followers of Ibn al-ʿArabī, the Ishrāqīs, and the new views proposed by Sirḥindī; and the superiority of the prophets. A final *fasl* discusses heretics (*malāḥida*).

Khwāja Khurd is the author of a number of works, including a commentary on the *Taswīya* <sup>76</sup> of Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh Ilāhābādī, who is discussed below. According to Rizvi, Khwāja Khurd wrote several short treatises to popularize *waḥdat al-wujūd*, and he "even wrote to Shaykh Muḥammad Maʿsum [the son of Sirḥindī] in an effort to convince him of the superiority of *Waḥdat al-Wujūd*."<sup>77</sup> Presumably the short treatises that Rizvi has in mind include *Fawāʾih*, *Nūr-i waḥdat*, *Partaw-i ʿIshq*, and *Parda bar andākht wa pardagi shinākht*. The longest of these is the Arabic *Fawāʾih* <sup>78</sup> (VII), which begins with

<sup>73</sup> IIS 2139 (13ff.).

<sup>74</sup> HSI II 249-250.

<sup>75</sup> AP *Kalām* 603 (57ff.).

<sup>76</sup> HSI II 271.

<sup>77</sup> HSI II 250.

<sup>78</sup> KH 3997 (28ff.); AMU Subhanullah 297.7/34 [3] P, AMU Habibganj 21/83 A. There is an incomplete Persian translation in AP 1734/3 (11ff.).

a high level discussion of various points of doctrine. In discussing the controversy over *waḥdat al-wujūd* and *waḥdat al-shuhūd*, Khwāja Khurd sums up his position by saying, "The *shuhūd* that is opposed to *wujūd* is not worthy of consideration." The last third of the work deals mainly with points related to practice and the stations of the path and provides a number of autobiographical details. *Nur-i waḥdat*<sup>79</sup> (VII) is sometimes ascribed to Bāqī Billāh, but is probably by Khwāja Khurd, given the identity of its style with the other Persian works mentioned here; parts of it are translated into Arabic in *Fawāʾih*. The work deals simply and poetically with the basic aim of the traveler to pass beyond multiplicity into Unity. Khwāja Khurd tells us that *Parda bar andākht wa pardagi shinākh*<sup>80</sup> (VII) is to be kept from the uninitiated (*nāmahram*). It is divided into nine introductory *fasls*, on *ʿilm-i iʿtiqādī* and *ʿilm-i ʿamālī*, and ten *aṣls* on the nine principles of the *ṭarīqa* (*tawba*, *zuhd*, *tawakkul*, *qanāʿa*, *ʿuzla*, *dhikr*, *ṣabr*, *murāqaba*, *riḍā*) and the reality of the self. It has excellent brief summaries of basic teachings of Ibn al-ʿArabī's school on these points, with a balanced emphasis on the importance of the *Sharīʿa*. *Partaw-i ʾishq*<sup>81</sup> (V) is written in an ecstatic style somewhat reminiscent of ʿIrāqī's *Lamaʾāt*, but with few references to the specific terminology of the school. Khwāja Khurd is also the author of a one page treatise called *ʿArif* that summarizes in beautiful Persian prose the essential qualities of the gnostic according to Ibn al-ʿArabī's teachings.<sup>82</sup>

The most outstanding defender of Ibn al-ʿArabī's own teachings in the subcontinent during the whole period under consideration was no doubt Muḥibb Allāh Mubārīz Ilāhābādī (d. 1058/1648). His master was Abū Saʿīd Chishtī Ṣābirī Gangohī (d. 1049/1639-40), who traced his line through two intermediaries back to ʿAbd al-Quddūs Gangohī.<sup>83</sup> Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh was thoroughly versed in the *Fuṣūṣ* and *Futūḥāt* and based his writings mainly on these two works, with relatively little influence from such intermediary figures as Farghānī and Jāmī. He placed great stress upon the cognitive and intellectual dimension of Ibn al-ʿArabī's teachings, clearly in reaction to the tendency among certain Sufis to claim that all understanding must derive from "states" and "tasting" (*dhawq*). He frequently prefaces Ibn al-ʿArabī's name with a series of titles in rhymed prose, including the expression, *az wajd u ḥāl barī*, "free of ecstasy and states." He writes with a clarity that is rare to find at any period. He is the author of a large number of works, in which he often

<sup>79</sup> Printed in *Rasāʾil-i sitta-yi darūriyya* (Delhi: Maṭbaʿaʾ-yi Muḥtabāʾi, 1308/1891) 79-91; AMU Habibganj 21/289, 21/101; AP 733, AP 867, AP 872, AP 906, AP 1972, AP 1267J; IIS 3175/2; KOR 2601/1; Reza handlist 855, 965.

