

Jurists and Sufis from the Mongols to the Qājārs

The conflict between the jurists and the Sufis was a fundamental characteristic of the religious life of Qājār Persia, but it had a long history behind it, which first must be reviewed and understood in its proper historical context — as a distinct sectarian phenomenon in the theological history of Iranian Islam over the preceding six centuries. In what follows I will focus on the relations between the two groups from the 13th century onwards.

From the early days of Islam to the present there have always been severe differences between the representatives of the esoteric and exoteric approaches to faith and practice. These stem from two fundamentally different religious temperaments. The jurists' legally oriented understanding of Islam, what Marshall Hodgson identifies as 'shariah-minded' Islam vs. the 'haqīqah-minded' Islam of the Sufis. Despite the efforts of several important Muslims, particularly al-Ghazālī (1058-1111), who tried to bridge the chasm between exoteric (*ẓāhir*) and esoteric (*bāṭin*) faith perspectives, the divide between these two religious worldviews has been a constant since the second Islamic century. Many great Sufis such as Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī were scholars of *fiqh* and hadith and felt that the shariah was essential to hold on to but that deeper Islam must include a deep dive into the esoteric mysteries that are referred to frequently in the Qur'an.

However, particularly in the world of Shi'ite Islam, the scholars of *fiqh* generally resented and rejected the doctrines of the Sufis. The opposition to Sufism dates back to the first generation of Sufis, even before the name 'Sufi' had been adopted.¹ The early Muslims who are looked to as early masters of this esoteric understanding of Islam and are acclaimed as the founders of the Sufi way adopted an ascetic lifestyle. In doing so they were criticised by Muslim scholars, who believed that asceticism was against the tradition of the Prophet Muḥammad.² Among the early generations of the Muslim community, Sufis were not a distinct class like theologians (*mutakallimūn*) and clerics (*ulama*), and their difference from the rest of the Muslim community lay only in their adherence to certain strict codes of piety.³

As Vincent J. Cornell says, 'One of the oldest stereotypes in Islamic studies is that of the eternal conflict between scholar and Sufi, legalist and mystic, doctor and saint, or *sharī'a* and *ḥaqīqa*.'⁴ Jurists viewed Sufis as their rivals, challenging their authority, and in return Sufis condemned them for being enthralled by worldly matters. As a matter of fact, on numerous occasions during the formative period of Sufism, Sufis directly challenged the authority of clerics, as Ibn 'Arabī observed in the *Futūḥāt*:⁵ 'The name *faqīh* is much more appropriate for the Tribe [i.e. the Sufis] than for the exoteric scholar, for . . . it is he [the Sufi] who calls to God "upon insight", just as the messenger of God calls upon insight.'⁶

The conflict between the jurists and Sufis also arose because Sufis claimed to have a knowledge of God/the Truth (*Ḥaqq*) that could not be gained through academic study in the seminary colleges of Islam. They claimed access to an intuitive knowledge (*ma'rifat*, gnosis or intuitive insights and *dhawq*, literally tasting) that could be gained through certain methods of spiritual guidance and by means of mystical experiences or unveiling (*kashf*).⁷ It is said that Dhū'l-Nūn (d. 246/859) was the first Sufi master to explain intuitive knowledge of God (*ma'rifat*) as opposed to knowledge of the seminary sciences.⁸ It was through the mystical experience of union that one could gain this intuitive knowledge; as Qushayrī remarked, 'Without union there can be no true knowing (*ma'rifa*).'⁹ A number of Sufi masters were illiterate and some viewed formal learning and the seminary sciences as veils to this union. They made a mockery of the clerics studying in seminary schools. They claimed that everything was revealed to their hearts from God.¹⁰ Therefore, Sufi doctrines of gnosis came to be viewed not as complementary modes of religious understanding but as direct challenges to the beliefs of the exoteric Muslim clerics that religious knowledge could only be gained from formal studies in a *madrasa*.

The early Sufis seldom challenged political authority, but merely condemned those who were involved in worldly matters. As Gerhard Böwering observes, 'The Muslim mystics of classical Sufism — from the beginnings of Islamic asceticism to the time of al-Ghazālī — did not challenge their opponents with an agenda of the just society, a blueprint of political reform or a call for an Islamic state.'¹¹ However, after the abolition of the Caliphate in Baghdad in 556/1258, Sufi masters began to lead some of the political movements.

Sufism also underwent different stages of transition. There was, first of all, an evolution in Sufism from asceticism to mystical philosophy. This occurred, as Van Ess has pointed out, once early Sufis like Junayd (d.

297/910) became concerned about defining the phenomenon of mysticism.¹² Secondly, during the 13th century Sufis started to form *ṭarīqas* or Sufi brotherhoods, a development which had been anticipated two centuries earlier in the institution of the Sufi meeting lodge (*khanaqāh*), first established in Khurāsān during the time of Abū Saʿīd Abū al-Khayr (357/967–440/1049). In the 12th century, during the Mongol period, Sufism became organised into different brotherhoods, most of which demanded unconditional obedience to their masters.¹³ In some places Sufism became affiliated with the state and in some cases an instrument for the government to control the masses.¹⁴ As the brotherhoods became more formalised, their affiliation to different sectarian and theological schools of Islam became more crucial. Shiʿite and Sunni Sufi orders became clearly distinguishable from each other.

Particularly in the Shiʿite world, the clerics were prone to accuse Sufis of being innovators in religious matters. These shariah-oriented scholars referred to traditions from the Prophet and Shiʿite Imāms,¹⁵ such as one of the most often-quoted sayings of the Prophet, ‘O Abū Dharr, those wearing wool in the summer and winter, are cursed by the angels of heaven and earth.’¹⁶ They claimed that Sufis were rejected by the Prophet and Shiʿite Imāms. They were viewed as infidels deserving to be fought with and put to death (*kāfar ḥarbī*).¹⁷

In the 16th and 17th centuries in Iran, during the period of the clerical formation of Shiʿism under the Safavids, and again in the 18th and 19th centuries with the consolidation of the Uṣūlī school in the Zand and Qājār eras, Sufis challenged the authority of the mujtahids. The ulama reacted with an inquisition of the Sufis near the end of the Safavid dynasty. This inquisition and persecution continued throughout the Qājār era. The two major figures in this anti-Sufi movement were Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī (d. 1110/1700) and Āqā Muḥammad ‘Alī Bihbahānī (d. 1216/1801).¹⁸ Shiʿi Sufis presented a spiritual and esoteric understanding of Shiʿism that was a direct threat to the Shiʿi ulama. As Mangol Bayat observes, ‘Refusing to acknowledge the mujtahids as the sole exponents of Shii Islam, denying them the right to represent the collective voice of religious conscience, the Sufi leaders offered their followers a spiritual alternative to the *fuqahā*’s legalistic institutionalized religion’.¹⁹

The revivalist movement of Sufism at the end of the Zand and the beginning of the Qājār periods was largely based on charismatic Sufi leaders who encouraged the enthusiastic participation of their followers in Sufi practices rather than have them focus their faith on the rulings of the exoteric clerics

whose fatwas competed among themselves for more and more arcane and pointless rules to be followed revolving round issues of ritual purity. As a result, those Muslims who were tired of the strict exoteric understanding of religion became more interested in the systematised and formalised path of Sufism presented by these masters.

During the latter half of the Safavid period, and throughout the Afsharid and Zand periods and into the Qājār era, many wandering dervishes migrated to Persia. They were known for performing miracles for which they would receive alms. They were also known for libertinism and not following religious laws.²⁰ Ordinary people believed in the charismatic power of these wandering dervishes who were treated with respect or fear. These dervishes were not organised into 'orders', so there was no mass conversion to their teachings. Their behaviour and conduct were not generally accepted by Persian society, which objected to the idea of a libertine who did not work, and some rulers and scholars viewed them as parasites on society.

However, stories about these wandering dervishes became deeply rooted in Persian culture and mythology, with tales of their feats becoming mixed with local religious practices. The history of Persia is full of fables and epics, which are extremely important for understanding Persian culture, although to the modern eye they are too unrealistic to be accepted as fact. Malcolm has an explanation for the Persian attitude to such tales and hagiographical stories:

If we desire to be fully informed of a nation's history, we must not reject the fables under which the few remaining traces of its origin are concealed. However extravagant they always merit attention. They have influence on the character of the people to whom they relate. They mix with their habits, their literature, and sometimes with their religion. They become, in short, national legends, which it is sacrilege to doubt; and to question the deeds of Roostum would raise in the breast of a Persian, all those feelings which would be excited in an Englishman if he heard a foreigner detract from the name of Alfred.²¹

Sufism was part of this culture too, as one can find in the proliferation of legendary stories about the lives of Sufi masters, such as 'Aṭṭār's *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'*.²² As stories about the extraordinary acts of wandering dervishes became part of the popular and oral culture of Persia, they affected the historical views of scholars too. However, in order to understand the religious

situation of Sufism during the Zand and the Qājār periods, it is necessary to look at how Sufism had evolved in Iran several centuries earlier, when Iran was still a Sunni country. In what follows I will examine the development of Sufism in Iran during the Mongol period.

Sufism in Mongol Iran

The invasion of Persia and other Islamic lands by the Mongols at the beginning of the 13th century was a devastating event for all Muslims. As Lewisohn has pointed out, “‘Nightmarish’ is too light an adjective’ for this era.”²³ It was an era of mourning, as the ruthless Mongol commanders slaughtered untold numbers of Persians through their ‘shock and awe’ military strategy. Mast ‘Alī Shāh calls the invasion of Mongols ‘the great calamity and the major event’ in the history of Persia.²⁴ Browne pointed out that the Mongol invasion was one of the most ‘dreadful calamities’ for humanity.²⁵

Nevertheless, there were positive cultural developments during this era as well. Roger Savory has noted, ‘This event [abolishment of the Caliphate and the capture of Baghdad] not only marks a watershed in the political history of the Islamic world but had far-reaching effects on religious developments as well. For 600 years, the Caliphate had been the visible symbol of the unity of the Islamic world, and the upholder of the orthodoxy of the Islamic faith.’²⁶ It created an opportunity for those religious beliefs not in accordance with the Caliphate system of Sunnism to flourish. Sufism, Shi‘ism and messianic movements started to grow as the Sunni ideology of the Caliphate faced a military, cultural and theological challenge. Mongol rulers showed tolerance towards other religious beliefs as long as they were no political threat to the new Mongol order.²⁷

Sufism as an esoteric spiritual path which brought about hope for union with God became a sanctuary for those whose lives had been overtaken by the Mongol conquest, and thus, paradoxically, the disaster of the Mongol invasion led to a mass cultivation of Sufism.²⁸ At the same time, the Il-khanid era (654-750/1256-1335)²⁹ (that of the Mongol dynasty that ruled Persia) was a period of decline for the Islamic judicial system.³⁰

Genghis Khān did not follow a particular religion, though he felt sympathetic towards all mystics of different religions, including Sufis.³¹ This favourable attitude of Genghis Khān, and after him the Ilkhānid rulers, towards Sufism created a constructive period for the organised development and spread of Sufi movements and ideas in Persia.³² Some of the

Kubrawī masters of the period were well-respected by the Mongol rulers. Shaykh Sayf al-Dīn Bākharzī (d. 659/1261), a Kubrawī master, converted the Mongol ruler Berke (r. 1257-67) to Islam.³³ Sulṭān Ghāzān (d. 703/1304) was another Ilkhānid ruler who embraced Islam. He was known to be kind to the saints, clerics and theosophers. Shaykh Ṣadr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad Ḥamūya (d. 722/1322), a Kubrawī master, was his consultant.³⁴

The Ilkhanid ruler, Sulṭān Muḥammad Khudābanda (Üljāytü) (r. 716/1316), became a Shi'ite and had a good relationship with both Shi'ite clerics and Shi'ite Sufis.³⁵ He also respected all the religious scholars from different theological and mystical persuasions within Islamic culture.³⁶ He reconstructed the shrine of Biṣṭāmī and paid homage to it.³⁷ It was especially during Üljāytü's reign (r. 703-716/1304-1316) that Shi'ites started to propagate their strongly messianic beliefs. Messianic movements, most of which were quasi-Shi'ite and quasi-Sufi, soon became popular among the general population. As Shahzad Bashir observed in this respect, 'The need for a savior arises in an unstable political environment such as after the death of a caliph.'³⁸ One of the major Shi'ite-Sufi movements against the Mongols was that of the Sarbidārān in Sabziwār.³⁹ The Sarbidār leader, Shaykh Khalīfa, preached in a mosque and claimed that his order could be traced back to Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq through Bāyazīd al-Biṣṭāmī; the latter, he claimed, had been taught by Ja'far al-Ṣādiq to rise against the tyranny of the ruler, by extension implying rising up against the tyranny of the Mongols. As a charismatic person who claimed to be a Shi'ite Sufi, he became famous among the Shi'ites of Sabziwār. This caused the religious clerics of Sabziwār to feel that their authority over the people had been challenged by followers of Sarbidār teachings. They wrote letters to Abū Sa'īd Ilkhān (r. 716-736/1316-1335) about Shaykh Khalīfa's beliefs and told him that Khalīfa deserved to be put to death. Shaykh Khalīfa was murdered under mysterious circumstances in 736/1335.⁴⁰

Theosophical Sufism

Alongside these revolutionary movements, there were a few Shi'ite-Sufi philosophers who attempted to synthesise the Sufi metaphysics of Ibn 'Arabī with Shi'ite mystical theology. Sayyid Ḥaydar Āmulī (d. 787/1386) was the most important figure to unite Shi'ite theology with Sufi philosophy. His main doctrine, which was especially evident in his masterpiece, *Jāmi' al-asrār*, is that true Sufism is in essence Shi'ism, and vice versa. This idea of the essential unity of Shi'ism and Sufism, which was maintained by

means of various theological, metaphysical and mystical arguments, later became very popular with pro-Sufi thinkers in Safavid Iran.⁴¹

One of the great Sufi figures of this period was Shaykh Maḥmūd Shabistārī (d. 737/1337). His view was similar to that of Ibn ‘Arabī, which was that exoteric scholars were in opposition to the Sufis due to greed and spiritual ignorance. Shabistārī accused them of being enthralled by money and possessions. These criticisms of exoteric scholars clarify the relationship between the exoteric and esoteric leaders and their very different take on what is true Islam. As Leonard Lewisohn said, ‘Albeit this dislike for the anti-unitarian dogmatism of the Muslim clergy is not particular to Shabistārī; it is generally characteristic of all the Sufi poets of this period.’⁴²

In sum, Sufism flourished during the Mongol era.⁴³ This is a formative period in which many religious scholars joined different Sufi brotherhoods as they became more institutionalised.⁴⁴ It is during this period that Sufis started to gain more respect and dignity among the Sunni masses.⁴⁵ The Sufi saints developed an alternative to literalist, shariah-minded Islam by the combining of the shariah and haqiqah dimensions of Islam. In doing so they came closer to orthodoxy without relinquishing the higher mystical ground of intuitive knowing through the Sufi path as presented by its leaders.

The Jurist-Sufi Conflict in Timurid and Turkemen Persia

Timur-i lang, known to the West as Tamerlane (d. 807/ 1405), was a Turko-Mongol ruler and commander who was one of the greatest conquerors of Asia. He claimed to be a descendant of Genghis Khān and upheld his nomadic Mongol values.⁴⁶ Beside his nomadic heritage, Timur was a Muslim ruler who tried to create legitimate sovereignty for himself. Being the protector of exoteric laws (shariah) and having connections to supernatural forces were two of the most important qualifications for a ruler among Muslim elites in this era.⁴⁷ Tamerlane was a ruthless commander and he invaded Persia three times, carrying out massacres in Isfahan and other cities, and made minarets with the heads of people during his genocidal campaigns.⁴⁸

As under Mongol dominion, the harsh social and political conditions under the rule of the Timurids created an environment in which people were receptive towards mystical movements. Messianic and mystical movements became popular among Persians, and the spiritually deadening focus

on the minutiae of theoretical but impractical legal rulings by the shari'ah-minded scholars became less popular. From the Mongol to the Timurid eras, the mystical beliefs of Shi'ism and Sufism became assimilated to one another. As Shahzad Bashir has observed, 'In addition to the enhancement of Sufis' societal functions, the Tīmūrīd period is known also for a kind of rapprochement between Sufism and Shi'ism leading to messianic doctrines and other "syncretistic" ideological formations.'⁴⁹

The Sufi shaykhs adopted political roles and sometimes took on many of the roles attributed to the Shi'ite Imams. Bashir in this regard commented, 'With his religious prestige and political pretensions, the new type of Sufi shaykh now becoming common approximated more and more closely the status given to the religio-political figure of the imām in Shi'ism.'⁵⁰ So, messianic figures who appeared among the Sufis, revolted in some cases even against the ruler. For example, the movement of the Sarbidārs mentioned above, which started under the Mongols and continued under the Timurids. Other quasi-Mahdi masters of Sufism arose during this period, as Abbas Amanat pointed out:

The presence of latent messianic aspirations in Shaykh Khalīfā and Shaykh Ḥasan Jūrī (d. 746/1342), Shaykh Ishāq Khutlānī (the founder of the Ightishāshīya, d. 826/1423), Sayyid Muḥammad Nūrbakhsh (d. 869/1464), and Shāh Ni'matullāh Walī (d. 834/1431) made the Sufi orders they represented a fertile ground for chiliastic speculation. Yet neither the Sufi Mahdis nor the claimants to the position of deputyship of the Imām went so far as to proclaim a new cycle of inner truth free from the exterior realities of Islamic *sharī'a*.⁵¹

Shāh Ni'matullāh Walī and Sayyid Muḥammad Nūrbakhsh are the two most important figures among these Sufi masters of the Timurid period. The two well-known Sufi orders of Nūrbakhshīya and Ni'matullāhīya trace themselves back to or through these two masters. Sayyid Muḥammad Nūrbakhsh was the most influential figure to rise up against the Timurid ruler Shāhrukh (r.807-850/1404-1447). Nūrbakhsh traced his order back to the Kubrawī order,⁵² which had a strong influence on mystical Shi'ite philosophy and messianism.⁵³

Some Sufi masters who professed messianic doctrines that were close to Shi'ite religious beliefs were persecuted by Timur with the support of Muslim clerics. Shaykh Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī (796/1394) was a quasi-Sufi master who founded the Ḥurūfī sect (a mystical movement based on

numerology, with many similarities to Sufism).⁵⁴ His beliefs about the inner meanings of letters (*hurūf*) and their relationship to the Divine had some similarities with the Ismāʿīlī beliefs as well as with the extremist Shiʿites (*ghulāt-i shīʿī*), which provoked the animosity of Muslim clerics.⁵⁵ Mīrān-shāh (d. 810/1408), son of Timur, eventually executed Astarābādī and suppressed his sect and followers.

Muslim clerics were successful in consolidating their religious authority in society and recovered from the decline they had experienced during the Mongol era. Sufis also gained popularity among the masses, such that many Sufi orders developed into strong political, charismatic and organisational movements under the Timurids. There were occasions when Timur challenged the authority of Sufi masters.⁵⁶ However, there is strong historical evidence that Timur and Shāhrukh highly respected the Sufi Shaykhs, but only those who were no threat to their power and authority, such as Khāwja Bahā al-Dīn Naqshband (d. 791/1389).⁵⁷ The Timurid rulers showed respect to the shrine and descendants of Shaykh Aḥmad Jāmī (d. 536/1141). It has also been said that Shāhrukh respected the Naqshbandī master, Khāwja Ḥasan ʿAṭṭār (d. 802/ 1399),⁵⁸ son of the great Naqshbandī Shaykh Khāwja ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār (death date unknown).⁵⁹

In general, the Timurid rulers had a good relationship with the Sufis. In one incident, as a sign of respect, none of the Timurid princes took their seats while Naqshbandī Shaykh Khāwja ʿUbayduʾllāh Aḥrār (d. 895/1490) was present in a session.⁶⁰ According to accounts found in certain hagiographies, the Timurid Sulṭān, Abū Saʿīd (d. 873/ 1469), had a successful accession to the throne due to the spiritual support given him by Khāwja ʿUbayduʾllāh.⁶¹ Those Sufi masters who attracted many disciples often provoked the jealousy of shariʿah-minded Islamic clerics, who consequently persecuted Shāh Niʿmatullāh Walī (d. 834/1431) and Sayyid ʿAlī Hama-dānī (786/1385).⁶² Although Terry Graham maintained that Timur had an ambiguous relationship with the Sufis, it can be said that if he had not felt them to be a threat to his power, he would have been more sympathetic towards Sufis.⁶³ It is related that once Timur invited Shāh Niʿmatullāh Walī (d. 834/1431) to his court and asked him why he had accepted the invitation and agreed to eat with him. Niʿmatullāh said it was because Timur liked dervishes.⁶⁴ It is also related that when he received a similar invitation to visit Shāhrukh's court, the visit ended in the monarch becoming an admirer of Shāh Niʿmatullāh.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, there were certain cases where the Timurids, with the support of Muslim clerics, suppressed Sufi masters and Sufi movements.

Shi'ism and Sufism in Safavid Iran

The Safavids came to power as an influential Sufi order with a philosophy of armed revolt against the rulers of Persia. Like all other Sufi orders, they had to legitimise their order through chains of spiritual initiation, and thus they traced their order back to Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn Ishāq Ardabīlī⁶⁶ (d. 735/1334), who was initiated by Shaykh Zāhid Gīlānī⁶⁷ (d. 700/1301), who traced his order back to Abū Najīb Suhrawardī (d. 1168 C.E.), the founder of the Suhrawardīyya order.

Shaykh Ṣafī was the key link in the chain and a crucial figure in the development of this Sufi order. For a long time Shaykh Ṣafī held Sufi sessions and became known for his spiritual power. The Mongols venerated him, and in many cases he prevented the Mongols from harming people in his home town.⁶⁸ After Shaykh Ṣafī passed away, the leadership of the order became hereditary and his son, Ṣadr al-Dīn, was appointed to lead the Ṣafawīyya Sufi order.⁶⁹ The order was named Ṣafawīyya after Shaykh Ṣafī by his spiritual successors. Ṣadr al-Dīn continued with the propagation of Ṣafawīyya Sufi beliefs.

Junayd (d. 864/1460), the great grandson of Ṣadr al-Dīn, and Ḥaydar (d. 839/1488), the son of Junayd, are the two crucial figures in the history of the Ṣafawīyya Sufi order since they transformed its mystical ideology into a militant movement.⁷⁰ Junayd's years of exile in Anatolia were crucial for the formation of a nucleus Turcoman group, known as Qizilbāsh. These Qizilbāsh devotees considered their leaders to be divine and formed an extremist religious sect.⁷¹ As a result, what was later to emerge as 'Safavid Sufism' was more akin to a mystical path filled with extremist beliefs (*ghuluww*). It was also different from the institutionalised Shi'ism at the end of the Safavid era.⁷²

Thus, the Safavid dynasty came to power with extremist Shi'ite beliefs, which were close to extremist Sufi beliefs although their ideology did not have any systematic jurisprudence or scholastic theology. As Roger Savory notes, 'The Safavid leader was even apotheosised as divine incarnation', Safavi Sufis would address Safavid kings as "God".⁷³ As Leonard Lewisohn pointed out, 'His [Shāh Ismā'il] religion was a kind of sectarian religious totalitarianism focused on *ghulāt* Islam, the doctrines and practices of which are completely alien to both traditional Shi'ism and classical Sufism.'⁷⁴

The Safavi Sufis had exclusivist views about Shāh Ismā'il whom they viewed as the 'Perfect Master' (*murshid kāmīl*) and 'Grand Sufi' (*ṣūfī-yi a'ẓam*). Other Sufi masters were denounced and the shrines of Jāmī, Abū Ishāq Kāzīrūnī and 'Ayn al-Qudāt Hamadānī were demolished on Ismā'il's

orders.⁷⁵ Shāh Ismā'īl's purpose was to weaken all other rival Sufi traditions in Persia in order to monopolise power only for himself.

