



Khomeini, *Wilāya*, and the Influence of Ibn ‘Arabī

The subject matter of this chapter is the study and critical analysis of Ayatollah Khomeini’s key texts concerning the theory of *wilāyat al-faqīh*. In line with previous chapters, the author seeks to analyze Khomeini’s mystical writings to study his conceptualizations of *wilāya* as well as his contribution to both *Ṣadrīan* philosophy and *Akbarīan* mysticism. After all, as will be discussed, Khomeini was a student of the School of Mullā Ṣadrā, and the mark of *Akbarīan* mysticism on his *‘irfān* was in large part due to the sages of the School of Tehran; among them, Āqā Muḥammad Riḍā Qumshīrī was notable. Parallel to his inspiration from the School of Tehran, Khomeini was largely stunned by *al-Shaykh al-Akbar*’s mysticism—which was the dominant form of *‘irfān* in *Shī‘a* Iran—directly and through Ibn ‘Arabī’s disciples and exponents who had written commentaries and glosses on *Fuṣūṣ al-Hikam*. Therefore, Khomeini’s familiarity with, and specialization in, *Akbarīan* mysticism became possible through two channels: the School of Tehran and Ibn ‘Arabī’s non-*Shī‘ī* expositors. He not only glossed on Sharaf al-Dīn Dāwūd Qayṣarī’s (d. 751 H/1350) commentary on *Fuṣūṣ*, but also wrote commentaries on both *Miftāḥ al-Ghayb* (the Key of the Unseen) of Ṣadr al-Dīn Qūnawī (607 or 605 H/1207–673 H/1274) and *Miṣbāḥ al-Uns bayn al-Ma‘qūl wa al-Mashhūd* (the Lamp of Fondness Betwixt the Sensible and Evident) of Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ḥamzah al-Fīnārī (d. 834 H/1430), itself a commentary on *Miftāḥ al-Ghayb*.

In the following, a brief introduction to the genealogy of the theory of *wilāyat al-faqīh* will be given, and then attention will be turned to Khomeini's glosses on Qaṣṣārī's text entitled *Ta'liqah 'alā Sharḥ al-Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* (Glosses on the Commentary on *al-Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* and *Miṣbāḥ al-Uns*). A study and analysis of the conceptualization of *wilāya*, *nubuwwa*, and imamate in his mystical text will be done subsequently. And finally, Khomeini's doctrine of the Four Journeys, with regard to its roots in both *Ṣadrīan* philosophy and *Akbarīan* mysticism, will be studied.

5.1 GENEALOGY OF THE THEORY OF *WILĀYAT AL-FAQĪH*

The theory of *wilāyat al-faqīh* is the official theory of governance and statecraft in post-Revolutionary Iran, and it is based on the four epistemological and anthropological assumptions of guardianship, Divine appointment, jurisdiction, and absolutism. This theory defends the unconditional right of just jurists, as the general vicegerents of the Hidden *imām*, to wield political power over the community of believers. The idea of vicegerency along with the notion of *marja'* and reference to the *'ulemā*, when the *imām* is not accessible, appears for the first time in the *aḥādīth* belonging to the fourth century when the *'ulemā* were vested with some of the *imām*'s authority as his vicegerent in the *Shī'a* community. However, the *marja'*, "as a referential model for his followers, is peculiar to the thirteenth/nineteenth century *Shī'a* community" (Kazemi Moussavi 1994, p. 280).

Kazemi Moussavi has studied the evolution of the notions of *taqlīd* and *mujtahid* (a scholar who is qualified to perform *ijtihād*) and has shown how the former 'in its rudimentary form' can be found in the *aḥādīth* of the fourth century of Hegira, in its technical sense or following the 'the speculative opinion of a *mujtahid* in the absence of a specific legal rule' appears in the post-Mongol era with the *Shī'a* School of *Ḥillah*, which provided new definitions for both *taqlīd* and *ijtihād* (Kazemi Moussavi 1994, p. 280). He also discusses "the juxtaposition of *taqlīd* with *marja'* and the advent of the concept of *marja'īyyat al-taqlīd* in *Shī'a* juridical thought" (Kazemi Moussavi 1994, p. 280), which are regarded as developments of the nineteenth century "during which the *Uṣūlī* structure of the religious hierarchy proposed the obligation of following both the legal opinions and rulings of the most learned *mujtahid* as a referential model" (Kazemi Moussavi 1994, p. 280).¹

From this perspective, there existed two intertwined trends during the thirteenth/nineteenth century: the mandate of the office of *fiqāhat* (also *fiqāha*, but not the authority of a single individual *faqīh*) over the community of believers as the only legitimate heir of the legacy of the Prophet and the *imāms*, and the birth of the idea of ‘the monarchy of the *Shīʿī* king’. Later in the century, the conceptualization of ‘*wilāyat-i intīṣābī-yi ʿamma-yi fuqahā*’ was engendered (Kadivar 1378a, p. 12, footnote no. 3).

According to this conceptualization, the Prophet and the *imāms* are directly appointed by God to the office of *wilāya* to rule over the *ummah* (community of believers) and to execute *sharʿa* and the Divine laws. On the basis of both transmitted and intellectual sources, in the time of the occultation of the *imām*, the just jurists are appointed by God to exercise authority and guardianship over the community of believers. So, the Lawgiver is the one who confers *wilāya*, the just jurists are the *awlīyā* and the people are the ones under the guardianship (Kadivar 1378b, pp. 80–81). The theory of ‘*wilāyat-i intīṣābī-yi ʿamma-yi fuqahā*’ is the predecessor of the theory of *wilāyat al-faqīh*, and it is believed that the *Uṣūlī ʿulemā*, as general vicegerents, are in charge of worldly interests and the daily religious life of believers. Mullā Aḥmad Narāqī and Shaykh Jaʿfar Kāshif al-Ghiṭā are the representatives of this narration of the role and responsibilities of the *ʿulemā*. According to Kadivar’s classification of *Shīʿa* political thought,² the theory of ‘*wilāyat-i intīṣābī-yi ʿamma-yi fuqahā*’ should be treated as the dominant discourse of the second age (thirteenth/nineteenth century), and it was in this time that the idea of the political *wilāya* of jurists was invented (Kadivar 1378a, pp. 13–14).

Mullā Aḥmad Narāqī’s formulation that the *Shīʿa* jurisprudence, which “could assume the *imām*’s authority in its full sense” (Kazemi Moussavi 1996, p. 37), is known as ‘*wilāyat-i ḥākim*’ (the guardianship of ruler). This should be understood in the historical and intellectual contexts of nineteenth-century Persia, as well as in the power competition between the Qajar court and the *Uṣūlī ʿulemā* on one hand, and the *ʿulemā* and other tendencies such as *Akhbārī* School, *Shaykhism*, popular Sufism, and *Bābism* on the other. In nineteenth-century Persia, the authority of the *ʿulemā* and their learned hierarchy were challenged by their *Akhbārī*, *Shaykhī*, Sufi, and *Bābī* rivals, as all of them proposed several alternative positions, such as *walī*, *qutb*, *rukn-i rābī*³ (this doctrine is discussed in Chap. 3), and finally *bāb*, “whose occupancy required an esoteric initiation which hardly fit into *fiqh*” (Kazemi Moussavi 1996, p. 105). In terms of their uneasy relationship with the Qajars, and despite the fact that the

‘*ulemā*’ were reluctant to give fully fledged legitimacy to the court (Gleave 2005, pp. 41–71), they also did not aim at “furthering the legitimacy of jurisprudents at the expense of weakening the ruling government’s power” (Kazemi Moussavi 1996, p. 155). Therefore, one can conclude that the favorable situation for them was a controlled court, crushed rivals, and a powerful hierocracy.

Given the above, Narāqī’s theory of ‘*wilāyat-i intiṣābī-yi ‘āmma-yi fuqahā*’ is widely regarded as the background of Ayatollah Khomeini’s conceptualizations of *wilāya* and the theory of *wilāyat al-faqīh*.³ There are, however, a number of differences between these two: first, Narāqī believed in general guardianship and Khomeini in an absolute one. Second, Narāqī’s theory is not ambitious enough to assume the political authority for the vicegerent, while the role of *faqīh* in Khomeini’s theory is political with his authority embracing political affairs as well. This theory, to be more precise, was invented to be stretched into the political sphere. Third, Narāqī believes in the collective office of the vicegerency. Fourth, Narāqī does not take the bold step of his successor in interpreting the controversial *Qur’ānīc* phrase of ‘*ulu-l-amr*’ (the guardians of the cause) as the *Shī‘ī* jurists; though both of them use the same *aḥādīth* and argumentations to prove *wilāyat al-faqīh* on one hand and believe in the Divine and immediate legitimacy of the *Shī‘ī faqīh* on the other (Kadivar 1378b, p. 48).

Having said this, the present chapter will proceed with a review of the intellectual genealogy of Khomeini with particular emphasis on his teachers, his education, and his writings on mysticism. Khomeini’s ‘interest’ in ‘*irfān*’, which has so far been a topic of interest for many scholars, needs to be defined and clarified: this interest was not limited to writing ‘*irfānī*’ texts and training interested students. More than that, Khomeini lived an ‘*irfānī*’ lifestyle and since *Shī‘a* mysticism after the School of Mullā Ṣadrā has been tightly intertwined with philosophy, both mysticism and *Ṣadrīan ḥikma* gave Khomeini a wide and rich perspective about Man, his place, and his spiritual journeys in this world. It is this ‘mystical and philosophical outlook’ that makes him “perhaps the greatest, or at least the most influential, Muslim political leader of the twentieth century” (Knysh 1992, p. 632). Furthermore, as Ridgeon ascertains, for Khomeini, as for his master Shāhābādī, ‘*irfān*’ had significant political implications and was a medium to express socio-political discontent (Ridgeon 2014, p. 215).

5.2 KHOMEINI'S INTELLECTUAL BACKGROUND

Rūhullāh Khomeini's (d. 1368 H/1989) interest in writing flourished when he was a student. *Sharḥ-i Duʿāy-i Saḥar* (the Commentary on the Dawn Prayer), which was his first work in *ʿirfān*, was written when he was twenty-seven years old and attending the classes of Ayatollah Mīrzā Muḥammad ʿAlī Shāhābādī (d. 1369 H/1950) in Qum,⁴ himself an influential teacher and master who had a great impact on the development of the young Khomeini's personality.⁵ Before finding Shāhābādī, Khomeini had other masters in *ʿirfān*, such as Mīrzā ʿAlī Akbar Mudarris Ḥikamī Yazdī⁶ who taught him *Sharḥ-i Manẓūmih* (the Commentary on *Manẓūmih* of Mullā Hādī Sabzivārī).⁷ After the death of Yazdī, Khomeini continued his studies in *ʿirfān* with Mīrzā Javād Āqā Malikī Tabrizī⁸ who passed away immediately after Yazdī (Moin 1999, p. 42). Khomeini's presence in Shāhābādī's classes lasted five or six years.⁹ Together they would read a number of key *ʿirfānī* texts such as the above-mentioned *Miftāḥ al-Ghayb* (the Key of the Unseen) of Qūnawī,¹⁰ *Sharḥ-i Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam* (the Commentary on *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*) of Dāwūd Qayṣarī,¹¹ and *Manāzil al-Sāʾirīn* (the Abodes of Travelers) by Khāwja ʿAbdullāh Anṣārī.¹² According to Knysh, he also studied Ṣadrā's *Kitāb al-Asfār al-Arbaʿi* (Book of Four Journeys) with Shāhābādī (Knysh 1992, p. 634).