<sup>80</sup> AMU Habibganj 21/290 (6ff.). Reza handlist 965.

<sup>81</sup> Printed in *Rasāʾil-i sitta-yi darūriyya*, pp. 92-100; AMU Habibganj 21/291 (4 ff.).

<sup>82</sup> I have published the text and a translation: "Risāla-yi ʿarif-i Khwāja Khurd," *Sūfi* 4 (1368 [1989]), pp. 22-25; "Khwāja Khord's Treatise on the Gnostic," *Sūfi* 5 (1990), pp. 11-12.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. HSI II 267ff.



differentiates the teachings of the elect, chief among them Ibn al-'Arabī, from the general run of Sufis.

In the Arabic *Anfās al-khawāṣṣ*<sup>84</sup> (V), Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh comments in detail on a single saying (*nafās*) of each of many spiritual authorities. The first saying (*al-nafās al-awwal al-Aḥmadi*) is the *ḥadīth qudsī*, "But for thee, I would not have created the heavenly spheres." Both copies I saw appear to be incomplete. The Khuda Bakhsh copy includes about fifty-three sayings, ending with *al-nafās al-Muḥini*, from Muḥin al-Dīn Chishtī. The Andhra Pradesh copy has well over one hundred sayings. Another Arabic work, *ʿAqā'id al-khawāṣṣ*<sup>85</sup> (VI+), also called *Daqā'iq al-urafā'*, is divided into twenty-one *daqīqas*. Though the author tells us that he supports each *daqīqa* by quotations from the *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, this is so that, "You will consider them to be among the beliefs of the elect; it is not because I have taken them from it, since these are a divine instruction (*ta'lim ilāhī*)." The goal of the book is to disprove the claim of those who say that anything other than God is *mawjūd*. Among the headings of the first few *daqīqas* are the affirmation of the Necessary Being, the attributes of God, the verification of the prescription of the Law (*taḥqīq al-taklīf*), command to the good and forbidding the evil, and the vision of God. Muḥibb Allāh is also the author of an Arabic commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ* called *Tahliyat al-Fuṣūṣ*,<sup>86</sup> and a second, much longer, Persian commentary (VII), written later and completed in 1041/1631-32.<sup>87</sup>

The Andhra Pradesh library has the second volume of a *Sharḥ-i Futūhāt*<sup>88</sup> which a later hand attributes to Mawlawī Muḥibb Allāh Bihārī, a well-known logician whose works show no Sufi tendencies. Most likely the work is by Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh; both its length and its style suggest his authorship. I was only able to see this work briefly on the last day of my stay in Hyderabad. Cursory examination showed that the chapter numbers do not correspond to any order found in the *Futūhāt*. The work begins in the middle of *bāb* 24, and the title of the next chapter (on folio 381a) is obscured by wormholes. Chapter 26 (f. 394b) is called, "Concerning the charismatic acts of God's friends" (*fī karāmāt al-awliyā'*); Chapter 29 (f. 436a), "On the realities of faith" (*fī haqā'iq al-īman*), Chapter 66 (f. 534a), "On gratitude" (*fī al-shukr*), Chapter 71 (731b), "On warning them against incoming thoughts" (*fī tanbīh*

<sup>84</sup> KH Ar 1284 (236ff) AP *Kalām* 1689 (ca 160ff) A second ms by the same name in AP (*Kalām* 1588) is a different work, though it is the same at the beginning for a few lines, and contains many technical discussions from Ibn al-'Arabī's school a third (*Kalām* 1589) has nothing to do with the school

<sup>85</sup> SJ Tas 26/1 81ff, but incomplete)

<sup>86</sup> AMU A H 3/562 (not seen)