The Suppression of the Sufi Orders under the Safavids

The intolerant religious policies of the Safavid Sufi order did not allow for the propagation of other Sufi orders, which were expelled from the country.⁷⁶ The persecution of Sufi orders happened gradually during the Safavid era. Shāh Ismā'īl obliged Sufi orders to decide either to accept Twelver Shi'ism or to leave Persia. Shāh Ismā'īl was hostile to rival Sufi orders; for instance, the followers of the Sufi order of Abū Ishāq Kāzīrūnī (d. 426/1035)⁷⁷ were suppressed by the Shāh's command.⁷⁴ However, the Ni'matullāhī Order was to a certain extent exempt from persecution, since Shāh Ni'matullāh's descendants, who controlled the order in Persia, were related to the Safavid court through intermarriage,⁷⁸ as the head of the order in Persia, Nūr al-Dīn Bāqī (d. 920/1514), had married a sister of Shāh Ṭahmāsb and lived with the nobles in a Safavid palace.⁷⁹ Once Shāh 'Abbās II (r. 1052/1642-1077/1666) was enthroned, the Safavid relationship with Ni'matullāhīs became less friendly. Shāh 'Abbās was heavily influenced by Shi'ite clerics, a fact which led to the suppression of Sufi orders, and most of these Sufi orders went underground.

The Ni'matullāhī Sufi order was in decline before the ascension of the Safavids, as Shāh Ni'matullāh's son and spiritual successor, Shāh Khalīlullāh (d. 862/1458), departed for India in 1447.⁸⁰ The decline of the order reached its peak when the sole deputy of Khalīlullāh and his son, Mīr Shams al-Dīn, passed away in 854/1450. There was a spiritual hiatus experienced by the Ni'matullāhī order when the Ni'matullāhī masters, blood descendants of Shāh Ni'matullāh, became more political and symbolic figures under the control of Safavids with no spiritual charisma.⁸¹

The animosity between the followers of the Ṣafawī and the Ni'matullāhī orders had a long history, which became part of the doctrinal beliefs and practices of both groups. Zarrīnkūb proposes that it started as a quarrel between two religious groups because the Ḥaydarīs, named after the Ṣafawī Sufi master Ḥaydar, had more Shi'ite tendencies, whereas the Ni'matis, named after Shāh Ni'matullāh, had Sunni tendencies.⁸² In the latter part of the Safavid era this quarrel ceased to have any religious meaning and became a ritual played out for the Safavid kings. According to Kathryn Babayan, 'By the age of Shāh Abbas I (r. 1587-1629), these spontaneous performances were

transformed into ritualized fights between two *futuvvat* factions (Ni'matul-lahi and Haydari), in which the monarch himself participated.⁸³

The Dhahabīyya order is known in Persian history for its contribution to the mystical and theological literature of the Sufi orders. Due to the suppression of all Sufi orders, there was a decline in the Dhahabī order as well as the other great Shi'ite Sufi orders, such as the Nūrbakhshīyya.⁸⁴ Scholars have claimed that some of the great figures who belonged to the School of Isfahan during the Safavid period were affiliated to this order.⁸⁵

The Naqshbandīyya and Khalwatīyya, which were known to be Sunni, were the first two Sufi orders to be suppressed by the Safavids. Many other Sufi orders which had Sunni spiritual chains of initiation were forced to disguise themselves and adopt an Alawī system of belief.⁸⁶ Later on, the Safavid kings were able to suppress Shi'ite Sufi orders with the support of Shi'ite clerics. As Amanat writes, 'By the end of the seventeenth century, Ni'matullahīs, Nuqtāvis, Ḥurūfīs, and the Sufi ghulāt were systematically persecuted and removed from the political scene.'⁸⁷

The Importation of Shi'ite Clerics from Lebanon

After the consolidation of the Safavids and the declaration of Shi'ism as the state religion, there was a need for a more theological and jurisprudential religious organisation. Persian Shi'ite thought started to be formalised during this era, and as a consequence of the importation of Shi'ite ulama from *Jabal al-āmil* in Lebanon the Shi'ite clergy gained an authoritative position in the Safavid social and political system. As Mansur Sefatgol observed:

Since they [Shi'ite seminary scholars] had close relations with the state, and it, in turn, needed them for elements of its operation, the new class of Shi'ī '*ulamā*' constituted a significant proportion of the administration. The religious institution, then, occupied a position of considerable power throughout the Safavid period, and was involved in all aspects of Iranian society. In effect, the Safavid state became the defender of Shi'ism, while at the same time it used Shi'ism as a tool to legitimate their political and cultural claims.⁸⁸

Therefore, the relationship between Shi'ite clerics and Safavid kings was mutually beneficial. Again, according to Sefatgol, 'The Safavids supported the religious institution through financial aid and appointed members of the ulama to the religious offices of the state. In return, the religious institu-

tion supported the political and religious goals of the state and defended it against internal political and religious challenges.⁸⁹

Shāh Ṭahmāsb Ṣafawī (r. 930-984/1524-1576) was very enthusiastic about importing Shi'ite scholars from Shi'ite seminary schools. His support for these scholars eventually created a religious environment in which any opposition to the Shi'ite clerics was considered a blasphemous act. 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Karakī, known as Muḥaqqiq Karakī, (d. 941/1534) was among those scholars venerated by Shāh Ṭahmāsb Ṣafawī who became an influential Shi'ite scholar in the history of Safavid Shi'ism in Persia.⁹⁰ Karakī was appointed as 'Deputy of the Imām' (*nā'ib al-imām*), which legitimised his religious authority as the ultimate religious power after the Imām.⁹¹ Shāh Ṭahmāsb stated, 'It is clear that opposition to the religious verdict of highly ranked Shi'ite scholars (*mujtahidīn*), who are the protectors of the law of the master of messengers, is equivalent to polytheism (*shirk*).'⁹²

It was during the reign of Shāh Ṭahmāsb (r. 930-984/ 1524-1576) that the Shi'ite seminary scholars were given the supreme authority over religious matters, which marked the beginning of the struggle between Sufis and Shi'ite scholars. At this time Shāh Ṭahmāsb also expelled the Mevlevi Sufi order from Persia.⁹³ As Shi'ite religious sciences were being formalised in Persia, Karakī was the first scholar to revive the old animosity between the 'people of the Sufi Path' (*ahl-i ṭarīqa*) and the 'people of the religious laws' (*ahl-i shari'a*). He also was the first person to write a treatise against Sufism in Safavid Persia.⁹⁴

Qalandars and Libertinism

Shi'ite clerics during the Safavid period often denounced Sufis for their alleged 'libertinism' and for not following Islamic laws. This accusation was largely based on their distaste for the antinomianism of the wandering dervishes. Many wandering dervishes, known as *Qalandars*, had migrated to Persia from India; they were not known for following all Islamic laws and were therefore called antinomian dervishes (*darwishān-i bī-shar'*). These dervishes were not initiated into any Sufi order and did not have any firm discipline based on following the traditions of an order.⁹⁵

Indian Qalandari culture was slightly different from what are known as the classical Qalandari beliefs and doctrines. During the 7th and 8th centuries of the hejira (13th and 14th centuries C.E.), there were numerous Qalandars in India. La'l Shabbāz Qalandar (d. 672/1274) and Abū 'Alī Qalandar (d. 722/1323)⁹⁶ were the most influential figures among them. La'l

Shahbāz adopted the lifestyle of the people of blame (*malāmātiyya*),⁹⁷ and resided in the taverns (*kharābāt*) becoming popular because of his miracles (*karāmāt*).⁹⁸

The *Malāmātiyya* (the Path of Blame) was a mystical movement which began in Nishābur in the 8th century, the point of which was to mortify one's passions by incurring public blame.⁹⁹ The movement began as a reaction to the increasingly artificial, hierarchical formalisation of Sufism and the hard-line views of certain shariah-minded Sufis, which did not mean, however, that they rejected either the letter or spirit of the shariah. Nonetheless, the *Malāmātī* movement became open to misinterpretation of its philosophy, such that after a while some Sufis used *Malāmātī* doctrine as an excuse for their libertinism and rejection of shariah.¹⁰⁰ This group of Sufis, who did not follow shariah and were not initiated in any Sufi order, were known as *darwishān-i jalālī*¹⁰¹ or the *Jalālīyya*.¹⁰² Zarrīnkūb proposed that the *Jalālī* Sufis represented what remained of the Qalandari'ite culture, which involved wandering and begging.¹⁰³

The Qalandars criticised the relationship between the Sufi master and his disciple. The path of Sufis was generally considered to be separate from that of the Qalandars, as Sufis had their own codes of conduct and station, whereas Qalandars adopted a libertine path of life without any obligations. The *Qalandarī* movement soon became known for its decadence, and the name *qalandar* became a derogatory term in society, while preserving its positive value as a poetic topos.¹⁰⁴ The claim by the Qalandars and wandering dervishes to be the inheritors of the culture of Sufism provided the Safavids' Shi'ite clerics with a perfect excuse to accuse Sufis of libertinism and not following Islamic laws.

The Qizilbāsh and the Safavid Monarchs

The leaders of the Safavid movement came to power through the self-sacrifice of devout Safavid Sufis called Qizilbāsh.¹⁰⁵ During the Safavid era, the Qizilbāsh were committed disciples of the shāhs. As Ata Anzali observed, 'Qizilbash religiosity was marked by a mixture of shamanistic ideas, Sufi ideals, and a distinct messianic vision.'¹⁰⁶ They were extremist Sufis in the service of their master. They soon became an elite group of Safavid bureaucrats who wielded enormous influence on Persian social and political affairs.

After the initial period of the consolidation of exoteric Shi'ism, the Safavid kings soon perceived the Qizilbāsh as a threat to the state.¹⁰⁷ Their passion for political authority and their strongly authoritarian character made the

Safavid shāhs suspicious of their activity,¹⁰⁸ since the diehard Qizilbāsh had ultimate authority after the king. However, after the importation of Shi'ite scholars into Persia, the Shi'ite scholars became the second most important authority within the political and social systems of Persia, and successfully rivalled the Qizilbāsh. Shāh 'Abbās I (r. 1588-1629) in particular was suspicious of the Qizilbāsh and reduced their tribal and spiritual power in society.¹⁰⁹ He suppressed some of them and clearly demonstrated his dissociation with their extremist views,¹¹⁰ emphasising his reliance on Shi'ite clerics.

As Rasūl Ja'fariyān has noted, Shi'ite tradition allowed Shi'ites (especially Shi'ite scholars) to penetrate the royal court, the caliph's court or other ruling classes of society which were not part of Shi'ite society or did not follow Islamic laws.¹¹¹ Most Shi'ite scholars supported the Safavid kings, viewing them as their protectors although they had no religious legitimacy.¹¹² The last Safavid king, Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn (r. 1105/1694-1135/1722), was the only ruler who was himself a seminary student, and as a result he put a lot of effort into supporting the hierarchy of Shi'ite clerics.¹¹³ As a ruler, Sulṭān Ḥusayn was opposed to Sufism. He insulted, humiliated and persecuted Sufis. Sufis who practised *dhikr* were executed and many Sufi masters were banished from their homes. One of the most active and fervent supporters of Sulṭān Ḥusayn was that great Shi'ite scholar and enemy of Sufism, Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī (d. 1110/1700).¹¹⁴

As Mast 'Alī Shāh observed:

In every province and suburb they humiliate the people of spiritual knowledge (*ahl-i ma'rifat*) and the adepts in mystical states (*ahl-i ḥāl*). And in every land and in every place, they try to eliminate the people of certainty (*ahl-i yaqīn*) and possessors of sainthood (*ṣāhib wilāyat*). The worst part is that they think these obscene acts are good deeds and they dub their iniquity 'relieving religion of troublesome elements'.¹¹⁵

Mast 'Alī Shāh for this reason referred to Sulṭān Ḥusayn as an 'ignorant king' whose persecution of Sufis ended with the emigration of all Sufis from Persia and led to the fall of the Safavids.¹¹⁶

The School of Isfahan

Shāh 'Abbās I (r. 996-1038/1587-1629) moved the capital of the Safavid Empire from Qazwīn to Isfahan. Although Isfahan was an abandoned city after the Seljuk era (429-552/1037-1194), it flourished under the kingship of Shāh

‘Abbās. His domination of the Persian Gulf and his ability to consolidate the Persian Empire created a better opportunity for commerce and economy. Isfahan, being the capital city, became the centre of attention for Safavid kings. Numerous magnificent mosques, bazaars and monuments were built, and much effort was put into the improvement of Shi‘ite seminary schools. Isfahan became a centre for Shi‘ite seminaries and the religious sciences.¹¹⁷ All Shi‘ite sciences from jurisprudence to mystical philosophy flourished in Isfahan. Some of these philosophers taught the classical mystical philosophies of Ibn ‘Arabī and Suhrawardī, which were not part of practical Sufism.¹¹⁸

The School of Isfahan was an asylum for scholars of a Sufi temperament who wanted to be immune from clerical persecution. None of the philosophers following this school openly declared their affiliation to a Sufi order,¹¹⁹ although they had respect for Sufi ethics and beliefs.¹²⁰ These theosophers were careful to distinguish themselves in the eyes of the elite and the common people from the wandering dervishes. According to Leonard Lewisohn, “They [the highest adepts of the Iṣfahān School of theosophers] rigorously insist on distinguishing between the “vulgar” or “popular” (*awāmm*) generality of dervishes and the “high” and “elect” (*khāṣṣ*) Sufis.”¹²¹

Muḥammad Bāqir Astarābādī, known as Mīr Dāmād (d. 1040/ 1632), was the earliest figure in the ‘School of Isfahan’.¹²² He was highly respected by Shah ‘Abbas and was connected to Sufism through the philosophy of illumination (*ḥikmat al-ishrāq*) initiated by the works of Suhrawardī (d. 587/1191) and Ibn ‘Arabī’s philosophy,¹²³ although he was not affiliated to any Sufi order. Mullā Ṣadrā (d.1050/1640), the greatest philosopher in the School of Isfahan, was also influenced by Sufi philosophical ideas and his works were full of references to Sufi masters. *The Transcendent Philosophy of the Four Journeys of the Intellect (Al-ḥikmat al-mutī‘āliya fī-l asfār al-‘aqliyya al-arba‘a)* is his masterpiece, in which work he used Sufi terms like ‘unity of being’ (*waḥdat al-wujūd*) and ‘presential knowledge’ (*‘ilm-i ḥuḍūrī*).¹²⁴

Mullā Ṣadrā was highly influenced by Ibn ‘Arabī but opposed to the libertinism of Qalandar forms of Sufism. He wrote a book called *Kasr al-aṣnām al-jāhiliya fī kufr [dhamm] jamā‘at-i al-Ṣuffiyya [mutaṣawwifa]* (*Breaking the Idols of Ignorance through Refutation of Sufis*),¹²⁵ written in defence of mystical philosophies and in refutation of vulgarised forms of Sufism.¹²⁶ As Lewisohn maintains, “[The treatise] is one of the most important documents for the understanding of seventeenth-century Persian Sufism and the causes of the clerical persecution of Sufism during the period.”¹²⁷ In this treatise he condemns both pseudo-Sufism and the superficial observance of the religious laws.

In his ‘Treatise on Three Principles’ (*Risāla sih aṣl*), Mullā Ṣadrā condemns the jurists (*fuqahā*) and scholastic theologians (*mutakalimīn*) of his time and defends the ideals of true Sufism against both groups. Lewisohn points out that Mullā Ṣadrā introduced himself as *khādīm al-fuqarā* (servant of the poor—a common term for Sufis), which clearly shows his affiliation with Sufism. He also wrote about the necessity of having a master on the Sufi path.¹²⁸ One can conclude that he was an advocate of philosophical Sufism. As Lewisohn explains, ‘Mullā Ṣadrā, in this work [*Sih aṣl*] at least, is an advocate of specifically *Sufi* philosophical mysticism (*ḥikmat*), rather than some independent Shī‘ite philosophical mysticism divorced from the Sufi tradition.’¹²⁹

Another great figure in the history of mystical Safavid Shī‘ism was Muḥsin Fayḍ Kāshānī (d. 1090/1680), a disciple of Mullā Ṣadrā and his son-in-law, who had spiritual connections with Shaykh Bahā al-Din ‘Āmilī (d. 1030/1621).¹³⁰ ‘Āmilī, who was a seminary teacher, jurist, mystic (*‘ārif*) and master theosopher (*ḥakīm*),¹³¹ was a crucial figure for the connection of Sufism and Shī‘ism. There is no doubt that he was a Sufi while acting as Shaykh al-Islam of Isfahan where he was respected by all the different religious groups in Persian society.¹³²

Theosophers of the School of Isfahan accomplished their mission to a certain extent by keeping the mystical tradition and philosophy of Sufis alive in the seminary schools. Their influence is undeniable, given that Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī, who was known to be a vehement enemy of Sufism, admired Mir Dāmād.¹³³ Mir Dāmād, Mullā Ṣadrā and Shaykh Bahā‘ī were generally respected by Shī‘ite clerics. They were among the very small number of people who were crucial for the survival of the mystical philosophy of Sufism during the Dark Ages of the Safavid dynasty.

Clerical Opposition to Sufism in Safavid Persia

From the very first generation of Shī‘ite clerics during the Safavid era, the animosity between ‘people of the Sufi path’ (*ahl-i ṭarīqat*) and ‘people of religious laws’ (*ahl-i shari‘a*) became evident. Karakī, one of the first Shī‘ite scholars from Lebanon, as mentioned above, was extremely anti-Sufi and wrote a treatise in refutation of Sufis. The Shī‘ite clerics were politically and financially supported by the Safavid kings, and in return the Safavid kings were theologically and religiously legitimised by Shī‘ite scholars. Shaykh Ḥur ‘Āmilī (d. 1091/ 1680) was a well-known scholar of hadith (*muḥadith*), author of an encyclopaedia of Shī‘ite traditions called *Wasā’il al-Shī‘a*,¹³⁴ who wrote an anti-Sufi treatise called *Risālat al-Ithnā ‘asharia fi al-radd ‘alā*

al-Ṣūfiyya (*The Treatise of the Twelver Shi'ites in Refutation of the Sufis*),¹³⁵ in which he referred to the Qur'ān, Shi'ite traditions and the narration of Shi'ite seminary scholars to demonstrate the heretical beliefs of the Sufis.¹³⁶

Mullā Muḥammad Ṭāhir Qumī (d. 1098/1686) was another figure among the major Shi'ite scholars opposed to Sufism and philosophy. He was contemporary to both Majlisī and known to be affiliated with the Akh-bārī school of Shi'ism. In a dispute recorded between Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī and Qumī, he vehemently refuted Sufism.¹³⁷ *Tuḥfat al-akhyār* by Qumī was among the most important Sufi refutations of Sufism written in this era.¹³⁸ His *Mūnis al-abrār* is a compilation of his poetry in praise of Imām 'Alī, in which the poet refutes Sufis. *Muḥibbān-i Khudā* is another treatise dedicated to Shāh Sulaymān in refutation of Sufism, and *Malādh al-akhyār* is yet another treatise written by him, in which disparaged the Sufis. He also wrote *al-Fawā'id al-dīniyya*, which contains a denunciation of Sufism and philosophy.¹³⁹

Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Ardabīlī, known as Muqaddas Ardibīlī, (d. 993/1585), was an influential Shi'ite scholar to whom a treatise called *Ḥadiqat al-Shī'a*, partially written in refutation of Sufism, is attributed.¹⁴⁰ In this treatise all Sufis are viewed as heretical Sunnis in opposition to the Shi'ite Imāms, with traditions and sayings going back to the Shi'ite Imāms showing that the Imāms were against Sufism. The author also criticised Ḥallāj, Bisṭāmī, Ibn 'Arabī and other great figures within the Sufi tradition.¹⁴¹ Some Sufis like Mast 'Alī Shāh (d. 1253/1837) maintained that this treatise was not written by Muqaddas Ardibīlī, citing in this respect Muḥammad Bāqir Khurāsānī's (d. 1090/1679) claim that *Ḥadiqat al-Shī'a* was written by Mu'iz al-Dīn Ardīstānī (in the 16th-17th centuries).¹⁴²

However, the most serious blow to Sufism to be delivered by the Shi'ite ulama came from Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī (d. 1110/ 1700), who was appointed the Shaykh al-Islam of Isfahan,¹⁴³ and who, as Rasūl Ja'fariyān observed, was crucial to the campaign of the Shi'ite seminarians against Sufis.¹⁴⁴ Majlisī was a bigoted, exclusivist Shi'ite who exhibited fanatical behaviour towards all Islamic sects other than his own, and was zealously concerned with gaining a monopoly over the religious system of Persia.¹⁴⁵ As Mangol Bayat has pointed out, Majlisī was one of the first Shi'ite clerics to lay down the doctrinal basis for the supremacy of Shi'ite clerics, allowing themselves to intervene in personal lives of people.¹⁴⁶

Although *Ayn al-Ḥayāt* is Majlisī's best-known and most detailed refutation of Sufism, he wrote numerous books on the subject, such as *I'tiqādāt*. He maintained that all Sufis were Sunnis. However, he did not deny that

there were Shi'ites who were ascetics like Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn Ardabili, Ibn Ṭāwūs and Ibn Fahad Ḥillī, who belonged to the mystical tradition. Majlisī, however, claimed that they were not Sufis but merely held mystical beliefs.¹⁴⁷

Interestingly, Majlisī's father, Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī, held strong Sufi beliefs. Muḥammad Taqī (d. 1070/1660), known as the 'First Majlisī' (*Majlisī-yi awwal*), was born in 1003/1594.¹⁴⁸ He was a pupil of Shaykh Bahā'ī. The senior Majlisī's solid reliance on sayings and traditions said to have come from the Prophet and the Shi'ite Imāms (*akhbār* or *aḥādīth*) led to the assumption that he was an Akhbārī jurist.¹⁴⁹ Based on the first Majlisī's writings and historical evidence, it seems more than likely that he belonged to a Sufi tradition.¹⁵⁰ Majdhūb 'Alī Shāh and Mast 'Alī Shāh suggested that the first Majlisī was initiated into Sufism by Shaykh Bahā'ī.¹⁵¹ His mystical beliefs led contemporary Shi'ite clerics to oppose him. Sayyid Muḥammad Mīr Luwḥī Sabziwārī Iṣfahānī (d. after 1000/1592 before 1083/1673) attacked the first Majlisī for defending Sufis.¹⁵² One of the staunch enemies of Sufism was Mullā Muḥammad Ṭāhir Qumī (d. 1100/1689), who had harsh disputes with the first Majlisī for writing so favourably about Sufi philosophy.¹⁵³ The first Majlisī's treatise entitled *Encouragement to the Wayfarers* (*Tashwīq al-sālikīn*) is strong evidence of his Sufism.¹⁵⁴

Muḥammad Bāqir Majlisī's belief about the position of his father in respect to Sufism was highly inconsistent. In some of his writings he mentioned that his father was a Sufi but repented of his beliefs at the end of his life.¹⁵⁵ In other places he claimed that he was not a Sufi but socialised with them because he wanted to guide them to the path of truth.¹⁵⁶ The relationship between Majlisī Senior and the Sufis is undeniable, and it would seem that Majlisī Junior was looking for a way to justify his father's relationship with Sufis.