Even a cursory look at his studies in *ʿirfān* and the texts he read (all of them key mystical and philosophical compositions) shows that from an early age Khomeini was committed to a serious training in *ʿirfān* and metaphysics. Ironically, *ʿirfān* “had always been to some extent frowned upon by orthodox Islam, as with its supposition of individual union with God and, in its more extreme form of pantheism, the presence of God in all things, it undermined the orthodox concept of divine transcendence” (Martin 2007, p. 33), but many clerics like Khomeini and Shāhābādī preferred to start their career with it. Mysticism, due to “it's more purely spiritual manifestation” (Martin 2007, p. 33), has always been able to challenge both orthodox Islam and the state. The case of Najm al-dīn Kubrā (d. 618/1221) and after him ʿAlāʾ al-Dawlah Simnānī of the late seventh and the early eighth centuries are notable examples of this regard. For these figures, so for Shāhābādī and his student, *ʿirfān* was not only a matter of self-empowerment, but also social responsibilities. Therefore, *ʿirfān* was seen “as a means of assuming the hardest responsibilities and duties” (Martin 2007, p. 34).

However, after the Revolution of 1979, Shāhābādī became famous as ‘the Philosopher of Nature’ (*ḥikmah-i faṭrat*) (Shāhābādī 1386, p. 21). A number of his writings including *Rashaḥāt al-Bihār* (Trickles from the Oceans), *Rashaḥāt al-Ma‘ārif* (Trickles of Gnosis), *Shadharāt al-Ma‘ārif* (Golden Particles of Gnosis), and *Siḥ Risāla-yi Uṣūlī* (Three Treatises on Principles of Jurisprudence) have been published, and there have been a few books written about him and his contribution to the *Shī‘a ‘irfānī* and *kalāmī* heritage (Shāhābādī 1386, p. 23).¹³ Shāhābādī moved to Tehran, though, Khomeini’s interest in *‘irfān* and *Ṣadrīan* philosophy continued and bore fruit in his practice of *‘irfān* and adopting a Sufi lifestyle (Knysh 1992, p. 635; Ridgeon 2014, *passim*). Finally, Khomeini emerged as an expert in theoretical mysticism¹⁴ (Ḥā’irī 1381, p. 58).

Another decisive turning point in the intellectual life of Khomeini was his acquaintance with Shaykh ‘Abdulkarīm Ḥā’irī Yazdī (known as Ayatollah *Mu’assis*, d. 1276 H/1959). He became a student of Ḥā’irī when he was studying in the *ḥawza* of Arak, which was re-established by Ḥā’irī in 1333 H/1915.¹⁵ Ḥā’irī was followed from Arak to Qum by most of his students, including Rūḥullāh Khomeini—then twenty years old (Algar 2002, p. 6). In Qum, Khomeini continued *sath* (intermediate level of the *ḥawzawī* schooling)¹⁶ with Ayatollah Seyyed ‘Alī Yathribī Kāshānī (d. 1379 H/1959),¹⁷ Āqā Mīrzā Muḥammad ‘Alī Adīb Tehrānī (d. 1369 H/1949),¹⁸ and Ayatollah Muḥammad Taqī Khwānsārī (d. 1371 H/1951),¹⁹ and after five years started *khārij* with Ayatollah Ḥā’irī. Once he found Ḥā’irī, Mahdī Ḥā’irī claims, he did not attend any other scholar’s class (Ḥā’irī 1381, p. 52).²⁰ After completing three steps of religious education, by the early 1930s, Khomeini became a *mujtahid*.²¹

As an expert in theoretical mysticism, he wrote extensively on *‘irfān* and metaphysics. Along with the aforementioned *Sharḥ-i Du‘āy-i Saḥar*, which will be discussed in the following, he wrote other *‘irfānī* texts, such as *Ādāb al-Ṣalāt* (the Rituals of Prayer), *Ta’līqāt ‘alā Sharḥ Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam wa Miṣbāḥ ul-Uns* (the Glosses on the Commentary on *Fuṣūṣ* and the Lamp of Fondness), *Tafsīr-i Sūray-i Ḥamd* (the Commentary on the Sūrat al-Ḥamd), *Tahzīb-i Naḥs* (Self-Refinement), *Jihād-i Akbar* (the Greater *Jihād*), *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāya ila-l-Khilāfa wa-l-Wilāya* (the Lamp of Guidance toward Vicegerency and Guardianship), and *Chihil Ḥadīth* (Forty Ḥadīth).²² Khomeini’s entire body of sixty works can be divided into seven fields: philosophy and mysticism, theology, principles of jurisprudence, ethics, commentary on the *Qur’ān*, literature and poetry, and

politics and statecraft.²³ His conceptualizations of *wilāya* and *nubuwwa* are cited both in *ʿirfānī* texts (comments, glosses and original texts) and juridical books. From among his *ʿirfānī* writings, *Sharḥ-i Duʿāy-i Saḥar*, *Sirr al-Ṣalāt* (the Mystery of Prayer), *Ādāb al-Ṣalāt*, *Tafsīr-i Sūray-i Ḥamd*, and *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāya* (the Lamp of Guidance) are analyzed here to discuss his arguments for the conceptualization of the perfect man, of the office of *wilāya* and its relation to that of *nubuwwa* and the doctrine of the Four Journeys.

5.3 TAʿLĪQAH ʿALĀ SHARḤ AL-FUṢŪṢ AL-ḤIKAM WA MIṢBĀḤ AL-UNS

Taʿlīqah ʿalā Sharḥ al-Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam is the product of Khomeini's classes with his favorite master Shāhābādī in Qum, written in 1355 H/1935, when he was thirty-five years old.²⁴ The book has two sections: first is Khomeini's glosses on Qayṣarī's commentary on *al-Fuṣūṣ*, and the second his glosses on al-Finārī's commentaries on Qūnawī's *Miftāḥ al-Ghayb*. The fact that he wrote glosses on one of the main products of *Akbarīan* philosophy is itself a witness to his fascination with, and inspiration by, this type of philosophy. The book revolves around typical *Akbarīan* themes: *waḥdat al-wujūd*, *aʿyān al-thābita* (permanent archetypes); two kinds of emanations, *fayḍ al-aqdas* and *fayḍ al-muqaddas*, *ḥaḍarāt al-khams* (the Fivefold Presences); the doctrine of the names and attributes (one of Khomeini's favorite topics, on which he is an expert); and the status of *al-insān al-kāmil* as the culmination of all names which are reflected in *al-ism al-jāmīʿ*—Allah. In terms of the method, he blends transmitted sources (including *Shīʿa ḥadīth* traditions) with examples of classic Persian poetry, and from this perspective, he is an heir to the legacy of prominent figures such as Shaykh Maḥmūd Shabistarī and the above-mentioned Mullā Hādī Sabzivārī (Chap. 4, Sect. 4.3, pp. 130–136).

Khomeini asserts his skill and in-depth knowledge of the intricacies of *Akbarīan* mysticism throughout the text, but since the task at hand is the conceptualization of *wilāya* in Khomeini's writings, particular emphasis is given to his arguments for the status of the perfect man and its nexus to the doctrine of Divine names and attributes. His arguments are classic: *insān* (Man) is the manifestation of *al-ism al-jāmīʿ*, *umm al-kitāb*, itself the full theophany of *ḥaḍrat-i wāḥidīyya* or Divine Essence which stands beyond Man's capacity to grasp. It is called *umm al-kitāb* because it is the

intermediary of both creation and destruction (*khalq wa al-in'idām*), and since creation and destruction occur continually and uninterruptedly, every moment, by means of *al-ism al-jāmi'*, and particularly the two names of *rahmān* (the Merciful) and *qahhār* (the Subduer), *insān*, who is the manifestation of this name, lives in a never-ending process of annihilation and renewal. From a mystical perspective, Khomeini argues that every creature including *insān* is regarded as *umm al-kitāb* because it encompasses Divine commandments such as *khalq wa al-in'idām*. One of the main sources used by Khomeini in the *Ta'līqah* is *Du'āy-i Saḥar* (upon which he had written his first *'irfānī* commentary), from which he brings sentences to sustain his arguments for the status of the names and their *zurwa* (lit. pinnacle), *al-insān al-kāmil*.

The synthesis of Ibn 'Arabī's mysticism with philosophy and *Shī'a* theology which had started with Mullā Ṣadrā and continued into its fully fledged Persianization in the writings of Iranian sages like Shabistarī and Sabzivārī now culminates in Khomeini's glosses on these two important texts. He may not have been innovative and his arguments look old and even reproduced, but they neither detract from the value of his work nor question his expertise in *Akbarīan* mysticism. His commentaries on *Du'āy-i Saḥar* and his symbolic exegesis of *ṣalāt*, having been conducted from a *Shī'a* perspective, are indicative of his immersion into the deep ocean of mysticism that provided him with the competencies to look into his *Shī'a* tradition from a new viewpoint. In the following, and in the study of Khomeini's conceptualization of *wilāya*, Ibn 'Arabī's influence on his thought will be discussed.

5.4 WALĪ AND THE OFFICE OF WILĀYA IN THE 'IRFĀNĪ TEXTS

As observed, Khomeini's fascination by the 'rationalizing interpretation' of Ibn 'Arabī's teachings (Knysh 1992, p. 636) bore fruit in his *Ta'līqah 'alā Sharḥ al-Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam wa Miṣbāḥ al-Uns*. In addition, he was attracted by *al-Asfār al-Arba'i* (the Four Journeys) of Ṣadrā as his first exposition to the *Ṣadrīan* metaphysics. His *'irfānī* texts are written from this perspective and should be treated as an addition to these two traditions. *Sharḥ-i Du'āy-i Saḥar*, which is written in Qum in 1347 H/1928 (Khomeini 1388, Introduction), is a summary of "Khomeini's philosophical studies and spiritual labors" (Knysh 1992, p. 636). The *Du'ā* upon

which this commentary is written is famous among *Shīʿas* and is also known as *Mubāhila* (lit. to curse or take away mercy from someone who engages in falsehood or lie). It is believed that it contains Divine wisdom and meanings as a spiritual tie between the lover and the Beloved. Khomeini, like his predecessors, believed that Divine names and attributes bridge the gap between Deity and creation, and this is the main reason behind his decision to comment upon *Duʿāy-i Sahar* because the *Duʿā* contains the greatest name (*al-ism al-aʿẓam*) and the full theophany of God in this name.

