NOTES ON IBN AL-\(^{5}\)ARABÏ‘S INFLUENCE
IN THE SUBCONTINENT

Few Muslim thinkers have been as pervasively influential as Ibn al-\(^{5}\)Arabi, known among Sufis as the Greatest Master (\(\text{al-shaykh al-akhar}\)). 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."\(^1\) 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-\(^{5}\)Arabi 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-\(^{5}\)Arabi and to the well-known teaching usually ascribed to him, \(\text{wahdat-wujûd}\) or the "Oneness of Being."\(^2\) 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-\(^{5}\)Arabi’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.\(^3\)

---


2. Concerning the problems that arise by ascribing this doctrine to Ibn al-\(^{5}\)Arabi without qualification, see Chittick, "Rumi and \(\text{Wahdat-Wujûd}\)," in *The Heritage of Rumi*, ed. Amin Banani and Georges Sabagh (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), forthcoming.

I attempted to survey all Sufi manuscripts in these libraries with a doctrinal and theoretical orientation. 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-'Arabi and how these teachings reached the Indian authors. Did they learn of them directly through Ibn al-'Arabi'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-'Arabi'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 Ṭrāqī (688/1289), Saʿīd al-Dīn Farghani (d. 695/1295), and Muʿayyid al-Dīn Jandī (d. ca. 700/1300); the Fusūs commentators Abd al-Razzāq Kāshānī (d. 736/1335) and Sharaf al-Dīn Dāwūd Qaysārī (751/1350); the Persian poets Maḥmūd Shabistārī (d. ca. 720/1320) and Shams al-Dīn Maghrībī (d. 809/1406-7); ʿAbd al-Karīm Jilī (d. ca. 832/1428), and ʿAbd al-Rahmān 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-'Arabi'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 mawālīd composed in honor of local saints, and the ijāzas and the siklas 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.

If, on the one hand, I was interested in assessing the extent of Ibn al-'Arabi'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

---

4 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-'Arabi's teachings on the more popular level through poetry, but much less of a role through prose writings.

5 Chodkiewicz, "The Diffusion," pp. 41-42.
approaches to Ibn al-ʿArabi’s doctrinal teachings. On one extreme, certain works reflect concerns that are mainly philosophical and theological, showing mastery of the learned discourse of the madrasas and relatively little attention to the unveiling (kashi) of the unseen world and the direct vision of God in His self-disclosures that forms the ground on which Ibn al-ʿArabi 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-ʿArabi’s school. IV. Containing intellectual content especially worth noting, but again not connected to Ibn al-ʿArabi’s school. V. Displaying important instances of influence from the writings of Ibn al-ʿArabi and/or his followers. VI. An important text in Ibn al-ʿArabi’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 Sirhindi). VII. An outstanding work, offering fresh and original contributions to Ibn al-ʿArabi’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-Š-Arabi 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-Š-Arabi and his immediate followers. However, relatively few authors were familiar with Ibn al-Š-Arabi’s own writings, even if most had some acquaintance with the *Fusūs al-Hikam* through one of its numerous commentaries. The major lines of influence were not Ibn al-Š-Arabi’s own works, but those of such authors as Farhānī 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-Š-Arabi’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-Š-Arabi’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 *khānqāhs* 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-Š-Arabi, 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-ʿArabi 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-ʿArabi. What differentiates these works from the earlier works is the use of specific technical terminology and concepts deriving from Ibn al-ʿArabi'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 Jahângïr Simnânî (d. probably in 829/1425) studied in his youth with 'Alâ al-Dawla Simnânî (d. 736/1337), who is famous for his critical views of Ibn al-'Arabi expressed in his correspondence with the Fusûs commentator, 'Abd al-Razzâq Kâshânî. Sayyid Ashraf was not completely satisfied with 'Alâ al-Dawla and went to Kâshân at about the age of twenty-three to study with 'Abd al-Razzâq, leaving after the latter's death in 730/1330. He is said to have become a traveling companion of Sayyid ʿAli Hamadânî (d. 786/1385). He visited and corresponded with Gísü Darâz, became the disciple of a shaykh in Bengal, and eventually settled down in Jaunpur.6 Laṭâ'īf-i Ashrafi 7 (VI) is a work of some 850 pages compiled by his student Nizäm Hâjjî al-Yamînî, in sixty latîfas, explaining Sayyid Ashraf's views on a variety of topics. The twenty-eighth latîfa is particularly important since it is dedicated to "waḥdat al-wujûd." This is probably Jâmi's source in NafaAât al-uns for the text of the correspondence between Simnânî and Kâshânî and also for the idea that this debate concerns waḥdat al-wujûd, since this term is not mentioned by the two principles. Sayyid Ashraf offers several arguments to show that Simnânî had misunderstood Ibn al-ʿArabi's position and that his criticisms are unjustified.

I saw two of Sayyid Ashraf's works having no special relevance to the school: Irshâd a-ikhwân 8 (III) and Tanbih al-Ikwân9 (II). Rizvi tells us that Sayyid Ashraf wrote Mirâṭ al-ḥagâqîq and Kanz al-dagâ'rîg "for the benefit of specialists,"10 and these may deal with advanced technical discussions His Maktubât 11 (VI) are certainly of importance, and these along with the Laṭâ'īf are enough to show that he was a major conduit for Ibn al-ʿArabi's influence.