In his campaign against the Sufis, Majlisī Junior banned all Sufi gatherings and the uttering of the Sufi invocation *yā hū* (O He!), such that his disciples were known publicly to smash any pots in which the blowing of the wind could create the sound of *hū*. Majlisī's campaign succeeded in turning the public against Sufism, and nearly all the seminary scholars used to curse the Sufis during their sermons in the mosque. Sayyid Quṭb al-Dīn Tabrizī wrote a letter to Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn stating that animosity towards Sufism was so dominant that the Shi'ite clerics damned the shāh's ancestors for being Sufis.¹⁵⁷ As a consequence of this poisonous atmosphere, the majority of the Sufi Orders emigrated to India or else went underground during the 17th century. The mystical path of Sufism continued to be represented among members of the School of Isfahan, who, however, did not publicly

declare themselves to be part of the Sufi tradition. Unfortunately, the teachings of this school were available only for the educated elite. Lastly, there were bands of wandering dervishes, whose approach to Sufi doctrine and practice was a world apart from that of the classical Sufi orders.

In conclusion, the Safavid era was one of severe decline for the entire Sufi tradition in Persia in terms of organisational development, practical teachings and mystical literature. Although nearly all religious minorities were suppressed, among them all the Sufis received the harshest treatment.

Sufism and Clerical Shi'ism during the Afsharids and the Zands

This decline in Sufism continued throughout most of the Afsharid (1148/1736-1163/1750) and Zand (1163/1750-1209/1794) periods. The chaotic nature of the period precludes any academically reliable historical account of the state of Sufism in Persia during this time, but it is clear that the majority of the Sufi orders had already emigrated out of Persia. There are very few accounts about the Sufi revival by Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh at the end of Karīm Khān's reign (1163/1750-1193/1779). As Mast 'Alī Shāh put it, for about half a century Sufism had been dormant in Persia.¹⁵⁸ About this particular period Ma'ṣūm Shīrāzī maintained, 'For about seventy years, people were distant from any spiritual merit or station. People of knowledge were pushed to the periphery. After the arrival of Sayyid [Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh], however, discussions about Sufism and the Divine Reality [*ṭarīqat wa ḥaqīqat*] reappeared among people.'¹⁵⁹ From the end of the Safavid period and into the Zand rule, seminary scholars and philosophers did not command respect among the ruling class and, as Ma'ṣūm Shīrāzī observed, 'The people of that era lived in ignorance and neglect.'¹⁶⁰

The Shi'ite clerics, despite their relative lack of authority, did not tolerate any other religious group and continued to persecute the Sufis.¹⁶¹ The scholars tried to maintain their prestige among the masses and cultivate their relationship with the royal court. As Mansur Sefatgol stated, 'The religious offices, which were a vital part of the state, survived and were operative even under Nādir Shāh. The Afsharid and Zand dynasties had their own state-religious administration, and they regularly appointed leading religious leaders to state religious offices, such as Ṣadr, Qādī or Mullābāshī.'¹⁶² These titles became formalised but the rulers, especially Nādir, did not have much respect for them, and they had little power or influence among the ruling classes.

The Afsharid Dynasty (1148-1163/1736-1796)

The mighty king of Persia and the founder of the Afsharid dynasty, Nādir Shāh (1100-1160/1688-1747), was born into a low social class in Khurāsān and was the eldest son of Riḍā Qulī Khān.¹⁶³ He was a talented man, and his brilliance as a general in battle was remarkable. Nādir's attitude towards religion was much more liberal than those of any of his predecessors or successors. He had studied the Jewish and Christian holy books¹⁶⁴ and was open to learning from other religions, accepting some aspects of other religions as divine revelation. He was interested in religious debates and gathered Jewish, Christian and Muslim leaders together to debate different theological matters. He was not popular among the Shi'ite clerics, mainly because he supported reconciliation between Shi'ism and Sunnism and the idea of Shi'ism being taught within Sunni schools of laws. Nādir's views on Shi'i and Sunni disagreements were more liberal than those of other kings and rulers of that period,¹⁶⁵ although Nādir's attempt to reconcile the two sects was rebuffed by the Turks (Ottomans).¹⁶⁶

During certain periods, Nādir suppressed and reduced the power of Shi'ite seminary scholars and favoured Sunnis.¹⁶⁷ Although he built a golden dome and minarets for Imām 'Alī's shrine in Najaf, he did not favour the clerical hierarchy of Shi'ism.¹⁶⁸ Nādir seized the mosque revenues and abolished the position of high priest (*ṣadr al-ṣudūr*) in the country, while assigning him a very small pension just for maintaining the name.¹⁶⁹

Sufism was part of popular culture, but, as Malcolm said, 'The contempt of Nādir for the arts by which the dervishes, and other religious mendicants, imposed on the credulity of his countrymen, was shown on every occasion.'¹⁷⁰ Mast 'Alī Shāh in this regard commented, 'Since Nādir Shāh murdered some of the descendants of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn and harmed a number of friends of God, the kingdom of Afsharids vanished quickly.'¹⁷¹ This judgement, whether true or not, is at least indicative of Nādir's poor relationship with the Sufis, and theirs with him.

Karīm Khān Zand

Karīm Khān Zand (1116-1193/1705-1779) was the ruler of Persia and founder of the Zand dynasty. He made great effort to establish a unified kingdom while fighting his rivals. For a short period he was able to create a stable and prosperous capital city, Shiraz, in South Western Persia. Malcolm said of Karīm Khān, 'It is pleasing to recount the actions of a chief, who, though

born in an inferior rank, obtained power without crime, and who exercised it with a moderation that, for the times in which he lived, was as singular as his humanity and justice.¹⁷² Karīm Khān, not of high birth, had no authority in Nādir's army, but was capable.¹⁷³ He was the chief of a small tribe, which was a branch of the Lak tribe. Although he was an ambitious man, goodness of heart, noble courage and a forgiving personality.¹⁷⁴

According to Amanat, 'By 1757 the rise of Karim Khan Zand in the south was the only positive outcome. His regency was the most benign and durable of any attempt since 1722 to revive a nominal Safavid rule and govern in the shadow of its memory.' He rewarded and gave encouragement to all industrious classes of his subjects. Persia's cities flourished under his rule but none more than Shiraz.¹⁷⁵ The prosperity and stability Karīm brought created an opportunity for different guilds, groups and religious minorities to flourish under his rule, which in turn allowed the Sufi missionaries to return to Persia for their revivalist movement.¹⁷⁶

During the Zand period, dervishes were viewed as mystics with supernatural powers, connected to Indian culture. Jānī, a Qalandar who was against Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh (the first master in the revivalist movement of the Ni'matullāhīs in Persia), was one of the wandering dervishes from India who lived, according to the historians of time, like other wandering Sufis. In this context, Rustam al-Ḥukamā narrates stories about dervishes of that time who were 'perfect Sufis' and spiritual kings, mentioning a certain Darwīsh Bayrākī who was 300 years old, and could talk to animals. He used to eat bread with tobacco juice and smoke as much opium as possible. He possessed only a horse, a parrot and a ragged garment, and no shoes or hat, which are all indicative of Dervish Bayrākī's metaphysical power. Rustam al-Ḥukamā categorised him among the group of 'pure Muslims' (*Musalmān-i pāk*).¹⁷⁷

Following the migration of Ni'matullāhī masters to India in the Safavid period, the connection between Persian Ni'matullāhī disciples and masters became extremely limited due to the geographical distance between Persia and India. However, they were not totally disconnected and a few Ni'matullāhī disciples would still go to India for visitation with their masters. It was during this era that Riḍā 'Alī Shāh (d. 1214 A.H./1799 C.E.), the Pole (*quṭb*) of the Ni'matullāhī order, received complaints from his disciples who were scattered across Persia regarding their need to be under the direction of a master to reunite the order.¹⁷⁸

Shi'ite clerics did not have much influence in the royal courts of either the Afsharids or Zands, which made it possible for Ni'matullāhī masters directly to interact with their disciples in Persia.¹⁷⁹ Therefore, teachers were

sent off to Persia to guide the Ni'matullāhī disciples and seekers of the path. As Abbas Amanat asserts, 'Some of his [Riḍā 'Alī Shāh] disciples were dispatched to Iran for the purpose of providing guidance to the remnants of the order.'¹⁸⁰ Hence, the revival movement of the Ni'matullāhī order was formed by the spiritual guides sent by Riḍā 'Alī to Persia.

Upon the Ni'matullāhīs' arrival in Persia, Karīm Khān established a good relationship with the Ni'matullāhī masters. Shi'ite clerics who did not want to lose their social authority were able, however, to spread slanderous accusations about Ni'matullāhī masters. As a result, Karīm Khān became suspicious and intolerant of the order and banished Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and his disciples from Shiraz.¹⁸¹

There are different accounts of Karīm Khān's religious lifestyle. John Perry asserted that Karīm Khān revived traditional Shi'ism, which was suppressed by Nādir Shāh.¹⁸² It is true to an extent that Karīm Khān did not suppress Shi'ite clerics, but he did not favour them as had the Safavid kings. Malcolm said, 'The mode which Kerreem Khan took to attain and preserve his power, was different from that pursued by any former monarchs of Persia. He made no effort to gain strength with the aide of religious or superstitious feelings.'¹⁸³ He did not accept many irrational traditions narrated by the seminary scholars. One of these traditions was about the Antichrist. Once, when he was accused by Shi'ite seminary scholars of not accepting the sayings of the Shi'ite Imāms, he replied, 'The Imām never uttered irrational words, these [certain Shi'ite traditions] are attributing irrationality to the Imāms.'¹⁸⁴ On the whole, although Karīm Khān was a religious person, he made use of his own innate powers of reasoning, and did not rely on the interpretations of Shi'ite clerics *per se*; however, one cannot deny Shi'ite clerics' influence over all the classes of Persian society, including the king. However, in comparison to other kings, he was far less subject to their influence.

Malcolm notes how '[h]e built tombs over the remains of Sadi and Hafiz, which are deposited near Shiraz, and endowed these edifices with gardens and lands for the support of the dervishes, or holy men, appointed to watch over them.'¹⁸⁵ He was a powerful and strong ruler of Persia, who was always cautious lest he lose power among people and his rivals. While he never declared himself against Sufism or all Sufis, neither did he show much sympathy for Sufism.¹⁸⁶ If he felt that a certain group would challenge his authority, he would suppress it. Seeing that he was suspicious of Ni'matullāhīs claiming political authority, he banished them. Karīm Khān did not support any seminary schools or Sufi lodges during his reign. It has been said that he believed that those religious classes—Shi'ite clerics, seminary

students, wandering dervishes and sayyids collecting money for religious matters—were parasites on Persian society and refused them a pension.¹⁸⁷ Karīm Khān died in 1194/1780 at nearly 80 years old. He had been a ruler for 26 years, 20 of those without any rival to his rule. Following Karīm Khān's death, there was a three-year period of civil war (1193-1195/1779-1782), which Zarrīnkūb has rightly called 'the age of terror' (*ʿaṣr-i waḥshat*).¹⁸⁸

ʿAlī Murād Khān (r. 1195-1199/1781-1785)

ʿAlī Murād Khān Zand (d. 1200/ 1785) was the fifth Zand ruler, who spent most of his time suppressing revolts and his Zand and Qājār rivals. His approach to social, religious and philosophical minorities was not as tolerant as Karīm Khān's. He was not a humane ruler and was intolerant of religious minorities, ordering the plundering of the Church of Julfā from which he took the gold for use in minting his own coins.¹⁸⁹

The historical narratives about his relationship with Ni'matullāhīs indicate that it underwent different stages. ʿAlī Murād Khān supported the Ni'matullāhīs at the beginning of his rule.¹⁹⁰ Nevertheless, since the wandering dervishes showed no respect for the Zand rulers, he eventually turned against all Sufis. ʿAlī Murād Khān's reaction to the wandering dervishes affected all other Sufis.¹⁹¹ He ordered that the ears of Maʿṣūm ʿAlī Shāh and Nūr ʿAlī Shāh should be cut off and banished them from Isfahan. (A detailed account of this incident is in the following chapter.) He died in the year 1199/1785.

It was at the end of the reign of the Zands and beginning of that of the Qājārs that Shi'ite scholars became seriously alarmed about the Sufis, whom they viewed as a serious rival religious movement. The revival movement of Uṣūlī scholars took place in this era. Shi'ite seminary schools were divided into two schools: Uṣūlism and Akhbārism. The roles of Akhbārī scholars were less authoritative. On the other hand, Uṣūlī scholars considered themselves to be deputies of the Imām with more of an authoritative role towards every aspect of the lives of the Shi'ite community. The Uṣūlī scholars had faced a bitter loss of power after the Safavid era, and so fought intensely to regain their power and would not tolerate any rival theological or mystical schools. As Joanna De Groot pointed out, 'By the end of the century [during Afsharid and Zand rule], twelver ulama were consolidating an orthodoxy that buttressed the arguments for the authority of *mujtaheds* with clearer opposition to rival tendencies.'¹⁹²

The Uṣūlī scholars during the Zand period had lost the financial support of the government and so had little authority among society's govern-

ing class. As a result, the ulama entered the economic market. The chronic weakness of the state was a powerful incentive for the ulama to venture into trade, agriculture, moneylending and property speculation.¹⁹³ Even though Uṣūlī jurists such as Āqā Muḥammad ‘Alī Bihbahānī and other Shi‘ite clerics put a lot of effort into suppressing Sufism, specifically the Ni‘matullāhī order, during the end of the Zand and beginning of the Qājār period, Sufism flourished due to the revivalist movement led by the Ni‘matullāhī masters who migrated back from India to Persia.¹⁹⁴

The Jurist-Sufi Conflict in Qājār Iran: Āqā Muḥammad Khān (r. 1195-1211/1782-1798)

The founder of the Qājār dynasty, Āqā Muḥammad Khān Qājār (d. 1211/1797), was the most powerful enemy of Karīm Khān and chief of the Qājār tribe.¹⁹⁵ Following the reign of the Zands, Āqā Muḥammad Khān became king of Persia when the country faced disunity, conflict with neighbouring countries and civil war. For most of his life he had to negotiate with enemies and engage in wars with neighbouring countries.¹⁹⁶ He had had close contact and meetings with the Ni‘matullāhīs¹⁹⁷ during the time he had been imprisoned by Karīm Khān in Shiraz, and thus became sympathetic towards them. Mast ‘Alī Shāh stated that long before the reign of the Qājār dynasty, the Qājārs had had a good relationship with Sufis.¹⁹⁸

It was during these chaotic years that the Shi‘ite clerics had the opportunity to consolidate their power without reliance on the royal court. In the late 18th century, as the Qājārs wanted to control Persia, Shi‘ite Uṣūlī clerics waged their bloodiest movement against other Shi‘ite scholars whom they accused of holding heretical beliefs. The two major victims of this movement were their old enemies: the Akhbārī scholars and the Shi‘ite Sufis.¹⁹⁹

During the initial years of the formation of the Qājār dynasty, the Shi‘ite clerics of the Uṣūlī School consolidated their power and suppressed the rival school of Akhbārism. Waḥīd Bihbahānī, known as the reviver of the Uṣūlī School, was mainly responsible for the suppression. His son, Āqā Muḥammad ‘Alī, continued his father’s career of intolerance and succeeded in suppressing the other movement rivalling Uṣūlism, that is to say, Sufism, and thus gained the title of ‘Sufi-killer’.²⁰⁰

These persecutions of Sufism forced Sufi masters to conceal their beliefs to safeguard themselves from complete annihilation by the Uṣūlī scholars. Despite this clerical hostility different parts of the Qājār state witnessed

a revival of Sufism. During the reign of Fath 'Alī Shāh (r. 1212-1250/1797-1834), the Uṣūlī Shi'ite clerics who viewed Sufis as dangerous rivals to their authority became influential in the government. One such influential figure was the aforementioned scholar, Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī, who was the champion of the anti-Sufi movement.

These clerics were alarmed about the danger that Sufism posed to their authority. They also knew that some of the Qājār princes had sympathy for Sufis, and were aware that some Sufi masters such as Rawnaq 'Alī Shāh (d. 1225/1810) did not hesitate to criticise them.²⁰¹ According to Rawnaq, the Uṣūlī scholars did not have any legitimate spiritual permission from the Imām to guide the masses, nor were they his deputies.²⁰² Shi'ite clerics were more often than not victorious in these quarrels, which usually ended in the banishment, flogging or execution of the Sufis. Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh was thus, for example, executed by Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī, an episode that will be explored in detail in the next chapter.

Fath 'Alī Shāh, the second Qājār monarch, is known to have been a religious man, interested in following those exoteric Islamic laws which provided religious legitimacy for the Qājār dynasty. As Kamran Aghaie indicates, 'Like the Safavids before them, the Qājārs used Shī'ī religious symbols and rituals to promote their legitimacy.'²⁰³ These efforts by Fath 'Alī Shāh created a mutually beneficial relationship between the Shi'ite clerics and the monarch. In fact, it is said that Fath 'Alī Shāh used to say that he was the deputy of Shi'ite clerics. As Amir Arjomand observes, 'Fath 'Alī Shāh showed his gratitude for the clerical support of the new dynasty with deference, stating "our rulership is on behalf (*bi-nīyābat*) of the *mujtahids* of the age".'²⁰⁴

Many Shi'ite scholars emphasised the religious role of the king, with some believing the monarch to be the deputy of the twelfth Imām. The ulama believed their seminary studies qualified them to be the best interpreters of the tradition of the Shi'ite Imāms and gave them spiritual authority from the Hidden Imām as the living guides for society.²⁰⁵ In this capacity, they also collected religious taxes and alms as representatives of the Imām. Therefore, they became financially powerful and limited the role of the king.

Shi'ite scholars successfully influenced Fath 'Alī Shāh and convinced him to embrace their animosity towards the Sufis. As Abbas Amanat declares, 'Despite their great though ephemeral popularity, the Sufis were losing ground to the ulama, who under Fath 'Alī Shāh (1797-1834) enjoyed even greater support. Fath 'Alī Shāh's attitude toward Sufis was one of reticence and suspicion, which no doubt contributed to the increasing hostility of the ulama and was reflected in their numerous anti-Sufi refutations.'²⁰⁶ Some

of these clerics, such as Āqa Muḥammad ‘Alī Bihbahānī and Mullā Aḥmad Narāqī, wrote poetry and treatises in refutation of Sufism. These scholars tried to maintain a friendly relationship with the Qājār king because they were concerned that the Sufis would penetrate into the Qājār court, thereby directly challenging their authority. This behaviour ended in the suppression of both Sufism and all other Shi‘ite schools of thought. They practised excommunication, as Joanna de Groot narrates:

One expression of professional identity was the expanded use of ‘orthodox’ *mujtaheds*’ exercise of *takfīr* — the act of declaring opponents *kāfir*/infidel or heretical. These powers were used against *Sufis* in Kirmān in the 1790s, Kirmānshah in the early 1800s, in Gilan in 1819–20 and Tehran in the reigns of Fath ‘Alī Shah (1797–1834) and the pro-*Sufi* Muḥammad Shah (1834–48). While this did not eliminate Sufi interests and beliefs, it sharpened ideas or boundaries of orthodoxy and the *‘ulama*’s power to establish them.²⁰⁷

In this context, Mast ‘Alī Shāh quoted a wise man, without mentioning his name, who laconically opined that one can summarise Shi‘ite beliefs as the damnation of all other Muslims.²⁰⁸ Mast ‘Alī Shāh indicated that Uṣūlī scholars believed that all other followers of the Prophet Muḥammad besides themselves, meaning all the Islamic groups and Shi‘ite groups other than the Uṣūlī school of law, were debauchees (*fāsiq*) and infidels. They also believed that they were the only true heirs of the Prophet Muḥammad.²⁰⁹ As Mangol Bayat says:

The bitter Akhbari-Usuli controversy that dominated Twelver Shia circles in the seventeenth, eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries must be viewed as a reaction to the power acquired by the mujtahids. Some leading Sufi masters and theosophers also strongly resented the mujtahids’ dominance of the Shia intellectual scene, and objected to the limitations imposed by the official Usuli determination of Shia doctrines. Some of them echoed the Akhbaris in charging the mujtahids with literalism and a narrow-minded interpretation of the holy text.²¹⁰

As will be discussed in detail, in certain cases Ni‘matullāhī masters echoed Akhbārī views on certain issues such as *taqlīd* (imitation) and challenged the authority of the *mujtahids*. Mast ‘Alī Shāh is among those Sufi masters who always complained about exclusivist Uṣūlī views.

Mast 'Alī Shāh remarked about the Uṣūlī clerics of his time, 'The majority of the scholars in that city [Karbalā] are Uṣūlī and people imitate them. All of them are enemies of Sufis and Akhbārī Shi'ites. They follow the path of taunting and damnation toward these two groups or any other Muslim group. [Their enmity is to the extent] that they would annihilate anyone who belongs to one of these two groups in Karbalā.'²¹¹ Even a conservative seminary scholar and Sufi like Ḥusayn 'Alī Shāh (d. 1234/1818) was not protected from persecution.²¹² As mentioned earlier, the Uṣūlī scholars were intolerant towards any Shi'ite scholars who had mystical tendencies. Mullā 'Abd al-Ṣamad Hamadānī is among those few seminary scholars who became disciples of the Ni'matullāhī masters. However, he was persecuted by the other seminary scholars after his initiation into the Ni'matullāhī order.²¹³

Most of the wandering dervishes and *Khāksār* Sufis (known as Jalālīs) during the Qājār era traced themselves back to Ghulām 'Alī Shāh Hindi (Indian), for whom there exists no biography or dates. It is clear that he was of Indian origin and inheritor of the Indian Qalandari culture.²¹⁴ Shi'ite Sufis like Mast 'Alī Shāh vituperated the antinomian behaviour of Qalandars in an effort to clarify their own respect for and belief in Islamic laws.²¹⁵ The masters of the organised Sufi orders were well aware of the accusation of jurists about the libertinism of all Sufis.

Ghuluww (religious excess and exaggeration) about the Shi'ite Imāms was another accusation made by Shi'ite scholars to refute those Sufis who were Shi'ites. However, masters like Mast 'Alī Shāh responded by claiming that extremism had always been a part of Uṣūlī Shi'ism and not Sufism.²¹⁶ However, Uṣūlī clerics deliberately made generalisations that all Sufis practised *Ghuluww* and condemned them as heretics.

