

15

SUFI ORDERS IN THE MEDIEVAL PERIOD

Lloyd Ridgeon

Introduction

Subsequent to the ascetics and pietists of the seventh and eighth centuries, the early Sufis of the ninth and tenth centuries and also among the great Sufi masters of the twelfth century, scholars have observed a major development in the tradition during the thirteenth century. Alexander Knysh argues that the period witnessed the emergence of the Sufi “Order” (*ṭarīqa*) as a social institution, within which there were five common components.¹ First was a spiritual genealogy (*silsilah*) that connected individual Sufis to the Prophet to demonstrate the *ṭarīqa*’s authenticity. Second, certain rules and conditions were to be met concerning admission to the *ṭarīqa*, such as the oath of allegiance to the Shaykh (otherwise known as the *pīr* or *murshid*). Third, there were instructions in the literature about specific litanies, or invocations to God (s. *dhikr* / pl. *adhkār*). Fourth, the *ṭarīqa* included directions about *khalwat* (seclusion), another major ritual of the Sufis which typically involved periods spent in isolation for prayer, recital of litanies and concentration and focus upon the divine. Lastly, communal living within the Sufi convent, or *khānaqāh* involved the observance of rules and regulations, which were specific to each *ṭarīqa*. Knysh’s analysis correlates well with hagiographies that were written in the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries, as they display the same concerns, in addition to portraying the virtues and powers of the saint.² The emergence of the *ṭarīqa* assumes significance because it assisted the establishment of Sufism as a “mass institutionalised religion”³ which had implications in the ways that both figures of authority and the general masses conceived of power-relations, be they religious, political, social or economic. The lack of centralised authority in many regions of the Islamic world in the wake of the demise of the Abbasid Caliphate in 1258 left a vacuum in which the Sufis were able to contribute significantly for several centuries. Green has argued that the Orders “developed into mechanisms of tradition capable of reproducing the standardized and proprietary method of a given Sufi across time and distance.”⁴ This does not mean that a singular form of a *ṭarīqa* emerged triumphant; indeed, even after the fall of the Caliphate, Sufism is best represented as a hydra, possessing a core of similar doctrines, values and practices, but each head manifested specific geographical variegation, as the subsequent chapters in this section so graphically illustrate.

Despite the general scholarly consensus about the emergence of the *ṭarīqa* at this historical juncture there remain large gaps in the academic understanding of this period of Sufi history. For example, Carl Ernst and Bruce Lawrence have observed, “Despite the abundance of texts about Sufi orders, their place in the emergence of Islamic civilization remains unclear.”⁵ It is this question that the present chapter addresses. The absence of a simple, coherent and believable answer to this question is indicative of the complexity of the problem. This chapter proposes that the development and emergence of the Sufi *ṭarīqa* by the end of the thirteenth century is best explained with reference to several factors; there was not just a single, simplistic cause.

Before investigating the topic at hand it is worthwhile making an observation about the terminology that is frequently used. Scholars in the West have employed the term “Order” to refer to a Sufi *ṭarīqa* (pl. *ṭurūq*). The word “Order” demonstrated to the early generations of such scholars the “underlying affinity [of these Sufi associations] with the monastic orders of Christian Europe.”⁶ However, there are differences between the Sufi *ṭurūq* and the monastic orders, and since space does not allow a full deliberation on the subject, just one example will suffice. This concerns the difference in the relative lack of a hierarchical authority in the Sufi case, which contributed to decentralisation among the various Sufi communities compared with overarching power structure of the Vatican in the Christian West. It is sufficient for readers to be aware that there are dangers in employing Christian influenced terminology, and therefore, in this chapter the Arabic *ṭarīqa* / *ṭurūq* is used as much as possible.

This demarcation of the thirteenth century as the point when that the Sufi *ṭurūq* emerged as identifiable structures was preceded by the attempts by Sufis themselves to delineate various streams of Sufi thought and practice. Early examples of Sufis creating taxonomies of different groups in order to distinguish between correct and incorrect forms of Sufism may be discovered in the works of Sufis, including Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj (d. 988) and Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 1111). Their groupings focussed on Sufis that were deemed reprehensible.⁷ However, their efforts were not based on Sufis who were representative of and operated within social organisations. Likewise, “invented” taxonomies are visible in the work of Hujwīrī, writing in the eleventh century, who described twelve groups in his *Kashf al-Mahjūb*.⁸ It has been argued that his taxonomy of Sufi groups also represents an attempt to make sense of the different streams of Sufi ontological and epistemological thought, rather than the descriptions of actual institutionalised Sufi associations.⁹ Hujwīrī’s time, the eleventh century, is too early for a date for the emergence of the *ṭurūq*. A more probable starting point of departure for the emergence of the *ṭurūq* is the twelfth century (at the earliest) and a gradual development through the thirteenth and into the fourteenth centuries in the Islamic heartlands and North Africa, Central Asia and the Indian sub-continent. This chapter serves as an introduction to the *ṭurūq* (several of which are studied in the chapters subsequent to this) that came to prominence in the Islamic world during the medieval period (that is from about the thirteenth century until the appearance of the Gunpowder Empires, the Safavids (1501–1722), the Ottomans (1453–1922) and the Moghuls (1526–1857), by the early sixteenth century).

The beginnings of a theory: Trimingham’s organisation and discipline

A seminal work on the Sufi *ṭurūq* remains J. Spencer Trimingham’s *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, first published in 1971.¹⁰ This work has been criticised on a number of counts. For example, Simon Digby pointed to Trimingham’s failure to detail the “historical factors responsible for the great diffusion of Ṣūfī organisations through the Islamic world in the twelfth century

A.D.”¹¹ Nevertheless, the work remains one of the most influential texts for scholars working on the Sufi tradition, and indeed Trimingham did point to three major historical changes to early Sufism that resulted in the institutionalisation of the tradition. The first was the use of increasingly large convents, or *khānaqāhs* (and also smaller complexes). The second was the development of the teacher–pupil relationship within the *khānaqāh*, which was transformed into a director–disciple one, and this reflected a change from adherence based on piety to one based on initiation.¹² The third reason was the addition to the *khānaqāh* complex of “an honoured tomb,” which focussed the Sufi lineage through a chain of masters with a particular form of rituals back to Muḥammad.