Another important channel of influence was the above-mentioned Kubrawî shaykh Sayyid ʿAli Hamadânî, the patron saint of Kashmir. He is the author of at least forty works, most of which are short rasâʾîl. He is probably the author of the commentary on Ibn al-ʿArabi's Fusûs al-ḥikam known as Hall-i Fusûs.12

7 (Delhi: Nuṣrat al-Maṭâbî', 1295). Manuscripts are rather common.
8 AMU Univ. Pers. Tas. 263.
9 AMU Univ. Pers. Tas. 265.
10 HSI I 268.
12 This work was recently published in Tebran by J. Misgarnizhâd but attributed to Khwâja Muhammad Parsa. The editor shows that much of it is taken from Jandî's commentary on the Fusûs. N. Mâyîl Hirawî offers a number of reasons supporting Hamadânî'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 Hamadânî's works in Istanbul, Şehid Ali Pawsa 2794, ff. 508-684, dated 901. In that collection, his treatise Wujûdîyya, which is identical to the introduction to Hall al-Fusûs (Mâyîl Hirawî, pp. 106-107), is called İstidâhî (ff. 478-481).
Among his rasā'il is the Arabic Asrār al-nuqta, 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." One of the most prolific Sufis of this period was the Chistī shaykh, Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusaynī, known as Gisū Darāz, who died at the age of over 100 in 825/1422. Many of his works were published in Hyderabad and Gulbarga by Sayyid ʿAtā ʿHuṣaynī in the first half of this century. Perhaps Gisū Darāz’s work that shows the most indebtedness to Ibn al-ʿArabi’s school is Asmār al-asrār, in which he criticizes Ibn al-ʿArabi and some of his followers, such as Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī, on several occasions. In one of the chapters of Tāhsīrat al-iṣṭilāḥat al-sūfīyya (VI), Gisū Darāz’s eldest son, Sayyid Akbar Ḥusaynī, gathers together all these criticisms and adds his own commentary. In general, Gisū Darāz employs the terminology of Ibn al-ʿArabi’s school, though he is more inclined to the ecstatic mode of expression, as exemplified by ʿIrāqī’s Lāmāʾāt, than the more philosophical and logical, as exemplified by most of the Fūṣūṣ commentators.

According to Rizvi, "The pioneer of Delhi’s Waḥdat al-Wujūd movement was Maṣūd Bak," who probably died in 789/1387. He was a disciple of Niẓām al-Dīn Awliyāʾ 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-ʿArabi 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-ʿArabi. In Miʿrāt al-ʿārifn (IV) Maṣūd Bak may be reflecting some influence from ʿIrāqī’s Lāmāʾāt, but for the most part he expresses himself in modes much more reminiscent of ʿAyn al-Qudāt Hamadānī’s Tamālāt. 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 māʾī-wuḥūd illa lāh (“There is nothing in
existence but God"), often employed by Ibn al-\textsuperscript{5}Arabi. But his mode of explaining the meaning of this idea shows no sign of being dependent on Ibn al-\textsuperscript{5}Arabi's school. The rest of the work deals mainly with various stations of the Sufi path. A second work, \textit{Umm al-sahā'i} (\textit{fi ʿayn al-mā ʿāriʿ}) (IV),\footnote{AP 1444 (p. 133ff.); this is probably the same as \textit{Umm al-naṣāʾīh}, of which Lawrence tells us, "the medieval hagiographers make mention but which does not appear in any of the published catalogues" (\textit{Sufi Literature}, p. 67).} 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-\textsuperscript{5}Arabi's \textit{Naqṣ al-ṭūṣūs} \footnote{AP 39 (38ff.), AP 211 (51ff.).} dated 795/1392-93, which is sixty-eight years before the composition of Jāmī's well-known \textit{Naqṣ al-nuṣūs fi sharḥ naqṣ al-ṭūṣūs}. One manuscript indicates that the work was written at the request of Shihāb al-Dīn Āḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd al-Raḥīm. Much of the text, like that of \textit{Naqṣ al-nuṣūs} seems to be based upon the well known \textit{Ṭūṣūs} commentaries.

\section*{Ninth/Fifteenth Century}

The works of the famous Firdawsī shaykh Sharaf al-Dīn Yahyā Manērī (d. 782/1381) are not completely free of the influence of Ibn al-\textsuperscript{5}Arabi's school, even though he is said to have been one of those who spoke against Ibn al-\textsuperscript{5}Arabi's theories of the "Unity of Being" as they became increasing popular in the Indian subcontinent.\footnote{A. Schimmel, in the foreword to Maneri's \textit{Khvān-i Pur Nīmat}, (Delhi: Idarah-i Adabiyyat-i Delhi, 1986) xiii.} His successors were directly familiar with some of the writings of the school. Thus some of the works of Ḥusayn ibn Muḥizz Balkhi Nawshah-i Tawhīd (d. 1440 A.D.), the nephew and successor of Manērī's immediate successor, Mużaffar ibn Shams Balkhi, touch on well known discussions. Most interesting is \textit{Kāshīf al-asrār} \footnote{KH Pers. 4049 (45ff.), KH Acc. 1826/3 (24ff.). The work was printed in Bankipore (K. 6543 and 9862).} (V) by Ḥusayn's son and successor Ḥasan, a Persian commentary on Ḥusayn's Arabic \textit{Ḥadārāt al-khamūs}. 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 (ḥadārāt al-māḥbūbiyyā). 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 (īḍlāl) and Misleading (īqhwā), which is the presence of imprisoning multiplicity.\footnote{For the more standard schemes, see Chittick, "The Five Divine Presences: From al-Qūnawī to al-Qāṣārī," \textit{Muslim World} 72 (1982), pp. 107-128.}
One of the most outstanding representatives of the philosophical type of interpretation of Ibn al-ˁArabî typified by Şadr al-Dîn Qûnawi is ʿAlâʾ al-Dîn Āli ibn Aḥmad ibn Āli ibn Aḥmad Mâhî ṭîrî (d. 835/1432), who, according to Akhbâr al-akhyâr, was from Gujrat. Rizvi tells us that Mâhî ṭîrî is the same as Konkan, a region in west Deccan.26 Among Mâhî ṭîrî’s works, all of which seem to be in Arabic, are a commentary on the Fusûs, Khusûs al-nîʾâm fi sharh fusûs al-hikam,27 a commentary on Maghribî’s Jâm-i jahân-numây called Mirât al-daqaqîq,28 and another on Qûnawi’s Nûsûs, Mashra’ al-khusûs ilâ maʾnî al-nûsûs29 (VI + ). Mâhî ṭîrî is also the author of a tafsîr, Tabsîr al-rahmân, which has been published, and a commentary on Suhrawardi’s Āwârîf al-maʾârîf called Dhawârîf al-latâʾîf (VI -),30 completed in 319/1416. The latter shows its indebtedness to Ibn al-ˁArabî already in the khitba, which employs the terms fusûs and futûhât in their literal senses. Ajillât al-taʾyîd fi sharh adillât al-tawhîd31 (VI) comments on one of the author’s own short treatises. Amhâd al-nasihat al-şâhiha32 (VI + ) answers a letter by Jamâl al-Dîn Muḥammad al-Mizjâjī [?] from Zabîd in Yemen and defends Ibn al-ˁArabî and his school in the style of Kalâm polemics.

Mâhî ṭîrî’s Arabic commentary on Maghribî’s Jâm-i jahân-numây is particularly significant in that it points to the widespread popularity of this treatise. Maghribî quotes most of his work, without ascription, from the introduction of Mashârîq al-darârî by Farghâni, who in turn based his book on notes taken at Qûnawi’s lectures on Ibn al-Fârîd’s Nazm al-sulûk. Maghribî provides three diagrams illustrating various important technical terms of the school; these seem to have inspired many similar diagrams by later authors. Commentaries on Jâm-i jahân-numây normally reflect thorough acquaintance with the writings of Qûnawi and his immediate followers. Typical is Dawaʾ ir-i Rashidi33 (VII), by the Kubrawî shaykh Rashid al-Dîn Muḥammad ibn Āli Bîdâwâzî.34 The author tells us that after reading Maghribî’s treatise in the

26 HSI II 336
27 O. Yaha, Histoire et classification de l’œuvre d’ Ibn ˁArabî (Damascus Institut Franzais de Damas, 1964), p. 246, no. 22, a copy (not seen) is also found in Deoband, 460/6
28 Brockelmann, Geschichte der arabischen Literatur, S II 311, this commentary was translated into Persian with the title Daqaqîq-numây byʿAbd al-Nabî Shattârî (KH Acc 801), who is said in the Khuda Bakhsh handlist, on the authority of Tadhikra yi ʿulamâ Hind to have died in 1020
29 AP 55 (82 ff )
30 AP 1478 (410ff )
31 AP Kalâm 1553
32 KH 2579/25 (25ff , incomplete)
33 SJ Tas 62 (131ff ), copied in 960/1553
34 The author is not identified in the manuscript, except through the takhallus Rashid Bîdâwâzî is known to have written a commentary on Shabistârî’s Gulshan-i râr and, in the year 852/1448-49, a mathnawî called Mishârî Rashidi. He was the successor of ʿAbd Allâh Barzishâbâdî (d. 872/1467-68), a Kubrawî shaykh who was a disciple of Khwâja ʿIshâq Khuttalânî, the successor of Sayyid ʿAli Hamadânî See D Deweese, “The Eclipse of the Kubraviyah 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, “Amir Shihab al-Din ‘Abd Allâh” Barzishâbâdî, who wrote back telling him that this was a sign of his firm rootedness and constancy in the Shari'a 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 Qûnawî and Farghânî. It is laced with the author’s own poetry, ending with a qaṣîda 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 ḥadîth 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-‘Arabi after the Shaykh himself, is ‘Abd al-Rahmân Jâmî, 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-Mu’ayyad Muḥammad ibn Khaṭîr al-Dîn al-Shâṭârî, known as Muḥammad Ghawth (d. 970/1563). He was the younger brother of Shaykh Phûl and along with him a khâlifa of Shaykh Ţûhûr Ḥâjji Ḥâmiḍ. According to Rîzvi, the two brothers were the most influential Shâṭârîs of their time. Humâyûn was a disciple of Shaykh Phûl, and the latter was killed by Humâyûn’s rebellious brother. Muḥammad Ghawth settled in Gwalior and helped Bâbur’s army seize the Gwalior fort. His support of Bâbur led to his being declared an unbeliever by Shër Shâh the Afghan, though this was ostensibly for his conversations with God described in his Risâlâyî mi’râjiyya.35 Rîzvi says that the most significant of his works is JawâAir-i khamsa; others include ZaMa’îr, Basâ’îr, and Kanz al-wâhdat.36 His Bahr al-ḥayât (III), which has been printed,37 is a Persian translation of the Sanskrit Amritkund. I saw three manuscripts of his Kalidî- makhâzîn (VII),38 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

---

35 HSI II 156-157.
36 HSI II 159.
37 HSI II 12.
38 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 daqlqas, and a conclusion. The introduction discusses the mystery of the divine Essence or "Heïness" (huwwiyya), and the first daqlqa 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 daqlqa discusses the spirit (rūḥ), the third prophecy (nubuwwat) and sanctity (valāyat), and the conclusion the resurrection (qiyyāmat).

Wajih al-Dīn Ahmad ibn Naṣr Allāh 'Alawi Gujrātī Ahmadabādī Shaṭṭārī (d. 997/1539) was a disciple of Muhammad Ghawth.39 His disciple Mīr Sayyid Šībghat Allāh ibn Rūḥ Allāh was prominent in spreading Muhammad Ghawth's teachings in Medina.40 According to Rizvi, Wajih al-Dīn's malfūzāt "are exceedingly frank and militant in the assertion of the superiority of Wahdat al-Wujūd." 41 Among his works is a widely-read commentary on Jām-i jahān-numā,42 and a short Arabic summary of Ibn al-'Arabī's metaphysics and typology of the saints called al-Ḥaqiqat al-Muḥammadīyya43 (VI + ). The latter seems usually to have been read along with its Persian translation and commentary by Wajih al-Dīn's khali'a, 'Azīz al-Dīn.44

Ibrāhīm Shaṭṭārī Janatābādī (d. 991/1583) was a disciple of Muḥammad Ghawth.45 Rizvi tells us that for about eighteen years Ibrāhīm was Muḥammad Ghawth's prayer leader.46 He is the author of an important commentary on Jām-i jahān-numā called Ā'īna-yi ḥaqāiq-numā (VI) (or A'īna-yi ḥaqq-numā),47 The work shows a great deal of influence from Jāmi, Farghānī, and Ibn al-'Arabī's Futūḥāt.

Another important author of the same period is Khūb Muḥammad Chishti, who composed Amwāj-i Khūbī (VII) in 990/1583.48 He also calls his work Sharḥ-i khūb turang, Khūb turang being a Gujrati mathnawi he composed

39 HSI II 158.
40 HSI II 329-30.
41 HSI II 11.
42 AMU Habibganj 21/366 (92ff.), 21/207 (41ff.); AMU Dāmīma Taṣawwuf Fārsī 59; IJIS 2395 (16ff.); AP 470 (37ff.), 474 (36ff.), 1332 (38ff.), 1817, 1975; SJ Tas. 98, Tas. 232/1; KH P1376; LK 225.
43 SJ Tas 232/8 (6ff.); KH 1346/1 (10ff.).
44 HSI II 13; AP 1713 (54ff.), 1841 (50ff.), SJ Tas. 100 (32ff.), KH 1346/2 (69ff.).
45 According to Rizvi, he was a disciple of Shaykh-i Lashkar Muḥammad Ḍirī (d. 993/1583), himself a disciple of Muḥammad Ghawth, but Ibrāhīm refers to Muḥammad Ghawth as his mursjā in Aīna-yi ḥaqāiq-numā (Hyderabad: Maṭba'a Abū'l-Alā', n.d.), p. 3.
46 HSI II 169.
47 Published in Hyderabad: Maṭba'a Abū'l-Alā', n.d., 100 pp.; AP 1452, SJ Tas. 23, AMU Sulaiman 157/58, Reṣa handlist 872.
48 AP 496 (117ff.), SJ Tas. 14, KU 93700. There is a mathnawi version of the same work by 'Aṣim written in 1166; the manuscript (AP 1527) was copied in the same year by Muḥammad Yāḥyā Qādirī.
in 986/1578. The author says the work is derived from passages quoted from Shaykh Kamāl Muḥammad.\textsuperscript{49} It offers simple yet profound discussions of many of the basic concepts of the school, showing obvious influence from Jāmī and Farghānī. 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 \textit{Sirāt al-mustaqim} \textsuperscript{50} (VI), in 981, the \textit{abjad} value of the title. The style is similar to \textit{Amwāj-i khūbī}, poetical with detailed discussions of such basic ideas as \textit{wujūd}, the immutable entities, levels of existence, etc. He quotes from Ibn al-Ṣāriʿ in several passages. A third work, \textit{Miftāḥ al-tawḥīd} \textsuperscript{51} (V) is a commentary, perhaps by a disciple, on a \textit{gasida} by Khūb Muḥammad dealing with the levels of existence.

**Eleventh/Seventeenth Century**

A number of Sufis of the Bījāpūr region show the influence of Ibn al-Ṣāriʿ's school, including Shāh Burhān al-Dīn ibn Mirāṇjī Shams al-Ṣūshāq (d. 1005/1597), also known as Burhān al-Dīn Jānām.\textsuperscript{52} His \textit{Makhzan al-sāliktın wa maqṣad al-ārifın} \textsuperscript{53} (VI+) describes the levels of existence in familiar style. Especially interesting is \textit{Marīfat al-suluk} \textsuperscript{54} (VII-) by his khalīfa Māhmūd Khwush-dahān Chishti (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 Bījāpūr school.\textsuperscript{55} Though the terminology is instantly recognizable as belonging largely to Ibn al-Ṣāriʿ'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 \textit{ḥadīth}, "He who knows himself knows his Lord" as his shaykh explained it in "his own terminology" (\textit{istilāh-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 Ḥūsain ibn Qāsim al-Jundī (d. 1031/1621-22)\textsuperscript{56} called Shāh Ḥūsain Jund Allah and sometimes Ḥūsain al-Ṣāra, a disciple of Shaykh-i Lashkar Muḥammad ʿArif (d. 993/1583), himself a disciple of Muḥammad Ghaṭī (970/1563). Rizví calls  

\textsuperscript{49} AP 920 (29ff.),  
\textsuperscript{50} AP 724 (10ff.), KU 93700.  
\textsuperscript{52} H-ARL 92/1 (26ff.), AP 556/3.  
\textsuperscript{53} Lithographed in Lucknow: Nawal Kishore, 1898; OU 752, 1047 (69ff.); SJ Tas. 232/5, Tas. 250; AP 30682.  
\textsuperscript{54} Cf, Eaton, \textit{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.  
\textsuperscript{55} His full name is given as Ḥūsain ibn Qāsim ibn Yūsuf ibn Rukn al-Dīn... al-Māfrūfī al-Shihābī al-Jundī al-Sindī al-Hindī al-Birārī al-Ṣūshqī al-Shaṭṭārī al-Qādirī (HSI II 13; cf, his \textit{Ayn al-maʿānī}, p. 3).
Isa “a passionate devotee of Wahdat al-Wujud, having closely studied Ibn Arabi’s works which he staunchly defended. Because of this Muhammad bin Fazru’illah Burhānpūri,” himself a well-known representative of Ibn al-Arabi’s school, especially due to his Tuhfat al-mursala, “called him ibahiyya and zindig.” 57 Among Isa’s works is Anwār al-asrār, “a Qurʾānic exegesis which is designed to demonstrate that the seeds of the Wahdat al-Wujūd... can be found in verses of the Qurʾān,” a commentary on the Insān al-kāmil of Jili, and another on the Jawahir-i khamsa of Muḥammad Ghawth.58