<sup>87</sup> AMU Habīgsanj 21/241 (759ff), AP 1485 (755ff), SJ Tas 102, SJ Tas 103, LK 6/b, KH Acc 902, KH Acc 45, IIS 2026 (556ff, missing the first few folios) The introduction and first *fāssw* printed with Urdu translation with the title *Ifādāt-i Ibn 'Arabī* (Ilāhābād Idāra-i Anīs-i Urdū, 1961)

<sup>88</sup> AP 1461J (390ff), this is clearly the second volume, since the folios are numbered 357-747)

*īyyāhum bi'l-khawātir*); and Chapter 77 (741b), "On audition and its rules of conduct" (*fi'l-samā' wa ādābihī*).

Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh wrote *Ghāyat al-ghāwāt*<sup>89</sup> (VI) at the request of disciples who wanted to know about Ibn al-ʿArabī's teaching on the origin of the cosmos and the reason for God's giving existence to it. The work is divided into five chapters: 1. On *Kalām* and the exoteric scholars (f. 3a). 2. On the fact that ecstasy (*wajd*) and states (*ḥāl*) are imperfections in the traveler (16a). 3. Concerning gnosis of the Real (23b). 4. The reason for the origin of the cosmos (46b). 5. The origin of the spiritual creation and human bodies (65a). Chapters 4 and 5 are based mainly on Chapters 6 and 7 of the *Futūḥāt*. Most of the passages from *Futūḥāt* are quoted without Persian translation, but there is a great deal of useful commentary. Sayings from other Sufis are frequently quoted in support of Ibn al-ʿArabī's position, and these, according to the author, are all taken from Jāmī's *Nafahāt al-uns*.

*Haft aḥkām*<sup>90</sup> (VI+), completed in 1053/1643 is mainly a translation of and commentary on the chapter on *mā'rifa* (*bāb* 177) in the *Futūḥāt*, which talks about seven kinds of knowledge.

*ʿĪbādāt al-khawāṣṣ*<sup>91</sup> (VII), completed in 1053/1643, translates and comments on the five long chapters of the *Futūḥāt* dedicated to the acts of worship (*ʿĪbādāt*). In the *khutba*, Muḥibb Allāh tells us that the elect take no notice of the views of the authorities on *Kalām* concerning the principles of religion (*uṣūl al-dīn*), nor do they imitate those of the jurists who follow their own opinions (*faqīh-i ahl-i ra'y*) in the branches of the religion (*furū' al-dīn*). He then tells us that Ibn al-ʿArabī explains his own choice (*mukhtār*) among the various positions of the jurists of the *madhāhib* in the chapters on *ʿĪbādāt*, and where he is not explicit on this, one can deduce it from the *ʿĪtibārāt* or "considerations" which he mentions as supporting the different points of view. The first part of the work contains a semi-independent treatise called *Imālat al-qulūb*, on false Sufis and the path of the Folk of Allāh in fifteen *tanbihs*. The work is then divided into nine *bābs* and a conclusion: 1. On the double testimony of faith. 2. On the Fire. 3. On the Garden. 4. On the principles of jurisprudence (*uṣūl-li fiqh*). 5. On purification (*ṭahāra*). 6. On the ritual prayer. 7. On alms-giving. 8. On fasting. 9. On the ḥajj. Conclusion: On supererogatory acts (*nawāfil*), recommended acts (*sunan*) and obligatory acts (*farā'id*).

Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh completed *Manāẓir-i akḥaṣṣ al-khawāṣṣ*<sup>92</sup> (VII-) in Ramadan 1050/December 1640. It contains twenty-seven *mānẓars* or perspectives on Sufi teachings and is mainly concerned with the stations of the

<sup>89</sup> AMU Subhanullah 297.7/34 [2] (83ff.).

<sup>90</sup> LK 20 (47ff.).

<sup>91</sup> AMU University FT 193 (694ff.).