As mentioned above, Āqā Muḥammad Bāqir Bihbahānī (118-1205/1706-1790) is recognised as the founder of the modern Uṣūlī school, and his views led to its triumph²¹⁷ and the imposition of absolute religious authority on society.²¹⁸ Bihbahānī and his disciples developed the Uṣūlī school into a methodological theory for the emerging body of the mujtahids trained in the 'Atabāt (the holy cities of Najaf and Karbalā in Iraq) madrasas. His efforts resulted in consolidation of the power of *ijtihād*, which became restricted to them alone, the so-called mujtahids.²¹⁹ Besides the theological disputes between Uṣūlīs and Akhbārīs, Bihbahānī often resorted to physical violence to enforce his views.²²⁰

Bihbahānī had his own executioners (*mīr ghazab*) to persecute his rival Akhbārī scholars and later on his son, Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī, followed a similar path in relation to the Sufis.²²¹ The final blow to the Akhbārī School was

accomplished at the end of the 18th century at the hands of Āqā Muḥammad Bāqir Bihbahānī and his son, Āqā Muḥammad ‘Alī Bihbahānī, known as the ‘Sufi-killer’.

Āqā Muḥammad ‘Alī Bihbahānī (the eldest son of Baqir Bihbahānī)²²² became a well-known scholar, largely due to his zealous campaign against Sufism. In a brief fatwa issued on the question of the Ni‘matullāhīs’ activities he declared, ‘Beyond any doubt, the deviation of this damned group from the path of rightfulness and true guidance, and their efforts to provoke discontent and to corrupt people of the cities, have become obvious and apparent.’²²³ Bihbahānī bluntly declared, ‘The responsibility [for] such acts [punishment of the Sufis] falls only within the jurisdiction of the ‘*ulamā*’ and the executioners of the holy law.’²²⁴ The powerful minister, Hājji Ibrāhīm Khān I‘timād al-Dawla (d. 1216/ 1801), arrested two Ni‘matullāhīs and sent them to Kirmānshāh, stating, ‘We send them . . . to be delivered over to you [Āqā Muḥammad ‘Alī Bihbahānī], whom we consider as wisest, the most learned, the most virtuous of all the oulāmāhs [‘*ulama*’] of our kingdom. Put them to death, confine them, or punish them in the way you deem most proper and most consonant to the decrees of the holy religion.’²²⁵ Mast ‘Alī Shāh remarked that the enmity of Ibrāhīm Khān, ruler of Kirmān, and other rulers towards Sufis was due to their overwhelming ignorance (*jahl-i murakkab*) and prejudice (*ta‘āṣsub*). The governor of Kirmānshāh, Muṣṭafā Qulī Khān Zanginih, thus supported Āqā Muḥammad ‘Alī Bihbahānī in the execution of Ma‘ṣūm ‘Alī Shāh.²²⁶

Mast ‘Alī Shāh maintained that Āqā Muḥammad ‘Alī Bihbahānī was second only to Mullā ‘Abd Allāh Kirmānī for murdering Sufi masters during this period,²²⁷ although the former was more active in propagating the execution of Sufis in Persia. In certain cases, he used his powerful connections to capture Sufi masters such as Ma‘ṣūm ‘Alī Shāh and Muẓaffār ‘Alī Shāh (d. 1215/1800).²²⁸ From his letters to the Qājār rulers such as Faṭḥ ‘Alī Shāh, it is clear that he had a good relationship with the ruling class of Persia.²²⁹

The two-volume treatise written by Āqā Muḥammad ‘Alī Bihbahānī in 1796 and entitled *Risāla-yi Khayrātīyya* constituted the harshest refutation of Sufism penned during this era and is still quoted by bigoted anti-Sufi Shi‘ite mullahs in modern-day Iran.²³⁰ Mast ‘Alī Shāh complained that the Shi‘ite scholars did not see any problem with accusing other Muslims, even if their accusations were not true, justifying their bigotry by a tradition from Imām Naqī to the effect that Shi‘ites are supposedly permitted to slander Sufis. Bihbahānī in his *Khayrātīyya* everywhere resorts to this technique of pious blanket slander of his Sufi opponents.²³¹

Bihbahānī was apprehensive about the popularity of Nūr 'Alī Shāh, Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh, Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh and Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh, calling them 'the beasts of the path' or 'the wolves attacking the lambs of Islam,' in particular fiercely criticising Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh for his 'corrupt' beliefs.²³² He accused them all of 'misguiding' the public and of 'undermining the rules of the applied *sharī'a*'. He also condemned Sufis for being tolerant towards other religions.²³³ In a couple of places in his treatise, Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī calls Ma'sūm a *Chūkī* (yogi), connecting Ma'sūm to 'heretical' Hindus and Indian Sufis.²³⁴

He sent letters to Shi'ite scholars and governors warning them about the dangers of the Sufi movement in Persia. He did not mind at all using force to physically suppress the Sufis. He described in detail his own view about the formation of Sufism as being an innovation in religion,²³⁵ and referred to the traditions of the Shi'ite Imāms in the refutation of Sufis and Sufism.²³⁶ He tried to demonstrate that Sufi masters were careless about observing Islamic laws (*sharī'a*)²³⁷ and permitted what should have been prohibited by Divine Law.²³⁸ His treatise has two main chapters: one on the erroneous beliefs of Sufis and the other on the infidelity of Sufis.²³⁹ The subtitles in reference to Sufi masters give an indication of the sort of poisonous jargon and vituperative tone of the work: '[c]iting some of the nonsensical beliefs of Sufis such as Ibn 'Arabī and others'.²⁴⁰ The greater part of this book is dedicated to biographies and explanations of Sufi masters' lives, but the tone of the work reflects the author's conceited bigotry and intolerance. Being pervaded by foul language and insults towards Sufi masters and Sufism in general, any dignity which he may have had as a scholar is lost, so that his work sinks to the basest level of personal polemic. Despite Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī's knowledge of poetry, his poems against Sufism are trite and superficial. His son, Āqā Muḥammad Ja'far Āl-i Āqā (d. 1259/ 1843), followed his father's path by writing a book in refutation of Sufism, which is almost a complete copy of his father's treatise.²⁴¹

Another well-known opponent of the Sufis was Mullā 'Abd Allāh Kirmānī, who lived through the end of the Zand and beginning of the Qājār eras and was an influential cleric among the people of Kirmān. Although there are no accounts of his life in the well-known biographical books of Shi'ite scholars such as *Qīṣaṣ al-'ulamā'*, Mast 'Alī Shāh states that he was the first seminary scholar who dared to order the murder of Sufi masters in Persia.²⁴² Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh even predicted that he would be killed by Mullā 'Abd Allāh Kirmānī, who in fact issued the death sentence on Mushtāq in 1206/1792.²⁴³

Mīrzā Abū al-Qāsim Jāpulqī, known as Mīrzāy-i Qumī²⁴⁴ (d. 1231/1816), also wrote a treatise in refutation of Sufism. He was a contemporary of Majdhūb ‘Alī Shāh, and accordingly there will be a detailed explanation of this treatise in the chapter on Majdhūb. From the correspondence between Qumī and Fath ‘Alī Shāh it is clear that they had a friendly relationship. Royal princes and courtiers had a lot of respect for Qumī.²⁴⁵ Qumī was always anxious to prevent the penetration of Sufis into the king’s court.²⁴⁶ He maintained that the path of Sufism did not conform to the divine law of Shi‘ism.²⁴⁷

Conclusion

The animosity of Shi‘ite scholars in general and Uṣūlī clerics in particular towards Sufism during the 18th and 19th centuries has been a prominent feature in the social and religious history of early Persia over the past 300 years. There were apogee points of the persecution of Sufism during this period. After the formalisation of the Shi‘ite seminary sciences at the end of the Safavid era, the inquisition of Sufism led by Shi‘ite scholars was championed by Majlisī Junior in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. His polemics succeeded in causing the emigration of all the Sufi orders from Persia. During the Afshār and Zand eras, the power of the Shi‘ite clerics waned, and Persia experienced political instasbility, providing an opportunity for Sufi masters to revive their spiritual doctrines and practices in the main towns of Persia.

However, at the end of the Zand dynasty and at the beginning of the reign of the Qājārs, Uṣūlī scholars consolidated their power and started to persecute the Sufis again. The champion of this second inquisition of Sufism was Āqā Muḥammad ‘Alī Bihbahānī. Sufis were the indirect victims of the libertinism of the Qalandars and wandering dervishes, whose lack of observance of Islamic laws was used by the Shi‘ite scholars as a reason to refute all Sufis. They were also direct victims of their main rivals, the formalist Uṣūlī Shi‘ite clerics, who were extremely zealous in maintaining their social and religious authority over the populace at all costs. As a result, it became customary for most Persians to be against Sufism. Rejection of Sufism was no longer just a religious act but became a prestigious and fashionable intellectual position for elites and men of learning to hold, a position which is still largely maintained by intellectuals in contemporary Iranian society today.²⁴⁸

The seminary scholars were thus largely successful in their campaign to marginalise Sufis and Sufi masters from the greater society of Persia.²⁴⁹ Mast 'Alī Shāh confessed that the majority of the Persian people were against Sufism due to the power of the Uṣūlī clerics over the masses.²⁵⁰ In his chapter about Isfahan, Mast 'Alī Shāh stated that although many Sufi masters came from that city, during his own time the majority of the people were against Sufis. He commented as well that:

The general tradition of Persians is that whoever talks about self-mortification, spiritual striving, improvement of morals, and disciplining the carnal soul or follows the path of perfection of the soul, actualization of the spiritual path, purification of the heart, and refinement of the soul, and whoever mentions the term 'Sufi Path' (*tarīqat*), or 'Divine Reality' (*ḥaqīqat*), or the tradition of gnosis, or follows the path of asceticism, piety, submission, acceptance, poverty, and annihilation is to be declared an infidel and heretic without any proof or evidence.²⁵¹

It is undeniable that the clique of anti-Sufi mujtahids delivered a strong blow to both the survival and the revival of the Sufi orders in Persia, especially to the Ni'matullāhī order during the Zand and Qājār periods. But unlike in the Safavid era, the Ni'matullāhīs did not emigrate from Persia during the Qājār period, but rather made superficial changes in their appearance and practices in order to adapt to the oppressive anti-mystical milieu that surrounded them. After Riḍā 'Alī Shāh passed away, many of the later Ni'matullāhī masters adopted the wearing of the garments of Shi'ite scholars and decreased their emphasis on Sufi practices that might draw public attention to them. As an example, silent *dhikr* replaced the practice of loud *dhikr* sessions. This tactic of dissimulation made them less vulnerable to persecution by Shi'ite scholars who opposed them.²⁵²

The Ni‘matullāhī Order from Ma‘šūm ‘Alī Shāh to Muẓaffar ‘Alī Shāh

Introduction

After a period of social turmoil in Persia under the Safavids during the 16th and 17th centuries, and the ensuing religious inquisition against Sufis, Sufism was almost completely suppressed; only a few Nūrbakhshī masters in Mashhad and Dhahabīs in Shiraz remained. In the 16th century the Ni‘matullāhī masters of Persia had immigrated to the Deccan plateau in India. As Amanat states, ‘By the end of the seventeenth century the Ni‘matullāhīs, Nuqṭavīs, Ḥurūfīs, and Sufi ghulāt had been systemically persecuted and removed from the political scene.’¹ As a result, and as noted above, there was an intermission in Sufi activity in Persia that lasted until the Zand era.² As Mast ‘Alī Shāh stated, ‘From the middle of Shāh Sulṭān Ḥusayn’s era to the end of Karīm Khān’s, the tradition of Sufism was abolished in Iran.’³ He continued, ‘For approximately sixty years, Iran was devoid of Sufi doctrines and the subtleties of certitude and no one’s ear heard the name of the spiritual path (*ṭarīqat*) and no one’s eye saw a person of the spiritual path (*ahl-i ṭarīqat*).’⁴

The religious system of society during the Zand and Qājār periods was inherited from the Safavids and was based exclusively on the exoteric aspects of religion. This belief system gave all power to Shi‘ite Uṣūlī scholars. For this reason, only conservative Sufi orders that simultaneously addressed both the exoteric religious and the esoteric spiritual needs of the people could play any open role in Persian society. The Ni‘matullāhīs and Dhahabīs were the two major Sufi orders involved in the intellectual and spiritual revival of Sufism during this period. The instability of the political leadership also opened up the opportunity for charismatic Sufi masters to enter Persia and propagate their beliefs. As Foltz observes, ‘With the weakening and instability of government, however, came a resurgence of

charismatic leadership from among the Sufi brotherhoods, particularly the Ni'matollahis and the Nurbakhshis whose esoteric teachings held sway over a large number of the general population.⁵

All the three main Sufi orders (Ni'matullāhī, Dhahabī and Nūrbakhshī) already had their followers scattered around Persia, and indeed Sufism, contrary to Mast 'Alī Shāh's assertion above, had not been completely eradicated. However, the Sufis had remained dormant underground until the advent of the revival movement. Amanat points out that '[t]he most outstanding example of this revival can be seen in the activities of the Ni'matullāhī emissaries, who by the second half of the eighteenth century had attracted a large audience in the southern and central provinces.⁶ One of the most crucial acts in the Ni'matullāhīs' revival movement was the centralisation of the leadership around a few of the charismatic Ni'matullāhī masters. Of necessity, these charismatic leaders were aware of the persecution of Sufis by their clerical foes.

Riḍā 'Alī Shāh (d. 1214/1799) was the last known master of the Ni'matullāhī order in India. Some of the hagiographers of the order believe that he was of Persian descent, but his ancestors had lived long enough in India to be called Deccani.⁷ He had not attended any religious seminary schools. He was an ardent Shī'ite and had good relationships with both Muslims and non-Muslims.⁸ Living in Indian society during a relatively calm period made him more tolerant towards other religious groups. He felt the need to dispatch some of his disciples to Persia to provide guidance to the remnants of the Ni'matullāhī order there,⁹ especially after he received complaints from those who sought guidance on the Sufi path but could not find any Ni'matullāhī masters. It has been said that, once in Persia, a sayyid kept seeking to enter the Ni'matullāhī path but, after searching far and wide, could not find a master and therefore went to the Deccan. In the Deccan, he complained to Riḍā 'Alī Shāh which resulted in him deciding to send a deputy to Iran.¹⁰ It was in 1184/1770 that Riḍā 'Alī Shāh Deccanī appointed Mīr 'Abd al-Ḥamīd with the spiritual title of Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh to propagate the spiritual teachings of the Ni'matullāhī order in Persia.¹¹ Mast 'Alī Shāh claims that Riḍā 'Alī Shāh was the main reason the people of Persia heard about Sufism and were able to meet people of the spiritual path.¹² To a certain extent this statement is accurate, yet Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh himself played the main role in the return to Persia of the Ni'matullāhī order, which soon became one of the most important Sufi orders there. Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh (Riḍā 'Alī Shāh's spiritual deputy) played the crucial role in the revival of the order and trained all the influential masters on whom the continuance of

this movement heavily relied. Numerous scholars and poets belonging to the Ni‘matullāhī order were originally initiated under his guidance.¹³

The Ni‘matullāhī Persian Sufi Order and Ma‘šūm ‘Alī Shāh

Ma‘šūm ‘Alī Shāh was born in Ḥaydarābād (modern-day Hyderabad) in the Deccan.¹⁴ Īzadgushasb’s *Shams al-tawārīkh* is one of the few texts in which Ma‘šūm’s birth date is mentioned, and in it the author gives it as being the year 1147/1734.¹⁵ Ma‘šūm ‘Alī Shāh had come from a noble Muslim family who were sayyids.¹⁶ Mast ‘Alī Shāh said, ‘He was from a family of wealth and honorable lineage.’¹⁷ It is narrated that he rode a horse, moving through the streets like a prince, and 80 people used to accompany him holding gold and silver staves, as was the tradition in wealthy Indian families.¹⁸ Despite all this wealth, he was not satisfied and his inner desire for spiritual truth led him to seek a spiritual guide. Eventually, he met Riḏā ‘Alī Shāh and became his disciple. A day after his initiation he gave up all his wealth to the poor and needy.¹⁹ The account of Ma‘šūm’s admission to the *khānaqāh* of Riḏā ‘Alī Shāh gives a good picture of the dominant culture of asceticism among the Ni‘matullāhīs. Ma‘šūm, being among those Sufis who reached the highest state of spirituality in the order, is a guiding model for other wayfarers on this path, as is narrated in *Janāt al-Wiṣāl* (a compendium written by Nūr ‘Alī Shāh (d. 1212/1797) and completed by two other Ni‘matullāhī masters):

He said to himself, ‘The king has told me
If you want admission you must come alone;
Truly, I am accompanied by much worldly wealth-
How can I be alone with all these possessions?’...
So all that our hero owned
He gave away amongst his friends
And of all his wealth kept not even enough
To carry a gift to his sovereign lord...
Along the road, on his way to the khānaqāh,
He found some camel dung,²⁰
And, having nothing else, took it with him
As an offering to that incomparable one.²¹

Under Riḏā ‘Alī Shāh’s guidance, Ma‘šūm became qualified to be a spiritual guide (*murshid*), resulting in Riḏā ‘Alī Shāh bestowing the Sufi cloak

(*khirqa*) on him, qualifying him to tread the Sufi Path and initiate others into its mysteries.²² Riḍā 'Alī Shāh then appointed Ma'sūm to go to Persia and guide the seekers of spiritual truth on to the path of Imām Riḍā.²³

During Ma'sūm's life in Persia the masters of the Ni'matullāhī order adopted the life of wandering Qalandars. They wandered around and did not have any profession or work. As Pourjavady mentioned, they were supported by the endowments of their wealthy disciples. They did not deny the fact that they had no income or jobs. As Riḍā 'Alī Harātī (d. 1211/1796), one of Ma'sūm's disciples, said:

My idleness is busyness and all my business is idle;
I have no job — I am unemployed — and I dance.²⁴

The path of Sufism as propagated by Ma'sūm was an ecstatic path oriented towards intoxication (*sukr*) rather than Sufism of the school of sobriety (*ṣaḥw*). Ma'sūm and his disciples conducted themselves with enthusiasm and fervour.²⁵

Mast 'Alī Shāh says that around the year 1190/1776, Ma'sūm and his wife went to Shiraz via the sea route,²⁶ although 'Abd al-Rafī' Ḥaḳīqat relates that a different route by way of Afghanistan was taken for Ma'sūm's entrance to Persia. From Afghanistan he went to Mashhad in Khurāsān, and from there he went to the holy shrines of the Shi'ite Imāms in Iraq. Finally, he went to Shiraz where he took up his Sufi teaching work.²⁷

Shiraz and Karīm Khān Zand

Shiraz, which was ruled by Karīm Khān (r. 1164-1193/1751-1779), was known to be more socially and politically stable than many other areas of Persia. Karīm Khān was able to improve the trade routes, as a result of which communication with other trading cities became easier. This brought relative prosperity to Shiraz. Therefore, lots of wandering Indian dervishes started to migrate to the prosperous cities of Persia.²⁸ Some scholars believe that Karīm Khān's system of governing people was based on a tribal and fatherly manner.²⁹ He was not particularly religious and was known for his tolerance and forbearance. Malcolm indicated that during Karīm Khān's reign Ma'sūm arrived in Shiraz, where he soon gained fame by having more than 30,000 followers.³⁰ Most probably Malcolm overestimated the number of initiates, though the figure does represent the popularity of Ma'sūm among the people of Shiraz.³¹ Abbas Amanat believes that Ma'sūm gathered round him a small number of disci-

ples who were very active in propagating Ni'matullāhī beliefs.³² Ma'sūm's charisma attracted a growing number of disciples in Shiraz, among whom were Mullā 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Ṭabasī Fayḍ 'Alī Shāh (d. 1200/1786),³³ his son Mullā Muḥammad 'Alī Nūr 'Alī Shāh (d. 1212/1797),³⁴ and Mullā Mahdī Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh (d. 1206/1792) who were initiated into the order during this period.³⁵

Nūr 'Alī Shāh's description of his first encounter with Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh is a good depiction of the Sufi path of love. Whether or not it is a true story, it represents the beliefs and the mentality of the Ni'matullāhī masters during that era. While Nūr 'Alī Shāh was wandering around the city of Shiraz, he met a sayyid (Ma'sūm) at whom children were throwing stones at the instigation of some Shi'ite scholars. In response, Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh did not lament, but sang a poem:

Children's stones have turned
My head into a tulip bed
Ah, it's springtime
And madness reblossoms.³⁶

He viewed this attack in a poetic manner. The stones were viewed as rain, which is a blessing that ends in the blossoming of flowers, and so he did not exhibit any protest.

The majority of Persians viewed Sufis as libertine dervishes who smoked hashish and did not bother seriously to follow shariah. For instance, Rustam al-Ḥukamā', a well-known historian of the time, talked about Dervish Bayraki (*Darwīsh Bayrākī*) and mentioned that dervishes smoked opium and received offerings from people.³⁷ On some occasions dervishes were very arrogant regarding warning the rulers and kings and were known to take the side of the people in their opposition to the king. A good example is the account of Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī (1134-1186/1722-1773) who lived during the era of Nādir Shāh's and ruled Afghanistan. Once when he decided to attack Khurāsān, a dervish came to him and started to insult the king in order to dissuade him since his decision would end in the massacre of people.³⁸

Another challenge to the state was the quasi-Mahdist beliefs of the Sufis and their masters.³⁹ These beliefs of certain masters had a very strong influence and authority over their disciples. The ultimate spiritual authority of a master could sometimes present a challenge to the authority of a sovereign. As a result, they were not always favoured by the kings.

The ethical uprightness, courtesy, friendliness and humility of the Sufis towards the common people greatly facilitated their public fame. Ma'sūm

became popular among the masses and Ni'matullāhī doctrines, which were steeped in the Shi'ite spiritual tradition, became popular, while emphasizing spiritual matters of religion. They focused on the interior contemplative disciplines of Sufism but, unlike Qalandars, they did not reject the exoteric rituals and laws of Islam. Consequently, the Sufis came to represent a middle path between the extremes of antinomian libertinism and philistine religious formalism. It has been said that once one of Shāh Ni'matullāh's disciples asked him whether an authority was needed for his disciples to administer their following of exoteric Islamic laws (*shar'ā*). Shāh Ni'matullāh replied, 'The Ni'matullāhī libertines (*rindān-i Ni'matullāhī*) do not need a magistrate (*dārūgha*).'⁴⁰ In another incident, a person taunted Shāh Ni'matullāh, stating that those who committed sins were not worthy of being his disciples. Ni'matullāh replied, 'How can they be worthy enough to be a slave of God and the people of the Prophet Muḥammad, but not a disciple of poor Ni'matullāh?'⁴¹ Basically, the spiritual doctrines of the Ni'matullāhī order were based on a moderate way of following the exoteric aspects of Islam while focusing on the esoteric aspects, which made this order quite popular, being suitable for the modest needs of the common people.