Isa’s Ayn al-ma’āni 59 (VII), written in 997, is a commentary on his own Rawdat al-ḥusnā fi sharh asmāʾ Allāh al-ḥusnā (written in 989) and displays a great amount of attention to the works of Jāmi and Farghāni. 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 muʾammā (puzzle), ishāra (allusion), mażāhir (loci of manifestation), wazāʾif (duties), and ashghāl (occupations). Under muʾammā, 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 mażāhir lists the phenomena in the cosmos and the soul that manifest the properties of the name. In dealing with wazāʾif the author mentions practical duties that become increasingly inward as he moves down the list of most or all of the following: ʿābid (worshiper), zāhid (renouncer), dāʾī (supplicator), āshiq (lover), ārif (gnostic), mutakhalliq (the one who assumes the divine names as his own traits), muwahhid (the one who professes God’s Unity), muḥaqiq (the Verifier). In the section on ashghāl, Isa provides brief instructions concerning invocation of and meditation on the name.

Isa’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 (tanazzulat-i wujūd) and the five senses. It frequently employs material from Jāmi’s Naqd al-nuṣṣūd without mentioning the source.

One of Isa’s important disciples was Shaykh Burhān al-Dīn Burhānpūri (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.
60 AP 617 (7ff.), AP 867 (8ff.), AP 186, SJ Tas. 66/2.
61 AP Majmūʿa 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 wahdat-i wujūd (AP 717) and Risāla dar Ilm-i mā’rifat-i li adri (AP 753).
Gulshan-i rāz, an important Persian compendium of Ibn al-ʿArabī’s teachings by Muḥammad Lāhiḥī (d. 912/1506). Burhān al-Dīn’s short Daqāʾiq al-ḥaqāʾiq or Rīsālat al-daqīqa ⁶⁴ (VI) is attributed in some copies to ʿĪsā. Burhān al-Dīn’s disciple ʿAqīl Khān Rāzī⁶⁵ (d. 1108/1696) compiled his master’s malfūzāt as Thamarat al-hayāt.⁶⁶ Rāzī is himself the author of Naghamāt al-ʾishq⁶⁷ (VI-VII), a work inspired by ʿIrāqī’s Lāmaʿāt.

ʿAbd al-Jalīl ibn Ṣadr al-Dīn Ilāḥābādī may be identical with Shaykh ʿAbd 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 Sharia.⁶⁸ Among his works are Irshād al-sālikīn (II), written because one Muḥammad Miya 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 (adḥkār) and spiritual practices (aṣghāl) of the Chishtīyya and other orders. He may be the author of Maktūbāt-i ʿAbd al-Jalīl⁶⁹ (V), which contains forty letters, mostly simple and practical; the Reza Library (Rampur) list ascribes the work to ʿAbd al-Jalīl of Lucknow, while the Khuda Bakhsh catalogue says it is by ʿAbd al-Jalīl Ṣiddīqī.

By far the most relevant of ʿAbd al-Jalīl’s works for our concerns here are two visionary conversations, one between the spirit and the soul, and the other between ʿAbd al-Jalīl and Ibn al-ʿArabī. ṫRūḥ wa nafs or ʿUbūdat al-tazyīn⁷⁰ (VII) was written to show that belief in waḥdat al-wujūd in no sense contradicts the necessity of following the Sharia. One of the manuscripts was copied in the year “47 of the accession” presumably that of Akbar, i.e. 1010/1602.⁷¹ 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 (muḍīl). The treatise exhibits a mastery of many of the subtle issues that are raised by Ibn al-ʿArabī’s teachings and a thorough familiarity with the philosophical mode of exposition. Though the soul is transformed into nafs-i muṭmāʿīna (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 Aḥwād al-Dīn Bālyānī in Rīsālat al-ḥadīthyya.⁷²

---

⁶⁴ AP 1945, AP 1975, OU 178 (2-3ff.).
⁶⁵ More completely, ʿAli ʿAskari ibn Muḥammad Taqī ibn Muḥammad Qāsīm al-Khwāfī (HSI II 13).
⁶⁶ HSI II 13.
⁶⁷ Printed in Fatḥpur, 1265; AMU Subhanullah 297.7/56 [5] (14ff.). Reza handlist (Rampur) 980B.
⁶⁸ HSI II 289-290. However, Rizvi also refers to ʿAbd al-Jalīl I-lāḥābādī, without any elaboration (HSI II 97).
⁶⁹ AP 1413 (33ff.); SJ Ad. 164/13, KH 1584, Reza handlist, 942, 965.
⁷⁰ LK Maj. 31/2 (10ff.); AMU Subhanullah 297.7/46 [4].
⁷¹ Conceivably it could be the 47th year of Awrangzeb, in which case the year would be 1115/1704.
⁷² Cf. M. Chodkiewicz, Épitre sur L’Unicité Absolue (Paris: Les Deux Océans, 1982); Chittick, “Rūmī and Waḥdat al-Wujūd.” This work is attributed explicitly to Bālyānī in its Persian translation (AP 450, SJ Tah. 72).
To those with only a superficial knowledge of Ibn al-\^Arabi’s teachings, it may appear that the soul is defending \textit{wa\-hdat al-wujüd} 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 ʻAbd al-Jalîl’s presentation is profound and shows a deep acquaintance with Ibn al-\^Arabi’s own writings as well as those of followers such as Jâmî.

In \textit{Su‘al wa jawâb} \textit{73} (VII) ʻAbd al-Jalîl recounts how he asked Ibn al-\^Arabi in a vision about the interpretation of various difficult ideas in his works. The work again displays a profound knowledge of Ibn al-\^Arabi’s teachings. Among other things it places in Ibn al-\^Arabi’s mouth a perceptive appraisal of the reasons that led Sufis such as Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindî (d. 1034/1634) to criticize his perceived position.

A good deal has been written about Sirhindî and his concept of \textit{wa\-hdat al-shuhüd} which he is supposed to have proposed as a corrective to \textit{wa\-hdat al-wujüd}. It need only be pointed out here that Sirhindî’s writings are a major instance of the influence of Ibn al-\^Arabi’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 Sirhindî’s shaykh, Bâqî Billâh (d. 1012/1603), accepted his disciple’s superiority to Ibn al-\^Arabi as the hagiographic literature maintains, Bâqî Billâh’s two sons, Khwâja Khurd (b. 1010/1601) and Khwâja Kalân (b. four months earlier than his half-brother), continued to uphold the superiority of \textit{wa\-hdat al-wujüd} even though their father had entrusted them to Sirhindî for their upbringing.\textit{74}

Khwâja Kalân is the author of \textit{Mabla\-gh al-rijâl} \textit{75} (VI), a brief history of Islamic thought, dealing in four \textit{wasâls} with philosophy; \textit{Kalâm} and the ancient Sufis; the followers of Ibn al-\^Arabi, the Ishräqs, and the new views proposed by Sirhindî; and the superiority of the prophets. A final \textit{fasl} discusses heretics (\textit{malâhidâ}).

Khwâja Khurd is the author of a number of works, including a commentary on the \textit{Taswiya} \textit{76} of Shaykh Muḥibb Allâh Ilâhâbâdî, who is discussed below. According to Rizvi, Khwâja Khurd wrote several short treatises to popularize \textit{wa\-hdat al-wujüd}, and he “even wrote to Shaykh Muḥammad Ma’sum [the son of Sirhindî] in an effort to convince him of the superiority of \textit{Wa\-hdat al-Wujüd}.”\textit{77} Presumably the short treatises that Rizvi has in mind include \textit{Fawai\-nâ, Nûr-i wa\-hdat, Partaw-i Ṣhq, and Parda bar andâkht wa parda\-gî shinâkht}. The longest of these is the Arabic \textit{Fawâ\-dê} \textit{78} (VII), which begins with

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{IIIS 2139 (13ff.).}
\item \textit{HSI II 249-250.}
\item \textit{AP Kalâm 603 (57ff.).}
\item \textit{HSI II 271.}
\item \textit{HSI II 250.}
\item \textit{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.).}
\end{enumerate}
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 (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 Fawāʾīḥ. The work deals simply and poetically with the basic aim of the traveler to pass beyond multiplicity into Unity. Khwāja Khurd tells us that Farda barāt andāfāt is to be kept from the uninitiated /nāmahram/. It is divided into nine introductory fasls, on ʿilm-i ʿiqād and ʿilm-i āmali, and ten asls on the nine principles of the ʿariqa (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 ʿishq (V) is written in an ecstatic style somewhat reminiscent of ʿIraqī’s Lamaʿat, but with few references to the specific terminology of the school. Khwāja Khurd is also the author of a one page treatise called ʿĀrif that summarizes in beautiful Persian prose the essential qualities of the gnostic according to Ibn al-ʿArabī’s teachings.

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 Mubāriz Ilāhābādī (d. 1058/1648). His master was Abū Saʿīd Chishtī Sābīrī Gangohī (d. 1049/1639-40), who traced his line through two intermediaries back to ʿAbd al-Quddūs Gangohī. Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh was thoroughly versed in the Fusūṣ 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 prefaced Ibn al-ʿArabī’s name with a series of titles in rhymed prose, including the expression, az wajdu ḫal bari, “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

---

79 Printed in Rasāʾil-i sittā-yi darūrijyā (Delhi: Maṭbāʿā-yi Mujtabāʿī, 1308/1891) 79-91; AMU Habibganj 21/289, 21/101; AP 733, AP 867, AP 872, AP 906, AP 1972, AP 1267; IIS 3175/2; KOR 2601/1; Reza handlist 855, 965.
80 AMU Habibganj 21/290 (6ff.). Reza handlist 965.
81 Printed in Rasāʾil-i sittā-yi darūrijyā, pp. 92-100; AMU Habibganj 21/291 (4 ff.).
83 Cf. HSI II 267ff.
differentiates the teachings of the elect, chief among them Ibn al-ʿArabī, from the general run of Sufis.

In the Arabic Anfāṣ al-khawāṣṣ 84 (V), Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh comments in detail on a single saying (nafāṣ) of each of many spiritual authorities. The first saying (al-nafāṣ al-awrwal al-ʿAḥmadi) is the ḥadith qudsi, “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-nafāṣ al-Muʿīnī, from Muʿīn al-Dīn Chishti. The Andhra Pradesh copy has well over one hundred sayings. Another Arabic work, ʿAqāʿid al-khawāṣṣ 85 (VI +), also called Daqīq al-ʿurafā, is divided into twenty-one daqīqas. Though the author tells us that he supports each daqīqa by quotations from the Fusūṣ 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 (taʿlīm ilāhi).” 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-takhlīf), 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 Fusūṣ called Tahliyat al-Fusūṣ, 86 and a second, much longer, Persian commentary (VII), written later and completed in 1041/1631-32. 87

The Andhra Pradesh library has the second volume of a Sharḥ-i Futūḥāt 88 which a later hand attributes to Mawlawi 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 Futūḥāt. 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 haqīq al-ʿiman), Chapter 66 (f. 534a), “On gratitude” (fī al-shukr), Chapter 71 (731b), “On warning them against incoming thoughts” (fī tanbih

---

84 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-ʿArabi's school a third (Kalām 1589) has nothing to do with the school

85 SJ Tas 26/1 81ff , but incomplete

86 AMU 3/562 (not seen)

87 AMU Habibgsanj 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 fasswere printed with Urdu translation with the title Ḥādat-i Ibn ʿArabī (Ilahābād Idāra-i Anis-i Urdu, 1961)

88 AP 1461J (390ff , this is clearly the second volume, since the folios are numbered 357-747)
Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh wrote Ghaṣyât al-ḥawāwît 89 (VI) at the request of disciples who wanted to know about Ibn al-ʿArabî’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 (waʿjid) and states (ṭāl) 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 Futūḥât. Most of the passages from Futūḥât 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-ʿArabî’s position, and these, according to the author, are all taken from Jāmi’s Nafaḥât al-uns.

Haft aḥkām 90 (VI + ), completed in 1053/1643 is mainly a translation of and commentary on the chapter on māʾīla (bāh 177) in the Futūḥât, which talks about seven kinds of knowledge.

ʿĪbādat al-khawāsṣ 91 (VII), completed in 1053/1643, translates and comments on the five long chapters of the Futūḥât dedicated to the acts of worship (ʿĪbādat). 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 (ʿusūl al-din), nor do they imitate those of the jurists who follow their own opinions (faqīh-i ahl-i raʿî) in the branches of the religion (furūʿ al-din). He then tells us that Ibn al-ʿArabî explains his own choice (muḥkṭār) among the various positions of the jurists of the madhāhib in the chapters on ʿĪbādat, and where he is not explicit on this, one can deduce it from the iṭbārat 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-qlūb, on false Sufis and the path of the Folk of Allāh in fifteen tābīhās. The work is then divided into nine bāhs and a conclusion: 1. On the double testimony of faith. 2. On the Fire. 3. On the Garden. 4. On the principles of jurisprudence (ʿusūl-li fiqh). 5. On purification (tahāra). 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 (farāʿid).

Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh completed Manāzir-i akhṭās al-khawāsṣ 92 (VII-) in Ramadan 1050/December 1640. It contains twenty-seven mānẓârs or perspectives on Sufi teachings and is mainly concerned with the stations of the
path and methods of practice. It is drawn largely from the Futūhāt. 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 (’ilm) is higher than other human qualities, such as godfearing (taqwā), ecstasy (wa’d), spiritual states (ḥāl), asceticism (zuḥd), etc. The last concerns the seal of the absolute and greatest sanctity (khwātam al-walā’ya al-muṭlaqat al-kubrā).

Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh himself added a Persian translation and commentary to his short Arabic work al-Taswiya 93 (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. Rizví 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.94

In Wujūd-muṭlaq 95 (VI) Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh explains the meaning of the term mentioned in the title with reference to ‘Alāʾ al-Dawla Simnānī’s criticisms of Ibn al-ʿArabī. He quotes a good deal from the Fusūs and Futūhāt, 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 Maktūbāt96 (V) in the manuscripts, to questions asked of him by Prince Dārā Shukūh. These have been partially translated by Rizví.97

Dārā Shukūh’s own shaykh, Mullā Shāh Akhūn (d. 1072/1661), a master of the Qādirī order, was an important follower of Ibn al-ʿArabī’s school. He was the most prominent disciple of Miyan-Mir (d. 1045/1635). According to Rizví, Mullā Shāh was so immersed in waḥdat al-wujūd “that his utterances while in ecstatic states began to match those of Bayazid and Ḥallaj. Although Miyan-Mir ordered him to restrain himself..., in 1044/1634 the court ‘ulamāʿ...
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.  

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 sīsila.”  

He accepted Dārā Shukūh and his sister Jahānārā in Kashmir in 1049/1639-40, during a visit with their father Shāhjahān.  

Mullā Shāh’s Risāla dar tawḥīd-i ḥaqq  

presents in straightforward language interspersed with a great deal of poetry some of the simpler discussions of Ibn al-ʿArabi’s school. His  

Sharḥ-i rubāʾiyāt  

explains the meaning of a collection of his own rubāʾiyāt and contains technical discussions of many important concepts. Much of the commentary is presented in  

mathnawi  

form. His  

Shāhiyya  

is a  

mathnawi  

written in 1055/1645, which begins and ends with a discussion of  

tawḥīd  

and devotes attention to topics such as the relationship between  

tashbīḥ  

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 Wali 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  

Īlm al-kitāb  

displays a good deal of familiarity with Ibn al-ʿArabi’s school, which is not surprising from a shaykh of the Mujaddidiyya Tariqa founded by Sirhindī. Very influential was the poet Mīrzā ʿAbd al-Qādir Bidil, (d. 1133/1721), who was intimately acquainted with Ibn al-ʿArabi’s teachings, as witnessed, for example, in his  

mathnawi  
called  

ʿIrfañ.  

In Delhi, Shāh Kalim Allāh Jahānābādī Chishti (d. 1142/1729) was a master of the school. He was the grandson of Shaykh ʿAḥmadi Mīrār, who designed the Taj Mahāl and the Red Fort. Among his teachers was Shaykh Burhān al-Dīn Burhānpūrī, mentioned above. Through his  

Kasḵūl  

and its appendix  

Muragga,  

completed in 1101/1690, Kalim Allāh established what “soon came
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to be regarded as a new framework for Chishtiyya teachings and practices. "

He wrote a commentary on Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh’s al-Taswiya and "added an attack on the Mujaddid for his criticism of Waḥdat al-Wujūd." His Arabic Sawā’ al-sabil 109 (VI + ), in sixty-four māḥalas, 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-Ṣārū’s followers. One of the most prolific authors of the period is the Qādirī shaykh, ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Muhammad Makhdūm Bījāpūrī Sāwī, whose dated works were written between 1108/1696 and 1123/1711. He mentions one Shāh Nāṣîr al-Dīn as his own shaykh. 110 He probably had some connection to the Bījāpūr school mentioned above, since he sometimes quotes Hindi poetry from Shāh Burhān al-Dīn and his father Mīrānji Shams al-Ṣūshāq. He also quotes from Maḥmūd Khwush-Dāhān, but for the most part does not follow the latter’s unusual definitions of terms as found in Maṣřifat al-sulūk, preferring instead the usage of Ibn al-Ṣārū 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 ḥamād and ʿalā, he usually begins his works with the prayer, "Ya Shaykh ʿAbd al-Qādir, shayʿan li-Lāh.” Ḍāṣ-yī Mūṣā 111 (V) is a discussion of “otherness” (ghayrīyya) and tawḥīd. Bayān al-tawḥīd 112 (VI) identifies tawḥīd with waḥdat al-wujūd and is mainly a defence of the latter, through copious quotations from the Qurʿān, Ḥadīth, Ibn al-Ṣārū, ʿAbd al-Karīm Jīlī, Jāmī, Burhān al-Dīn Būḥānpūrī, Khwāja Khurd (mentioned simply as “a great one”), Gīsū Darāz, and many of the Persian Sufi poets. Bayān-i wāqr 113 (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 waqr 114

107 HSI II 298. The Kashku’ī is available in a commercial edition, with Urdu translation, with the title Kashku’ī Kalimi (ed. by Muḥammad Mustaḥṣīn Ṣāḥīb Fārūqī, the sajjā-nisā’in of Kalīm Allāh’s dargāh. (Delhi: Āstāna Book Depot, n.d.). Rūṣvī provides excerpts in HSI II 298-304.
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110 Bayān al-tawḥīd, H-ARL, p. 54; in Latāfī-i latāfī (V + ) (by Ghułām Muḥīy al-Dīn Sayyid ʿAbd al-Latīf, 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 Nāṣîr al-Dīn. According to the same source, the rest of the silsilā back to ʿAbd al-Qādir Jīlānī goes through Dāryā Muḥammad, Rājī Muḥammad, Ḥājī ʿIshāq, Sayyid ʿAlīmad Qādirī, Sayyid Abū Naṣr Muḥīy al-Dīn, Abū Ṣāliḥ Naṣr, and Sayyid Tāj al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Razzāq. In the other direction, the silsilā leads from Muḥammad Makhdūm, to Muḥammad Fakhru al-Dīn, then to Shāh Abūl-Ḥasan Qādirī and then to the latter’s son Ghułām Muḥīy al-Dīn, the author of the work.

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

112 H-ARL 99 (56ff.); Dalīt-i muḥkam (SJ Tas. 230/1) seems to be selections from this work.
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(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. *Ghayāt al-tamthīl* 115 (V) discusses the relationship between the non-manifest and the manifest, or the *muzāhir* and the *miḥāzar*. *Ḥayāt-i jān* 116 (V) deals with *waḥdat al-wujūd* in the context of wayfaring (*sulūk*). *Ism-i Allāh* 117 (V) discusses the symbolism of the name Allāh in terms of degrees of Unity. *Istighnā* 118 (V) treats two kinds of self-knowledge. *Mīzān al-mašīni* 119 (V) is a simple and useful treatise on basic ideas such as the immutable entities and the perfection of Adam. *Yak gani az panj ganj* 120 (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 Qurān. *Qabd wa bast* 121 (V) discusses the body and spirit, the five divine presences, and *waḥdat al-wujūd*. *Tajadd-i amthāl* 122 (V) deals with Ibn al-ʿArabī’s doctrine of the renewal of creation at each instant. *Tanjīb al-ʿārīfīn* 123 (V) includes a discussion of three levels of unity: *waḥdat, wāḥdi dīyāt, and aḥadiyyat*. *Wujūdia* 124 discusses a few terms in a manner reminiscent of Maḥmūd Khwush-Dāhān’s *Mafāfī al-sulūk*. *Zād al-tālibīn* 125 (V) concerns the path to the station of perfect man. Other short works include *jāmiʿ al-asrār, Maḥfūth al-ghayb, Umm-i kuniẓ, Panj ānāsir, and Kayfiyyat ʿalam-i saḥhīr*, 126 and still others are referred to in the shaykh’s works.

The handlist of the Andhra Pradesh library attributes a long *Sharīʿaʾ ʿaqīd-i jāmiʿ* 127 (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*, 128 (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

---
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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 Munib Allāh ibn ‘Ināyat Allāh al-Ḥusaynī al-Awraṅgābādī. His major work is the Arabic Ḍaghar al-nūr\(^{129}\) (VII), which was commented upon in Arabic by his son, Mawlawī Nūr al-Hudā, in 730 folios.\(^{130}\) The book is divided into seven Ḍaghārs (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-ishrāqīyūn) are illuminated (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, mutāf of Arkāt concerning waḥdat al-wujūd in which he refers to the detailed answers he has already given in Mazār al-nūr.\(^{131}\)

Another important figure from the same area is Sayyid ‘Abd al-Qādir Fakhri Naqawī, a Qādirī shaykh. His Fayḍ-i ma‘nawi\(^{132}\) (V+) is a commentary on the first line of Rūmī’s Mathnawī. In Miftāḥ al-ma‘ārif\(^{133}\) (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 Kālām. 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 tanzih and tashbih, and so on. Fakhri begins Subuhāt\(^{134}\) (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 jamāʿ), 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\(^{135}\) (VII), which
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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 Wādīh. His autobiography of 406ff., Kalimāt-i ‘āl-lāt 136 (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 wahdat 137 (VII+), a work of 324ff., he expresses in mixed prose and poetry, without any quotations from other works, a profound understanding of Ibn al-‘Arabī’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 ‘Abd al-‘Alī Lakhnawī Bahr al-‘Ulūm (d. 1225/1810), the author of a useful Risāla fi bayān wahdat al-wujūd, also called Tanazullāt-i sīta and Risālāt wahdat al-wujūd wa shuhūd al-haqq fi kull māwjūd 138 (VI-VII), which reflects an ‘alīm’s precision and a careful reading of many works of the school, from Qûnāwī to Muḥibb Allāh Ilāhābādī. To the same author is also attributed a commentary on the Maṭnawī. Ḥākīm ‘Alī ibn Ḥākīm Muḥḥammad Liqā Khān composed Makhraj-i ‘Irān 139 (VI+) in 1244/1828-29. It consists of an introduction, two tafsīls, and a conclusion. The first tafsīl explains the two presences (ḥaqra) 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.
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