Shāhābādī's presence is clearly observable throughout the text, as Khomeini shows his respect and devotion to him and praises him as “the perfect mystic” and “our master” (Khomeini 1388, pp. 2–3). The other figure who is mentioned occasionally is Khomeini's second teacher in ʿirfān, the above-mentioned Mīrzā Javād Āqā Malikī Tabrīzī (Khomeini 1388, p. 21). Khomeini's concern in this text is to demonstrate ‘the compatibility of the *sharʿī* with Irfan’, as well as his debt to Ibn ʿArabī and his inspiration by the *Akbarīan* doctrine of the perfect man (Ridgeon 2014, p. 214). He deploys transmitted sources (the *Qurʾān* and *ḥadīth*) to develop his argument for the status of *insān* and his identification with God. As Deity encompasses the names of both Beauty and Glory (*ṣifāt-i jamāl wa jalāl*), His *khālifa*/perfect man, due to his closeness to God, contains antithetical attributes such as *lutf* (beneficence) and *qahr* (wrath), and therefore the office of *khilāfa* is an all-encompassing one (Khomeini 1388, pp. 26–27).

His other major ʿirfānī book is *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāya ila-l-Khilāfa wa-l-Wilāya*, in which Khomeini discusses *asmāʾ wa ṣifāt* (Divine names and attributes) and their nexus to the doctrine of *khilāfa*. It seems that the book was written immediately after *Sharḥ* in 1349 H/1930 when he was only twenty-eight years old, and therefore suffers from a number of features which are “common to many others early, but not yet mature” texts (Knysh 1992, p. 636). In terms of the form and writing, as Knysh maintains, the book lacks a

compositional perfection which in Khomeini's case is the disparity of the parts constituting the discourse, an unnecessary repetition of rather trite metaphysical propositions, and the absence of a clearly defined approach. The impression of immaturity is reinforced by constant references to the Muslim thinkers whose writings determined the course of Khomeini's reasoning and his overall attitude toward religion. (Knysh 1992, p. 636 & 648)

One of these Muslim thinkers who is often mentioned and his impact on Khomeini's thought is clearly visible is Āqā Muḥammad Riḍā Qumshī'ī, the *hakīm* of the School of Tehran whose ideas are discussed at length in the previous chapter (Sect. 4.4, pp. 136–140). In different places, Khomeini praises him and quotes from “his noble words” (Khomeini 1360, p. 57ff). As Qumshī'ī's conceptualization of *wilāya*, *khilāfa*, and *nubuwwa* was noted, he argued in favor of a coherent understanding of the term and functions of *khilāfa*, and that's why he was compared to the French thinker Jean Bodin. Following him, Khomeini, both in the present text and his other mystical writings, develops arguments for a coherent, indivisible office of *khilāfa* whose authority cannot be divided among any other sources of authority. To be more precise, there are no other sources to claim authority and hegemony over believers; it is *walī* on one side, who rules on behalf of God, and the cosmos on the other. In a long quotation from Qumshī'ī, who is called ‘our perfect mystic’, Khomeini argues for the role and duty of the perfect *walī* after he returned from his fourth journey to warn people of and forbid them from evil-doing (Khomeini 1360, pp. 87–88).

Using transmitted sources, mainly *ḥadīth Qudsī*, Khomeini argues that the philosophy behind the appointment of *khalīfa/walī* by God is His desire to be known and loved by people,²⁵ and therefore *al-insān al-kāmil* is signified to be the locus of all Divine names and their secrets, and as such, the permanent archetype of him (of *al-insān al-kāmil*) has authority over other permanent archetypes. He is the full manifestation of *al-ism al-a'zam* (or *al-ism al-jāmi'*, the Greatest Name), and since this name encompasses all other names and attributes, the status of *khilāfa* is total and all-encompassing (Khomeini 1360, pp. 29–61).

Linked to the doctrine of the permanent archetype(s) (*ʿayn/a'yān al-thābitah*) are other important notions in Islamic mysticism such as *ḥayḍ* (emanation) and its two manifestations of *ḥayḍ al-aqdas* (the Most Holy Emanation) and *ḥayḍ al-muqaddas* (the Holy Emanation). One can summarize Khomeini's theory on the permanent archetype and its nexus to two typologies of emanation as follows: it is through *ḥayḍ al-aqdas* that the permanent archetypes come into existence. In other words, the first sign of creation of the permanent archetypes in the presence of Divine knowledge happens through *ḥayḍ al-aqdas*, whereas it is by *ḥayḍ al-muqaddas* that the permanent archetypes find external existence in the real world. The difference between these two types of emanation is that the former (the Most Holy Emanation) helps the internal existence of the permanent

archetypes be possible, while the latter (the Holy Emanation) externalizes it (Khomeini 1360, pp. 68–69). The existence of the permanent archetype of the perfect man depends on *ḥaqd al-aqdās*, and that's why it is the most important of all permanent archetypes, because it is externalized and multiplied through *ḥaqd al-muqaddas* (Khomeini 1360, p. 70).

Drawing upon the legacy of the School of Tehran, both through Mullā Ṣadrā and his metaphysics and via the above-mentioned commentaries on *Fuṣūṣ*, Khomeini develops his argument in the context of the synthesis of *wilāya*²⁶ and *wujūd* (*ousia*), both of them modulated (*mushakkak*) entities. As it is observed in the previous chapter, the nexus between *wilāya* and *ousia* was one of the main concerns of the philosophers of the School of Tehran, and the literature was developed out of the commentaries on the *faṣṣ* of Seth (*faṣṣ Shaythī*) in Ibn ʿArabī's *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*. The *faṣṣ* discusses “*wilāya* as the expiration of the ‘Breath of the Merciful’ (*naḥās-i raḥmānī*)” (Rizvi 2005, p. 118). It is on this ground that Khomeini articulates his doctrine of the greater vicegerency (*Khilāfa*). *Khilāfat al-kubrā* is under the rule of the name of Allah, and since Allah is a comprehensive name, encompassing both the names of Beauty and Glory, *khilāfat al-kubrā* is all-encompassing too. *Khilāfat al-kubrā* is identical to the eternal individuality of the perfect man, and as such, the relationship between it and other eternal individualities is the same as the relationship between the Great Name—Allah—and other Divine names.

The reality of *wilāya* is embedded in the comprehensive status of the *Muḥammedan Khilāfa* (*Khilāfat al-Muḥammadīyah*) and as such, enjoys a number of qualities like closeness, love, *wilāyat al-takwīnīya*, and absolute authority. From this perspective, the status of both *wilāya* and *khilāfat al-kubrā* has the same authority and absolute power to act upon the cosmos. Khomeini calls this ‘to command and to create’ (*inshāʾ al-amr wa al-khalq*), referring to the well-known *āyah* ‘Be, and it is’ that occurs several times in the *Qurʾān*. The *Muḥammedan Khilāfa* is a double-faceted status in the sense that the office of *wilāya* is *bāṭin* (inward), while the office of *nubuwwa* is *ẓāhir* (outward) (Khomeini 1360, pp. 13–38). The *Muḥammedan Khilāfa* has a status in which all Divine realities and hidden names are aggregated (Khomeini 1360, p. 51) and is manifested in the office of *nubuwwa*. In other words, these realities and names are hidden as long as *nabī* does not exist, but once he is appointed by God, he will make them manifest. Since *wilāya* is the inward of *nubuwwa*, *walī* (here *imām* Ali and other *imāms* from the household of the Prophet) is regarded as the manifestation of Divine secrets (Khomeini 1360, pp. 53–61).

Before taking leave of *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāya*, it is necessary to remember that in this text, Khomeini shows his disagreement with Qayṣarī's interpretation of Ibn 'Arabī. However, his arguments and reasoning are nothing but a "slight reformulation of Ibn 'Arabī's favorite themes" which had been stated several centuries ago (Knysh 1992, p. 643). Khomeini's other 'irfānī texts, including *Ādāb al-Ṣalāt*, *Sirr al-Ṣalāt* and *Tafsīr-i Sūray-i Ḥamd* focus more on the theory of the perfect man. *Ādāb al-Ṣalāt*, which was written in 1361 H/1942 in Qum, contains Khomeini's ideas on spiritual mysteries of the daily prayer. The book has a pair which is *Sirr al-Ṣalāt* and is written for the elite (those who have knowledge of 'irfān), but *Ādāb al-Ṣalāt* targets a wider audience among ordinary people in order to teach them the spiritual meanings of the daily prayer in simple language. The book contains Khomeini's 'irfānī anthropology and his instructions for the seeker who attempts to reach the station of the perfect *walī*. He makes an argument which is typical of a Ṣadrīan scholar and a jurist: mankind, according to his original disposition (*fiṭra*) is able to be the manifestation of Divine names and enjoys the right of authority and power to act upon the cosmos. He is superior to angels due to his ability and eligibility to learn God's names and to reach the status of the name of Allah, which rules over the eternal individuality of the perfect man (Khomeini 1378a, p. 206).

Referring to the famous *Qudsī ḥadīth* which concerns the status of the Prophet, "I take oath that I created the cosmos because of you",²⁷ Khomeini concludes that the creation of the cosmos is a prelude to the creation of the perfect man. When a seeker reaches the station of self-annihilation, he becomes *walī* and therefore *wilāya* is the final step, the last journey, in a seeker's travel to God (Khomeini 1378a, pp. 262–263). At the end of this path, the seeker is able to breach veils and understand whatever has been forbidden to be seen before, such as the secret laws of the Day of Judgment (*Yawm al-Dīn*) (Khomeini 1378a, p. 272). Along with the Prophet, Ali is the only one who has reached such a station (Khomeini 1378a, p. 298). To enlarge on this and the Four Journeys, a *sālik* endeavors to reach the station of *wilāya* in the following way. Addressing the office of *nubuwwa* and *wilāya* of the Prophet, Khomeini argues that due to the exalted status of the *Muḥammedan* Reality, the religion of the seal of the prophets is the most perfect and the most comprehensive one, and not only encompasses the previous religions, but also reveals them in their best manifestations (Khomeini 1378a, p. 309). In explaining the office of *wilāya*, Khomeini uses the verb *kashf* (to unveil)

and indicates that *walī* (the Prophet and the *imāms*) is an individual who, due to his closeness to God, can approach all that is exclusively apparent to God, and as such participate in Divine knowledge. Enjoyment of the right of *kashf* endows *walī* with the right of absolute authority to act upon the cosmos (Khomeini 1378a, p. 343ff).