<sup>92</sup> LK 60 (259ff.).

path and methods of practice. It is drawn largely from the *Futūḥāt*. The first *manẓar* explains why the perspective of the gnostics differs from that of the exoteric scholars (*ahl-i rusūm*). The second explains why knowledge (*ʿilm*) is higher than other human qualities, such as godfearing (*taqwā*), ecstasy (*wajd*), spiritual states (*ḥāl*), asceticism (*zuhd*), etc. The last concerns the seal of the absolute and greatest sanctity (*khātam al-walāya al-muṭlaqat al-kubrā*).

Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh himself added a Persian translation and commentary to his short Arabic work *al-Taṣwiya*<sup>93</sup> (VI-VII), which sets down the basic position of Ibn al-ʿArabī's school on *waḥdat al-wujūd* and other important teachings. The work became somewhat controversial, and Emperor Awrangzeb wrote to Shaykh Muḥammadī, a disciple of Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh, telling him that he should either write a commentary on the work or burn it. Rizvi describes the exchange, quoting Shaykh Muḥammadī as replying

I do not deny being his disciple, nor does it behove me to show repentance for I have not yet reached that elevated mystic stage which the Shaikh had acquired and from which he talked. The day I reach that stage, I will write a commentary as desired. However, if His Majesty has finally decided to reduce the tract to ashes, much more fire is available in the royal kitchen than can be had in the house of the ascetics who have resigned themselves to God. Orders may be issued to burn the work along with any copies that can be acquired.<sup>94</sup>

In *Wujūd-muṭlaq*<sup>95</sup> (VI) Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh explains the meaning of the term mentioned in the title with reference to ʿAlāʾ al-Dawla Simnānī's criticisms of Ibn al-ʿArabī. He quotes a good deal from the *Fuṣūṣ* and *Futūḥāt*, and suggests that the reader looking for further clarification and not able to read these books, should study the *Diwān* of Maghribī.

Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh also wrote brief answers, usually called *Maktūbāt*<sup>96</sup> (V) in the manuscripts, to questions asked of him by Prince Dārā Shukūh. These have been partially translated by Rizvi.<sup>97</sup>

Dārā Shukūh's own shaykh, Mullā Shāh Akhūn (d. 1072/1661), a master of the Qādiri order, was an important follower of Ibn al-ʿArabī's school. He was the most prominent disciple of Miyān Mīr (d. 1045/1635). According to Rizvi, Mullā Shāh was so immersed in *waḥdat al-wujūd* "that his utterances while in ecstatic states began to match those of Bayazid and Ḥallāj. Although Miyān-Mīr ordered him to restrain himself..., in 1044/1634 the court *ʿulamā*

<sup>93</sup> AP 766 (33ff.); IIS 2403 (22ff.); AMU Univ. Ḍamīma Taṣawwuf Fārsi 42; SJ Tas. 243/1; KH 3861 (39ff.); KH 4319 (32ff.).

<sup>94</sup> HSI II 270-271.

<sup>95</sup> IIS 2140 (25ff.); AP 1734/1 (13ff.).

<sup>96</sup> IIS 2141 (7ff.), AP 1734/2 (3ff.).

<sup>97</sup> HSI II 139-142.

persuaded Emperor Shahjahan to sentence Mulla-Shah to death for blasphemy." Dārā Shukūh interceded on behalf of the shaykh, and thereby became interested in him.<sup>98</sup> In general, Mullā Shāh refused to initiate disciples. He rejected Khwāja Khurd on the grounds that he was the son of a great shaykh "and therefore he should not undergo the humility of being initiated into another *silsila*."<sup>99</sup> He accepted Dārā Shukūh and his sister Jahānārā in Kashmir in 1049/1639-40, during a visit with their father Shāhjahān.<sup>100</sup>

Mullā Shāh's *Risāla dar tawḥīd-i ḥaqq*<sup>101</sup> (VI) presents in straightforward language interspersed with a great deal of poetry some of the simpler discussions of Ibn al-ʿArabī's school. His *Sharḥ-i rubāʿiyyāt*<sup>102</sup> (VI) explains the meaning of a collection of his own *rubāʿiyyāt* and contains technical discussions of many important concepts. Much of the commentary is presented in *mathnawī* form. His *Shāḥiyya*<sup>103</sup> (VI) is a *mathnawī* written in 1055/1645, which begins and ends with a discussion of *tawḥīd* and devotes attention to topics such as the relationship between *tashbīh* and *tanzīh*, the seven fundamental divine attributes and the stations of the travelers.