Trimingham directed his readers to the contexts and reasons that explain for these three changes (despite Digby’s criticisms). He referred to the use of convents among other Islamic schools (such as the Karrāmiyya),¹³ which spread rapidly across Khurāsān and as far as Jerusalem. The success of such bases, and also of the *madrassa* system of schooling for Islamic studies, provided models that the Sufis were to copy in order to gain more adherents and popularity. Similarly, Trimingham also noted the growth and influence of the *futuwwa* guilds that offered Sufism a model of institutionalisation by which it could moderate its following. The model of *futuwwa* included a spiritual lineage, oaths of obedience to the head of the organisation, specific garments and communal rituals within an established meeting place.¹⁴ Interestingly, the parallels between the institution of *futuwwa* and Sufism were drawn by contemporaneous Sufi masters themselves.¹⁵ And lastly, Trimingham noted the decline of Shī‘ī Islam as a political (and religious) force in the region (and the associated practice of giving an oath of loyalty, or *ba‘ya*), and this vacuum may have been filled by Sufi sentiments, in which obedience and loyalty were significant elements of the path. While Trimingham’s interests and contribution to Sufi studies should be noted (indeed, in the following I build on several of his observations), the nature of his project did not permit him to pay sufficient attention to the political, economic and religious backgrounds that underlay the changes and manifestations of the *ṭurūq*.

Matrices of power, piety, patronage and populism

In his *Muslim Communities of Grace* Jamil Abun-Nasr argues that insufficient attention has been paid to the decline of centralised political authority, in the form of the caliphate, to explain for the emergence of the *ṭurūq*. He claims that the eponymous Sufi leaders acted as spiritual guides of their local communities, which was at times outside of caliphal control, and even in defiance of it. These Sufi leaders were able to enjoy such independence because their followers regarded Sufi authority as a “credible alternative” to caliphal power.¹⁶ Abun-Nasr’s theory is not completely innovative, as for long scholars have observed how the Seljuq rulers (from the twelfth century onwards) provided patronage to the Sufis.¹⁷ Sufi hagiographies of the medieval period contain anecdotes that suggest the ultimate authority belonged to the Sufis and not to the caliph, or local military commanders. The anonymous hagiography of Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī (d. 1238) illustrates the point very well. In one episode of this work Kirmānī was offered the territory and “throne” of a commander by the name of Gökböri who ruled Erbil.¹⁸ And in another episode he was able to assemble 200 dervishes who besieged a castle which was being held by a rebel, and they successfully returned it into the hands of the local emir. However, Abun-Nasr’s theory is not completely water-tight, as demonstrated in the case of Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umār Suhrawardī (d. 1234). Suhrawardī was the spiritual guide of the caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (d. 1225), and he had been the recipient of the sumptuous al-Marzūbaniyya *khānaqāh* in Baghdad. However, the caliph dismissed

Suhrawardī from his post, possibly because the Sufi enjoyed the prestige of his position a little too much, revelling in the gifts and presents he had received following one of the “diplomatic-spiritual” missions.¹⁹

Patronage was clearly a significant factor in the emergence of Sufism, and power and political considerations were entwined with the development of Sufism even before the Seljuqs appeared as rulers in the region. To comprehend this point it is necessary to appreciate that after the controversial death of Ḥallāj in 922 CE, the Sufi tradition became somewhat cautious in expressing the “secrets” of the human-divine relationship, which Ḥallāj had supposedly revealed in his famous words “I am the Truth,” suggestive of unity between man and God. Subsequent to Ḥallāj, Sufism became “sober,” cautious and pious, typified in the writings of Sulamī (d. 1021),²⁰ Qushayrī (d. 1072),²¹ Hujwīrī (d. 1077)²² and Ghazālī (d. 1111). However, in their attempts to nurture and expand their support base, the Seljuq local commanders and princes courted the Sufi masters, believing that they held considerable sway over local populations. To this end, the Seljuqs bestowed their patronage upon Sufis and granted them *khānaqāhs* and other financial benefits. Consequently, the Sufis had the space and perhaps the growing confidence to express themselves, both in literature and in ritual activity, with more freedom than the eleventh- and twelfth-century Sufis. It is certainly true that some *khānaqāhs* were huge complexes and lavishly furnished, like “decorated palaces,” to use the description of Ibn Jawzī,²³ while the Sa’īd al-Su’adā *khānaqāh* in Cairo could accommodate up to 300 dervishes.²⁴ In effect, power became decentralised under the Seljuqs and adjacent areas, and the Sufi shaykh assumed increasing influence within society. Indeed, the hagiographical literature portrays Sufi shaykhs adjudicating over spiritual matters as well as the personal and seemingly mundane affairs of their followers. The collection of letters that are attributed to Rūmī (d. 1273), published under the title *Maktūbāt*, shows that he asked high-ranking individuals for favours in securing employment, finance and protection for his friends and associates.²⁵ Clearly, Sufi spirituality cast a very wide net.

And as the patronage increased, so did the claims of the Sufis and belief in their charismatic powers. By the thirteenth century, and due to the Mongol invasions of Central Asia and Iranian heartlands, Anatolia became a safe location with Sufis looking for protection and patronage from Seljuq rulers. This only served to increase the sheer diversity of the tradition, which will be discussed in due course. Caution needs to be exercised with the discussion about patronage, however, as some Sufi communities and distinguished individuals shunned connections with political power and financial resources. A good example of such Sufis is Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā (1238–1325), a representative of what became known as the Chishtiyya order in India.

Trimingham’s attempts in the early 1970s to address the question as to why the Sufi *ṭurūq* emerged when they did are an advance on previous efforts, such as the remarks made by A.J. Arberry in 1950 that the rise of the *ṭurūq* reflected the decay of Muslim society and culture and the victory of the “credulous masses.”²⁶ His choice of the term “credulous masses” is at best unfortunate. Certainly, a more appropriate understanding was expressed by the historian Marshall Hodgson who, as mentioned in the introduction, called Sufism of the medieval period “a mass institutionalised religion.”²⁷ That the masses, credulous or not, were interested in Sufism there can be little doubt. This would explain why Sufi texts in the twelfth century, typified by Abū’l-Najīb Suhrawardī’s *Ādāb al-murīdīn*,²⁸ give a list of dispensations from “normative” Sufi behaviour for novices. There were clearly individuals who wished to benefit from some kind of association with the Sufis and their master, and

their activities in the *khānaqāh*. It may have been “credulous” spiritual benefit, and it may also have been something rather more mundane such as the enjoyment of participating in communal rituals, including listening to poetry or music for “spiritual” purposes, or the possibility of the Sufi guide acting as an intercessor for material benefit. For some, it may even have provided a personal and alternative form of piety to the “scholasticism of orthodox theologians,”²⁹ although it should be remembered that some Sufis themselves endorsed the positions adopted by theologians and clerics. Certainly, the hagiographies of the period are replete with anecdotes in which respected and highly educated members of society engage in the companionship of a leading Sufi. If hagiographies are not to be trusted, the travelogues provide sufficient examples of the eminent engaging with Sufis for devotional practices. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, the famous Moroccan traveller (d. 1368), left an account of his voyages in which there are copious references to his encounters with Sufis, staying at Sufi lodges and even initiation at the hands of a Sufi shaykh.³⁰ Although he was not initiated as a “full-time” Sufi, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa received the *baraka* and perhaps even the material benefits that he was looking for by connecting with a Sufi *ṭarīqa*, and the *ṭarīqa* benefitted by expanding, propagating its message and possibly enhancing its prestige and possibility of winning patronage.