Sirr al-Ṣalāt, which is Khomeini's sixth book, was published in 1358 H/1939 (Naqvi 2015, pp. XIV–XV). Recently, Amjad Shah Naqvi has provided an elegant introduction as well as a translation of the book. Naqvi locates the text in the context of the intellectual developments of Iran's early modern period, and rightly believes that it should be treated as the outcome of Khomeini's personal interest in mysticism, *ḥikma*, and theology on one hand, and “the end of a venerable set of religious and scholarly traditions” on the other (Naqvi 2015, p. XX). *Sirr al-Ṣalāt* is also important as it sheds light on the formulation of Khomeini's political theology through the questioning of prayer and “its link to one's journey within reality towards God” (Naqvi 2015, p. XXI), and demonstrates “his concern with *askesis* and what Foucault called ‘care for the self’ – and ‘technologies of the self’-, as the ways in which humans mediate experience and make” (Naqvi 2015, p. XXI).

The text draws on an expansive variety of sources from the *Qurʾān* and *ḥadīth* compilations, to poetry and theology, to ethics and philosophy (Naqvi 2015, pp. XXII–XXIII). It is a treatise on the inner meaning and dimension of prayer, particularly indebted to two similar works, one by Zayn al-Dīn ibn ʿAlī al-Āmilī known as *al-Shahīd al-Thānī* (the Second Martyr, d. 911 H/1506) and the other by the aforementioned Qāḍī Saʿīd Qumī (Naqvi 2015, p. XXIX). *Sirr al-Ṣalāt* revolves around *wujūd* and its degrees and contains Khomeini's *ʿirfānī* anthropology which is intimately connected to the modulated stages of reading, comprehending, and interpreting the *Qurʾān*. He classifies five types of reading (*qirāʾa*), including the reading of ordinary people (*ʿāmmah*), the reading of the privileged (*khāṣṣah*), the reading of the people of knowledge (*aṣḥāb-i maʿrifā*), the reading of the people of the heart (*aṣḥāb-i ḡhulūb*), and finally of the people of *wilāya* (*aṣḥāb-i wilāya*). The last one is the most perfect reading and designated to *awliyā* who have reached the station of unification with God. Each of them also has inner stages, though Khomeini does not mention them (Khomeini 1390, pp. 80–81).

The last *ʿirfānī* text, *Tafsīr-i Sūray-i Ḥamd* (the Commentary on the *Sūrat al-Ḥamd*), contains similar arguments for the offices of *wilāya* and *nubuwwa*, the theory of the perfect man, spiritual conduct, and the nexus

of Divine names and the status of the *Muḥammedan* Reality. The text is composed of four sections, each of them is written at a different time. The first part which is a concise exegesis of the *sūrat al-Ḥamd*, the first *sūrah* of the *Qurʾān*, was written in 1358 H/1939. The second part could be regarded as a more detailed exegesis of the same *sūrah* and was written three years later in 1942. The third part contains Khomeini's lectures on *tafsīr al-Qurʾān* which were broadcast on Iranian TV in 1980, and the last part is a collection of his remarks about different *sūrahs* which had been disseminated in his other books and treatises (Khomeini 1378b, *shamsī*, p. 3). *Tafsīr-i Sūray-i Ḥamd* is an *ʿirfānī* and *ḥikamī* exegesis and revolves around the importance of Divine names and attributes and their relationship to the status of *insān*. He deploys names to explain the problematic of unity and its relationship to multiplicity, and this method, as we know, belongs to both the *ḥikmat* and Sufi traditions, and not that of theologians.²⁸

Addressing the status of *al-insān al-kāmil*, he is the pivot of the cosmos (a typical argument which is guided by using transmitted sources), and His *khalīfa* on earth and turning face toward *insān* is equivalent to turning face toward Allah, because *insān* is annihilated in Him. Once again, Khomeini uses the names to explain the issue of sin which is an important question in Islamic mysticism. Addressing these two questions that 'if *insān* is *khalīfat al-llāh*, why does he commit sin?' and 'how one can explain him being sinful', Khomeini argues that the secret of *insān* committing sin is because he becomes amused with the multiplicity of the names and his inability to see oneness in all names. Paying attention to the multiplicity of the names (*kathrat-i asmāʾī*) is the Tree of Evil (*Shajarat al-Munḥiya* or *Khabūtha*) as opposed to the Tree of Good (*Shajarat al-Taḥyibah*) from which Man has been warned (Khomeini 1378b, pp. 18–27).

As mentioned previously in Chap. 2 (Sect. 2.2, pp. 28–35), Ibn ʿArabī invented the doctrine of names and attributes and their relationship to the Essence for the first time in the history of Islamic mysticism in order to explain the problematic of *badʿ* (spring, creation in the terminology of the mystics). Dealing with this vital question of 'how one (*wāḥid*), with regard to the fact that His Essence is unknowable and will remain so, can create countless things in the real world', Ibn ʿArabī sought to approach it by the doctrine of unity vs. multiplicity. The theory has been used extensively by his successors to describe the gap between deity and people (*khalq*). All Khomeini's *ʿirfānī* texts which were examined here are written from this perspective. As observed in the discussion of Khomeini's glosses on Qayṣarī's commentary on *Fuṣūṣ*, he deploys the doctrine of names and attributes to elucidate the status of Man in the cosmos, and his relation to

Deity. For Khomeini, it is a doctrine that can also explain the question of sin committed by Man, the *khalīfat al-llāh*: he commits sin because he gets stuck in the darkness of multiplicity.

Khomeini's fascination with *Akbarīan* mysticism is more apparent when he tries to interpret the word *al-rahmān* (the Merciful) in the phrase '*bism i-llāh-i rahmān-i rahīm*'. Khomeini quotes *al-Shaykh al-Akbar* in his book *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkīyah* (the Meccan Revelations) in which he says "the cosmos (*al-ʿālam*) appears by *bism i-llāh-i rahmān-i rahīm*" (Khomeini 1378b, p. 81). Or, quoting Qayṣarī in his commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ*, Khomeini maintains that *al-rahmān* is *rabb ul-awwal* (the Primal Lord) which is the station of totality as opposed to the station of particularity and belongs to the word *al-rahīm* (the Compassionate). *Al-rahīm* is *naṣṣ-i kullī* (the Universal Self) (Khomeini 1378b, p. 84).

In overall assessment of Khomeini's *ʿirfānī wilāya* and the status of *walī*, one can say that he does not mention *wilāyat al-ʿāmmah* which was very prominent in ʿAllāmah Ṭabāṭabāʾī's writings. The importance of this and also its contrast to *wilāyat al-khāṣṣah*, which is Khomeini's concern, will be emphasized when we discuss Khomeini's doctrine of the Four Journeys, as well as the identification of the individual who finishes the last journey. With regard to the centrality of the conceptualization of *wilāyat al-khāṣṣah* and the absence of *wilāyat al-ʿāmmah* in Khomeini's thought, one can safely conclude that he is the faithful disciple of the scholars of the School of Tehran.²⁹ *Wilāyat al-ʿāmmah*, as it is elaborated by Ṭabāṭabāʾī, is innovative and unique in the sense that he not only switched the center of gravity from *wilāyat al-khāṣṣah* (the specific *wilāya*, which is signified to the elite; the Prophet and the *imāms*) to *wilāyat al-ʿāmmah* (the general *wilāya* which is accessible by any believer), but also founded his entire philosophical system on this concept. It is no longer *wilāyat al-khāṣṣah* which is at the heart of his philosophy, but the type of guardianship that is signified to every believer through his or her deeds and efforts. Besides, *wilāya* is not a Divine gift endowed exclusively to the *imāms* and the Prophet, but an attainable virtue which is gained by the good deeds of believers.

5.5 THE FOUR JOURNEYS

Khomeini's discussion of the Four Journeys is a different reformulation of the idea of Ibn ʿArabī; though the latter's influence is undeniable. It is called 'a different reformulation', because, *al-Shaykh al-Akbar* only mentions the first two journeys and his conceptualization of them is different

from Mullā Ṣadrā's interpretation which became the dominant reading of the Four Journeys and influenced later scholars, among them Khomeini (Ḥassan Zādiḥ 1390, pp. 11–13). There are two points here: what Khomeini had inherited from his predecessors was through the commentaries of 'Aff a-Dīn al-Ṭilmisānī (d. 690 H/1291), 'Abd al-Razzāq Kāshānī (also Qāshānī, d. 736 H/1335), and Sharaf al-Dīn Dāwūd Qayṣarī (d. 751 H/1350). It was these figures who elaborated on Ibn 'Arabī's idea (and not theory) of spiritual journeys and turned it into a coherent doctrine of the Four Journeys of the seeker. Mullā Ṣadrā's reading was perpetuated in his book entitled *al-Asfār al-Arba'i*. The second point is that, compared with other themes and concepts, Khomeini's conceptualization of the Four Journeys is brief and scattered through his *'irfānī* texts.

Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāya ila-l-Khilāfa wa-l-Wilāya is one of the main texts containing Khomeini's doctrine of the Four Journeys. The book was written in 1309 *shamsī*/1349 H, two years after *Sharḥ-i Du'āy-i Saḥar*, when Khomeini was twenty-nine years old. The political implications of the text, as well as Khomeini's discussion of the *asfār al-arba'i*, have been emphasized by scholars like Lloyd Ridgeon who gives a lengthy account of Khomeini's reading of the doctrine and its political consequences (Ridgeon 2014, pp. 213–232). Before starting on an analysis of the text, it is worth remembering that *Miṣbāḥ* is the only text in which the *asfār* is discussed in full and, in this book as in *Sharḥ-i Du'āy-i Saḥar*, Qumshī'ī's influence is evident. In fact, Khomeini's conceptualization of the Four Journeys is a restatement of Qumshī'ī's theory. Qumshī'ī is praised as 'the perfect gnostic' and 'our great *shaykh*'. The first journey (*min al-khalq ila l-ḥaqq*), during which three veils of the carnal soul (*nafs*), intellect (*'aql*), and his spirit (*ruh*) are breached, starts from leaving creation/people (allegory of worldly attachments) for the delimited Truth (*ḥaqq-i muqayyadah*). *Fanā* (self-annihilation) and confession to servitude (*iqrār bi 'ubūdīyat*) are gained at the end of this journey (Khomeini 1360 *shamsī*, pp. 205–206).