This popularity led to the jealousy and opposition of Shi'ite Uṣūlī scholars, who were always looking to undermine the position of the Sufis.⁴² These clerics were cognizant of the fact that Karīm Khān was suspicious of any quasi-Mahdist beliefs and that he had his own peculiar understanding of the anti-Christ (*dajjāl*). Karīm Khān had stated that he did not believe in the traditions (*akhbār*) about the anti-Christ narrated by the ulama but had his own belief that the anti-Christ would be a person who claimed to be the divine manifestation and would be accompanied by many magicians and hashish smokers.⁴³ Basing themselves on the vulgar social parody of Sufis as all being hashish-smoking wandering vagabonds, it proved easy to manipulate Karīm Khān's mind and persuade him that Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh and his disciples really espoused corrupt, deviant and dangerous beliefs that were a serious threat to the religious standards of Persian society. Besides the Sufis' 'heretical' beliefs, the clerics added that they also claimed kingship by adding the title of shāh to their spiritual titles, which was also a threat to Karīm Khān.⁴⁴ These insinuations offended Karīm Khān enough to cause his relationship with the Ni'matullāhīs to deteriorate⁴⁵ and ultimately caused him to banish Ma'sūm and his disciples from Shiraz.⁴⁶

The fact that previously dispersed and fragmented Sufis were now cohesively reuniting and effectively reconstituting their orders after several centuries of exile and suppression (the foremost example of which was the

Ni'matullāhī revival movement) came to be viewed as a real threat to both the Shi'ite clerical establishment and the state. As mentioned earlier, Sufi orders were scarce in Persia and only a few Sufi masters had been living in Mashhad and Shiraz. However, the population of wandering dervishes was considerable, and their revival and unification under the banner of the Ni'matullāhī order presented a real challenge to the state and also to the authority of the ulama.

Mast 'Alī Shāh believed that it was not Shi'ite scholars who persuaded Karīm Khān to banish Ma'sūm, but Jānī Hindūzādih, to whom Ma'sūm refused to teach the knowledge of alchemy.⁴⁷ Jānī is known to have been a Sufi: a wandering dervish with strong ties to Khān's court. A number of hagiographical biographies of Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh state that six months after this banishment Karīm Khān died, suggesting that this was divine punishment for his persecution of the mystics.⁴⁸

Isfahan and 'Alī Murād Khān

Due to Karīm Khān's decision, Ma'sūm relocated to Isfahan where Fayḍ 'Alī Shāh became one of his most important disciples. Fayḍ was appointed the spiritual guide of seekers.⁴⁹ At the time 'Alī Murād Khān was the ruler of Isfahan. He favoured Sufis and built a tekke⁵⁰ for the Ni'matullāhīs called *takīyya-i Fayḍ*, named after Fayḍ 'Alī Shāh. Nūr 'Alī Shāh succeeded his father (Fayḍ 'Alī Shāh) after his death, and became famous among the



Shrine of Fayḍ 'Alī Shāh in Takht fūlād of Isfahan. (Photo by Ḥasan Roholamīn)

people of his time.⁵¹ The number of Ma'sūm's disciples had increased in Isfahan, a fact which in turn increased the suspicion of the Shi'ite scholars and they consequently warned 'Alī Murād Khān that the heretical beliefs of Sufis could bring about the end of his reign.⁵² Another account indicates that while 'Alī Murād Khān escaped Isfahan because of the Qājār threats to capture the city, some of the wandering dervishes (*darwīshān-i kuchih gard-i jalālī*) blew their trumpets, which was indicative of their rejoicing at his troubles.⁵³ This event of rejoicing led to 'Alī Murād Khān harbouring feelings of hatred towards the Ni'matullāhīs.⁵⁴ Javād Nūrbakhsh states that 'Alī Murād Khān felt offended by Fayḍ's behaviour, which led to his hatred of Sufis.⁵⁵ Abbas Amanat's view is that the Ni'matullāhīs had a secret relationship with Āqā Muḥammad Qājār, and when 'Alī Murād Khān left the city he found out about this relationship and subsequently banished them from the city.⁵⁶

Eventually, as Aḥmad Dīwānbaygī notes, the Shi'ite scholars of Isfahan motivated Rustam Khān ('Alī Murād Khān's commander) to plunder and demolish the Fayḍ tekke and banish Sufis from there. Rustam Khān and Aṣlān Khān ('Alī Murād Khān's second-in-command for this mission) were sent to cut off the ears of Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh and Nūr 'Alī Shāh in Mūrchiḥ Khurt near Isfahan as they fled the city. They also shaved the beards off these Sufi masters, which was a great insult and meant to deprive them of any spiritual legitimacy in the eyes of the populace.⁵⁷

Tehran, Kirmān, Mashhad and Hirāt

Some scholars state that Āqā Muḥammad Khān Qājār either had previously met Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh or was familiar with the basic tenets of the Sufi doctrine from the time of his incarceration in Shiraz.⁵⁸ Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh and Nūr 'Alī Shāh travelled to Tehran where Āqā Muḥammad Khān welcomed them and paid their travelling expenses to Mashhad.⁵⁹ According to Malcolm, Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh and Nūr 'Alī Shāh fled to Kirmān, where a Shi'ite scholar issued religious verdicts against them. Thus, Ma'sūm was forced to flee to Mashhad, but was refused admission.⁶⁰ Other traditions, though, indicate that they arrived in Mashhad but were expelled after a short time.⁶¹ Mast 'Alī Shāh also stated that Ma'sūm headed directly for Mashhad after his banishment from Isfahan. There, he was able to visit the shrine of the eighth Imām of the Shi'ites. From Mashhad he dismissed Nūr 'Alī Shāh, Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh, Rawnaq 'Alī Shāh, and Ḥusayn 'Alī Shāh and commanded them to return to their cities or anywhere else they were appointed to.⁶²

After leaving Mashhad, his next destination was Hirāt. There are two accounts of Ma'sūm's journey after entering Hirāt. Malcolm said that Ma'sūm went to Hirāt, desiring to go to Kabul and then India; however, the King of the Afghans compelled him to return to Persia.⁶³ Another source suggests that Ma'sūm had a dream about Riḍā 'Alī Shāh and, because at the time Ma'sūm 'Alī was so close to the city of his master, Riḍā 'Alī Shāh proposed that Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh should return to Persia, perhaps knowing that he was destined to martyr there.⁶⁴

Najaf, Karbalā and Kirmānshāh

During Ma'sūm's time, the Shi'ite holy cities of Najaf and Karbalā were places of refuge for Sufis. On his return from Afghanistan, Ma'sūm first stayed in Najaf briefly and then headed for Karbalā, where he was reunited with Nūr 'Alī Shāh, staying there for the next five years.⁶⁵ It was during this period that Majdhūb 'Alī Shāh initiated the following persons to the brotherhood: Mullā 'Abd al-Ṣamad Hamadānī (d. 1216/1802), Mullā Muḥammad Naṣīr Dārābī (d. 1226/1811) and Shaykh Zāhid Gilānī (d. 1222/1807). These persons were influential scholars in Shi'ite seminaries and but became a group of Sufi scholars who started the transformation of the Ni'matullāhī order and its doctrines into an intellectually solid and theosophically sophisticated movement, elaborating its philosophical beliefs based on seminary teachings.⁶⁶

Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh decided to go on another pilgrimage to Mashhad. But due to numerous invitations from his disciples from Kirmānshāh, he stayed in Kirmānshāh before travelling to Mashhad. In Kirmānshāh, Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī, a staunch follower of the Uṣūlī school and an active anti-Sufi scholar, became suspicious of Ma'sūm's presence in Kirmānshāh and arrested him.⁶⁷ Bihbahānī was supported by Ibrāhīm Khān I'timād al-Dawla, a minister, who was a strong supporter of Shi'ite jurists, to the extent that he defended the view that the Shi'ite jurists should act independently of the state when issuing jurisprudential verdicts, including verdicts of religious excommunication.⁶⁸ Aḥmad Dīwānbaygī states that Majdhūb 'Alī Shāh and his uncle Muḥammad Khān paid a considerable amount of money to a person to help Ma'sūm to escape, but Ma'sūm refused, claiming he was not guilty and therefore had no need to flee.⁶⁹

There are different accounts about Ma'sūm's martyrdom. One tradition narrates that he was murdered while performing a congressional prayer with his disciples. It is also reported that he was murdered in Bāgh-i 'Arsh in Kirmānshāh by Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī himself and buried there.

Yet another account suggests that Ma'ṣūm was drowned in the Qarasū river in 1212/1797.⁷⁰ Likewise, Nūr 'Alī Shāh, who was appointed the successor to Ma'ṣūm 'Alī, was not immune from religious persecution; he was banished and so departed for Karbalā and Mūṣil.⁷¹

Ma'ṣūm was said to have lived for about 60 years and reputed to be a charming man with brown skin and hair, who wore the garment of the Qalandar Sufis and kept his hair long.⁷² On his first encounter with him, Nūr 'Alī Shāh said he saw a sayyid clothed in rags (*jhindih pūsh*). He was known for being a quiet person who paid no attention to worldly matters,⁷³ which connected him to the Qalandari'ite way of life. When he received a gift it would immediately be distributed among the needy and his disciples.

From Popular Mysticism to Elitist Sufism

There are numerous sayings and traditions about Ma'ṣūm's life which confirm the view that he had adopted the Qalandari'ite way of life. Abbas Amanat calls Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh 'an Indian wandering dervish'.⁷⁴ As a result of several centuries of persecution of Sufism by the fundamentalist Shi'ite clerics, the people of Persia had become strangers to their own traditional mystical culture. Mystical philosophy had ceased to be popular among the general population or among the merchants and craftsmen of the bazaar, and there were very few seminary schools where one could find theosophers teaching mystical *ḥikmat*, much less anything related to *taṣawwuf*. The only way to meet Sufis was by meeting wandering dervishes who would beg for food or money as payment for a prayer or blessing. It was a popular way of being a dervish and attracted initiates and disciples who were more familiar with this type of Sufism than with its more sophisticated forms.

These wandering dervishes initially came from India. They were called *Qalandars* among the common people, although their beliefs may have differed from the classical Qalandari'ite beliefs. They were known for the performance of extraordinary acts such as fire eating. People had respect for them and would bring votive offerings to them. They were known as lone Sufis (*munfarid*) because they did not belong to any Sufi order. Most of these wandering dervishes were known as *darwīshān-i bī shar'* because they did not follow Islamic laws.⁷⁵ This type of dervishhood was culturally popular in all Persianate societies, including that of India. Their beliefs were not accepted by Shi'ite scholars in India, but they were not systematically persecuted by scholars or rulers, and it was problem free for a wandering dervish to enter Persia.

The Ni'matullāhī masters' beliefs on worldly matters were very close to those of the early ascetic Sufis, or even the wandering dervishes that lived during their time. Early Sufis such as Ḥasan al-Baṣrī (d. 110/728) are known for their path of renunciation of the material world.⁷⁶ Ma'şūm believed that there were four types of death to reach the state of poverty (*faqr*): White Death (*muwt-i abyad*), which is hunger; Black Death (*muwt-i aswad*) refers to acceptance of the hurts caused by others; Red Death (*muwt-i aḥmar*) refers to the suppression of the carnal soul; and Green Death refers to being content with one's possessions.⁷⁷ These four types of death indicate a way of life that renounces the material world. There are numerous traditions and sayings by Ma'şūm indicating the futility of this material world. He believed that the ease and comfort of this world are inconstant; thus, one should not rely on them.⁷⁸

Ma'şūm Shīrāzī mentioned that Ma'şūm 'Alī Shāh always advised his disciples to eat as little as possible.⁷⁹ He encouraged them to undertake physical mortifications and not to pay any attention to anything other than God. He said that one may not accumulate wealth although one's heart may desire it. A real Sufi must be free of desiring anything other than God. He mentioned that there are some Sufis who are not outwardly ascetics (*zāhid*), such as Solomon, who was inwardly an ascetic despite all his worldly wealth and dominions. If one's heart is occupied by worldly matters, then there is no room for God to enter. Only the love of God can be in the heart of Sufis.⁸⁰ As one of the early Sufis, Rabi'a, said, 'There is no place in my heart for the love or hatred of another.'⁸¹ To a certain extent, these beliefs were later emphasised and adopted by the Qalandars.

Ma'şūm's conduct, philosophy and practice were strongly influenced by the classical practices and beliefs of the Qalandars. But at the same time he was careful not to be confused with the libertine wandering dervishes, as some of these dervishes claimed to be *Malāmatī* Sufis and were often blamed for not following the *sharī'a*. Ma'şūm's understanding of *Malāmatī* philosophy was quite different from the general understanding of *Malāmatī* beliefs. He asserted, 'The *Malāmatī* is not the one who attracts blame through deliberately breaking the *sharī'a*; he is one who fears not following God's commands regardless of the blame received from others.'⁸² He is clear that all Sufis must follow the path of the Prophet Muḥammad. He said, 'Liberation of the divine bird from the imprisonment of the cage of human nature is not accomplished without the effects of spiritual rapture, which is dependent on following the Prophet Muḥammad.'⁸³ Shi'ite scholars frequently charged Ni'matullāhīs with blasphemy, but Ma'şūm was able, to a

certain extent, to reconstruct the exoteric framework of Ni'matullāhī beliefs in Persia by strongly advocating the necessity of following the *sharī'a*.⁸⁴

Ḥusayn 'Alī Shāh (d.1234/1818),⁸⁵ the sole master of the Ni'matullāhī order after Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and Nūr 'Alī Shāh, came from a family of Shi'ite seminary scholars. He travelled throughout Islamic countries in search of spiritual truth. Finally, he met Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and Fayḍ 'Alī Shāh, and the former directed him to follow the spiritual guidance of Nūr 'Alī Shāh.⁸⁶ Mullā 'Abd al-Ṣamad Hamadānī was among the scholars converted to Sufism by Ḥusayn 'Alī Shāh during Ma'ṣūm's life.⁸⁷ Ma'ṣūm's charisma also thus attracted some of the shariah-minded seminary scholars whose spiritual quest led them to enter the Sufi path.⁸⁸

Another important decision of Ma'ṣūm's was that the majority of the disciples he spiritually trained for Persia would be Persian, though he himself was from India. It was highly likely that he was aware that in order to revive the Ni'matullāhī order in Persia he needed to train some Persian Sufis and gain followers who had a seminary background.

The Anti-Sufi Movement of the Shi'ite Uṣūlī Scholars

As mentioned in the last chapter, this was a period of consolidation for the Uṣūlī Shi'ite scholars. Their triumph over the Akhbārī school of Shi'ism increased their centralised power. As Joanna De Groot states, 'By the end of the century [thirteenth century A.H./eighteenth century C.E.] twelve *'ulama* were consolidating an "orthodoxy" that buttressed the arguments for the authority of *mujtaheds* with . . . opposition to rival tendencies; this did not preclude the pragmatic pursuit of alliances in particular local settings, as when the *'ulama* of Kirmān, who attacked the popular Sufi missionaries . . . also acquiesced in the rule of a local governor, whose wealth came from the leadership of dissident Ismā'īlī, as a guarantor of law and order.'⁸⁹ Shi'ite scholars claimed to be the religious authority drawing the boundaries between orthodoxy and heterodoxy. This allowed them to monopolise religious matters from within the seminaries.

The religious practice of *takfīr* was used by seminary scholars as a means of suppressing their religious rivals, and in this respect the Uṣūlī scholars practised *takfīr* against their rivals, the Akhbārīs. With the start of Ni'matullāhī revivalism in Persia, these Shi'ite scholars practised *takfīr* against Sufis in the 1790s, in cities such as Kirmān, leading to the death of Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh, and Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh.

As explained in the previous chapter, Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī, known as the Sufi killer, was the leading figure in the suppression of Sufis in Persia, especially the Ni'matullāhīs. His father, Āqā Muḥammad Bāqir Bihbahānī (d. 1205/1790), known as Waḥīd, is recognised as the founder of the modern Uṣūlī school.⁹⁰ The prestige of his father's acclaim as a famous theologian gave Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī more privilege and power among Shi'ite scholars. He also had some strong supporters among the ruling class of Persia. Ibrāhīm Khān was among those powerful ministers who supported him. When Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī arrested Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh, Ibrāhīm Khān told him, 'Put them to death, confine them, or punish them in the way you deem most proper and most consonant to the decrees of the holy religion.'⁹¹ Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī also warned Mullā 'Abdullāh, a low-ranking cleric among the followers of Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī, in Kirmān about Mushtāq, which led to Mushtāq's tragic martyrdom in 1206/1792.⁹²

The Ni'matullāhī Sufi Order and Nūr 'Alī Shāh

Nūr 'Alī Shāh (d. 1212/1797) is one of the most important figures in the history of the Ni'matullāhī revival of the 18th century.⁹³ He also played a significant role in the history of the revival of Persian Sufism after decades of oblivion. Nūr 'Alī Shāh's mystical way of life was close to that of the wandering dervishes. His appearance was more like that of a Qalandar than a scholar like Ma'sūm, although he belonged to a family of scholars and his grandfather led the congressional Friday prayers (*Imām jum'ih*) of Ṭabas.⁹⁴ There are two different stories about the birthplace of Nūr 'Alī Shāh's father, Mīrzā 'Abd al-Ḥusayn, who had the spiritual title of Fayḍ 'Alī Shāh. According to one account, he was born in Tūn (Ṭabas) in Khurāsān and later migrated to Isfahan to study seminary sciences.⁹⁵ Other scholars like Mast 'Alī Shāh recount that he was born in Isfahan some time around 1758.⁹⁶ It is also said that Mīrzā 'Abd al-Ḥusayn left everything behind in search of the truth, and went to Isfahan.⁹⁷ It was at the end of Nādir Shāh's reign that Mīrzā 'Abd al-Ḥusayn entered Isfahan and took up residence there,⁹⁸ where he became interested in the occult sciences, and practised numerical divination (*jafr*) and other occult sciences.⁹⁹

Under the supervision of his father, Nūr 'Alī Shāh studied the common religious sciences of the day.¹⁰⁰ According to Muḥammad Taqī Khuyī, 'As the exterior sciences (*'ulūm ḡāhirī*) do not open the gate of inner



Portrait of Nūr 'Alī Shāh. (From Nūr 'Alī Shāh, *Janāt al-Wiṣāl*)

sciences (*'ulūm bāṭini*) and having the knowledge of exterior is a cause for the knowledge of inner, therefore, he entered the valley of seeking (*wādī ṭalab*).¹⁰¹ Fayḍ 'Alī Shāh took Nūr 'Alī Shāh to Ma'şūm for initiation into the order and both father and son were initiated at about the same time, while Ma'şūm was in Shiraz.¹⁰² As is written in *Janāt al-wiṣāl*, father and son became brothers on the spiritual path.¹⁰³ Later on, the young Nūr 'Alī Shāh reached the highest station of Sufism such that he even rose above the spiritual station of his father. Nonetheless both, after passing through certain spiritual states, reached the level of perfection to guide others. Ma'şūm gave them permission for the inculcation of *dhikr* and propagation of the spiritual path (*ṭarīqat*).¹⁰⁴ They were to become the two most important figures to be initiated into this order in the 18th century. Fayḍ passed away in 1199/1784.¹⁰⁵

Nūr 'Alī Shāh was the closest and most important disciple of Ma'şūm 'Alī Shāh and accompanied Ma'şūm on all his travels. Even in Mürchih Khurt, when Ma'şūm dismissed everyone, warning his disciples that the commanders of 'Alī Murād were coming to torture them, Nūr 'Alī Shāh said, 'Where should I take a refuge, when I am from this refuge?'¹⁰⁶

In Mashhad, Ma'şūm dismissed him and told him to stay in Persia, whilst Ma'şūm headed towards Hirāt.¹⁰⁷ Most probably, Ma'şūm felt that Persia and the Persian Sufis needed spiritually strong masters like Nūr 'Alī Shāh and Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh. Later on, Ma'şūm handed over the leadership of the Ni'matullāhī order to Nūr 'Alī Shāh who continued the revival movement.¹⁰⁸ Upon the spiritual confirmation of Riḍā 'Alī Shāh, Nūr 'Alī Shāh received permission to choose a successor for himself, hence the continuation of the movement.¹⁰⁹

Nūr 'Alī Shāh and Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh went to Kirmān. Mushtāq was martyred in 1206/1792 and Nūr 'Alī moved on to Shiraz.¹¹⁰ Luṭf 'Alī Khān was the ruler of Shiraz at the time, and tried hard to harm Nūr 'Alī, which eventually made him migrate to the 'Atabāt in 1207/1792.

In Iraq, he was favoured by Aḥmad Pāshā, the ruler of Baghdād and the surrounding area. Nūr 'Alī Shāh became a popular figure among the people of Persia too. His eagerness to broadcast the Ni'matullāhī doctrines led to the initiation of a large number of people into the brotherhood. Muḥammad 'Alī Mudarris notes how 'Nūr 'Alī Shāh became famous everywhere: when he would stay in a city for a while to guide, people would gather around him to an extent that rulers would become suspicious of his activities and order his banishment from that city.'¹¹¹ His popularity led to the jealousy of those who thought of Nūr 'Alī Shāh as a rival to their authority. His primary

opponents were Shi'ite scholars who accused him of claiming kingship and not following Islamic laws.¹¹²

Some of Nūr 'Alī Shāh's poetry directly challenged Shi'ite clerics. In one of his poems he says, 'And from the command of Mahdī, I will revive the universe with my breath.'¹¹³ For Shi'ite clerics this was an outrageous claim and a direct challenge to their authority, as they considered themselves deputies of the hidden twelfth Imām. Claiming to have direct contact (spiritual or physical) with the twelfth Imām was much more dangerous than not following Islamic laws. In extreme cases, it could end in the execution of the claimant.

Nūr 'Alī Shāh's poems were full of ecstatic utterances (*shaṭḥiyyāt*). He says, 'If you seek the divine light, the search is a vain effort; I am the orient of lights.'¹¹⁴ Or he goes further and directly addresses the Shi'ite scholars and says:

O pious clergyman,
If by now
You haven't known us
In the truth of Absolute Unity:
It's we in the Ka'aba,
We in the idol-temple.
The worlds are but attributes,
We are the essence.¹¹⁵

He used to sing these poems in the street while he was wandering around the city as a water bearer wearing the garments of the wandering dervishes. People would be attracted to him and gather round him, and this became a successful way to broadcast the Ni'matullāhī doctrines. He also wrote poems in praise of the Shi'ite Imāms, which he used to sing in the streets. All of his poems were full of hidden mystical meanings, and many were 'ecstatic utterances' in a rhythmic format. Later Ni'matullāhī masters did not dare to make the claims Nūr 'Alī did in his poetry. For example, Majdhūb 'Alī Shāh stated that only the Prophet and Shi'ite Imāms are the manifestations of divine essence, a rank which Nūr 'Alī Shāh had claimed for himself.