Sufi shaykhs

The patronage mentioned in the previous section was only possible through the existence of Sufi guides and teachers, who in fact, enjoyed a position of veneration far in excess of dry and academic respect. The importance of the Sufi guide was not a new phenomenon in the twelfth and thirteen centuries, as they had commanded authority for several centuries prior to this era. The case of Ḥallāj demonstrates the exception to the rule, and the reaction to his behaviour is telling. Apparently, he skipped from one celebrated Sufi master to another in his search of spiritual perfection,³¹ revealing a kind of “impulsiveness and sense of personal calling and need for disengagement from control by the older shaykhs, which led him to ‘leave without asking permission’”³² Although this early example suggests the importance of the shaykh’s control in the development of the novices, it is in a later period that the significance becomes increasingly obvious. Some have noted the emphasis given to Sufi shaykhs in the twelfth century, for example, Fritz Meier remarked that the well-known image of the shaykh as a corpse washer appears in this period.³³ Perhaps the best illustration of the importance of the Shaykh was revealed by ‘Ayn al-Qudāt (d. 1132) who observed that the control and influence that the shaykh or *pīr* enjoys is such that he “witnesses himself in the mirror of the soul of the aspirant (*murid*) ...” [and] “the aspirant witnesses God in the soul of the *pīr*.”³⁴

By the thirteenth century the authority of the Sufi shaykh was discussed by the aforementioned ‘Umar Suhrawardī, who pointed to the possibility of an aspirant having more than one shaykh. And he mentions the robe of blessing (a gown given by a Sufi master to convey spiritual blessing (*khirqā-yi tabarruk*)), which is contrasted with the robe of full-right (*khirqā bi-ḥaqq*) that indicated the special relationship between the Sufi guide and his “real” master.³⁵ In other words, the aspirant could only have one master, unlike the example set by al-Ḥallāj. Gowns of initiation, or Sufi robes, are another indication of the tendency for specific lines of lineage to emanate from a single master, strengthening the argument for the creation of particular Orders at this time. As such, it was an indication of the authority of the Shaykh and the specificity of his community of Sufis. The case of the Kubrawī Order from Central Asia and Khurāsān is indicative of this. As a result of the Kubrawī practice of reciting *dhikr* and concomitant visions of coloured lights, it became a practice that “Kubrawī” Sufis would

“wear the colours they perceive in their visions.”³⁶ Abuali argues in favour of the idea of specific identities among Sufi groups in the thirteenth century, and claims that

as Sufi communities gradually became more self-consciously distinct, the claim to the supremacy of sight over sound elevates the Kubrawī method of recollection above others. It allows Kubrawī Sufis to advocate the effectiveness of their particular recollective method, and by extension the superiority of their particular community.³⁷

Another factor that illustrates significance and pre-eminence of the Sufi master at this time is his authority to promote certain Sufis by issuing *ijāzas*, or certificates of permission to teach texts that they had memorised and studied under him, and also “sanction to transmit the *khirqā* and initiate others under his authority.”³⁸ A case in point is the diffusion of Suhrawardī’s form of Sufism into India, as a result of the initial efforts of Bahā’ al-Dīn Zakariyyā (d. 1262). Such “official” and tangible evidence of Sufi authority was possibly one of the key factors in the spread of particular forms of Sufism. Not all Sufi masters approved of this kind of transmission of authority. One of the earliest indications of this is in the anonymous thirteenth-century hagiography of Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī, which states that he demanded no form of “*ijāza*, or letter (*nāma*) or other custom that existed in the way of the former Shaykhs.”³⁹ This may help explain the absence of a specific Kirmāniyya Order, even though Kirmānī is supposed to have advocated a rather idiosyncratic form of Sufism that would have made such a *ṭarīqa* distinctive.

Sufi diversity

Another factor that has not yet been sufficiently recognised in relation to the emergence of the *ṭurūq* is the appearance of a wide range of Sufi pious activity, whether in terms of composing literature, delineating specific beliefs or the performance of ritual practice. Among the pious individuals called Sufis, we may include “antinomian” groups and individuals, known collectively under the rubric “Qalandar” who emerged in the early thirteenth century. Antinomian individuals were also referred to as *muwallah* and did not conform to any recognised Sufi group, but rather they engaged in their own acts of piety and devotion (such as sitting on dung heaps), which usually contravened the “normative” standards of behaviour within Muslim societies.⁴⁰ They were considered to be ambivalent, at best, in the performance of canonical duties, although such accusations, which came from their opponents who followed the minutest details of Islamic prescriptions, are to be treated with caution.⁴¹ The origin of the Qalandars is normally associated with two individuals who sported unusual forms of head or facial hair (either shaving it off, or growing it in an unconventional manner), who shunned society and frequented mountainsides or graveyards, and refused to wear usual clothing, occasionally appearing next to naked. In respects similar to the Qalandars were the Rifā’iyya Sufis, who traced their origin to Abū’l-‘Abbās Aḥmad al-Rifā’ī (d. 1183) in Iraq, but who were soon to spread across much of the known Islamic world, and became infamous for eating fire, putting heated iron in their mouths, biting the heads of snakes and other unconventional practices.⁴²

At the other extreme were more “refined” and “sophisticated” Sufis, such as Ibn ‘Arabī (1165–1240), who is generally regarded as the founder of the school of thought known as the unity of existence (*waḥdat al-wujūd*), which is contained in various articulations in complex and intellectually challenging works such as the *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikām* and the *Futūḥāt al-Makkiyah*, both of which intricately weave a range of Islamic disciplines into an encyclopaedic whole.⁴³

But Ibn ‘Arabī was a Zāhirī, and so respected the precise implementation of all aspects of Islamic law. Moreover, his detailed and voluminous writings resulted in some Sufis regarding him as too intellectual, verging almost on the philosophical.⁴⁴ The compositions of Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar Suhrawardī are often contrasted with those of Ibn ‘Arabī, in particular, his *‘Awārif al-ma‘ārif*, a major manual of Sufism, dealing with communal life in the *khānaqāh*, is sober and intellectually uncomplicated.⁴⁵ But this text was highly influential and reflected the practical and daily issues that faced Sufis in the *khānaqāh*. Similarly, the “simple” type of Shādhiliyya Sufism which developed towards the end of the thirteenth century in North Africa also reflects a type of uncomplicated and unpretentious piety that could be practised by both intellectuals and those who preferred their spirituality less academically challenging.

At roughly the same time there were other Sufis who were composing works in a highly ecstatic vein. In their Persian poetry, ‘Aṭṭār (d. 1220) and Rūmī (d. 1273) described how the many was simply an illusion caused by the multiplicity inherent in the world, and that the ontological reality in the universe was unity, shared by God and humans alike.⁴⁶ A similar message in Arabic prose was relayed by Najm al-Dīn Kubrā, associated by many as the “founder” of the aforementioned Kubrawī *ṭarīqa*, and who is famous for having trained numerous articulate Sufis, who proceeded to propagate his message in Central Asia, Iran and the Arab world.⁴⁷ Diversity is also evident in the kinds of Sufi rituals which became contentious, typified in the controversy surrounding one of the most (in)famous Sufis of the thirteenth century, Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī.⁴⁸ Despite directing the Marzubāniyya convent in Baghdad for the last four years of his life (which was an appointment he received directly from the caliph), Kirmānī was vilified by a number of leading Sufis in subsequent generations. This was most probably because of his supposed penchant for gazing at beautiful young boys (*shāhid-bāzī*), and dancing during the *samā‘* (a musical “concert” when Sufi poetry was recited or sung).⁴⁹ Well before Kirmānī’s time the *samā‘* had some pedigree, and the tradition of *shāhid-bāzī* was not an uncommon activity, so the controversy surrounding Kirmānī is a little difficult to explain. Nevertheless, it is also true that non-Sufis, such as Ibn Jawzī, were vehemently opposed to the ritual.⁵⁰

Qalandars, Rifā‘iyya Sufis, Ibn ‘Arabī, Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umar Suhrawardī, Abū’l-Ḥasan al-Shādhilī, ‘Aṭṭār, Rūmī, Najm al-Dīn Kubrā and Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī to name just a few; it is a dizzying pantheon of Sufis and the list defies simple categorisation. It is to be wondered if the Sufis themselves recognised that such a bewildering collection of individuals and their various expressions and forms of devotion and piety contributed to the general confusion that the “credulous masses” perceived within the larger tradition.

Christian influences and models

Another possible reason for the establishment of Sufi *ṭurūq* in the thirteenth century is related to the presence of Christian monasticism in Palestine, and the spread of Christian brotherhoods in the region. Christian monasteries (in the form of Greek Orthodox and Armenian denominations) had existed in the Middle East for many centuries prior to the thirteenth. Monasteries were located in the Sinai desert, such as St Catherine’s, affiliated with the Orthodox Church, and there were a number of monasteries in the Armenian kingdom of Cilicia (the influence of which spread down as far as Antioch), and of course there were such institutions in Jerusalem and in the larger region of Palestine. In Palestine, monastic brotherhoods were known due to the presence of Carmelites, who traced their origin to hermits who gathered at the well of Elijah on Mount Carmel.⁵¹ In the early thirteenth century a group of hermits are said to have approached Albert, the Latin Patriarch of Jerusalem for a

rule, or a religious way of life. Albert obliged and composed a rule of sixteen articles, many of which resemble the kinds of lifestyles adopted by cenobitic Sufis.⁵² These conditions included strict obedience to their prior, residence in individual cells, constancy in prayer and a vow of poverty and of work. The rule was given official sanction by Pope Honorius III in 1226 and by Pope Gregory IX in 1229.

Roman Christian monastic orders with which Muslims might have been aware include the Franciscans, especially in the wake of a rather unusual event related to the voyage of Francis of Assisi (d. 1226) to Egypt in 1219. The details of the incident are shrouded in mystery, partly because the sources come from Christian authors and none derive from Muslims. The reason for Francis' journey to Egypt where the Crusaders were unsuccessfully besieging Damietta may have been to convert the Muslims. However, on landing in Egypt he was captured and taken before the Egyptian Sultan, al-Malik al-Kāmil, who was the nephew of the great Saladin (or Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, d. 1193). There is no documentation to record the conversation between the two, but Francis was released a few days later, completely unharmed.⁵³ It is to be speculated what al-Malik al-Kāmil made of St Francis; one modern commentator calls him "a sort of Christian Sufi."⁵⁴ In addition to discussing the Crusades and the particular campaigns around Damietta, perhaps St Francis spoke of Christian spirituality, or the various Christian brotherhoods, or his own spiritual Rule (the *Regula primitiva*) which had been recognised by the Pope in 1210, and which was the basis for Franciscan life.

The Franciscans were to join other Christian groups already in the region of Jerusalem. One of these was the Templars, which had been established in 1119 to protect pilgrims journeying to Jerusalem, but which soon became involved in battles with Muslim forces. Although sworn to individual poverty, the Templars as an organisation became incredibly wealthy due to donations and receiving letters of credit. They were able to construct fortresses, cathedrals and other estates not just in Western Europe but in all territories that led to Jerusalem, including, Cyprus, Syria and Palestine. But more pertinently, the Templars were organised like a Christian brotherhood, based on the model of the Cistercians.⁵⁵ The Templars as "militant monks" may even have reminded Sufis themselves that some authors traced the roots of the movement back to certain individuals such as 'Abdullāh Ibn al-Mubarak (d. 797) and Shaqīq al-Balkhī (d. 810), who supported both a renunciant and ascetic lifestyle while participating in armed battle against the non-believers.⁵⁶

A similar model to the Templars was provided by the Hospitalliers, an Order founded in the early eleventh century to provide care for the sick and needy among the pilgrims coming to Jerusalem, based in a hospice in Jerusalem that had been run by the Order of Saint Benedict. Following the victory of the Crusading forces in 1099 during the first Crusade, the Hospitalliers became a religious and military establishment under a Papal charter. The Order had three components: the military, the infirmarians and the chaplains, to whom was entrusted the divine service. The Hospitalliers and the Templars became the most effective and feared Christian forces during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and it is inconceivable that the Sufis of the time were unaware of them, especially as so many Sufis spent long periods travelling the length and breadth of the Islamic world, and would have encountered all sorts of people, from merchants and traders, soldiers, peasants, and also clerics and educated people. Sufis must have learnt about the various Christian brotherhoods, their organisations, how spirituality became institutionalised and channelled into these structures, and also about the Christian hospices and the rituals that were performed therein. Although it is surprising that Sufi literature of the time does not refer to the Crusades or the Christian forces, it is highly desirable that a full investigation of the topic of Christian influence on the establishment of Sufi *ṭurūq* in the thirteenth century is undertaken. Although similarity does

not prove that the Sufi *ṭurūq* were influenced by Christian brotherhood structures in devising models for their own creations, it is certainly a possibility worthy of further consideration.