The second journey (*fi al-ḥaqq bil ḥaqq*), which is a "traveling from the Truth towards the Truth by means of the Truth" (Ridgeon 2014, p. 215), becomes possible for the traveler because he has reached the status of *wilāya* as the result of the first journey. The status of *wilāya*, Khomeini maintains, is an expression of the traveler's *fanā* in terms of his total dissolution of personal identity (*dhāt*), attributes (*ṣifāt*), and doings (*af'āl*), as well as a journey from delimited Truth to absolute Truth (Khomeini 1360 *shamsī*, p. 206). The third journey (*min al-ḥaqq ila l-khalq bil ḥaqq*),

which is the station of total sobriety and traveler's voyage in Divine presences (Khomeini 1360 *shamsī*, p. 206), results in the office of *nubuwwa*, though the traveler does not enjoy the right of lawgiving (*tashrīʿ*). The fourth journey (*fi al-khalq bil haqq*), or the journey from creation to the creature by the means of the Truth, bares fruit in bringing religion and law to the traveler, in informing people of God and of His names and attributes (Khomeini 1360 *shamsī*, p. 207), and in making "exoteric commands pertaining to the body and, esoteric laws pertaining to the heart" (Ridgeon 2014, p. 216).

Khomeini's outlook that only the fourteen infallible figures are capable of reaching subsistence with God and finishing the fourth journey which is emphasized in this text (Khomeini 1360 *shamsī*, pp. 211–212) is in fact a culmination of the *Shīʿa* interpretation of *Akbarian* mysticism and, at the same time, a deviation from the entire Sufi tradition which never restricted spiritual conduct to any specific person. One of the historical reasons for the attraction of Sufism was its exposure to everybody, from any rank, through its emphasis on character building and the hope that every individual can reach *fanā fi al-llāh* and become a *walī* by austerity and detachment from world. Quoting Shāhābādī, another influential figure in his *ʿirfān*, Khomeini maintains that along with the Prophet, Ali was also eligible to bring a new law, but since the Prophet preceded him and brought Islamic *sharīʿa*, Ali follows his law (Khomeini 1360 *shamsī*, p. 212).

The second text in which the doctrine of the Four Journeys is discussed is the above-mentioned *Sharḥ-i Duʿāy-i Saḥar*, although Khomeini's conceptualization of it is brief. Shāhābādī's influence is visible throughout the text and is Khomeini's main source when he discusses the Four Journeys, Shāhābādī is the main source (Khomeini 1388, footnote, p. 2). Quoting his master and skipping the first two journeys, Khomeini mentions that at the end of the third journey, it will become possible for the *ʿārif* to recognize what makes people good and helps them to be closer to God. Since the ways to reach God are equal to the number of people, the *ʿārif* will be have to be able to distinguish between these paths and recognize which is the right path for every person. It is also in this station that the *ʿārif/walī* can legislate (*tashrīʿ*). Here again, Khomeini clarifies that it is only the first *imām* and his sons who have reached this station and are able to bring laws, but since Ali is the successor of the Prophet and has come after him, he has to follow the Prophet's *sharīʿa* and submit to it (Khomeini 1388, footnote, p. 2).

As Khomeini proceeds with the text, he expands on Shāhābādī's idea and discusses the journeys a traveler should make in order to reach self-annihilation and subsistence with God. In terms of method, he deploys a vast range of *ʿirfānī* as well as Islamic sources (the *Qurʾān* and *ḥadīth* tradition) to explain the Four Journeys, although, unlike *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāya*, the journeys are not discussed separately and in an orderly manner. The last station is *ḥaḍrat-i aḥadīyat* (the Presence of Divine Unity) in which other presences, multiplicities (*kathrāt*), and concrete determinations (*taʿayyunāt*) are annihilated. It is the status of sobriety or 'the Absolute Will' (*mashīyyat-i mutlaq*),³⁰ wherein the traveler is able to observe the unity behind the multiplicity of names and attributes. Khomeini identifies the individual—the Prophet—who has completed the last journey when Adam "was between water and clay"³¹ (Khomeini 1388, pp. 12–16).

Khomeini's discussion of the Four Journeys in *Sirr al-Ṣalāt* is a dialogue of the symbolic value and meaning of daily prayer (*ṣalāt*) and its importance in the spiritual mission of the seeker. The mystery of prayer is to reach God and by breaching the veils (*kharq-i ḥijāb*), the traveler becomes annihilated in Him (Khomeini 1390, Introduction, p. 12). In *Sirr al-Ṣalāt*, all journeys are mentioned, albeit briefly and, the author seeks to connect every journey to one of the rituals of the prayers. For example, prostration (*sujūd*) symbolizes total disappearance (*ghayb-i mutlaq*) from the world, while *tashahhud* (lit. to witness or to testify) stands for sobriety (*saḥw*) when the traveler returns to the world after being in the station of *ghayb* (Unseen). At the end of *tashahhud*, the traveler testifies to the *nubuwwa* and *wilāya* of the Prophet and his household and finishes the *ṣalāt*. *Salām* (lit. peace) which is the last step of *ṣalāt* symbolizes unity vs. multiplicity (or the station of totality) and stands for the last journey (*min al-khalq il al-khalq*) (Khomeini 1390, p. 114). The present text is the only writing of Khomeini in which he raises the possibility for every believer finishing the spiritual journeys (Khomeini 1390, pp. 114–115). In other texts, he restricts the Four Journeys to the fourteen illuminated figures. In another text, the aforementioned *Tafsīr-i Sūray-i Ḥamd*, he briefly mentions the Four Journeys without elaborating on them, and maintains that the perfect man, who is 'the Most Beautiful Name' (*asmāʾ ul-ḥusnā*) and 'the Greatest Name' (*ism-i aʿẓam*), is able to reach the last stage or *tawḥīd* which is subsistence (*baqā*) with God (Khomeini 1378b, p. 19).

Adāb al-Ṣalāt is the last text in which Khomeini discusses the doctrine of the Four Journeys. He distinguishes between two groups of seekers, both of whom have carried out the journey to God (*safār-i ila l-llāh*),

although the first group never returns to the world and to people because it dies after finishing the journey. Transmitting the famous *ḥadīth al-qudsī* that “My friends are hidden under my mantle (*qibāb, ḥijāb*), no one knows them except for Me” (Introduction, pp. 3–4), Khomeini argues that the first group will remain hidden under God forever. The second group includes those who return to the world in order to guide people on the righteous path and to restore cities (*takmil-i ʿibād wa taʿmīr-i bilād*) (Khomeini 1378b, pp. 347–348). This phrase has caused commentators, such as Muṣṭafā Muḥaḥiq Dāmād, to interpret it as Khomeini’s intention (as a political ʿarīf) of rising against the status quo to establish an Islamic government (Muḥaḥiq Dāmād n.d., p. 2).³² Khomeini, however, does not elaborate further on this idea to provide his reader with a more accurate understanding of what he means by this phrase. In addition, there is no convincing evidence to prove that Khomeini referred to himself as the *walī* who, after returning to creature from God, wants to guide people on the righteous path.

Likewise, there exists no direct indication of ‘restoring cities’ being stated in any other source. It seems that the lens through which Muḥaḥiq Dāmād and others are reading this phrase, as well as Khomeini’s intention of having political ambitions to stand for government, is an a posteriori one based on subsequent socio-political developments in the Iranian milieu after the Revolution of 1979. Another example is Fakhr al-Dīn Ḥijāzī (d. 1386 *shamsī*/2007), whose flattering statements at the dawn of the Revolution and in Khomeini’s presence, have been renowned for years. He goes far beyond Muḥaḥiq Dāmād’s scholastic reading and asks for a global, just government by Khomeini. Verbalizing what many others had in mind but dared not say, Ḥijāzī calls Khomeini ‘the Suleymān of the time and Dāwūd of the Age’, and asked him to rise up to establish a global kingdom and to administer justice all over the world. Khomeini responded to Ḥijāzī by saying that “I fear that if I believe Mr. Ḥijāzī’s statements about myself, they may result in bringing arrogance and personal decline (*inḥitāt*) to me. I shall take refuge in Almighty God”.³³ Khomeini’s reaction shows that he obviously did not imagine any role and/or responsibility for himself other than rising up against the Shah, of course more as a *faqīh* than as an ʿarīf, and establishing an Islamic government.³⁴

To sum up Khomeini’s theory on the *asfār*, there are two points here: there exists no connection between having a Sufi, or perhaps it is better to say, a spiritual lifestyle on one hand and being an *insān al-kāmil* on the other. The first one does not necessarily result in the second. Khomeini

had followed a spiritual path all his life.³⁵ His interest in *‘irfān* was not limited to reading mystical texts or having a mystical training, but rather to declaring that being an *insān al-kāmil* is not easy to prove. Secondly, Knysh’s analysis that “very probably Khomeini’s four-stage venture is simply a further particularization of Ibn Arabi’s vision of an exemplar human destiny and self-fulfillment” (Knysh 1992, p. 647) does not seem plausible, because Ibn ‘Arabī himself is brief about the Four Journeys and only mentions the first two, and Khomeini’s outlook, compared with his other ideas such as *wilāya*, *nubuwwa*, the perfect man and, most importantly, the doctrine of names and attributes, is short. As for the identity of the individual who completes the journeys, in all his texts examined here, with the exception of *Sirr al-Ṣalāt*, Khomeini leaves no doubt that only the *awliyā* (the Prophet and the *imāms*) have been able to complete this spiritual venture.

5.6 CONCLUSION

There are some lessons from this survey of Khomeini’s mysticism and its roots in the *Akbarīan* tradition. First and foremost, Ibn ‘Arabī and his apparatus had gained a *Shī’a* aura by the time of Khomeini, and the process of adjusting Ibn ‘Arabī’s mysticism to the *Shī’a* creeds, had in fact started with figures such as ‘Abd al-Razzāq Kāshānī, Seyyed Ḥaydar Āmulī, ‘Alā’ al-Dawlah Simnānī, and continued with Shaykh Maḥmūd Shabistārī as well as *Shī’a ‘irfānī* orders. During the Safawid period, as it was observed, the role of Mullā Ṣadrā and his students, particularly Qumshī’ī, in the process of making the *Akbarīan* School *Shī’a*, was undeniable. The *‘irfānī* conceptualization of *wilāya* (and other related concepts), however, remained immutable and unchanged, and it is from this perspective that Knysh evaluates Khomeini’s *‘irfānī* writings as “timeless, in so far as they could have been written three, four, or five centuries ago” (Knysh 1992, p. 649).