In the shrine cities of the 'Atabāt many Shi'ite scholars were outraged by Nūr 'Alī Shāh's successful propagation of Sufism.¹¹⁶ On the other hand, despite all the animosity, many well-known Shi'ite scholars were secretly initiated into the order or felt sympathy for Nūr 'Alī Shāh.¹¹⁷

Two perfect examples of this are Mullā 'Abd al-Ṣamad Hamadānī and Āqā Sayyid Mahdī Ṭabāṭabā'ī, known as the 'Sea of the sciences' (*Baḥr al-'ulūm*) (d. 1212/ 1797).¹¹² It is recounted that some of the Shi'ite seminary scholars went to Sayyid Mahdī Ṭabāṭabā'ī and asked him to issue an order for the excommunication of Nūr 'Alī Shāh. Sayyid Mahdī refused to do so without meeting Nūr 'Alī Shāh first. He asked Mullā 'Abd al-Ṣamad for a secret meeting with Nūr 'Alī Shāh. When they met, Sayyid Mahdī began by denying Sufism. However, it is said that, by the end of the meeting and due to the spiritual influence of Nūr 'Alī Shāh, Sayyid Mahdī felt extreme sympathy for Sufism and, according to some Ni'matullāhīs, it is believed that he was eventually initiated into Sufism.¹¹⁸ However, scholars like Abbas Amanat believe that Baḥr al-'Ulūm's sympathetic attitude has been exaggerated.¹¹⁹ Zarrīnkūb goes even further, saying that Baḥr al-'Ulūm did not issue any religious verdicts because, while he was cautious with regard to the Sufis, he did not have any genuine sympathy for them.¹²⁰ Some Sufi masters from other orders, such as Ḥājī 'Abd al-Wahāb Nā'inī (a Nūrbakhshī master), were initiated into the order and became disciples of Nūr 'Alī Shāh because of his charisma.¹²¹

Nūr 'Alī Shāh resided for about five years in the 'Atabāt, where he was poisoned twice. In 1212/1797, he passed away in Mūṣil and was buried beside Jonah's tomb.¹²² He wrote numerous treatises and books of poetry, including *Risāla Jāmi'* *al-asrār*, where the style of his writing is similar to that of the *Gulistān* of Sa'dī.¹²³ Zarrīnkūb, though, has asserted that his writing is not comparable with Sa'dī's *Gulistān*. However, his prose style represents a combination of the styles of two great Persian writers, Sa'dī and Khāwja 'Abdullāh Anṣārī (d. 481/1088).¹²⁴ His *Risāla uṣūl wa furū'* discusses theological matters and is written in rhymed prose form, which is similar to the writings of Khāja 'Abdullāh Anṣārī.¹²⁵ In this treatise he also refers to mystical poetry and explains the exoteric religious duties, before indicating that there are some esoteric duties which are crucial to practice in order for one perfectly to accomplish the exoteric religious duties. He wrote about the spiritual path and the necessity of having a master to guide one on the path.¹²⁶ He also wrote a poetic interpretation of the Chapter of the Cow (*Sūrat al-Baqara*) and translated the *Khutbat al-bayān* into a poetic form consisting of 152 verses.¹²⁷ Amongst his other writings is a *Dīwān* of *ghazals* and *Qaṣāyid* and a *Mathnawī* called *Janāt al-wiṣāl* (only two volumes of this compendium were written by Nūr 'Alī Shāh).¹²⁸ This *Mathnawī* was written at the end of his life in the city of Dhahāb. His aim was to write eight books alluding to the symbolic number of the eight heavens (*janāt*). However, he passed away before he could finish it, so he asked his disciples to finish the

rest of that compendium.¹²⁹ Michel de Miras believes that Nūr 'Alī Shāh's purpose in writing this treatise was to enable wayfarers to obtain gnosis.¹³⁰ Nūr 'Alī also wrote a book of poetry about Imām Ḥusayn called *Rawḍat al-Shuhadā'*,¹³¹ which was one of the first books written about the story of 'Āshūrā, after Mullā Ḥusayn Wā'iz Kāshifī's *Rawḍat al-shuhadā'*.

Nūr 'Alī Shāh was known to have a charming face and to wear his hair long, and his personality attracted many people.¹³² However, he did not have much contact with Shi'ite scholars, nor did he write any treatises in response to their accusations. Although he was propagating Ni'matullāhī doctrines among the masses, some scholars were attracted by his beliefs and personality; yet he did not have any desire to meet scholars. When Baḥr al-'Ulūm asked 'Abd al-Ṣamad Hamadānī to meet Nūr 'Alī Shāh for the second time, Nūr 'Alī Shāh's response was, 'It is not me who wants to see him, but if he wishes to see me, he can come over.'¹³³ Once, when he was passing a village near Mashhad, his dignity and his beauty led the people of that village to think erroneously that he was their missing prince. Nūr 'Alī Shāh tried to convince them that he was not the prince they had been waiting for, but they would not accept it. It was during this period that Mirzā Mahdī Mujtahid ordered him to cut his hair.¹³⁴ He was also a singer who sang his own poetry which, along with his charisma and charming face, led to his vast popularity but frightened the Shi'ite scholars and even the rulers.

As Mast 'Alī Shāh said, 'He suffered oppression from the scholars of the time (*'ulamā-yi zamān*) and rulers of the period (*ḥukām 'aṣr*).'¹³⁵ He was persecuted almost everywhere he went: Iraq, Fars, Kirmān and Khurāsān, etc. In his poetry he lamented being misunderstood by common people and the literal-minded:

First, I sold my donkey's ears
and acquired other, more human organs
so that every moment now I hear
from doors, from walls, the voice of Surūsh (angelic inspiration)
and as his songs ring in my ears
so secrets sing in my heart.
Where is your heart? Where is your ear
that I may sing these secret songs to you?
Secrets boil in my heart but to whom
can I reveal them, since there is not man of heart?
I used to speak in parables of these things
but now, O artful one, I have unveiled them for you.¹³⁶

These lines were written in the *Janāt al-wiṣāl* at the end of his life in Irāq, where he was put under pressure by exoteric Shi'ite scholars for his mystical views about religion. He was tired of his opponents not hearing his message, which was a message of love. Unlike his opponents he did not threaten them with death or persecution; he just complained about their foolishness.

Nūr 'Alī Shāh played a crucial role in the history of the Ni'matullāhī revival in Persia. Indeed, without his efforts it would not have been achieved. According to Zarrīnkūb, his form of Sufism represented a union of Shi'ite Sufism with Ḥallāj's and Shibli's intoxicated mysticism.¹³⁷ Nūr 'Alī Shāh's revival of the Sufi tradition in Persia was also a reformation of it, an attempt to purify it of ossified traditionalism while at the same affirming the necessity of following the shariah, and for this reason Nūr 'Alī Shāh appointed some of his disciples like Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh, Majdhūb 'Alī Shāh, Mullā 'Abd al-Ṣamad Hamadānī and Ḥusayn 'Alī Shāh to propagate exoteric Islamic laws as well as Ni'matullāhī beliefs.¹³⁸ Some of Nūr 'Alī Shāh's beliefs, however, were close to those of the Shi'ite extremists (*ghulāt*).

Nūr 'Alī Shāh's emphasis on the path and the wayfarer was also important for the revival of the order. His propagation of the spiritual path of Sufism and the wayfarers thereon gave great lustre to the order, but his persecution by the legalist clergy signalled the need for a change from a charismatic to a more rational approach.¹³⁹ The order's adherents needed to be more moderate in espousing their doctrines in accordance with Uṣūlī theology.

The first Persian Ni'matullāhī master to succeed Riḍā 'Alī Shāh was Ḥusayn 'Alī Shāh, a disciple of Nūr 'Alī Shāh.¹⁴⁰ Ḥusayn 'Alī Shāh was spiritually trained by Nūr 'Alī Shāh but belonged to the class of Shi'ite seminary scholars, and thus was among the first masters who started the transformation of the Ni'matullāhī order from a popular to an elitist movement. His contributions to the mystical and religious milieu of Persia will be discussed in Chapter Four.

The Ni'matullāhī Sufi Order and Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh

Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh (d.1215/1800) is another influential master in the history of the Ni'matullāhī order. Although his role in the revival of the order was not as crucial as that of Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh and Nūr 'Alī Shāh, he was one of the most active and knowledgeable masters of the Ni'matullāhīs during this era. He was the first master after the return of the order to Persia to write about its cosmological views. Owing to his knowledge of seminary

sciences, his works were highly respected by Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh and Nūr 'Alī Shāh.

His full name was Mīrzā Muḥammad Taqī ibn Muḥammad Kāzīm and his ancestors were all traditional doctors who came from the upper class of society in Kirmān.¹⁴¹ Aside from studying medicine, he began studying the rational and traditional seminary sciences (*'ulūm 'aqlī wa naqlī*) and became well-versed in these sciences. He had his own pupils studying these sciences, and it is said that every time he walked towards the mosque, as he was about to enter 12 professional readers of the Qur'ān would recite around him.¹⁴²

He was more of a philosopher (*hakīm*) than a jurist (*faqīh*). He had studied natural philosophy (*hikmat ṭabī'i*) and divine theosophy (*hikmat-i ilāhī*).¹⁴³ Like other Sufi masters, he was not satisfied with the seminary religious sciences and so started to search for a spiritual master. In Kirmān he met Nūr 'Alī Shāh, Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh and Rawnaq 'Alī Shāh, and became a disciple of Mushtāq 'Alī.¹⁴⁴

Before his initiation Muẓaffar had a strong bias against Sufism and avoided being with Sufis. He first encountered Mushtāq when he was invited to a session of the *rawḍa khānī* (mourning of Imām Ḥusayn). Mushtāq attended the session without being invited, and at dinner he sat in front of Muẓaffar. Muẓaffar did not eat because of Mushtāq's presence and Mushtāq became offended and said, 'O you, if this is the table of the Lord (*muwlā*) then it does not matter if friends or enemies are sitting around it. It does not matter if dervishes or non-dervishes are eating from it.' And he left the session. Muẓaffar went after him and from that incident his inner fire of spiritual love was kindled.¹⁴⁵

Following that incident, Muẓaffar went to Nūr 'Alī Shāh, who directed him towards Rawnaq 'Alī Shāh for the inculcation of *dhikr* and initiation into Sufism.¹⁴⁶ However, it was Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh's spiritual charisma that had attracted Muẓaffar and caused him to be initiated into the order.¹⁴⁷ After the initiation, he accompanied Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh who became his spiritual guide on the path.¹⁴⁸ His attraction to Mushtāq might have been the reason Ma'sūm commanded Mushtāq to go to Kirmān and guide seekers.

Mast 'Alī Shāh, with typical hyperbole, compared Muẓaffar's importance in Sufism with that of Rūmī, for both had dedicated their works of poetry to men less literate than themselves but possessing a high degree in Sufism, and both recounted similar experiences of love of their master. Rūmī dedicated his *Dīwān-i Shams* to Shams-i Tabrīzī, while Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh dedicated all his *Ghazaliyāt* and *Qasāyid* to Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh. Muẓaf-

far 'Alī Shāh, just like Rūmī, was well versed in the religious sciences of the day. However, Mast 'Alī Shāh believed that he was more knowledgeable in the philosophy of illumination (*falsafa-yi ishraq*) and Peripatetic philosophy than Rūmī.¹⁴⁹

Muẓaffar's pupils and those who would gather round him at the mosque were upset by his behaviour towards the illiterate Mushtāq. They begged him to return to seminary school, and some believed that he had become mentally unstable. Muẓaffar's response was, 'Your rational Mīrẓā (*mīrẓā-yi mantiqī*) [Muẓaffar] is dead. Leave and search for another Muḥammad Taqī [Muẓaffar].'¹⁵⁰ This response is similar to the one Rūmī's gave to those who came and begged him to his return to seminary school and abandon Shams-i Tabrizī.

Although the path of Sufism in Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh's time was outwardly a path of calamity, as the majority of the masters were persecuted and killed by those who rejected their utterances, nevertheless Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh entered into this path and diligently passed through the spiritual stations. After he had become spiritually qualified, Rawnaq 'Alī Shāh authorised him to be a guide for seekers.¹⁵¹ Mast 'Alī Shāh believed that it had been centuries since there had been a well-versed Sufi master like Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh, while Riḍā Qulī Khān Hidāyat noted that he was referred to as the 'Second Rūmī' (*Muwlawī thānī*).¹⁵²

As mentioned earlier, Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh's poetry had in-depth mystical meanings, and was very influential in the development of the Ni'matullāhī order. However, his knowledge of the seminary sciences did not protect him from persecution by fundamentalist Shi'ite scholars. Eventually, Mullā 'Abd Allāh Kirmānī issued a religious order for the murder of Mushtāq and wrote a letter to Āqā Muḥammad Khān Qājār proposing that he put Muẓaffar to death. However, owing to Āqā Muḥammad Khān's positive view about Sufism, especially the Ni'matullāhīs, he ignored Mullā 'Abd Allāh and invited Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh to Tehran.¹⁵³

After Āqā Muḥammad Khān Qājār passed away in 1797, Fath 'Alī Shāh became the king of the Qājārs. With the help of Ibrāhīm Khān-i Kalāntar, Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī brought Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh to Kirmānshāh. Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī tortured and persecuted Muẓaffar but he never invited him to a theological debate because he was aware of Muẓaffar's seminary knowledge.

Muẓaffar passed away in 1215/1800, three years after Nūr 'Alī Shāh. He wrote numerous books and literary papers which are highly valuable for a better understanding of Ni'matullāhī thought, although his role was not as

crucial to the success of the revival movement as that of his contemporaries, Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh, Nūr 'Alī Shāh and Riḍā 'Alī Shāh.

Muẓaffar also wrote a book called *Summary of the Sciences* (*Khulāṣat al-ʿulūm*) each chapter of which explains a common science of the time.¹⁵⁴ His masterpiece was 'Red Sulphur' (*Kibrīt al-aḥmar*), a treatise devoted to the meaning of the invocation of God (*dhikr*) in the Ni'matullāhī Order.¹⁵⁵ However, this treatise has been attributed to some other Ni'matullāhī masters as well. Some scholars believe that it was written by Nūr 'Alī Shāh under the title of *ʿAwārif al-maʿārif*. Others attribute it to Majdhūb, who most probably copied it from Muẓaffar, which was common among Sufi masters of that era. In this treatise Muẓaffar explained Sufi litanies and the practice of *dhikr* and asserted that the continuous practice of litanies and *dhikr* would lead to a state of proximity to the divine, and to divine peace of heart (*sakīna-yi qalbīyya*), which is among the first stations on the path. After Mushtāq was martyred in Kirmān, Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh started to write poetry lamenting his separation from Mushtāq, to whom he dedicated an anthology of his poetry, calling it *Diwān-i Mushtāqīyya*.¹⁵⁶ 'Compendium of the Seas' (*Jām-i al-biḥār*) and 'Sea of the Secrets' (*baḥr al-asrār*) are two other anthologies of poetry written by Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh.¹⁵⁷

Unlike the future Ni'matullāhī master, Muẓaffar did not dissimulate his opposition to the seminary scholars. Muẓaffar said, "Those scholars who are called the inheritors of the prophets are not the exoteric jurists, because the exoteric people confess that they are ignorant of the paths toward heaven."¹⁵⁸ Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh stated that all this bitter opposition to the Sufis was due the jurists' lack of understanding. His beliefs about the perfect man (*insān-i kāmīl*) were highly influenced by Ibn 'Arabī's philosophy. He also believed that during the time of the occultation of the twelfth Imām, perfect Sufis could act as the manifestation of the Imām, stating, 'Ma'sūm 'Alī is the manifestation of the guiding Mahdī'.¹⁵⁹

Therefore, like some of his predecessors, he believed in the Mahdī-like role of the Sufi master. However, he made it clear that when he mentioned the term Mahdī, he was referring only to the twelfth Imām of the Shi'ites, and never used the term Mahdī directly for a Sufi master. In praise of Mushtāq, he wrote:

I swear to God that in this cycle,
I am the deputy to the Mahdī of the 'Askarī faith.
I am the sun of truth, I am the one,
who was taught the art of fostering inferiors.¹⁶⁰

However, such beliefs constituted challenges to the authority of the Shi'ite seminary scholars. Muẓaffar indicated that their understanding of the traditions of the Shi'ite Imāms was limited and lacked true understanding of their in-depth meaning. However, the real Sufis, through the blessings of Shi'ite Imāms, had gained the gnosis that is the true understanding of religion.¹⁶¹ Here he clearly indicated both his Sufi and Shi'ite beliefs, which were later adopted by Majdhūb 'Alī Shāh.¹⁶² In this respect Muẓaffar 'Alī Shāh was an important influence on the mystical doctrine of Majdhūb 'Alī Shāh, who played an even more crucial role in the future formation of Persian Ni'matullāhī theosophy.

Conclusion

As we have seen in this chapter, the period during which these masters led the Ni'matullāhī order was far from tranquil. The order faced a great deal of opposition alongside its growing fame. Even when for short periods they were favoured by the rulers of different cities, the Shi'ite ulama were usually successful in persuading those rulers against giving any support to Sufism with the accusation that the Sufi masters they favoured intended to make a claim on kingship.

However, despite these vicissitudes, the three masters discussed in this chapter were responsible not only for the revival of the Ni'matullāhī order in Persia but also for its reformation. Their aim was to revive an esoteric tradition in Persia that had been absent for a long time, and to redirect Sufism back in the right direction. These masters fought against two different classes of society and tried to purify both. On the one hand, they endured opposition from the exoteric religious class who were led by Shi'ite shariah-minded scholars and yet tried to introduce the inner meaning of religion to them. On the other hand, they struggled against the decadence of the wandering *qalandars* and libertine Sufis who were careless about observance of the exoteric laws of Islam.

One of the main reasons for the opposition of the Shi'ite scholars and rulers to the Sufis was the relationship between the masters of the Ni'matullāhī order and their disciples. The absolute submission of disciples to their masters implicitly challenged the authority of both the rulers and Shi'ite seminary scholars. Nūr 'Alī Shāh had clearly stated that the power of the *qutb* (sole master of the order) was greater than that of any ruler.¹⁶³ More essential was their emphasis on the relationship between the Mahdī

(Twelfth Imām) and the Sufi Master. In certain cases, as explained in the story of Riḍā 'Alī Shāh, one of the Imāms would command the Sufi master through dreams or visions. The Sufi belief that the seeker should choose his master based on spiritual attraction gave more freedom to the individual seeker than was allowed by the *mujtahids*.

As Zarrīnkūb notes, the enthusiastic popular reception of this movement was suppressed by the triumph of the Shi'ite fundamentalist scholars and, in particular, their main champion, Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī.¹⁶⁴ The historical events would seem to indicate that Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī and other anti-Sufi scholars were triumphant in suppressing Sufis, but in reality this was not the case. On the one hand, the enthusiastic preaching and propagation of the order by masters such as Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh, Fayḍ 'Alī Shāh, Nūr 'Alī Shāh and Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh led to its popularity and revival; on the other, opposition to the order was harsh and there was a desperate need for consolidation for the order to survive the clerical persecution it was subjected to.¹⁶⁵ These masters gained fame among the people because they brought to Persian society a traditional yet new way of thinking that emphasised the inner meaning of religion. Although the people of Persia had become strangers to Sufism, during this historical period of political turmoil, an exoteric religious system could not respond to all the social and spiritual needs of the community.

During these masters' lives, the seat of the leadership of the Ni'matullāhī order was in the Deccan. Riḍā 'Alī Shāh was the *quṭb* (pole) of the order for about 60 years, and lived through the revival movement in Persia.¹⁶⁶ He trained those masters who dedicated themselves to its revival, and the historical record shows that the persecution of the Sufis by Shi'ite fundamentalist clerics more or less changed the direction of the order from an enthusiastic movement, which had been based on ecstatic poetry and a Qalandari'ite lifestyle, into an elitist movement providing a new, mystical interpretation of the Shi'ite seminary sciences. This evolution into a scholarly order even affected the outward appearance of its master, Ḥusayn 'Alī Shāh or Majdhūb 'Alī Shāh, who swapped the traditional dervish cloak and hat (*tāj*) for the cleric's gown and turban. As we shall see in the next chapter, Ḥusayn 'Alī Shāh even lived in a seminary school as a professor of religious studies for much of his life.

Chapter 2

- 1 For further information see Josef Van Ess, 'Sufism and its Opponents. Reflection on Topoi, Tribulations, and Transformations,' in Frederick de Jong and Bernd Radtke (eds.) *Islamic Mysticism Contested: Thirteen Centuries of Controversies & Polemics* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 22-44.
- 2 Frederick de Jong and Bernd Radtke, 'Introduction,' in de Jong and Radtke (eds.), *Islamic Mysticism Contested*, p. 1.
- 3 Ibid., p. 26.
- 4 Vincent J. Cornell, 'Faḳīh versus Faqīr in Marinid Morocco: Epistemological dimension of a polemic,' in Frederick de Jong and Bernd Radtke (eds.) *Islamic Mysticism Contested* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), p. 32.
- 5 'The Meccan Revelation (*Futūḥāt-i al-Makkiyya*)', as James W. Morris states, 'is Ibn 'Arabī's longest and most comprehensive work' (Muḥyi Al-Dīn ibn 'Arabī, *The Meccan Revelations*, trans. William C. Chittick and James W. Morris (New York: Pir Press, 2002), pp. 1-6).
- 6 Cited by Leonard Lewisohn, 'Overview: Iranian Islam and Persianate Sufism,' in Leonard Lewisohn (ed.), *Heritage of Sufism: The Legacy of Medieval Persian Sufism (1150-1500)*, vol. II (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 1999), p. 21.
- 7 Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders of Islam*, p. 1.
- 8 Annemarie Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* (Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press,), p. 43.
- 9 Michael A. Sells, *Early Islamic Mysticism* (New York: Paulist Press, 1996), pp. 116-117.
- 10 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Zarrīnkūb, *Arzish-i mīrāth-i Ṣūfīyya* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Amīr Kabīr, 1385 A. Hsh./ 2006), p. 167.
- 11 Gerhard Böwering, 'Perimeters and Constants,' in de Jong and Radtke (eds.), *Islamic Mysticism Contested*, p. 45.
- 12 Van Ess, 'Sufism and its opponents,' p. 35.
- 13 Ibid., p. 36.
- 14 Ibid., pp. 37-38.
- 15 Aḥmad Tamīm-dārī, *ʿirfān wa adab dar ʿaṣr-i Ṣafawī* (Tehran: Intishārāt Hikmat, 1373 A. Hsh./ 1994).
- 16 Muqaddas Ardībīlī, *Ḥadiqat al-Shīʿa*, eds. Ṣādiq Ḥassanzāda (Qum: Intishārāt Anṣārīyān, 1383 A. Hsh./ 2004), pp. 563-564; Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī, *Khayrātīyya*, vol. I (Qum: Intishārāt-i Anṣārīyān, 1412 A.Hsh./1991), p. 38; 'Allāma Āqā Muḥammad Ja'far ibn Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī, *faḍāyih al-Ṣūfīyya* (Qum: Intishārāt-i Anṣārīyān, 1413

- A. Hsh./1992), p. 38; Zayn al-Ābidīn Shīrwānī (Mast ‘Alī Shāh), *Rīyād al-Siyāḥa* (Tehran: Chāpkhānih Zuhrih, 1339 A. Hsh./1960), pp. 301-302.
- 17 Shīrwānī, *Rīyād*, pp. 301-302.
- 18 He will be discussed in this chapter.
- 19 Mangol Bayat, ‘Anti-Sufism in Qajar Iran’, p. 626.
- 20 Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū*, p. 358.
- 21 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. I, p. 6.
- 22 Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn ‘Aṭṭār Nayshāburī, *Tadhkirat al-ulīā*, Muḥammad Istīlāmī (ed.) (Tehran: Intishārāt Zawwār, 1383 A. Hsh./2004).
- 23 Leonard Lewisohn, *Beyond Faith and Infidelity* (Richmond Surrey: Curzon Press, 1995), p. 56.
- 24 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1779.
- 25 Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, vol. IV, p. 4.
- 26 Savory, *Iran under the Safavids*, p. 23.
- 27 Ibid.; Muḥammadriḍā Yūsifī and Aḥmadriḍā Riḍāyī Jamkarānī, ‘Taṣawwuf tashayyū’ garāy-i qarn-i nuhum’, in *Majalīh pazhuhishī muṭālī’āt-i ‘irfānī* (Kāshān: Danishkadīh’ulūm-i Insānī Kāshān, 1386 A. Hsh./2007), pp. 166-167.
- 28 Lewisohn, *Beyond Faith*, p. 56.
- 29 For further information about the Ilkhanid dynasty see Reuven Amitai, *The Mongols in the Islamic Lands: Studies in the history of the Ilkhanate*, London: Routledge, 2007); Feralk Hawting (ed.), *Muslim Mongols and Crusaders* (Oxford: Routledge, 2005); Dorothea Krawulsky, *The Mongol Ilkhans and Their Vizier Rashid al-Din* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2011).
- 30 Lewisohn, *Beyond Faith*, p. 32.
- 31 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1314; Shīrwānī, *Rīyād*, p. 61.
- 32 Lewisohn, ‘Overview: Iranian Islam’, p. 33.
- 33 Ibid., p. 34.
- 34 Ibid.
- 35 Shīrīn Bayānī, *Dīn wa dawlat dar Īrān-i ‘aḥd mughul*, vol. II (Tehran: Markaz-i nashr-i dānishgāhī, 1371 A. Hsh./ 1992), pp. 481-482; ‘Abd Allāh Abū al-Qāsim Kāshānī, *Tārīkh-i Uljāyṭu*, ed. Mahīn Hanbalī (Tehran: Bungāh-i tarjumīh wa nashr-i kitāb, 1348 A. Hsh./1969), pp. 90-96 and pp. 99-101; Shīrwānī, *Rīyād*: pp. 67-68.
- 36 Kāshānī, *Tārīkh-i Uljāyṭu*, pp. 99-101; Shīrwānī, *Rīyād*, pp. 67-68.
- 37 Lewisohn, ‘Overview: Iranian Islam’, p. 34.
- 38 Shahzad Bashīr, *Messianic Hopes and Mystical Visions: The Nūrbakhshīya Between Medieval and Modern Islam* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), p. 9.

- 39 For further information about the Sarbidārān dynasty see John M. Smith, *The History of the Sarbadar Dynasty 1336-1381 A.D. and its Sources* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012). Cf. Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 49.
- 40 Ibid., pp. 49-54.
- 41 Muḥammad Jāwidān, ‘Ālimān-i Shīʿa wa taṣawwuf’, in *Haft Āsmān: faṣl-nāma-yi takhaṣṣi adyān wa madhāhib* (Qum: Haft Āsmān Publications, 1383 A. Hsh./2004), Vol. 6, No. 22, p. 210.
- 42 Leonard Lewisohn, ‘The Transcendental Unity of Polytheism and Monotheism in the Sufism of Shabistari’, in Leonard Lewisohn (ed.), *The Heritage of Sufism: vol. II: The Legacy of Medieval Persian Sufism (1150-1500)*, (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 1999), p. 385.
- 43 Lewisohn, *Beyond Faith*, pp. 104-105; Zarrīnkūb, *Arzish-i mīrāth*, p. 76.
- 44 Lewisohn, *Beyond Faith*, pp. 104-105.
- 45 Zarrīnkūb, *Arzish-i mīrāth*, p. 77.
- 46 Justin Marozzi, *Tamerlane: Sword of Islam, Conqueror of the World* (Cambridge: Da Capo Press, 2004), p. 8.
- 47 Beatrice Forbes Manz, *Power, Politics and Religion in Timurid Iran* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p.192.
- 48 For further information see Marozzi, *Tamerlane*.
- 49 Bashir, *Messianic Hopes and Mystical Visions*, p. 38.
- 50 Ibid.
- 51 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 13.
- 52 For further information about the Kubrawī Sufi order see Muhammad Isa Waley, ‘Najm al-Dīn Kubrā and the Central Asian School of Sufism (The Kubrawiyyah)’, in H. Nasr, *Islamic Spirituality*, vol. II, pp. 80-105.
- 53 Yūsifi and Riḍāyī Jamkarānī, ‘Taṣawwuf tashayyu’ garāy-i qarn-i nuhum’, p. 173; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 183.
- 54 For further information about Shaykh Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī see Shahzad Bashir, *Fazlallah Astarabadi and the Hurufis* (Oxford: Oneworld Publication, 2005).
- 55 Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 55.
- 56 Manz, *Power, Politics and Religion in Timurid Iran*, p. 192.
- 57 Zarrīnkūb, *Arzish-i mīrāth*, p. 160.
- 58 Manz, *Power, Politics and Religion in Timurid Iran*, p. 193.
- 59 Ḥusayn Wāʿẓ Kāshifī, *Rashaḥāt-i ‘ayn al-ḥayāt*, vol. I (Tehran: Bunyād Nīkukārī Nūriyānī, 1356 A. Hsh./1978), pp. 158-164.
- 60 Zarrīnkūb, *Arzish-i mīrāth*, p. 160.

- 61 Jo-Ann Gross, 'Authority and Miraculous Behavior: Reflection on *Karāmāt* stories of Khwāja 'Ubaydullāh Ahrār', in Leonard Lewisohn (ed.), *Heritage of Sufism, II: The Legacy of Medieval Persian Sufism (1150-1500)*, p. 161.
- 62 Terry Graham, 'Shāh Ni'matullāh: Founder of the Ni'matullāhī Sufi Order', in Leonard Lewisohn (ed.), *Heritage of Sufism, II: The Legacy of Medieval Persian Sufism (1150-1500)*, p. 174.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 Jean Aubin, *Majmū'ih dar tarjumih aḥwāl-i Shāh Ni'matullāh Walī* (Tehran: Kitābkhānih Ṭahūrī, 1982/1361), p. 42; Manz, *Power, Politics and Religion in Timurid Iran*, p. 197.
- 65 Jean Aubin, *Aḥwāl-i Shāh Ni'matullāh Walī*, pp. 195-197; Manz, *Power, Politics and Religion*, p. 197.
- 66 He was a well-known Sufi Shaykh during the Ilkhanid period, under the rulers Oljeitu and Abū Sa'īd. See Darwīsh Tawakkulī ibn Bazzāz Ardabīlī, *Ṣafwat al-Ṣafā* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Zaryāb, 1375 A. Hsh./ 1997), pp. 640 and 267.
- 67 Shaykh Zāhid traced his order back to Abū Najīb Suhrawardī (d. 1168 C.E.), and from there to Ma'rūf Karkhī (Bazzāz Ardabīlī, *Ṣafwat al-Ṣafā*, pp. 180-181).
- 68 Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, *Tārīkh-i Guzīda* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Amīr Kabīr, 1381 A. Hsh./ 2002), p. 675.
- 69 Savory, *Iran Under the Safavids*, p. 9.
- 70 Leonard Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 68.
- 71 David Morgan, 'Rethinking Safavid Shī'ism', p. 20; Savory, *Iran Under the Safavids*, pp. 23-24.
- 72 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 65.
- 73 Savory, *Iran Under the Safavids*, p. 23.
- 74 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 73.
- 75 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 76; Muṣṭafā Kāmīl al-Shaybī, *Tashayū' wa Taṣawwuf*, trans. 'Alirīdā Dhakāwatī Qarāguzlū (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Amīr Kabīr, 1380 A. Hsh./ 2001), pp. 391-392.
- 76 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 73.
- 77 Shaykh Abū Ishāq Kāzīrūnī (d. 426/1035) was a great Sufi master who became popular in the Fārs region and the Kāzīrūniyya order was named after him. For further information see Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū*, pp. 217-219.
- 78 Graham, 'The Ni'matu'llāhī order under Safavid Suppression', in L. Lewisohn and D. Morgan (eds.), *The Heritage of Sufism; Late Classical Persianate Sufism (1501-1750)*, vol. III (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 1999), p. 176.

- 79 Newman, *Safavid Iran*, pp. 32-33.
- 80 Anzali, 'Safavid Shi'ism', p. 252; Graham, 'The Ni'matu'llāhī Order under Safavid Suppression', p. 178; Scharbrodt, 'The *qutb* as Special Representative of the Hidden Imam', p. 37.
- 81 Graham, 'The Ni'matu'llāhī order under Safavid suppression', pp. 183-184.
- 82 Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū*, p. 369.
- 83 Kathryn Babayan, *Mystic, Monarchs, and Messiahs: Cultural landscapes of Early Modern Iran* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), p. 225.
- 84 Arjomand, *The Shadow of God*, p. 115.
- 85 Many Sufi orders claimed that Bahā' al-Dīn Āmilī was a member of their order. However, the Nūrbakhshī order has a more authentic claim in putting Shaykh Bahā'ī's (Shaykh al-Islām of Iṣfahān) name in Nurbakhshī's genealogies. There is no strong evidence that indicates that Shaykh Bahā'ī was initiated into a Sufi order, and it is possible that he dissimulated his affiliation with a Sufi order. The name of Mullā Muḥsin Fayḍ Kāshānī (d. 1030/ 1621), who lived during Shāh 'Abbās II's reign, also appears in Nurbakhshī genealogies (Arjomand, *The Shadow of God*, p. 116).
- 86 Ḥāfiz Ḥusayn Karbalā'ī, *Rawḍāt al-jinān wa Janāt al-jinān* (Tabriz: Intishārāt-i sutūdiḥ, 1381 A. Hsh./ 2002), p. 159.
- 87 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 14.
- 88 Mansur Sefatgol, 'From Dār al-Salṭana-yi Iṣfahān to Dār al-Khilāfa-yi Ṭihrān: continuity and change in the Safavid model of state-religious administration during the Qājārs (1795-1895/1209-1313)', in R. Gleaves (ed.), *Religion and Society in Qajar Iran* (London: Routledge Curzon, 2005), p. 72.
- 89 Ibid.
- 90 Mīrzā Muḥammad Bāqir Khunsārī, *Rawḍāt al-Janāt* (Beirut: Dār al-Islāmiyya, 1991), vol. IV, pp. 346-348.
- 91 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 79.
- 92 Khunsārī, *Rawḍāt al-Janāt*, vol. IV, pp. 348-349.
- 93 Maryam Mir Aḥmadī, *Dīn wa dawlat dar 'aṣr Ṣafawī* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Amīr Kabīr, 1369 A. Hsh./ 1990), p. 77.
- 94 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 80. Āqā Buzurg Tihrānī and some other scholars recalled that Karakī wrote a treatise in refutation of Sufism entitled '*al-Maṭā'in al-mujrimīyya fī radd-i al-Ṣūfiyya*'. However, this treatise has been lost: Āqā Buzurg Tihrānī, *al-dhuriya ilā taṣānīf-i al-Shī'a*, vol. 21 (Qum: Mu'asisih Ismā'iliyān, 1187 A.H./ 1773), p. 328.
- 95 Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 244.

- 96 For further information about La'l Shabbāz Qalandar see Sarah Ansari, *Sufi Saints and State Power: the Pirs of Sind, 1843-1947* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 19. Abū 'Alī Qalandar's poetry made a great contribution to the Qalandari'ite literary canon. For further information about Abū 'Alī Qalandar see *Dīwān-i Sayyid Sharaf al-Dīn Bū 'Alī Qalandar*, ed. Mīr Ṭāhir (Tehran: Intishārāt-i tikkiya Khāksār, 1361 A.Hsh./1981).
- 97 Malāmatiyya began as an ascetic movement without any hypocrisy (Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū*, p. 346).
- 98 Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū*, pp. 372-373.
- 99 For further information see Muḥammad Riḍā Shafī'ī Kadkanī, *Qalandariyya dar tārikh: digardīshāy-i yik īdiuluzhī* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i sukhan, 1386 A. Hsh./2007 C.E.).
- 100 Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū*, p. 346
- 101 Ibid., pp. 372-373.
- 102 They were called *Jalālī* because they were named after Sayyid Jalāl Thānī (d. 785/1383), known as *Makhdūm Jahānīān* (Master of both worlds). His grandfather was a master of the Suhrawardiyya order, but Sayyid Jalāl was a deputy of Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar. He spread the Qalandari'ite spiritual doctrines but did not accept any disciples, as he believed that he was not qualified to be a master (Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū*, p. 373).
- 103 Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū*, p. 375.
- 104 Ibid., p. 359.
- 105 It has been said that Shaykh Ḥaydar ibn Junayd (the father of Shāh Ismā'īl) had a vision of Imām 'Alī who commanded him that he had to make a sign for his followers to distinguish them from hypocrites. Therefore, he commanded his disciples, to wear red hats, and they were called *Qizilbāsh* ('red heads') (Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 1328-1329).
- 106 Anzali, 'Safavid Shi'ism', p. 42.
- 107 al-Shaybī, *Tashayū' wa Taṣawwuf*, p. 399.
- 108 Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 239.
- 109 Anzali, 'Safavid Shi'ism', pp. 54-56; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 241.
- 110 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 83.
- 111 Rasūl Ja'fariyān, 'Tashayū' I'tidālī', in *Haft Āsmān: faṣlnāma-yi takhaṣuṣī adyān wa madhāhib* (Qum: Haft Āsmān Publications, 1383 A. Hsh./2004), Vol. 6, No. 22, pp. 58-59.
- 112 Ibid., p. 57.
- 113 Ibid.
- 114 Rasūl Ja'fariyān, *Dīn wa siyāsāt dar dawra-yi Ṣafawī*, pp. 251-254.

- 115 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 200.
- 116 Ibid., p. 262, 1848.
- 117 Tamīmdārī, *ʿirfān wa adab dar ʿaṣr ṣafawī*, vol. I, p. 37.
- 118 Hamid Dabashi, 'Mir Damad and the founding of the 'School of Isfahan', in O. Leaman and S. H. Nasr (eds.), *History of Islamic Philosophy* (London: Routledge Curzon, 1996), p. 597.
- 119 Nasr, 'The Place of the School of Iṣfahān', p. 11.
- 120 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 86.
- 121 Ibid., p. 67.
- 122 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 90; Nasr, 'The Place of the School of Iṣfahān', p. 121.
- 123 Ibid., p. 8.
- 124 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 95.
- 125 Ṣadr al-Dīn Shīrāzī, *Kaṣr al-aṣnām al-jāhillīya fī dham-i al-jamāʿat al-Ṣūfīyya* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Dānishgāh Tehran, 1340 A. Hsh./ 1961).
- 126 Jāwidān, 'Ālimān-i Shīʿa wa taṣawwuf', pp. 210-211.
- 127 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', pp. 95-96.
- 128 Ibid., p. 97.
- 129 Ibid., p. 98.
- 130 Ibid., pp. 130-131.
- 131 Known as Shaykh Bahāʾī, he was born in 1546 in Baʿalbak in present-day Lebanon. His father emigrated to Persia as a Shīʿite seminary scholar (Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 88).
- 132 Royce, *Mīr Maʿṣūm ʿAlī Shāh and the Niʿmat Allāhī Revival*, p. 37; private interview with Dr Shahrām Pāzūkī, August 2011, and Nasr, 'The School of Isfahan', p. 910.
- 133 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 93.
- 134 Jāwidān, 'Ālimān-i Shīʿa wa taṣawwuf', p. 211.
- 135 Jaʿfarīyān, *Dīn wa siyāsāt dar dawra-yi Ṣafawī*, p. 227; Jāwidān, 'Ālimān-i Shīʿa wa taṣawwuf', p. 211.
- 136 Ibid.
- 137 For this dispute between Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī and Qumī see Jaʿfarīyān, *Ṣafawīyya dar ʿarṣih dīn, farhang wa siyāsāt*, vol. II, pp. 605-658.
- 138 Ibid., p. 241.
- 139 Ibid., pp. 242-243.
- 140 Aḥmad Muqadas Ardibīlī, *Ḥadiqat al-Shīʿa* (Tehran: Nashr-i Dilshād, 1387 A. Hsh./ 2008). Allāma Burqīʾī has a detailed explanation about Shīʿite clerics proving that *Ḥadiqat al-Shīʿa* was written by Ardibīlī (Allāma Burqīʾī, *Ḥaqīqat al-ʿirfān* (place unknown, date unknown), pp. 47-48).

- 141 Nasrollah Pourjavady, 'Opposition to Sufism in Twelver Shiism', in F. de Jong and B. Radtke (eds.), *Islamic Mysticism Contested: Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), p. 622.
- 142 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1109; Shīrwānī, *Rīyāḍ*, p. 55.
- 143 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', p. 132; Scharbrodt, 'The *quṭb* as Special Representative of the Hidden Imam', p. 34.
- 144 Ja'fariyān, *Dīn wa siyāsāt dar dawra-yi Ṣafawī*, p. 254.
- 145 Lewisohn, 'Sufism and the School of Iṣfahān', pp. 132-133.
- 146 Bayat, 'Anti-Sufism in Qājār Iran', p. 625.
- 147 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 1114-1115.
- 148 Muḥammad Bāqir Khuwnsārī, *Rawḍāt al-jannāt fī aḥwāl al-'ulamā' wa al-sādāt*, vol. I (Tehran: Ismā'īliyyān publication, 1390/ 2011), p. 129; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 38.
- 149 The school of *Akhbārism* is explained below.
- 150 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. I, p. 268.
- 151 Kabūdarāhangī, *Ras'āl Majdhūbiyya*, p. 5; Shīrwānī, *Rīyāḍ al-Sīyāḥa*, p. 621.
- 152 Ja'fariyān, *Dīn wa siyāsāt dar dawra-yi Ṣafawī*, p. 235.
- 153 Ibid., pp. 246-249.
- 154 Mullā Muḥammad Taqī Majlisī, *Risāla tashwīq al-sālikīn* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Nūr-i Fāṭima, 1375 A. Hsh./1996).
- 155 Ibid., pp. 1115-1116.
- 156 Ja'fariyān, *Dīn wa siyāsāt dar dawra-yi Ṣafawī*, p. 253; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 1115-1116.
- 157 Ibid., p. 256.
- 158 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 262-265.
- 159 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 171.
- 160 Ibid.
- 161 Ibid.
- 162 Sefatgol, 'From Dār al-Salṭana-yi Iṣfahān to Dār al-Khilāfa-yi Ṭihrān', p. 72.
- 163 Axworthy, *Sword of Persia*, pp. 17-18; Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, pp. 3-4. Amanat, *Modern Iran*, pp. 142-151.
- 164 Āṣif, *Rustam*, p. 182.
- 165 Axworthy, *Sword of Persia*, pp. 165-166 and pp. 171-193; Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 45; John R. Perry, *Karīm Khan Zand* (Oxford: One-world Publications, 2006), p. 12.
- 166 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 45; Perry, *Karīm Khan Zand*, p. 12.
- 167 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 45.

- 168 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1770.
- 169 Ibid., p. 51.
- 170 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 51.
- 171 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1848.
- 172 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. I, p. 58.
- 173 Ibid., p. 59.
- 174 Amanat, *Modern Iran*, pp. 152-153.
- 175 Ibid., p. 153.
- 176 Ibid.
- 177 Āṣif, *Rustam*, p. 408.
- 178 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 71.
- 179 Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 91.
- 180 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 71.
- 181 Perry, *Karīm Khan Zand*, p. 123; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 661.
- 182 Perry, *Karīm Khan Zand*, p. 123.
- 183 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, p. 87.
- 184 Āṣif, *Rustam*, pp. 322-324.
- 185 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 86.
- 186 Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 127.
- 187 Perry, *Karīm Khan Zand*, p. 122.
- 188 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Zarrīnkūb, *Ruzigārān: Tārīkh-i Īrān az āghāz ta suqūṭ-i salṭanat pahlawī* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Sukhan, 1390 A. Hsh./ 2011), p. 727.
- 189 Āṣif, *Rustam*, p. 436.
- 190 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 75; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 130; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq Al-Ḥaqā'iq*, Vol. III, p. 187.
- 191 Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū*, p. 376.
- 192 Joanna De Groot, *Religion, Culture and Politics in Iran* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007), p. 89.
- 193 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 40.
- 194 Zarrīnkūb, *Arzish-i mīrāth*, p. 98.
- 195 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 66; Amanat, *Modern Iran*, pp. 162-166.
- 196 For further information about his wars and negotiation with neighbouring countries see Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, pp. 130-158; Amanat, *Modern Iran*, pp. 166-172.
- 197 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 75.
- 198 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1283.
- 199 Bayat, 'Anti-Sufism in Qājār Iran', p. 627.

- 200 Ibid.
- 201 Hidāyat, *Riyād*, p. 540.
- 202 Ḥā'irī, *Nakhushtīn*, p. 359.
- 203 Kamran Aghaie, 'Religious Rituals, Social Identities and Political Relationships in Tehran under Qājār Rule, 1850s-1920s', in R. Gleaves (ed.), *Religion and Society in Qājār Iran* (London: Routledge Curzon, 2005), p. 376.
- 204 Arjomand, 'Political Ethic and Public Law', p. 21.
- 205 Ibid.
- 206 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, pp. 76-77; Ḥā'irī, *Nakhushtīn*, p. 358.
- 207 De Groot, *Religion, Culture and Politics in Iran*, p. 90.
- 208 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1432.
- 209 Ibid., p. 1433.
- 210 Bayat, *Mysticism and Dissent*, p. 21.
- 211 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1431.
- 212 Ḥā'irī, *Nakhushtīn*, p. 410; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 251.
- 213 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1912; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, pp. 314-315.
- 214 Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū*, p. 375.
- 215 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 364-365 and 1054.
- 216 Ibid., p. 1041.
- 217 Āqā Muḥammad Bāqir was highly regarded by the followers of the Uṣūlī school. As Abbas Amanat observed, 'In the late eighteenth century, perhaps with some attention to the great scholars of the past and in comparison with the Sunni religious hierarchy, Āqā Muḥammad Bāqir Bihbahānī was acknowledged the "master of all," the "unique," and the "promoter" of the modern Uṣūlī school. Some scholars, most of them Bihbahānī's own students, regarded him as the "renewer of the beginning of the century," a concept more familiar in Sunni than in Shi'ite thought' (Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 41).
- 218 Bayat, 'Anti-Sufism in Qājār Iran', p. 627.
- 219 Ibid.
- 220 Andrew Newman, 'Anti-Akhhārī Sentiment among the Qājār 'Ulamā's: the case of Muḥammad Bāqir al-Khwānsārī (d. 1313/ 1895)', in R. Gleaves (ed.), *Religion and Society in Qājār Iran* (London: Routledge Curzon, 2005), p. 155.
- 221 De Groot, *Religion, Culture and Politics in Iran*, pp. 95-96.
- 222 Newman, 'Anti-Akhhārī', p. 165; Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 77; Jāwidān, 'Ālimān-i Shī'a wa Taṣawwuf', p. 210.
- 223 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 43.
- 224 Ibid.

- 225 Ibid., p. 78.
- 226 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 1461-1463.
- 227 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 267; Shīrwānī, *Rīyād*, p. 657.
- 228 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1495; Shīrwānī, *Rīyād*, p. 315.
- 229 Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī Bihbahānī, *Khayrātīyya* (Qum: Intishārāt-i Anṣārīyān, 1412 A.H./1991), p. 459.
- 230 Jāwidān, 'Ālimān-i Shī'a wa Taṣawwuf', p. 211. For further information see Royce, *Mīr Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, pp. 169-172.
- 231 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1433.
- 232 Bihbahānī, *Khayrātīyya*, vol. I, p. 9.
- 233 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 77.
- 234 Bihbahānī, *Khayrātīyya*, vol. I, p. 16.
- 235 Ibid., pp. 40-43.
- 236 Ibid., pp. 30-40.
- 237 Ibid., pp. 13-15.
- 238 Ibid., pp. 23-29.
- 239 Ibid., pp. 21-23, 29-30.
- 240 Ibid., pp. 15-21.
- 241 Āqā Muḥammad Ja'far ibn Āqā Muḥammad 'Alī, *faḍāyih al-Ṣūfiyya* (Qum: Intishārāt-i Anṣārīyān, 1413 A.H./ 1992 C.E.).
- 242 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 267; Shīrwānī, *Rīyād*, p. 657.
- 243 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 257.
- 244 His role in Shī'ite seminary schools was explained in Chapter One.
- 245 Ḥā'irī, *Nakhustīn*, pp. 356-357.
- 246 Ibid., p. 360.
- 247 Ḥā'irī, *Nakhustīn*, p. 358
- 248 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 199.
- 249 Richard C. Foltz, *Spirituality in the Land of the Noble: How Iran Shaped the World's Religions* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2008), p. 145.
- 250 Shīrwānī, *Rīyād*, p. 655.
- 251 Ibid., p. 265.
- 252 Pourjavady and Wilson, *Kings of Love*, pp. 142-143.

Chapter 3

- 1 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 14.
- 2 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 229; Hidāyat, *Uṣūl al-fuṣūl*, Hamadān, fols. 358-359; Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 10; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarāʾiq al-ḥaqāʾiq*, vol. III, p. 171; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 309.
- 3 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 262. Muḥammad Maʾṣūm Shīrāzī likewise asserts that prior to the spiritual leadership of Maʾṣūm ʿAlī Shāh for 70 years no one in Persia had received any spiritual guidance and Sufi mystical teaching (Shīrāzī, *Ṭarāʾiq*, vol. III; p. 171).
- 4 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 264.
- 5 Foltz, *Spirituality in the Land of the Noble*, p. 143.
- 6 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 71.
- 7 That is to say, they originated from the Deccan Plateau in India.
- 8 Pourjavady and Wilson, *Kings of Love*, p. 93; Royce, *Mīr Maʾṣūm ʿAlī Shāh and the Niʾmat Allāhī Revival*, pp. 82-83.
- 9 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 71; Royce, *Mīr Maʾṣūm ʿAlī Shāh and the Niʾmat Allāhī Revival*, pp. 83-86.
- 10 Dīwānbaygī Shīrāzī, *Ḥadīqat al-Shuʿarā*, vol. II, p. 1036.
- 11 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 219; Hidāyat, *Uṣūl* (Tehran), p. 547; Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 11; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarāʾiq*, vol. III: pp. 170-171; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 264; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 206.
- 12 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 264.
- 13 Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 11; Royce, *Mīr Maʾṣūm ʿAlī Shāh and the Niʾmat Allāhī Revival*, pp. 86-87.
- 14 Īzadgushasb, *Shams al-tawārīkh* (Tehran: Chāpkhānih Naqshi Jahān, 1345 A. Hsh./ 1966), p. 75; Khuyī, *Ādāb*, p. 351; Royce, *Mīr Maʾṣūm ʿAlī Shāh and the Niʾmat Allāhī Revival*, p. 87; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarāʾiq*, vol. III, p. 170; Sulṭānī, p. 206.
- 15 Īzadgushasb states that many have used the word ʿdhūʾlgharnaynʾ as the numerical value 1147 A.H. (Īzadgushasb, *Shams*, p. 75).
- 16 Khuyī, *Ādāb*, p. 352; Royce, *Mīr Maʾṣūm ʿAlī Shāh and the Niʾmat Allāhī Revival*, p. 87; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarāʾiq*, vol. III, p. 170; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 660; Sulṭānī, p. 206.
- 17 Royce, *Mīr Maʾṣūm ʿAlī Shāh and the Niʾmat Allāhī Revival*, p. 87; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 660.
- 18 Pourjavady and Wilson, *Kings of Love*, p. 94; Royce, *Mīr Maʾṣūm ʿAlī Shāh and the Niʾmat Allāhī Revival*, p. 673.

- 19 Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 10; Khuyī, *Ādāb*, p. 352; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, pp. 87-88; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 170; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 660.
- 20 Camel dung is still used for fuel among the lesser classes in India.
- 21 Pourjavady and Wilson, *Kings of Love*, p. 94.
- 22 Khuyī, *Ādāb*, p. 352; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 89; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 170; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 661.
- 23 Hidāyat, *Rīyāḍ*, p. 451; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 90; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 160; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 661.
- 24 Pourjavady and Wilson, *Kings of Love*, p. 125.
- 25 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 220.
- 26 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 71; Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 10; Khuyī, *Ādāb*, p. 342; Pāzūkī, 'qarn shishum', p. 43; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 90; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 661; Sulṭānī, p. 206.
- 27 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, pp. 229-230.
- 28 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 71.
- 29 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 220; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 310. [cf Amanat, *Modern Iran*]
- 30 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, Vol. II, p. 295.
- 31 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 171.
- 32 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 71.
- 33 For further information about Fayḍ 'Alī Shāh see Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, pp. 93-101.
- 34 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 72; Dīwānbaygī Shīrāzī, *Ḥadīqat al-Shu'arā*, vol. II, p. 1037; Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 230; Khuyī, *Ādāb*, pp. 352-353; Javad Nurbakhsh, *Masters of the Path: A History of the Masters of the Nimatullahi Sufi Order*, trans. Leonard Lewisohn (New York: Khaniqahi-Nimatullahi Publication, 1980), p. 76; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. II, p. 332; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 171; Shīrwānī, *Ḥadā'iq al-Sīyāḥa* (Tehran: Sāz-mān-i Chāp-i Danishgāh, 1348 A. Hsh./ 1969), p. 27; Sulṭānī, p. 206.
- 35 Dīwānbaygī Shīrāzī, *Ḥadīqat al-Shu'arā*, vol. II, p. 1037; Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 230; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. II, p. 332; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 661. For additional biography of Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh see Gulābzada, *Pazhūhishī dar rūy-dād-i qatl-i Mushtāq*.
- 36 Nurbakhsh, *Masters of the Path*, p. 84.
- 37 Āṣif, *Rustam*, p. 408.
- 38 Ibid., p. 234.

- 39 Sufi masters, as spiritual guides, were viewed as deputies of God. Some Sufis took this philosophy to extremes. Shi'ite Sufis, who believed in the deputyship of Imām or had chiliastic beliefs, were always in danger of being accused of claiming their master to be the Mahdī. Shāh Ni'matullāh (d. 834/1431) with strong chiliastic beliefs was among the prominent Sufi masters, whose order, as explained, became one the most influential Sufi orders within Shi'ite culture. Shaykh Ishāq Khutlānī (d. 826/1423) and Sayyid Muḥammad Nūrbakhsh (d. 869/1464) were also among those Sufi masters who created fertile ground for chiliastic beliefs. Sayyid Muḥammad Nūrbakhsh's views on the advent of the promised Messiah or Mahdī, for instance, did not provide any clear distinction between the person of the Mahdī and that of the Sufi master.

There were also extremist movements based on messianic beliefs. Shaykh Khalifa (d. 736/1335) and Ḥassan Jūrī (d. 743/1342) formed a rebellious movement against the tyranny of Ilkhanid rulers in Persia, known as the Sarbidārī movement (explained in Chapter Two). Extremist mystical quasi-Sufi philosophies were also formed by Sufis like Faḍlullāh Astarābādī (d. 796/1394), the founder of the Ḥurūfī movement, who was brutally executed for his heretical beliefs. Maḥmūd Pasīkhānī (d. 831/1427) also formed the Nuqtawīyya movement and declared himself to be the promised Mahdī. Furthermore, Muḥammad Musha'sha' (d. circa 1461) was the founder of the Musha'sha'īyya movement and claimed to be the earthly representative of the Mahdī. For further information see Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, pp. 13-15; Arjomand, *The Shadow of God*; Bashir, *Fazlallah Astarabadi and the Hurufis*; Bashir, *Messianic Hopes and Mystical Visions*; Siyāwash Dīlfānī, *Tārīkh-i Musha'sha'īyān* (Qazwīn: Baḥr ul-'ulūm publication, 1379 A. Hsh/2000); Muḥammadali Ranjbar, *Musha'sha'īyān: māhīyat fikrī-Ijtimā'ī wa farāyand taḥawulāt-i tārīkhī* (Tehran: Nashr-i āgah, 1382 A. Hsh./ 2003).

- 40 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 17.
 41 Ibid., vol. III, p. 18.
 42 Royce, *Mīr Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 128.
 43 Āshif, *Rustam*, p. 323.
 44 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 295.
 45 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p.75; Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 295.
 46 Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 76; Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, p. 295; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 172; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 661; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 320.

- 47 Khuyī, *Ādāb*, p. 353; Nurbakhsh, *Masters of the Path*, p. 77; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 129; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 266-267; Scharbrodt, 'The quṭb as Special Representative of the Hidden Imam', p. 38; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 207.
- 48 Khuyī, *Ādāb*, p. 353; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 172; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 266-267 and 661.
- 49 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 295; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 93.
- 50 A *tekke* is a building for Sufi gatherings. In Persia *tekkes* were also called *khānaqāh* and these buildings were often part of a complex which included the shrine of masters. A perfect example is the complex of Shaykh Ṣafī al-Dīn Ardabīlī, which is located in Ardabīl. For further information about *tekke* see Muḥsin Kīyānī, *Tārīkh-i khānaqāh dar Īrān*, pp. 106-110.
- 51 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 75; Dīwānbaygī Shīrāzī, *Ḥadīqat al-Shu'arā*, vol. II, p. 1037; Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, pp. 230-231; Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, p. 296; Nūr 'Alī Shāh, *Majmū'a az āthār-i Nūr 'Alī Shāh Isfahānī*, ed. Jawād Nūrbakhsh (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Khānaqāh-i Ni'mat-ullāhī, 1350 A. Hsh./1971-1972), introduction; Scharbrodt, 'The quṭb as Special Representative of the Hidden Imam', p.38; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 207; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 320.
- 52 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 296; Scharbrodt, 'The quṭb as Special Representative of the Hidden Imam', pp. 38-39; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 207.
- 53 Wandering dervishes wandered around and received donations from the public. Whenever they received a donation they would blow their trumpets in honour of the donor, which was a sign of joy, appreciation and happiness. Blowing their trumpets when 'Alī Murād Khān escaped Isfahān represented their joy at his escape and their aversion to 'Alī Murād Khān.
- 54 Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, pp. 37-38; Hidāyat, *Uṣūl* (Hamadān), p. 359; Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 296; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 137; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 172; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 207; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 320.
- 55 Muḥammad 'Alī Isfahānī (Nūr 'Alī Shāh), ed. Dr. Jawād Nūrbakhsh, *Dīwān* (Tehran: Intishārāt Yaldā Qalam, 1381 A. Hsh/ 2002), p. 6.
- 56 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 75.
- 57 Dīwānbaygī Shīrāzī, *Ḥadīqat al-Shu'arā*, vol. II, pp. 1037-1038; Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 231; Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 38; Īzadgushasb, *Shams*, p. 76; Hidāyat, *Uṣūl* (Hamadān), p. 359; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, pp. 138-139; Scharbrodt, 'The quṭb as Special Repre-

- sentative of the Hidden Imam', p. 39; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, pp. 172-173; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 207.
- 58 Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 38; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 144; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 173; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 207; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 320.
- 59 Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 38; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 173; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 207; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 320.
- 60 Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 39; Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 297.
- 61 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 232.
- 62 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 662; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 320.
- 63 Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, p. 297.
- 64 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 232.
- 65 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, pp. 234-235; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 321.
- 66 *Kings of Love* has a chapter called 'Mullās and Kings' which elaborates and explains this transformation of the Ni'matullāhī order from a Qalandari'ite movement to a scholarly movement (Pourjavady and Wilson, *Kings of Love*, pp. 136-155).
- 67 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 234; Hidāyat, *Uṣūl* (Hamadān), p. 361; Malcolm, *The History of Persia*, vol. II, pp. 297-298; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 171; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 174; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 663; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 208; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 321.
- 68 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 174; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 267 and 663; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 208; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 317.
- 69 Dīwānbaygī Shīrāzī, *Ḥadīqat al-Shu'arā*, vol. II, p. 1039.
- 70 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 77; Dīwānbaygī Shīrāzī, *Ḥadīqat al-Shu'arā*, vol. II, p. 1039; Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 15; Īzadgushasb, *Shams*, p. 76; Ḥā'irī, *Nakhustīn*, p. 359; Hidāyat, *Uṣūl* (Hamadān), p. 361; Pāzūkī, 'qarn shishum', p. 43; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 171; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 174; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 663.
- 71 Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 172.
- 72 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 175; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 663.
- 73 Khuyī, *Ādāb*, pp. 365-366. Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 175; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 663.
- 74 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 72.
- 75 Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, pp. 242-244.
- 76 Michael A. Sells, *Early Islamic Mysticism: Sufi, Qur'an, Poetic and Theological writings* (New York: Paulist Press, 1995), pp. 18-20.

- 77 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 185; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 666; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 209.
- 78 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 186; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 668.
- 79 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 171.
- 80 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 666, 668.
- 81 Cited in Sells, *Early Mysticism*, p. 163.
- 82 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 666; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 209.
- 83 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 184.
- 84 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 72.
- 85 He is discussed in the next chapter.
- 86 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 249.
- 87 Ibid., pp. 1911-1912.
- 88 Hidāyat, *Uṣūl* (Tehran), p. 509.
- 89 De Groot, *Religion, Culture and Politics in Iran*, p. 89.
- 90 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 35.
- 91 Ibid., pp. 77-78.
- 92 Pourjavady and Wilson, *Kings of Love*, p. 124; Scharbrodt, 'The quṭb as Special Representative of the Hidden Imam', p. 40.
- 93 For further information about the spiritual life of Nūr 'Alī Shāh see Michel de Miras, *La method spirituelle d'un maître du Soufism iranien, Nur 'Ali-Shah, circā 1748-1798* (Paris: Edition du Sirac, 1974).
- 94 Hidāyat, *Ri'yād*, p. 699; Khuyī, *Ādāb*, p. 365; Scharbrodt, 'The quṭb as Special Representative of the Hidden Imam', p. 37; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 187.
- 95 Hidāyat, *Ri'yād*, p. 699; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 187.
- 96 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 690; Khuyī, *Ādāb*, p. 365; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 93; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 187; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 262.
- 97 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 72.
- 98 Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 319.
- 99 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 72.
- 100 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 690; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 198.
- 101 Khuyī, *Ādāb*, p. 365.
- 102 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 198; Hidāyat, *Ri'yād*, p. 699; Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 690; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 661; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 206; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, pp. 319-320.
- 103 Nurbakhsh, *Masters of the Path*, p. 83.
- 104 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 661; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 206.
- 105 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 188.

- 106 Dīwānbaygī Shīrāzī, *Ḥaḍīqat al-Shu'arā*, vol. II, pp. 1037-1038; Īzadgushasb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 38; Ḥaḳīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 231; Hidāyat, *Uṣūl* (Hama-dān), p. 359; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, pp. 172-173.
- 107 Ḥaḳīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 690; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 198.
- 108 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, pp. 171, 198; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 661.
- 109 Pāzūkī, 'qarn shishum', p. 43; Pourjavady and Wilson, *Kings of Love*, p. 125; Sulṭānī, *Rahbarān*, p. 206.
- 110 Īzadgushasb, *Shams*, p. 76; Royce, *Mīr Ma'ṣūm 'Alī Shāh and the Ni'mat Allāhī Revival*, p. 102.
- 111 Muḥammad 'Alī Mudarris, *Rayḥānat al-adab*, vol. 6 (Tabriz: Nashr-i Khayyām, 1335 A. Hsh./1956), p. 256.
- 112 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 198.
- 113 Iṣfahānī (Nūr 'Alī Shāh), *Dīwān*, p. 122; Scharbrodt, 'The *quṭb* as Special Representative of the Hidden Imam', p. 43.
- 114 Iṣfahānī (Nūr 'Alī Shāh), *Dīwān*, p. 117; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 199.
- 115 Nurbakhsh, *Masters of the Path*, pp. 94-95; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 199.
- 116 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 199.
- 117 Ibid.
- 118 Ḥaḳīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 691; Hidāyat, *Riyāḍ*, p. 699; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, pp. 199-200. For further information see Tunikābunī, 'Qīṣaṣ', pp. 211-218.
- 119 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 43.
- 120 Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 323.
- 121 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 215.
- 122 Ḥaḳīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 692; Hidāyat, *Riyāḍ*, p. 699; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 200; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 268.
- 123 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, pp. 200-201; Hidāyat, *Riyāḍ*, p. 699; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 269.
- 124 Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 328.
- 125 Hidāyat, *Riyāḍ*, p. 699; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, pp. 200-201; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 269.
- 126 Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 326.
- 127 Hidāyat, *Riyāḍ*, p. 699; Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, pp. 200-201.
- 128 Hidāyat, *Riyāḍ*, p. 699; Muḥammad 'Alī Isfahānī (Nūr 'Alī Shāh), Rawnaq 'Alī Shāh and Nizām 'Alī Shāh, *Janāt al-Wiṣāl*, Dr. Javad Nurbakhsh (ed.) (Tehran: Intishārāti Khāniqāh Ni'matullāhī, 1348 A. Hsh./ 1969). Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, pp. 200-201; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 268-269.
- 129 Nūr 'Alī Shāh, Rawnaq 'Alī Shāh and Nizām 'Alī Shāh, *Janāt al-Wiṣāl*, p. T.

- 130 Mirsidih Hamadānī, 'Ṭarīqih ma'nawī Nūr 'Alī Shāh 'arif Īrānī', in M. Azmāyish (ed.), *'irfān-i Īrān* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Ḥaqīqat, 1381 A. Hsh./2002), No. 13, p. 128.
- 131 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, pp. 200-201.
- 132 Ḥaqīqat, *Tārīkh*, p. 692.
- 133 Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq*, vol. III, p. 200.
- 134 Īzadgushashb, *Nūr al-abṣār*, p. 41; Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, pp. 322-323.
- 135 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 268.
- 136 Pourjavady and Wilson, *Kings of Love*, p. 127.
- 137 Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 324.
- 138 Muḥammad 'Alī Iṣfahānī (Nūr 'Alī Shāh), *Rasā'il 'awārif al-ma'ārif* (Shīrāz: Intishārāt-i Kitābkhānīh Aḥmadī, 1363 A. Hsh./1984).
- 139 Hamadānī, 'Ṭarīqih ma'nawī Nūr 'Alī Shāh 'arif Īrānī', pp. 128-130.
- 140 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 249.
- 141 Ibid., p. 1492.
- 142 Muḥammad Ibrāhīm Bāstānī Pārīzī, 'Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh Shahīd Kirmānī', in M. Azmāyish (ed.), *'irfān-i Īrān* (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Ḥaqīqat, 1378 A. Hsh./1999), No. 2, p. 32.
- 143 Hidāyat, *Riyāḍ*, p. 587.
- 144 Ibid.; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1493.
- 145 Bāstānī Pārīzī, 'Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh Shahīd Kirmānī', pp. 32-33.
- 146 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1494.
- 147 Ibid., p. 662.
- 148 Ibid., p. 1494.
- 149 Hidāyat, *Riyāḍ*, p. 587; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 1492-1493.
- 150 Bāstānī Pārīzī, 'Mushtāq 'Alī Shāh Shahīd Kirmānī', p. 35.
- 151 Hidāyat, *Riyāḍ*, p. 587.
- 152 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1492; Hidāyat, *Riyāḍ*, p. 587.
- 153 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, pp. 1494-1495.
- 154 Ibid.
- 155 Muḥammad Taqī Kirmānī (Muḥafar 'Alī Shāh), *Kibrīt aḥmar wa baḥr al-asrār*, Dr. Javad Nurbakhsh (ed.) (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Khāniqāh Ni'matullāhī, 1350 A. Hsh./1971).
- 156 Muḥammad Taqī Kirmānī (Muḥafar 'Alī Shāh), *Diwān-i Mushtāqīyya*, Dr. Javad Nurbakhsh (ed.) (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Khāniqāh Ni'matullāhī, 1347 A. Hsh./1968).
- 157 Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1495.
- 158 Ibid., p. 1496.

- 159 Scharbrodt, 'The quṭb as Special Representative of the Hidden Imam,' pp. 43-44; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 664.
- 160 Amanat, *Resurrection and Renewal*, p. 74.
- 161 Scharbrodt, 'The quṭb as Special Representative of the Hidden Imam,' p. 43; Shīrwānī, *Bustān*, p. 1497.
- 162 For further information about Majdhūb 'Alī Shāh see Chapter Five.
- 163 Pourjavady and Wilson, *Kings of Love*, p. 117.
- 164 Zarrīnkūb, *Dunbāla*, p. 319.
- 165 Hamadānī, 'Ṭarīqih ma'nawī Nūr 'Alī Shāh 'arīf Īrānī', p. 124.
- 166 Pourjavady and Wilson, *Kings of Love*, p. 93.

Chapter 4

- 1 Nafīsī, *Tārīkh-i Ijtimā'ī wa Siyāsī*, vol. I, pp. 102-103.
- 2 Ibid., p. 100.
- 3 Ḥā'irī, *Nakhustīn*, pp. 356 and 360.
- 4 Nafīsī, *Tārīkh-i Ijtimā'ī wa Siyāsī*, vol. I, p. 107.
- 5 Ibid., p. 98.
- 6 Algar, *Religion and State*, p. 16.
- 7 Tunikābunī, *Qiṣaṣ*.
- 8 Algar, *Religion and State*, p. 72.
- 9 Ḥā'irī, *Nakhustīn*, p. 355.
- 10 This term refers to a verse from the Qur'ān: 'O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Messenger and those vested with authority (*ulū'l-amr*) from among you' (Qur'ān 4:59). There were disagreements between Shi'ite clerics and Sunni scholars about who were 'those vested with authority' and what their role was. Qummi, a Shi'ite cleric, condemned those believing the monarch to be 'vested with authority' as being part of Sunni tradition. There are different interpretations of the term 'vested with authority'. For further information see Ḥā'irī, *Nakhustīn*, pp. 327-356; Said Amir Arjomand, 'Ideological Revolution in Shi'ism', in S. A. Arjomand (ed.), *Authority and Political Culture in Shi'ism* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1988), pp. 178-209.
- 11 Ḥā'irī, *Nakhustīn*, p. 355.
- 12 Ibid., p. 360.
- 13 Algar, *Religion and State*, p. 64; M. Samī'ī and Kaywān Ṣadūqī, *Du Risāla dar Tārīkhi jadīd-i taṣawwuf* (Tehran: Pāzhang Publication, 1370 A. Hsh./1991), p. 63.

THE RISE OF THE NI‘MATULLĀHĪ ORDER

*SHĪ‘ITE SUFI MASTERS AGAINST ISLAMIC
FUNDAMENTALISM IN 19TH-CENTURY PERSIA*

Reza Tabandeh

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cover design: Tarek Atrissi Design
Cover illustration: Portrait of Majdhūb ‘Alī Shāh
(Private collection of Sultānḥusayn Tābandih)
Lay-out: Crius Group

ISBN 978 90 8728 367 4
e-ISBN 978 94 0060 412 4 (e-PDF)
e-ISBN 978 94 0060 413 1 (e-PUB)
NUR 717, 718

© Reza Tabandeh / Leiden University Press, 2021

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copy right owner and publisher of the book.

This book is distributed in North America by the University of Chicago Press
(www.press.uchicago.edu).