## Twelfth/eighteenth Century

Among the relatively well-known authors of this period are the Naqshbandī Shaykh Shāh Walī Allāh of Delhi (d. 1176/1762), who tried to show the underlying harmony between *waḥdat al-wujūd* and *waḥdat al-shuhūd*, and Mīr Dard (d. in Delhi, 1199/1785), whose *ʿIlm al-kitāb*<sup>104</sup> (VI) displays a good deal of familiarity with Ibn al-ʿArabī's school, which is not surprising from a shaykh of the Mujaddidiyya Ṭarīqa founded by Sirḥindī. Very influential was the poet Mīrzā ʿAbd al-Qādir Bīdil, (d. 1133/1721), who was intimately acquainted with Ibn al-ʿArabī's teachings, as witnessed, for example, in his *mathnawī* called ʿIrfān<sup>105</sup> (VII).

In Delhi, Shāh Kalīm Allāh Jahānābādī Chishtī (d. 1142/1729) was a master of the school. He was the grandson of Shaykh Aḥmadi Mīʿmār, who designed the Taj Maḥall and the Red Fort. Among his teachers was Shaykh Burhān al-Dīn Burhānpūrī, mentioned above.<sup>106</sup> Through his *Kashkūl* and its appendix *Muraqqaʿ*, completed in 1101/1690, Kalīm Allāh established what "soon came

<sup>98</sup> HSI II 116.

<sup>99</sup> HSI II 124.

<sup>100</sup> HSI II 122.

<sup>101</sup> KOR 85 (28ff.).

<sup>102</sup> KH 688/3 (103ff., incomplete).

<sup>103</sup> KH 688/1 (47ff., 50 verses per page).

<sup>104</sup> (Delhi: Maṭbaʿ Aḥmadi, 1308).

<sup>105</sup> KH 656 (330ff.).

<sup>106</sup> HSI II 296-297.

to be regarded as a new framework for Chishtiyya teachings and practices.<sup>107</sup> He wrote a commentary on Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh's *al-Taswīya* and "added an attack on the Mujaddid for his criticism of *Waḥdat al-Wujūd*."<sup>108</sup> His Arabic *Sawā' al-sabīl*<sup>109</sup> (VI+), in sixty-four *mārḥalas*, shows thorough acquaintance with the philosophical discussion of *wujūd* characteristic of the school.

Outside Delhi's sphere of influence, there was a great deal of activity among Ibn al-ʿArabī's followers. One of the most prolific authors of the period is the Qādirī shaykh, ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Muḥammad Makhdūm Bijāpūrī Sāwī, whose dated works were written between 1108/1696 and 1123/1711. He mentions one Shāh Nāṣir al-Dīn as his own shaykh.<sup>110</sup> He probably had some connection to the Bijāpūr school mentioned above, since he sometimes quotes Hindi poetry from Shāh Burhān al-Dīn and his father Mīrānījī Shams al-ʿUshshāq. He also quotes from Maḥmūd Khwush-Dahān, but for the most part does not follow the latter's unusual definitions of terms as found in *Maʿrifat al-sulūk*, preferring instead the usage of Ibn al-ʿArabī and his well-known followers such as Jāmī. He also frequently quotes from the great Persian Sufi poets. Muḥammad Makhdam is the author of a large number of treatises, most of them short and relatively straight-forward. After a brief *ḥamd* and *ṣalāt*, he usually begins his works with the prayer, "Yā Shaykh ʿAbd al-Qādir, *shayʿan li-Llāh*."