With regard to the forms and content, there is no major difference between his writings and the writings of the *ḥakīms* of the Schools of Tehran and Qum, with the only exception of ‘Allāmah Ṭabāṭabā’ī, who, as it was observed in the previous chapter (Sect. 4.7.1, pp. 149–153), switched the center of gravity from *wilāyat al-khāṣṣah* to *wilāyat al-‘āmmah*. Another development, which had started with Ibn ‘Arabī and had been firmly established by the time of Khomeini, was the analogy between the

humane and the Divine, having been crystalized in the theory of the perfect man. The personality of the perfect man is the consummation of the Divine plan, “combining in himself both the traits of God, and the features of the engendered universe, [by which] he rises to such a preeminence that he becomes invested with divine ‘deputyship’ (*nayāba*) and vicegerency” (Knysh 1992, p. 649). As it will be discussed in the next chapter, Divine deputyship, here through the channel of the Hidden *imām*, will play an important role in Khomeini’s juridical theory of *wilāyat al-faqīh*.

Perhaps as important as Ibn ʿArabī’s influence on Khomeini’s mysticism is the reconciliation of the two sources of authority (mysticism and jurisprudence) in his thought and personality, each representing a distinct form of authority, although reinforcing each other in different ways.³⁶ The former emphasizes qualities such as purity of the heart of the leader, piety, and devotion, while the latter is an expression of the qualities of justice, knowledge, and wisdom. How did our scholar reconcile these two, when jurisprudence carried a heavier weight and influence than mysticism? One can look for the answer in Khomeini’s charismatic personality, the socio-political circumstances of Iran in 1960s and 1970s, and developments in *Shīʿa* jurisprudence which had begun in the early nineteenth century. At the same time, mysticism had not undergone significant changes, particularly in terms of the theory of *wilāya*. Before reading Khomeini’s juridical texts and contextualizing them, both intellectually and from a socio-political perspective, one cannot reach a final answer to these questions, and this is what the author will do in the next chapter.

However, before turning our attention to juridical *wilāya* in Khomeini’s writings, it is worth remembering the research questions propounded in the Introduction (B. p. 13). With respect to these questions, in this chapter, the author sought to study how *wilāya* has been conceptualized in Khomeini’s *ʿirfānī* texts and how his inspiration by *Akbarīan* mysticism influenced his outlook. It was questioned whether *wilāya* had undergone any changes during the eighteenth to the twentieth century, and whether its conceptualization in the writing of our scholar—who stands at the end of this timeline—displays any difference from those of his predecessors. His arguments and the method he deploys, as discussed above, look ageless. Pertinent to this is his gloss on a number of original *ʿirfānī* texts that can be ranked as genuine additions to the exiting scholarship on *Akbarīan* mysticism, though at the same time, remain classic and typical.

NOTES

1. Moussavi has discussed *taqlīd*, *ijtihād*, *marjaʿ*, as well as the theory of *wilāyat al-faqīh* in other articles/books as well. See:

A New Interpretation of the Theory of Vilayat-i Faqīh, *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol.28, No.1, January 1992, pp. 101–107.

The Establishment of the Position of Marjaʿiyyat-i Taqlīd in the Twelver-Shiʿi Community, *Iranian Studies*, Vol. XVIII, No. 1, Winter 1985, pp. 35–51.

Religious Authority in Shīʿa Islam: From the Office of Mufti to the Institution of Marjaʿ, 1996 (International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization: Kuala Lumpur).

And two more sources that have discussed the topic in length:

Todd Lawson (ed), *The Attitude of the Ulama towards the Government in Nineteenth-Century Iran*, in *Reason and Inspiration in Islam: Theology, Philosophy and Mysticism in Muslim Thought* (Essays in Honour of Hermann Landolt), 2005 (London and New York: I.B. Tauris Publishers & the Institute of Ismaili Studies), pp. 522–536.

Abbas Amanat's article entitled, From Ijtihād to Wilāyat-i Faqīh: The Evolving of the Shiʿite Legal Authority to Political Power, *Logos*, 2.3, Summer 2003, discusses the subject in detail.

2. Along with Kadivar's classification of the *Shīʿa* political thought which is used here, Ahmad Kazemi Moussavi, in his book entitled *Religious Authority in Shīʿa Islam: From the Office of Mufti to the Institution of Marjaʿ*, has also classified the stages of the development of the *Shīʿa* jurisprudence, but the emphasis is on jurisprudence and not the *Shīʿa* political thought, though the former can include the latter as well. See:

Ahmad Kazemi Moussavi, Op.cit, 1996, Chapter 1, pp. 7–44.

3. There are a number of scholars who regard Narāqī as the forerunner. For example:

Mashaallah Ajudani, *Mashrūṭa-yi Irānī*, 1997 (London: Faṣl-i Kitāb).

Ahmad Kazemi Moussavi, Op.cit, 1996.

Said Amir Arjomand, *III: Shīʿism in History; the Pahlavi Era*, in *Expectation of the Millennium*, Seyyed Hossein Nasr, Hamid Dabashi and Seyyed Vali Reza Nasr (eds), 1989 (New York: State University of New York Press), p. 231.

Hamid Dabashi, Op.cit, 1993, pp. 11–12.

In addition to these scholars, Muhsin Kadivar, in his books, and particularly in *Hukūmat-i Wilāyī* (Divine Government) and *Naẓariyehāy-i Dawlat dar Fiqh-i Shīʿa* (The Theories of the Statecraft in *Shīʿa* Jurisprudence), traces the intellectual genealogy of the theory of *wilāyat al-faqīh* back to the developments of the nineteenth century and indirectly points to Narāqī as a pioneer figure.

4. Shāhābādī was the son of Shaykh Muḥammad Javād Bīdābādī from Bīdābād, Isfahan; though he is famous as Shāhābādī due to his residence in Shāhābād, a city district of Tehran which is now famous as Jumhūrī Eslāmī Avenue.
5. Shāhābādī's political and mystical influences on Khomeini are mentioned in a number of sources. See:

Baquer Moin, *Khomeini: the Life of the Ayatollah*, 1999 (I.B. Tauris Publishers: London & NY), pp. 43–44.

Asghar Seyed-Gohrab, Khomeini the Poet Mystic, *Die Welt des Islams* 51 (2011) 438–458, p. 441.

Alexander Knysh, 'Irfan' Revisited: Khomeini and the Legacy of Islamic Mystical Philosophy, *Middle East Journal*, Vol. 46, No. 4 (Autumn, 1992), p. 633.

Idris Samawi Hamid, Al-Qurʾān wa al-ʿItrah: a Treatise from the Rashahāt al-Bihār of Mīrzā Muḥammad ʿAlī Shāhābādī, *International Journal of Shiʿi Studies* 2(1), 2003, 121–158.
6. Alexander Knysh mentions 'Mīrzā ʿAlī Akbar Ḥakīm' which is obviously not correct (Knysh, Op.cit, 1992, p. 633).
7. Āqā Mīrzā ʿAlī Akbar Mudarris Ḥikamī Yazdī (d. 1344 H /1925) was the master of *ḥikmat* and *ʿirfān* of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. He was the student of Mīrzā Jahāngīr Khān Qashqāʾī and Āqā Muḥammad Riḍā Qumshīʾī, both the renowned *ḥakīms* of the School of Tehran. It seems that Yazdī was one of the key figures who attached Khomeini to the teachings of Mullā Ṣadrā via the mediation of the School of Tehran. According to the brief note of Khomeini in the introduction of Yazdī's book entitled *Rasāʾil al-Ḥikamīya* (the Theosophical Treatises) during the years of studentship in Qum, both he and other young students were very content with the coming of Yazdī to Qum and teaching philosophy and *ʿirfān* there (*ʿulūm-i bāṭinī* in his words), because at the same time Shaykh ʿAbdulkarīm Ḥāʾirī Yazdī taught *uṣūl* and jurisprudence (*ulūm-i ṣāḥirī*) and therefore the students had the opportunity to learn both the *ṣāḥirī* and *bāṭinī* sciences at the same time (Ḥikamī Yazdī 1372 *shamsī*, p. 13). Before the Qum years, when Ḥikamī Yazdī was living in Tehran and taught at *Madrasay-i* Shaykh ʿAbdul Hossein, figures such as Hossein Qumī Ṭabāṭabāʾī and Ḥāj Mīrzā Aḥmad Āshtiyānī attended his circle (Ḥikamī Yazdī, Ibid., p. 17). Yazdī's book is published in Tehran in 1372 *shamsī* by the Ministry of Culture and Islamic Guidance (*Wizārat-i Farhang wa Irshād-i Islāmī*).
8. Mīrzā Javād Āqā Malikī Tabrīzī was born in Tabriz and when he was young moved to Najaf to study in the *ḥawza*. He studied jurisprudence with Ayatollah Ḥāj Āqā Riḍā Hamidānī, *uṣūl* with Mullā Muḥammad Kāzīm Khurāsānī, and *ʿirfān* and ethics with Mullā Hossein qulī Hamidānī. After

returning home from Najaf, he moved from Tabriz to Qum to assist Shaykh Ḥā'irī Yazdī to establish the *hawza* of Qum. He died in 1343 H/1924 and buried in the *Shaykhān* cemetery in Qum. Malikī Tabrizī, 1372, pp. 3–4. His book entitled *Asrār al-Ṣalāt* (the Mysteries of Prayer) was published in Tehran in 1372 by *Payām-i Āzādī* publication.

9. According to Moin, seven years. See: Baqer Moin, Op.cit, 1999, p. 43.
10. In Moin's book, it is *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb* (the Keys of Unseen) which is not plausible. Khomeini read *Miftāḥ al-Ghayb* of Qūnawī and wrote a commentary on it which is known as *Miftāḥ al-Ghayb wa Miṣbāḥ al-Uns* (the Key of Unseen and the Lamp of Fondness). For more elucidation on the particular commentary and his impact on Khomeini, see: Knysh, Op.cit (1992, p. 635).
11. Knysh believes that this work and the commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ al-Hikam* (the Bezels of Wisdom), written by Qayṣarī's teacher, 'Abd al-Razzāq Kāshānī, "are probably the most influential and widely read elucidations of Ibn 'Arabī's masterpiece" which had "a profound and lasting effect on Khomeini's outlook in general and his metaphysical views in particular" (Knysh, Op.cit, 1992, p. 635).
12. In this book, which in fact is an 'irfānī exegesis of the *Qur'ān*, Khawja relates *Qur'ānīc* themes and concepts with one of the spiritual stations in 'irfān. The point is to show that the Path (*ṭarīqa*) and the laws (*sharī'a*) are identical. For more information see:
 Mahdī Mutī' and others, *Jilvīhāy-i Tafṣīr-i 'Irfānī-yi Qur'ān dar Bāb-i Akhlāq-i Manāzil al-Sā'irīn* (the Dimensions of the Mystical Exegesis of the Qur'ān on the Ethics of the Abodes of Travelers), *the Journal of Tafṣīr wa Zabān-i Qur'ān*, No. 1, Fall and Winter 1391, pp. 99–114.
13. Shāhābādī started his education with his father Shaykh Muḥammad Javād Bīdābādī, himself a student of Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥassan Najafī (d. 1228 H/1813) known as Sāhib al-Jawāhir and Shaykh Murtaḍā Anṣārī (d. 1281 H/1864). In 1320 Hegira, Shāhābādī moved to Najaf and stayed there for seven years, where he studied with Ākhund Mullā Muḥammad Kāẓim Khurāsānī (d. 1329 H/1911), Shaykh Faṭḥullāh Sharī'at (known as *Shaykh ul-Sharī'a*), and Ayatollah Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥassan Khalīlī. After the death of Khurāsānī, Shāhābādī moved to Samarra and attended the classes of Mīrzā Muḥammad Taqī Shīrāzī (d. 1338 H/1919) who granted Shāhābādī the *ijāza* of teaching and issuing *fatwā*. Along with Shīrāzī, nine more *mujtabiids* issued Shāhābādī the *ijāza*, including the above-mentioned *Shaykh ul-Sharī'a*, Seyyed Ismā'īl Ṣadr, and Mīrzā Khalīl Tehrānī (Shāhābādī 1386, pp. 31–33). Before turning his attention to Shāhābādī, Khomeini had another teacher in 'irfān and *ḥikma*, and unlike Knysh's opinion, he learned *Asfār al-Arba'i* with Seyyed Abu al-Ḥassan Rafī'ī Qazvīnī (d. 1354 *shamsī*/1976) in Qum, himself a student of 'Abdulkarīm Ḥā'irī Yazdī. See:

http://fa.wikishia.net/view/%D8%B3%DB%8C%D8%AF_%D8%A7%D8%A8%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%B3%D9%86_%D8%B1%D9%81%DB%8C%D8%B9%DB%8C_%D9%82%D8%B2%D9%88%DB%8C%D9%86%DB%8C, last accessed 2/17/17.

14. Murtidā Muṭaharī in his *ʿUlūm-i Islāmī* (Islamic Sciences, two volumes) has elaborated on the theoretical mysticism and practical mysticism—*ʿirfān-i naẓarī wa ʿamalī*, respectively. In volume two of the present book, Muṭaharī explains that the practical mysticism refers to spiritual conduct (*sulūk*), and the way masters initiate young novice in order to help him to access the station of unity with God. So, *ʿirfān-i ʿamalī* talks about a process which ends in self-annihilation or subsistence—*baqā*—with God. On the other hand, *ʿirfān-i naẓarī* is about the explanation or interpretation of existence (*wujūd/hastī*) and elaborates on the elements of the existence such as God, the cosmos and Man. See:

Murtidā Muṭaharī, *ʿUlūm-i Islāmī* (Islamic Knowledge, vol. 2 (*Kalām, ʿIrḥān, Hikmat-i ʿAmalī*), 6th edition, 1368 (Tehran: Šadrā Publication), pp. 81–96.

15. Ḥāʾirī himself was the student of Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥassan Šīrāzī (known as *Mīrzāy-i Šīrāzī* and *Mīrzāy-i Mujaḍḍid*, d. 1194 H/1814) and other principal teachers, such as Mīrzā Ibrāhīm Maḥallātī, Shaykh Faḍlullāh Nūrī, Mīrzā Muḥammad Taqī Šīrāzī, and Seyyed Muḥammad Fišārakī Iṣfahānī, all of them Mīrzā Ḥassan Šīrāzī's associates (Algar 2002, p. 3). On the death of his mentor, Ḥāʾirī left Samarra for Najaf to study under the celebrated Ākhund Khurāsānī. After returning to Iran, he resided in Arak for some eight years (Algar 2002, p. 4) and then moved to Qum to establish the *ḥawza* of that city (Algar 2002, p. 6). Algar believes that it was the “matchless” efforts of Ḥāʾirī which turned Qum to an elevated city as a “position of centrality in the religious life of Persia, almost if not fully competitive with the shrine cities of Iraq” (Algar 2002, p. 6). There is also another account for Ḥāʾirī's studies and administration. See:

Muḥsin al-Amīn, *Aʿyān al-Shīʿa* (the *Shīʿa* Figures), VIII, 1403 H/1983 (Beirut: Dār ul-Taʿāruf lil Maṭbūʿāt), p. 42.

16. A young student of *ḥawza* has three levels to go through to become a *mujtahid* or a *faqīh*. These are as follows:

Muqaddamāt (introductory level), *saṭḥ* (intermediate level), and *khāriḡ* (advanced level). It would normally take seven years to complete *muqaddamāt*, which consists of the following books: *Jāmiʿul Muqaddamāt* (the Comprehensive of Introductions, fourteen small volumes in Persian and Arabic) that includes Arabic grammar, syntax, logic, method of reading, and exercises, which are taught in conjugation. The objective of the course is to teach introductory Arabic syntax to the students and to prepare them for learning the subsequent courses. Along with that, students

study *Suyūṭī*, which is mostly on syntax. *Hāshīyah* (Gloss) is on basic logic and the new book used in the field is *al-Mantiq* (The Logic). There is also *Muṭawwal* (Detailed, or a summary of it) which teaches rhetoric and speech. The new books used for the course are *Balāghat* (Eloquence) and *Jawāhir ul-Balāgha* (the Jewelry of Balāgha). After *Muqaddamāt*, students are promoted to *sath* and are taught theology and jurisprudence. It takes eight years to finish this level. Sources include texts such as *Maʿālim ul-Uṣūl* (Guides of Principles), *Qawānīn* (Laws) by Mīrzā-i Qumī on theology, *Lūmʿah* (Spangle) by *Shahīd Thānī*, *al-Makāsib* (Transactions) by Shaykh Murtidā Anṣārī, *Rasāʾil* (Treatises), *Kifāyat ul-Uṣūl* (Adequacy of Principles) by Mullā Muḥammad Kāẓim Khurāsānī, *Manẓūma* and *Ishārat* (Indications) both on philosophy and mysticism, *Bidāyat ul-Hikma* (Beginning of Wisdom) and *Nihāyat ul-Hikma* (Extremity of Wisdom) on philosophy, *Aṣfār* (Four Journeys) of Mullā Ṣadrā, *Sharḥ-i Tajrīd* (Commentary on *Tajrīd*), *Maqāmāt-i Ḥāʾirī* (Stations of Ḥāʾirī), and *Maqāmāt-i Hamidānī* (Stations of Hamidānī) on Arabic literature. After mastering these two levels, students start *khārij* with the objective of becoming *marjaʿi taqlīd*. In the advanced level, other courses are also taught including: *Rijāl*, *Dirāya*, history of Islam, ethics, interpretations, and astronomy.

<http://www.islam-laws.com/howzasystem.htm>, last accessed 2/17/17.

For a socio-anthropological study of the *ḥawza* of Qum in pre-Revolutionary Iran, see: Michael M. J. Fischer, *Iran: From Religious Dispute to Revolution*, 2nd edition, 1980 (Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press), pp. 31–42 & 77–86. And for the levels of studying and curriculum of the *ḥawza* of Najaf in the early twentieth century, see:

Chibli Mallat, *the Renewal of Islamic Law; Muhammad Baqer Sadr, Najaf and the Shiʿi International*, 1993 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 39–50.

17. Born in Samarra, studied in Kashan and Najaf, he moved to Qum in 1341 H/1922, and when he was studying with Ḥāʾirī, founded an independent *ḥawza* for himself. Along with Khomeini, his other students were Ayatollah Marʿashī Najafī and Ayatollah Dāmād. He finally re-settled in Kashan and was buried there.

<http://www.tebyan.net/newindex.aspx?pid=37928>, last accessed 2/17/17.

18. Moin brings in Adīb Khurāsānī which is not plausible. It is Ayatollah Āqā Mīrzā Muḥammad ʿAlī Adīb Tehrānī, who was born in Tehran and studied under Shaykh ʿAbdulhusseyn Rashtī. Both in Arak and Qum, Adīb Tehrānī attended the classes of Ḥāʾirī and after leaving Qum and settling in Tehran, taught *uṣūl* and jurisprudence there. He was famous in literature.

- <http://www.hawzah.net/fa/Book/View/45232/17329/8-%D8%A2%DB%8C%D8%AA-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%84%D9%87-%D8%A2%D9%82%D8%A7-%D9%85%DB%8C%D8%B1%D8%B2%D8%A7-%D9%85%D8%AD%D9%85%D8%AF%D8%B9%D9%84%DB%8C-%D8%A7%D8%AF%DB%8C%D8%A8-%D8%AA%D9%87%D8%B1%D8%A7%D9%86%DB%8C>, last accessed 2/17/17.
19. Born in Khwansar, he moved to Najaf to continue his studies with Ākhund Khurāsānī and Seyyed Muḥammad Kāzīm Ṭabāṭabāʾī Yazdī (1248–1337 H). After their deaths, he started learning *uṣūl* with Ayatollah Muḥammad Hossein Nāʾīnī (1276 H/1861–1355 H/1936). He had the *ijāza* of *fatwā* and transmission of *ḥadīth* from Ayatollah Zīyā ʿArāqī. After returning to Iran, he resided in Qum and started teaching and training students in the *ḥawza*. When Ḥāʾirī died, along with Ayatollahs Ḥujjat and Ṣadr, he played an important role under their tripartite leadership to protect the *ḥawza* from governmental threat.
<http://www.hawzah.net/fa/Mostabser/View/3200>, last accessed 2/17/17.
 20. I had access to the book through this website:
http://honarvarnet.blogspot.com/2010/07/1_22.html, last accessed 2/17/17.
 21. See also Baqer Moin, *Khomeini, Ruhollah al-Musavi*, in the *Oxford Encyclopedia of the Islamic World*. Oxford Islamic Studies Online, <http://www.oxfordislamicstudies.com/article/opr/t236/e0457>, last accessed 2/17/17.
 22. The lengthy list of his *ʿirfānī* books is available in: [http://www.noorlib.ir/View/fa/CreatorList?SearchText=%D8%AE%D9%85%DB%8C%D9%86%DB%8C%D8%8C%20%D8%B1%D9%88%D8%AD%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%84%D9%87%20\(%20%D8%B1%D9%87%D8%A8%D8%B1%20%D8%A7%D9%86%D9%82%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%A8%20%D9%88%20%D8%A8%D9%86%DB%8C%D8%A7%D9%86%20%DA%AF%D8%B0%D8%A7%D8%B1%20%D8%AC%D9%85%D9%87%D9%88%D8%B1%DB%8C%20%D8%A7%D8%B3%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%85%DB%8C%20%D8%A7%DB%8C%D8%B1%D8%A7%D9%86\)&SearchKind=Creator](http://www.noorlib.ir/View/fa/CreatorList?SearchText=%D8%AE%D9%85%DB%8C%D9%86%DB%8C%D8%8C%20%D8%B1%D9%88%D8%AD%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%84%D9%87%20(%20%D8%B1%D9%87%D8%A8%D8%B1%20%D8%A7%D9%86%D9%82%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%A8%20%D9%88%20%D8%A8%D9%86%DB%8C%D8%A7%D9%86%20%DA%AF%D8%B0%D8%A7%D8%B1%20%D8%AC%D9%85%D9%87%D9%88%D8%B1%DB%8C%20%D8%A7%D8%B3%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%85%DB%8C%20%D8%A7%DB%8C%D8%B1%D8%A7%D9%86)&SearchKind=Creator), last accessed 2/17/17.
 23. http://en.imam-khomeini.ir/en/n3120/Biography/Immigration_to_Qom, last accessed 2/17/17.
 24. Vanessa Martin has discussed the subject in detail. See:
 Vanessa Martin, *Creating an Islamic State: Khomeini and the Making of a New Iran*, 2007 (New York: I. B. Tauris), pp. 34–45.
 25. The actual *ḥadīth* reference is: “I was a hidden treasure, I loved to be known, therefore I created people in order to be known”. The *ḥadīth* is not transmitted by any *Shīʿa ḥadīth* compilation, and in Muḥammad Bāqir