The successful creation of a *Ṭarīqa*

The focus on the *ṭurūq* in this chapter is the large popular variety, many of which encompassed huge swathes of territory. But even within certain regions there were many smaller *ṭurūq* that were created around the tomb of a saintly figure. For example, Ephrat has researched Sufism in Palestine and has observed that by the end of the Mamluk period (the beginning of the sixteenth century) “Palestinian cities ... and their hinterland were dotted with Sufi lodges and saintly tombs.”⁵⁷ Moreover, caution needs to be exercised when reading the word *ṭarīqa* in pre-modern texts because

the term *ṭarīqa* often denotes a method of spiritual guidance that was practiced by a particular Sufi guide rather than a method practiced by an institutional Sufi order or even a well-established route in terms of doctrine, rules and rituals.⁵⁸

Ephrat’s conclusion is borne out by examining the writings of a number of Sufis, which do not offer any evidence of institutionalised Sufism. For example, ‘Azīz Nasafī was a Persian Sufi who lived and wrote his Persian manuals and prose works in the second half of the thirteenth century when the *ṭurūq* were in the process of formation, but his writings bear very little trace of any kind of affiliation to Kubrāwī Sufism which it has often been associated with. His own guide, Sa’d al-Dīn Ḥamūwayh, was a disciple of the eponymous “founder” of the *ṭarīqa*, Najm al-Dīn Kubrā (d. c. 1220).⁵⁹

Yet it is true that the thirteenth century witnessed the rise of very large *ṭurūq*, some of which were specific to particular geographical regions, and others may be characterised as “transregional.” One of the aims of this chapter has been to provide some suggestions which may account for the rise of such large associations. The organisation and discipline theory, with the spread of the *khānaqāh*, increasing authority of the Sufi shaykh, the realm of his power and *baraka* that encompassed the “unseen,” greater levels of patronage, popular participation and acceptance, and the presence of similar institutionalised movements among other religious traditions are all factors that help to explain for the development of Sufism into the *ṭurūq*. The success of the Sufi movement in the twelfth century led to the dramatic mushrooming of different forms of Sufi activity, and it is to be wondered whether this resulted in a competition among the leading Sufis to attract adherents to their specific forms. Certainly, the hagiographies from the thirteenth century demonstrate an awareness of the very different manifestations of Sufism. But it is unclear what the specific criteria were for establishing a *ṭarīqa* that lasted and was able to re-create itself successfully over time. Among the criteria that were common among many of the large and successful orders, it is possible to point to the following: (i) a tomb complex for the “founder”; (ii) the existence of a recognised literary corpus; (iii) the development of specific rituals which denoted the particularity of the *ṭarīqa* and (iv) the geographical range of the Sufi movement enabled these institutions to develop organically over time, and to evolve with localised customs and traditions, and to interact with the established norms of specific form of Islamic law (*madhhab*) in those areas.

Let us consider the above points in more detail.

- i A significant number of the *ṭurūq* were established after the death of the Sufi for whom they are named, examples include the Mevleviyya (traced back to Rūmī – who is

known in Turkish as Mevlana), the Qādiriyya (named after ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī), the Suhrawardiyya (whose followers look back to the teachings of ‘Umar Suhrawardī) and the Badawiyya (which derives its origin from Aḥmad al-Badawī).⁶⁰ The creation of these *ṭurūq* was assisted by the establishment of substantial tomb complexes for the eponymous founders (indeed the aforementioned all have substantial tombs, the first in Konya and the second and third in Baghdad),⁶¹ which facilitated the tradition of visitation, or pilgrimage. The economic and political benefits that are concomitant with pilgrimage, usually on the death day, known as *‘urs*, of the “founder”, can only have strengthened the aforementioned *ṭurūq*. However, not all major Sufis of the time were remembered after their death with the construction of elaborate tomb complexes. For example, Ibn ‘Arabī had a wide following of Sufis in his time but after his death his “grave site lay deserted and forgotten in the cemetery of Ibn Zaki [in Damascus], indicating that his opponents, the jurists (*fuqahā*) had the upper hand in the city.”⁶² And it was only in the sixteenth century that an elaborate complex was built over his grave, even though the influence of his thought had been felt within Sufi circles, largely as a result of the activities of his students, including Ṣadr al-Dīn Qūnāwī (d. 1274). But no formal *ṭarīqa* was named or formed after Ibn ‘Arabī.

- ii While many of the *ṭurūq* were established around the figure of a great literary master (such as Rūmī, Najm al-Dīn Kubrā,⁶³ ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī,⁶⁴ and Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umār Suhrawardī⁶⁵) others could lay no such claim to such a scholarly legacy (such as the Qalandariyya). And there were many literary Sufis from the same period who assembled substantial groups of followers but yet failed to create a lasting legacy in the form of a *ṭarīqa* (such as Ibn ‘Arabī and Awhād al-Dīn Kirmānī). Yet a literary legacy was not necessary in the establishment of a successful *ṭarīqa*, typified by the case of the Egyptian Sufi, Aḥmad al-Badawī, who did not compose anything, and yet his *ṭarīqa*, the Badawiyya, has long been one of the most numerically strong in the region. Similarly, Shadhilī and his immediate successor “did not author a single work of Sufism.”⁶⁶
- iii While there is a core of ritual Sufi activity, it is the case that for many Orders, these rituals became distinct and associated specifically within the *ṭarīqa* in question. Reference has already been made to some of these, such as the whirling of the Mevleviyya, the body-piercing of the Rifā’iyya, the Shī’ī-flavoured rituals of the Bektashiyya, the *sharī’a* inattentiveness of the Qalandariyya (along with their distinctive, and shocking, physical appearance – which may have developed into a kind of ritual performance) and the light-infused doctrines which informed the rituals of the Kubrawiyya. And yet there were also orders which did not foreground any specific ritual activity, but instead insisted upon the “normativity” of the common Sufi practice of *dhikr*, which was the position of the Shādhiliyya. The Shādhiliyya were not unique, as Trimmingham observed, “as a *ṭarīqa* the Badawiyya lacked any distinctive characteristic.”⁶⁷

One last point worthy of consideration concerns the impact of the Mongol invasions upon the development of the Sufi *ṭurūq*. That the cataclysmic arrival of the Mongols in the region caused devastation in large sections of the Eastern half of the Islamic world must have necessitated those in authority to step forward and assume responsibility for some kind of social control and spiritual development. But this cannot be considered a sufficient reason for the emergence of the *ṭurūq* because the latter also emerged during this period in North Africa, where the Mongols did not set foot. Nevertheless, the vacuum in many Islamic communities caused by the Mongol invasions must have resulted in new political, social and economic configurations, and the presence of the Sufi shaykh must have assumed major importance.

The above brief discussion has suggested that there are no simple and sufficient rules that explain for the emergence of a successful *ṭarīqa*. Several factors assisted in the process, such as the ability of succeeding generations to popularise the Sufi in question, based on perceptions of the efficacy of *baraka* received in visiting the tomb, the virtues of the Sufi in question and the spread of his teachings. It is significant that the *ṭurūq* associated with ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī, Abū Ḥaṣḥ ‘Umār Suhrawardī and Rūmī were all carried on through the family line.⁶⁸

Notes

- 1 Alexander Knysh, *Islamic Mysticism: A Short History* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), p. 175.
- 2 See the hagiographies of the Mevleviyya by Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad Āflākī, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, trans. John O’Kane (Leiden: Brill, 2002) and the anonymous hagiography describing the virtues of Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī, trans. Lloyd Ridgeon in *Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī and the Controversy of the Sufi Gaze* (London: Routledge, 2018).
- 3 Marshall Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam: The Expansion of Islam in the Middle Periods* (Vol. II), (Chicago: University Press, 1974), p. 210.
- 4 Nile Green, *Sufism: A Global History* (London: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), p. 81.
- 5 Carl Ernst & Bruce Lawrence, *Sufi Martyrs of Love* (New York: Macmillan-Palgrave, 2002), p. 11.
- 6 Knysh, *Islamic Mysticism*, p. 173.
- 7 Hamid Algar, “Imposters, Antinomians, and Pseudo-Sufis: Cataloguing the Miscreants,” *Journal of Islamic Studies* 29.1 (2018), pp. 26–30. Algar’s excellent article also outlines the taxonomy of Abū Ḥaṣḥ Najm al-Dīn ‘Umar al-Nasafī (d. 1142), “primarily as a theologian of the Māturīdī persuasion, a Ḥanafī; jurisprudent, a commentator on the Qur’ān, and a *muḥaddith*,” p. 30, who may also have inclined to Sufi ideas. His taxonomy of twelve Sufi groups are condemned except the last, suggesting that the Sufi *ṭurūq* did not exist in his time.
- 8 *Kashf al-Mahjūb of Al Hujwiri: The Oldest Persian Treatise on Sufism*, ‘Alī B. Uthmān Al-Jullābī Al-Hujwīrī, trans. R.A. Nicholson (London: Luzac & Co, 1911).
- 9 One of the first to make this argument was R.A. Nicholson in his preface to the translation cited in note 6. (In Hujwīrī work there are admittedly a few individuals and groups which did indeed have some kind of coherence and social existence.) An example of a group that is known to have existed due to ample documentary evidence includes the Malāmātiyya. See Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-Mahjūb of Al Hujwiri*, pp. 62–69. See Sara Sviri, “Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the Malāmāṭī Movement,” *The Heritage of Sufism: Classical Persian Sufism from Its Origins to Rumi (700–1300)*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn (Oxford: Oneworld, 1999), pp. 583–613.
- 10 J. Spencer Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).
- 11 Simon Digby, “Review of *The Sufi Orders in Islam*,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 36.1 (1973), p. 136. He commented upon the “lack [of] any detailed consideration of the basic economic problem of Ṣūfī shaykh and Ṣūfī ‘orders’.” More recently Ernst & Lawrence have added to the criticism of Trimingham’s work, but from a very different perspective that argues that Trimingham’s work “contain[s] a modern and strongly Protestant attitude. He champions ‘personal religion’ over ‘institutionalized religion ... History serves as the mirror reflecting what one considers to be of real value and what constitutes a departure from that.” Ernst & Lawrence, *Sufi Martyrs of Love*, pp. 11–12.
- 12 For a discussion on the teacher-pupil and master/devotee difference see Fritz Meier, “Ḥurāsān und das ende der klassischen ṣūfik,” *Atti del convegno internazionale sul tema: La Persia nel Medioevo (Roma 31 marzo – 5 aprile 1970)* (Rome: 1971), pp. 545–570. An alternative view has been argued by Laury Silvers-Alario, “The Teaching Relationship in Early Sufism: A Reassessment of Fritz Meier’s Definition of the *shaykh al-tarbiya* and the *shaykh al-ta’lim*,” *The Muslim World* 93.1 (2003), pp. 69–97. In addition, the belief that the head of the community possessed *baraka* (spiritual blessing) and was regarded as occupying the pinnacle of the spiritual hierarchy of saints propelled forward the specificity of different paths, or Sufi *ṭurūq*. This differentiation (and one which Trimingham did not discuss) involved sartorial identification which certainly existed in the thirteenth century. The Qalandars, for example, soon became familiar because of the idiosyncratic shaving of facial hair (see Lloyd Ridgeon, “Shaggy or Shaved? The Symbolism of Hair among Persian Qalandar Sufis,” *Iran and the Caucasus* 14.2 (2010), pp. 233–263), and in some reports for specific items of clothing such as tall, conical hats. The “founders” or inspiration for the Qalandar

- movement initially shunned all forms of conventional clothing and spent most of the time in various stages of nakedness. See Ahmet Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Middle Period 1200–1550* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2006). On the conical hats see Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, p. 52. Other Sufis who formed into *ṭurūq* had other particular forms of covering. In the early fourteenth century Aflākī reported that followers of Aḥmad al-Rifāʿī (who coalesced into the Rifāʿiyya) appeared in *jilang* (which has two meanings: either in silken garments, or else with bells) (see Aflākī, *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 498). And the members of the *futuwwa* associations, which had a strong spiritual dimension (almost quasi Sufi in the understanding of Suhrawardī (d. 1234)), were initiated in special trousers (see the discussion in Lloyd Ridgeon, *Morals and Mysticism in Persian Sufism* (London: Routledge, 2010), pp. 77–80). And the Kubrawī Sufi, Majd al-Dīn Baghdādī (d. 1219), envisaged gowns of different colours for the Sufis in his entourage. See Eyad Abuali, “The Genesis of Kubrawī Sufism: A Study of Majd al-Dīn Baghdādī,” PhD dissertation submitted to SOAS, 2017. In particular, Chapter 5, “Investiture and Clothing,” pp. 264–318.
- 13 C. E. Bosworth, “Rise of the Karāmiyyah in Khurasan,” *The Muslim World* 50.1 (1960), pp. 5–14.
 - 14 The contribution of *futuwwat* (or in Persian *javānmardī*) to Islamic societies has been discussed in Lloyd Ridgeon, *Jawānmardī: A Sufi Code of Honour* (Edinburgh: University Press, 2011); See also D. A. Breebaart, *The Development and Structure of the Futuwah Guilds* (Princeton University Press, Doctoral Dissertation, 1961).
 - 15 See the remarks of ‘Umar Suhrawardī, cited in Ridgeon, *Morals and Mysticism in Persian Sufism*, p. 77. Suhrawardī pointed to the parallels between the *khānaqāh* and the *futuwwat* lodge, noting that the former was bestowed by princes, while the latter was the result of the earnings of *futuwwat* members. He also made parallels between the kinds of clothing used for initiation ceremonies. In Sufism it was the cloak, whereas with *futuwwat* it was the trousers. Moreover, he mentions the kinds of authority, that is, the position of the Shaykh in both traditions. The similarity of Sufism with *futuwwat* has led me to use the term Sufi-*futuwwat* to describe the ideal of *futuwwat* that Suhrawardī outlined.
 - 16 Jamil Abun-Nasr, *Muslim Communities of Grace* (London: Hurst, 2007), p. 83.
 - 17 Hamid Dabashi, “Historical Conditions of Persian Sufism during the Seljuq Period,” *The Heritage of Sufism*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn (London: KNP, 1993), pp. 153–169.
 - 18 Gökböri (1154–1233), otherwise Sultān Saʿīd Shāhid Muzaffar al-Dīn, mentioned by, among others, Ibn Khallikān, *Wafayat al-aʿyān*, Vol. IV (Delhi: Kitab Bhavan, 1996), pp. 103–104.
 - 19 See the discussion in Ridgeon, *Morals and Mysticism in Persian Sufism*, pp. 653–665.
 - 20 Sulamī authored several short treatises all of which demonstrate his rather conservative approach towards Sufism. See Ridgeon, *Morals and Mysticism in Persian Sufism*, pp. 29–45.
 - 21 For Qushayrī see *Al-Qushayrī's Epistle on Sufism*, trans. Alexander Knysh (Reading: Garnet, 2007).
 - 22 Aside from the primary source, *Kashf al-Mahjūb*, Hujwīrī has been the focus of a number of studies. Linus Strothman argues that Hujwīrī should be seen more as an advocate of Sufi ecumenism. See his *Managing Piety* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 2016).
 - 23 Cited in Edith Wolper, *Cities and Saints: Sufism and the Transformation of Urban Spaces in Medieval Anatolia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), p. 24.
 - 24 A. Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975), p. 232. See also part one of Nathan Hofer, *Popularisation of Sufism in Ayyubid and Mamluk Egypt, 1173–1325* (Edinburgh: University Press, 2015), which deals specifically with this *khānaqāh*.
 - 25 See Andrew C. S. Peacock, “Sufis and the Seljuk Court in Mongol Anatolia,” *The Seljuks of Anatolia*, eds. A. C. S. Peacock & Sara Nur Yildiz (London: I.B. Tauris, 2012), pp. 206–226.
 - 26 A. J. Arberry, *Sufism: An Account of the Mystics of Islam* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1950), pp. 119–121.
 - 27 See note 3.
 - 28 Abū'l-Najāb Suhrawardī, *Ādāb al-murīdīn, A Sufi Rule for Novices*, trans. Menahim Milson (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975).
 - 29 Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, p. 231.
 - 30 See David Waines, *The Odyssey of Ibn Battuta: Uncommon Tales of a Medieval Adventurer* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2010), pp. 110–135.
 - 31 See Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *Sufism: The Formative Period* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), p. 25.
 - 32 Herbert W. Mason, *Al-Hallaj* (Richmond: Curzon, 1995), p. 83.

- 33 Fritz Meier, "Khursan and the End of Classical Sufism," *Essays on Islamic Piety and Mysticism*, eds. Ulrich Harmaan & Wadad Kadi, trans. John O'Kane (Leiden: Brill, 1999), p. 127.
- 34 'Ayn al-Quḍāt, *Tamhīdāt*, ed. 'Afīf 'Usayrān (Tehran: Gulshan, 1373), p. 9.
- 35 Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar Suhrawardī, *Risāla-yi futuwwa*, trans. Lloyd Ridgeon in "Javanmardi: Origins and Development until the 13th century and its connection to Sufism," *Annals of Japan Association for Middle Eastern Studies* 21 (2006), p. 72.
- 36 Eyad Abuali, "Words Clothed in Light: *dhikr* (Recollection), Colour and Synaesthesia in Early Kubrawī Sufism," *IRAN* (forthcoming). doi: 10.1080/05786967.2019.1583046
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Erik Ohlander "Mecca Real and Imagined: Texts, Transregional Networks, and the Curious Case of Bahā' al-Dīn Zakariyyā of Multan," *Sufism and Society: Arrangements of the Mystical in the Muslim World, 1200–1800*, eds. John J. Curry & Erik S. Ohlander (London: Routledge, 2012), pp. 34–49.
- 39 Ridgeon in *Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī and the Controversy of the Sufi Gaze*, p. 116.
- 40 See Ahmet Karamustafa, "Antinomian Sufis," *The Cambridge Companion to Sufism*, ed. Lloyd Ridgeon (Cambridge: University Press, 2015), p. 115; Ridgeon, *Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī and the Controversy of the Sufi Gaze*, 20.
- 41 Abuali, "Words Clothed in Light: *dhikr* (Recollection), Colour and Synaesthesia in Early Kubrawī Sufism," op. cit.
- 42 See David Waines, *The Odyssey of Ibn Battuta*, op.cit, p. 115; Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad-e Aflākī, *The Feats of the Knowers of God (Manāqeb al-ārefīn)*, trans. John O'Kane (Leiden: Brill, 2002), p. 498.
- 43 For the *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikām* see the translation of Ralph Austin, *The Bezels of Wisdom* (New York: Paulist Press, 1980). The *Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya* is a multi-volume work, although Ibn 'Arabī's worldview as reflected in this work is rendered comprehensible by William Chittick in his *The Sufi Path of Knowledge* (Albany: SUNY Press, 1989).
- 44 Aflākī's fourteenth-century hagiography of the Mevlevi shaykhs provides an amusing example of this. He reports that some people were discussing Ibn 'Arabī's voluminous and profound *Futūḥāt al-makki* when a singer called Zaki appeared and began to recite "secrets" Rūmī observed, "Well now, the *Futūḥāt al-Zaki* are better than the *Futūḥāt al-makki*!" (*The Feats of the Knowers of God*, p. 324).
- 45 Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar Suhrawardī, *Awārif al-ma'ārif* (Cairo: Maktaba al-thaqāfat al-dīniyya, 2006).
- 46 Farīd al-Dīn 'Aṭṭār, *Manṭiq al-Ṭayr*, ed. Sayyid Ṣādiq Gawharīn (Tehran: Intishārāt-i 'ilmī wa farhangī, 1995/6); Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, *Mathnawī-yi Ma'nawī*, ed. B. Furūzānfar (Tehran: Pizhmān, 1994/5).
- 47 Najm al-Dīn Kubrā, *Fawā'ih al-jamāl wa fawātiḥ al-jalāl*, ed. Fritz Meier (Weisbaden: Franz Steiner, 1957). For an account of Kubrā and his school, see Muhammad Isa Waley, "The Central Asian School of Sufism," *Islamic Spirituality: Manifestations*, ed. S. H. Nasr (London: SCM Press, 1991), pp. 80–104.
- 48 The most detailed account of Kirmānī is found in Ridgeon, *Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī and the Controversy of the Sufi Gaze*, op. cit.
- 49 Other possible reasons for this vilification include a distaste among some for his friendship with Ibn 'Arabī who was famous for the doctrine of the unity of existence (*waḥdat al-wujūd*), and the shortcomings of human nature, including emotions such as jealousy. See Lloyd Ridgeon, "The Controversy of Shaykh Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī and Handsome, Moon-Faced Youths: A Case Study of Shāhid-Bāzī in Medieval Sufism," *Journal of Sufi Studies* 1.1 (2012), pp. 3–30.
- 50 See Ibn Jawzī, *Talbīs Iblīs*, translated as *The Devil's Deceptions* (Birmingham. Dar al-Sunna, 2014).
- 51 For the Carmelites see Nicki Verploegen, *Monks to Missionaries: Schools of Spirituality in the Christian Tradition* (Oregon: Cascade Books, 2011), pp. 52–65.
- 52 *The Rule of St Albert: Latin Text Edited with an Introduction and English Translation*, ed. and trans. Bede Edwards (London: Aylesford, 1973).
- 53 The most recent account of the exchange is John Tolan, *Saint Francis and the Sultan* (Oxford: University Press, 2009).
- 54 Tolan, *Saint Francis and the Sultan*, p. 5. There is quite an extensive discussion about the meeting between the two, but in English, the focus is on the Christian side, rather than the impact that the meeting may have had on the Muslim side. Typifying this approach is Paul Rout, "St Francis of Assisi and Islam: A Theological Perspective on a Christian-Muslim Encounter," *Al-Masaq: Journal of the Medieval Mediterranean* 23.3 (2011), pp. 205–215. The theological perspective mentioned in the title of this work is whole-heartedly one-sided. One of the few intriguing Muslim references to the encounter is found on the tomb of Fakhr al-Dīn Farsī, as reported by a fifteenth-century Arab chronicler. His epigraph reads: "This man's virtue is known to all. His adventure with

- al-Malik al- Kamil and what happened to him because of the monk, all that is very famous.” See Francis De Beer, *We Saw Brother Francis* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1986), p. 14.
- 55 Edward Burman, *The Templars: Knights of God* (Rochester: Destiny Books. 1990), p. 28.
- 56 Knysh, *Islamic Mysticism*, p. 21.
- 57 Daphna Ephrat, *Spiritual Wayfarers, Leaders in Piety: Sufis and the Dissemination of Islam in Medieval Palestine* (Cambridge: HCMES, 2008), p. 165.
- 58 Daphna Ephrat, *Spiritual Wayfarers, Leaders in Piety*, p. 191.
- 59 See Lloyd Ridgeon, *‘Azīz Nasaṣī* (Richmond: Curzon Press, 1998).
- 60 On Aḥmad al-Badaʿī and his shrine in Tanta, Egypt, see Edward B Reeves, “Power, Resistance and the Cult of Muslim Saints in a Northern Egyptian Town,” *American Anthropologist* 22.2 (1995), pp. 306–323; Catherine Mayeur-Jaouen, *Al-Sayyid Aḥmad al-Badaʿī. Un grand saint de l’Islam égyptien* (Cairo: Institut français d’archéologie orientale, 1994).
- 61 For a discussion of the tomb of Rūmī and a discussion of the formation of the Mevlevi order see Franklin D. Lewis, *Rumi, Past and Present, East and West* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2000), pp. 427–434. For the tomb complex of ‘Abd al-Qādir Gilānī see Noorah Al-Gailani, *The Shrine of ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī in Baghdad & the Shrine of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Jīlānī in ‘Aqra: Mapping the Multiple Orientations of Two Qādirī Sufi Shrines in Iraq*. PhD thesis submitted to the University of Glasgow, 2016. I have been unable to discover if any work has been carried out on the tomb complex of Suhrawardī.
- 62 Samer Akkach, “The Eye of Reflection: Al-Nabulusi’s Spatial Interpretation of ‘Ibn Arabi’s Tomb,” *Muqarnas* 32 (2015), p. 83.
- 63 See, for example, the work cited in note 52.
- 64 See note 63.
- 65 For Suhrawardī’s works, in particular *‘Awārif al-ma‘ārif*, see William Chittick, “‘Awāref al-ma‘āref” *Encyclopedia Iranica*, 1987, Vol. III, Fasc. 2, pp. 114–115.
- 66 See Lahouri Ramzi Taleb, “The Shādhiliyya” in the present volume.
- 67 Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, p. 65.
- 68 For ‘Abd al-Qādir Gilānī’s line see Noorah al-Gailani, op.cit. Abū Ḥafṣ ‘Umār Suhrawardī’s son ‘Imād succeeded in taking over the Marzūbaniyya *khānāqah* complex, and in promoting his father’s line. See Erik Ohlander, “Situating Group, Self, and Act in the Medieval Sufi *ribāṭ*: The *Kitāb zād al-musāfir wa-adab al-ḥāḍir* of ‘Imād al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Suhrawardī (d. 655/1257),” *Ethics and Spirituality in Islam*, eds. F. Chiabotti, E. Feuillebois-Pierunek, C. Mayeur-Jaouen, & L. Patrizi (Brill: Leiden, 2016), pp. 419–448. Rūmī’s son Sulṭān Walad eventually succeeded in heading the Mevlevi order, see Lewis, *Rumi, Past and Present*, pp. 230–241.

ROUTLEDGE HANDBOOK ON SUFISM

Edited by Lloyd Ridgeon

First published 2021
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2021 selection and editorial matter, Lloyd Ridgeon; individual
chapters, the contributors

The right of Lloyd Ridgeon to be identified as the author of the editorial
material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been
asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs
and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced
or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other
means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and
recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without
permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks
or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and
explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Ridgeon, Lloyd V. J., editor.

Title: Routledge handbook on Sufism / edited by Lloyd Ridgeon.

Description: New York: Routledge, 2020. | Includes bibliographical
references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2020010674 | ISBN 9781138040120 (hardback) |

ISBN 9781315175348 (ebook) | ISBN 9781351706483 (adobe pdf) |

ISBN 9781351706476 (epub) | ISBN 9781351706469 (mobi)

Subjects: LCSH: Sufism—History. | Mysticism—Islam—History.

Classification: LCC BP188.5 .R68 2020 | DDC 297.4—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020010674>

ISBN: 978-1-138-04012-0 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-17534-8 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by codeMantra