*Aṣā-yi Mūsā*<sup>111</sup> (V) is a discussion of "otherness" (*ghayriyya*) and *tawḥīd*. *Bayān al-tawḥīd*<sup>112</sup> (VI) identifies *tawḥīd* with *waḥdat al-wujūd* and is mainly a defence of the latter, through copious quotations from the Qurʾān, *Ḥadīth*, Ibn al-ʿArabī, ʿAbd al-Karīm Jilī, Jāmī, Burhān al-Dīn Burhānpūrī, Khwāja Khurd (mentioned simply as "a great one"), Gīsū Darāz, and many of the Persian Sufi poets. *Bayān-i wāqīʿ*<sup>113</sup> (VI) is a commentary on the following *ḥadīth*, "I am from the light of God, and everything is from my light," within which allusion is made to the six levels of existence. *Ghanimat-i waqt*<sup>114</sup>

<sup>107</sup> HSI II 298. The *Kashkūl* is available in a commercial edition, with Urdu translation, with the title *Kashkūl-i Kalīmī* (ed. by Muḥammad Mustahsin Ṣāhib Farūqī, the *sajjada-nishīn* of Kalīm Allāh's *dargāh*, (Delhi: Āstāna Book Depot, n.d.). Rizvi provides excerpts in HSI II 298-304.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.* 271.

<sup>109</sup> AP 1804 (108ff.); printed with Urdu translation and the title *Sawā' al-sabīl-i Kalīmī*, (Delhi: Āstāna Book Depot, n.d.), 282 pp.

<sup>110</sup> *Bayān al-tawḥīd*, H-ARL, p. 54; in *Laṭā'if-i laṭīfī* (V+) (by Ghulām Muḥyī al-Dīn Sayyid ʿAbd al-Laṭīf, AP 1611, f. 35 [the ms. was copied in 1187, the same year in which the work was written; another ms. is found in SJ 230/4]), the name is given as Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn. According to the same source, the rest of the *silsila* back to ʿAbd al-Qādir Jilānī goes through Daryā Muḥammad, Rājī Muḥammad, Ḥājī Ishāq, Sayyid Aḥmad Qādirī, Sayyid Abū Naṣr Muḥyī al-Dīn, Abū Ṣāliḥ Naṣr, and Sayyid Tāj al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Razzāq. In the other direction, the *silsila* leads from Muḥammad Makhdūm, to Muḥammad Fakhr al-Dīn, then to Shāh Abū'l-Hasan Qādirī and then to the latter's son Ghulām Muḥyī al-Dīn, the author of the work.

<sup>111</sup> AP 472/8 (12ff.), AP 1905/10.

<sup>112</sup> H-ARL 99 (56ff.); *Dalīl-i muḥkam* (SJ Tas. 230/1) seems to be selections from this work.

<sup>113</sup> H-ARL 93 (12ff.), AP 427 (10ff.), AP 472/6.

<sup>114</sup> SJ T as 245/12 (73ff. ).

(VI) is a long work in the form of questions and answers, including criticisms of those who deny *waḥdat al-wujūd*. Some of the answers are quite short, while one of them takes up about twenty-five folios. *Ghāyat al-tamthīl*<sup>115</sup> (V) discusses the relationship between the non-manifest and the manifest, or the *muzḥir* and the *mizḥar*. *Ḥayāt-i jān*<sup>116</sup> (V) deals with *waḥdat al-wujūd* in the context of wayfaring (*sulūk*). *Ism-i Allāh*<sup>117</sup> (V) discusses the symbolism of the name Allāh in terms of degrees of Unity. *Istighnā'*<sup>118</sup> (V) treats two kinds of self-knowledge. *Mīzan al-ma'ānī*<sup>119</sup> (V) is a simple and useful treatise on basic ideas such as the immutable entities and the perfection of Adam. *Yak ganj az panj ganj*<sup>120</sup> (V), of which I saw a single, incomplete copy, deals with five treasures, finding any one of which will lead to success in finding the rest: eternity and the unseen; the absolute created light, i.e., Muḥammad; the name Allāh; knowledge of self; the Qur'ān. *Qabḍ wa bast*<sup>121</sup> (V) discusses the body and spirit, the five divine presences, and *waḥdat al-wujūd*. *Tajadd-i amthāl*<sup>122</sup> deals with Ibn al-ʿArabī's doctrine of the renewal of creation at each instant. *Tanbīh al-ʿarīfīn*<sup>123</sup> (V) includes a discussion of three levels of unity: *waḥdat*, *wāḥi diyyat*, and *aḥadiyyat*. *Wujūdiyya*<sup>124</sup> discusses a few terms in a manner reminiscent of Maḥmūd Khwush-Dahān's *Ma'rifat al-sulūk*. *Zād al-tālibīn*<sup>125</sup> (V) concerns the path to the station of perfect man. Other short works include *Jāmi' al-asrār*, *Maḥāṭib al-ghayb*, *Umm-i kunūz*, *Panj 'anāsir*, and *Kayfiyyat 'ālam-i ṣaghīr*,<sup>126</sup> and still others are referred to in the shaykh's works.

The handlist of the Andhra Pradesh library attributes a long *Sharḥ-i 'aqā'id-i jāmi'*<sup>127</sup> (VI) to Muḥammad Makhdūm, but both manuscripts are incomplete and neither mentions the author. The work certainly reflects his concerns and is consistent with his style. I would readily attribute it to him, except that the author of this work refers to one of his own earlier works, about whose ascription to Muḥammad Makhdūm I am less convinced. This is *Mīzān al-tawḥīd*,<sup>128</sup> (VII) the finest and most lucid discussion of the meanings of *tawḥīd* and *waḥdat al-wujūd* that I encountered. This work may in fact represent Muḥammad

<sup>115</sup> H-ARL 96 (7ff. SJ 245/1.

<sup>116</sup> AP 472/9 (16ff.), AP 1905.

<sup>117</sup> H-ARL 94 (11ff.), AP 1858/1, SJ Tas. 245/7

<sup>118</sup> H-ARL 94 (4ff.), AP 1858/2, SJ Tas. 245/2.

<sup>119</sup> H-ARL 97 (14ff.), AP 1905/20.

<sup>120</sup> AP 1905/11, where the title is given as *Panj ganj*; the more complete title is mentioned in *Qabḍ wa bast*.

<sup>121</sup> H-ARL 95 (17ff.).

<sup>122</sup> H-ARL 91/2 (5ff.), AP 1858/7.

<sup>123</sup> AP 472/5 (4ff.).

<sup>124</sup> AP 1905/22 (2ff.).

<sup>125</sup> H-ARL 98 (3ff.); Ap 472/2, AP 1858/3, AP 1905.5, SJ Tas. 245/8.

<sup>126</sup> AP 1858/11, 12, 14, 15. See also OU Pers. 151, a collection of Muḥammad Makhdūm's writings that I was not able to go over.

<sup>127</sup> AP Kal. 199, 484 (ca. 300ff.).

<sup>128</sup> AP 1931 (140ff.).

Makhdūm's masterpiece, written, one would expect, after most of the smaller treatises.

Another important author from south India, apparently belonging to the same period, is Mawlawī Qamar al-Dīn ibn Munīb Allāh ibn 'Ināyat Allāh al-Ḥusaynī al-Awraṅgābādī. His major work is the Arabic *Maḥzar al-nūr*<sup>129</sup> (VII), which was commented upon in Arabic by his son, Mawlawī Nūr al-Hudā, in 730 folios.<sup>130</sup> The book is divided into seven *maḥzars* (pagination in the following refers to the commentary): 1. On introductory lights (1a). 2. Lights within which the Peripatetics walk (203b), 3. Lights to which the theologians guide (398a), 4. Lights by which the hearts of the illuminationists (al-ishrāqī'yūn) are illumined (464b), 5. The true lights through which God has expanded the breasts of the pure Sufis (502a). 6. The piercing lights which guard against the satans of doubt (592b). 7. The lights through which the Unity of the Existent Being is unveiled for those who maintain *waḥdat al-wujūd*. The AP library also has a copy of Mawlawī Qamar al-Dīn's answers to one Shaykh Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh, *muftī* of Arkāt concerning *waḥdat al-wujūd*, in which he refers to the detailed answers he has already given in *Maḥzar al-nūr*.<sup>131</sup>

Another important figure from the same area is Sayyid 'Abd al-Qādir Fakhri Naqawī, a Qādirī shaykh. His *Fayḍ-i maḥawī*<sup>132</sup> (V+) is a commentary on the first line of Rūmī's *Mathnawī*. In *Miftāḥ al-ma'ārif*<sup>133</sup> (VII), completed in the year 1200/1785-36, the author tells us that the book is the result of forty years spent in the company of the Sufis. It is concerned mostly with technical discussions of *wujūd* with a view toward *falsafa* and *Kalām*. The work is divided into twenty-one *miftāḥs* and a conclusion. The first *miftāḥ* deals with knowledge of the realities, the second with eliminating rational objections to *waḥdat al-wujūd*, the third with *tanzīh* and *tashbīh*, and so on. Fakhri begins *Subuḥāt*<sup>134</sup> (VII) by telling us that the gnostic sciences discussed therein are all taken without intermediary from the divine all-comprehensive self-disclosure (*tajallī-i ilāhī-i jam'ī*), not from the words of any author. The discussions reflect an unusual freshness and a high degree of mastery of the subject matter. Manuscript AP 1569 is particularly interesting because it was copied in a very precise and cultured hand by Fakhri's son, Sayyid Qādir Muḥyī al-Dīn, in Wellor (near Madras) in the year 1235/1819-20, and includes many marginal notes by the author and the copyist. A student of Fakhri, 'Ināyat Allāh, is the author of an interesting short work called *Mir'āt al-shuhūd*<sup>135</sup> (VII), which

<sup>129</sup> AP 1828 (A. 122ff.) AP 576, SJ Theol. 132.

<sup>130</sup> AP 117; the manuscript, in 19 lines, was copied in 1197/1783.

<sup>131</sup> *Risāla-i wa jawāb-i ān* (VI) AP 219 (8ff.).

<sup>132</sup> OU 748 (16ff.).

<sup>133</sup> AP 206 (102ff.), AP 712 (152ff.), AP 1753.

<sup>134</sup> AP 1533 (29ff.), AP 1569 (38ff.), SJ Tas. 85.

<sup>135</sup> AP 1569 (7ff.).

describes the sciences of the Muḥammadan inheritors with the aid of five diagrams.

Another author of the period who deserves mention is Mubārak Allāh, also known as Irādat Khān Wāḍiḥ. His autograph of 406ff., *Kalimāt-i ʿāl-lāt*<sup>136</sup> (VII), composed in 1116/1704-05 with copious marginal notes, is a collection of meditations upon many of the important ideas of the school. Finally, one Muḥtaram Allāh also seems to belong to this period. In *Awrang-i waḥdat*<sup>137</sup> (VII+), a work of 324ff., he expresses in mixed prose and poetry, without any quotations from other works, a profound understanding of Ibn al-ʿArabī's position. This is the most poetical and attractively written work I saw.

### Thirteenth/Nineteenth Century

Two authors of this period deserve mention. One is ʿAbd al-ʿAlī Lakhnawī Baḥr al-ʿUlūm (d. 1225/1810), the author of a useful *Risāla fī bayān waḥdat al-wujūd*, also called *Tanzullāt-i sittā* and *Risālāt waḥdat al-wujūd wa shuhūd al-ḥaqq fī kull māwjud*<sup>138</sup> (VI-VII), which reflects an ʿālim's precision and a careful reading of many works of the school, from Qūnawī to Muḥibb Allāh Ilāhābādī. To the same author is also attributed a commentary on the *Mathnawī*. Ḥakīm ʿAlī ibn Ḥakīm Muḥammad Liqā Khān composed *Makhrāj-i ʿirfān*<sup>139</sup> (VI+) in 1244/1828-29. It consists of an introduction, two *tafsīls*, and a conclusion. The first *tafsīl* explains the two presences (*ḥaḍra*) of Divinity and servanthood. The second deals with some of the loci of manifestation of the attributes specific to the worshiper and discusses many of the stations of the Sufi path as well as the nature of perfect man.

SUNY  
Stony Brook, New York

WILLIAM CHITTICK

<sup>136</sup> SJ Tas. 132.

<sup>137</sup> SJ Tas. 22. The manuscript was copied in 1160/1747.

<sup>138</sup> IIS 2404, IIS 3082 (59ff.), AP 234, AP 830, AP 848, AP 2025, AP 1030 J., AP 4111 J., SJ Tas. 79, AMU Habibganj 23/21. An Urdu translation by Abu'l-Ḥasan Zayd has been published (Delhi: Idāra-i Nadwat al-Muḥannifin).

<sup>139</sup> AP 722 (119ff.).





#### Copyright and Use:

**As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.**

**No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.**

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

#### About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.