Majlisī's *Bihār al-Anwār* (the Oceans of Lights) is mentioned as *khavar-i wāḥid* (a *ḥadīth* which is transmitted only by one transmitter and it lacks a chain of transmitters), indicating its unreliability; though it is a famous *ḥadīth* in Sufi literature and has always been used by Sufis. See:

<http://www.islamquest.net/fa/archive/question/fa8094>, last accessed 2/20/17.

26. For an adequate explanation of the perfect man in Khomeini's writings and its nexus to imamate, see: Furūgh al-Sādāt Raḥīm Pūr (ed), *Imamate wa Insān-i Kāmil az Dīdgāh-i Imām Khomeini* (Imamate and the perfect man in Imām Khomeini's Thought), 3rd edition, 1387 (Tehran: Mu'asasay-i Tanzīm wa Nashr-i Āthār-i Imām).
27. For the *ḥadīth* and its *Shī'a* background, see: http://fa.wikishia.net/view/%D8%AD%D8%AF%DB%8C%D8%AB_%D9%84%D9%88%D9%84%D8%A7%DA%A9, last accessed 2/20/17.
28. Knysh maintains that Khomeini has hardly had sympathy with 'Muslim speculative theologians', as he mostly took sides with Sufis and sages (Knysh, Op.cit, 1992, p. 641).
29. His closeness to, and inspiration by, Qumshī'ī is already mentioned.
30. The Absolute Will is also called 'the Holy Emanation' (*ḥayd al-muqaddas*), 'the All-encompassing Mercy' (*rahmat-i wāsi'a*), 'the Greatest Name' (*ism-i a'zam*), and 'the Absolute Muḥammedan wilāya' or '*maqām-i 'alawī*' or '*quṭbīyat*' (Khomeini 1388, p. 16).
31. Referring to the famous *ḥadīth* that 'I was prophet when Adam was between water and clay'. Khomeini transmits the *ḥadīth* from *Asrār ul-Sharī'a wa Atwār ul-Tarīqa wa Anwār ul-Ḥaqīqa* (the Secrets of Sharī'a, the Alterations of the Path and the Lights of the Reality), pp. 46 & 92 in Khomeini 1388, p. 16.
32. I am grateful to the author Muṣṭafā Muḥaqqiq Dāmād who supplied me with a copy of his unpublished article years ago when I was still in Tehran. The article entitled wilāyat-i Insān-i Kāmil az Didgāh-i Imām Khomeini (the Guardianship of the Perfect Man in Imām Khomeini's Thought) and a copy of it entitled '*Irfān wa Shahrīyārī* (Mysticism and Kingdom) are published in *Dīn, Falsafa, Qānūn* (Religion, Philosophy, Laws), Muṣṭafā Muḥaqqiq Dāmād, 1378 (Tehran: Sukhan publication), pp. 125–141.
33. Fakhr al-Dīn Ḥijāzī's statements and Khomeini's reaction are to be found in this one-minute YouTube clip at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=66DRInZGH7I>, last accessed 5/10/17.
34. Ridgeon in his article *Hidden Khomeini* points to his email correspondences with Hamid Algar, in which the latter supports the same perspective: "the assertion that Imam Khomeini believed that he had completed the four journeys and therefore, attained the status of insan-i kamil is, I think, unwarranted". See:

Lloyd Ridgeon, *Hidden Khomeini: Mysticism and Poetry*, in *A Critical Introduction to Khomeini*, Arshin Adib-Moghaddam, (ed), 2014 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), p. 217.

35. Ridgeon has expanded on this in *Hidden Khomeini*, Ibid., 2014, p. 215.
36. Ridgeon calls it “the juxtaposition of Khomeini as a faqih ... with that of the mystic who is able to commune with the divine ...” (Ridgeon 2014, p. 213), while Martin calls the former (mysticism), “a subtle unseen authority” which acts behind the visible, “manifest one” (Martin 2007, pp. 202–203).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ENGLISH BOOKS

- Algar, Hamid, *Hairi Abd-al-Karim Yazdi*, Encyclopædia Iranica, December 2002.
- Gleave, Robert, (ed), *Religion and Society in Qajar Iran*, 2005 (London and New York: Routledge Curzon).
- Kazemi Moussavi, Ahmad, The Institutionalization of Marjaʿ-i Taqlid in the Nineteenth Century Shiite Community, *the Muslim World*, Vol. LXXXIII, No. 3-4 July-October 1994, pp. 279–299.
- Kazemi Moussavi, Ahmad, *Religious Authority in Shiite Islam: From the Office of Mufti to the Institution of Marja*, 1996 (International Institute of Islamic Thought and Civilization: Kuala Lumpur).
- Knysh, Alexander, ‘Irfan’ Revisited: Khomeini and the Legacy of Islamic Mystical Philosophy, *The Middle East Journal*, Vol. 46, No. 4 (Autumn, 1992), pp. 631–653.
- Martin, Vanessa, *Creating an Islamic State, Khomeini and the Making of a New Iran*, 2007 (London & New York: I. B. Tauris).
- Moin, Baqer, *Khomeini: Life of the Ayatollah*, 1999 (I.B. Tauris Publishers, London & New York).
- Ridgeon, Lloyd, *Hidden Khomeini: Mysticism and Poetry*, in *A Critical Introduction to Khomeini*, Arshin Adib-Moghaddam, (ed), 2014 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 213–232.
- Rizvi, Sajjad, *Molla Sadra Shirazi*, in online Encyclopedia Iranica <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/molla-sadra-sirazi>.

PERSIAN BOOKS

- Ḥāʾirī Yazdī, Mahdī, *Khāṭirāt* (Memoirs), Habib Lajevardi (ed), 1381 (Tehran: Kitāb-i Nādir).
- Ḥikāmī Yazdī, Mīrzā ʿAlī Akbar Mudarris, *Rasāʾil-i Ḥikāmīyah* (Philosophical Treatises) 1372 (Tehran: Wizārat-i Farhang wa Irshād-i Islāmī).

- Ḥassan Zādiḥ Karīm Ābād, *Dāwūd, Asfār-i Arbaʿi dar ʿIrfān-i Islāmī* (the Four Journeys in the Islamic Mysticism), *Ḥikmat-i ʿIrfānī*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Winter 1390 *shamsī*, pp. 9–40.
- Kadivar, Muhsin, *Hukūmat-i Wilāyī* (Divine Government), 3rd edition, 1378a (Tehran: Ney Publication).
- Kadivar, Muhsin, *Naẓariyāhāy-i Dawlat dar Fiqh-i Shīʿa* (Theories of State in the Shīʿa Jurisprudence), 3rd edition, 1378b (Tehran: Ney Publication).
- Khomeini, Rūḥullāh, *Ādāb a-Ṣalāt* (the Rituals of Prayer), 1378a (Tehran: Muʿasasay-i Tanẓīm wa Nashr-i Āthār-i Imām).
- Khomeini, Rūḥullāh, *Sirr al-Ṣalāt* or *Mīrāj al-Ārifīn wa Ṣalāt al-Sālikīn* (the Mystery of Prayer), 14th edition, 1390 (Tehran: Muʿasasay-i Tanẓīm wa Nashr-i Āthār-i Imām).
- Khomeini, Rūḥullāh, *Sharḥ-i Duʿāy-i Saḥar* (the Commentary on the Dawn Prayer), 2nd edition, 1388 (Tehran: Muʿasasay-i Tanẓīm wa Nashr-i Āthār-i Imām).
- Khomeini, Rūḥullāh, *Tafsīr-i Sūray-i Ḥamd* (the Commentary on the Sūrat al-Ḥamd), 1378b (Tehran: Muʿasasay-i Tanẓīm wa Nashr-i Āthār-i Imām).
- Khomeini, Rūḥullāh, *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāya ila-l-Khilāfa wa-l-Wilāya* (the Lamp of Guidance toward Vicegerency and Guardianship), translated into Persian by Aḥmad Fahrī Zanjānī, 1360 *shamsī* (Tehran: Payām Āzādī).
- Khomeini, Rūḥullāh, *the Mystery of Prayer; the Ascension of the Wayfarers and the Prayer of the Gnostics*, translated into English by Seyyed Amjad H. Shah Naqvi, 2015 (London: Brill).
- Muḥaqiq Dāmād, Muṣṭafā, *ʿIrfān wa Shahrīyārī* (Mysticism and Kingdom), in *Dīn, Falsafa, Qānūn* (Religion, Philosophy, Laws), 1378 (Tehran: Sukhan publication), pp. 125–141.
- Muḥaqiq Dāmād, Muṣṭafā, *Wilāyat-i Insān-i Kāmil az Didgāh-i Imām Khomeini* (the Guardianship of the Perfect Man in Imām Khomeini’s Thought), Unpublished article.

ARABIC BOOKS

- Shāhābādī, Muḥammad ʿAlī, *Rashahāt al-Biḥār* (Trickles from Oceans), Zāhid Weyṣī (ed), 1386 (Tehran: Pazhūhishgāh-i Farhang wa Andīshayī Islāmī).

Leila Chamankhah

The Conceptualization of Guardianship in Iranian Intellectual History (1800–1989)

Reading Ibn ‘Arabī’s Theory of *Wilāya*
in the *Shī‘a* World

palgrave
macmillan

Leila Chamankhah
University of Dayton
Dayton, OH, USA

Palgrave Series in Islamic Theology, Law, and History

ISBN 978-3-030-22691-6

ISBN 978-3-030-22692-3 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-22692-3>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland