The Concept of jadhb *and the Image of* majdhūb *in Sufi Teachings and Life in the Period between the Fourth/Tenth and the Tenth/Sixteenth Centuries*

ARIN SALAMAH-QUDSI

Abstract

This paper discusses the theoretical basis of the Sufi term jadhb *(the effortless attraction of man by God), and examines the different approaches towards the figure of* majdhūb *as developed and presented in Sufi compendia and both Sufi and non-Sufi biographies of the period between the fourth/tenth and the tenth/sixteenth centuries. It suggests that there are three major phases in the development of the theoretical basis of* jadhb. *The first stage covers the period between the fourth/tenth century and the first half of the sixth/twelfth century.* Jadhb *during this stage was not discussed as a separate technical term, and its early foundations were embedded particularly in the early discussions of* tawba *(repentance) beside other expressions such as* ghayba *and* fanā'. *The period that began with the late part of the sixth/twelfth century and reached the early part of the seventh/thirteenth century was distinguished by attempts of later Sufi authors to moderate the problematic aspects of* jadhb *and to integrate it with the detailed discussions of* mashyakha *(*sheikh *status). In light of the increasing antinomian appearances of the* majdhūb*s and the anarchistic* qalandariyya *in Muslim landscapes, the period following the early part of the seventh/thirteenth century up to the tenth/sixteenth century witnessed the popularity of* majdhūb *Sufis whose antinomian approach towards social codes and religious rituals came to be freely presented in the sources.* Jadhb *became separated from the institutionalised doctrinal system of* mashyakha*, although some attempts were made to integrate* jadhb *with* sulūk *and, thus, to maintain the* majdhūb*'s ability to act as a spiritual guide.*

Introduction

Modern scholarship on early Sufism pays little attention to the problematic and elaborate concepts of *jadhb* (lit. effortless attraction of man by God), and *majdhūb* (the one who is attracted by God).[1] Included within his discussion of the saintly characteristics of the Sufi

[1] See Muḥammad Aʿlā b. ʿAlī al-Tahānawī, *Kashshāf iṣṭilāḥāt al-funūn wa l-ʿulūm*, (ed.) ʿAlī Daḥdūḥ, translated Persian into Arabic by ʿAbd Allāh al-Khālidī (Beirut, 1996), vol. 1, p. 554.

JRAS, *Series 3*, 28, 2 (2018), pp. 255–271
doi:10.1017/S1356186317000530

sheikh in *Die Schiitischen Derwischorden Persiens* (1976), Richard Gramlich investigates in great depth the dichotomy between *sulūk* (following a road, wayfaring, German: *Hinangezogene*)[2] and *jadhb* (effortless attraction, German: *Schreitende*) in Sufi literature. This dichotomy is implied in the detailed discussions of the process of qualifying wayfarers to the status of *sheikh* (*mashyakha*) in Sufi writings of the sixth/twelfth and seventh/thirteenth centuries.[3] At the beginning of his chapter on Sufi *mashyakha*, Gramlich refers to the influential role of the Sufi *sheikh* who "stands in the centre of the theories and aspirations of Sufi dervishes".[4] The state of *jadhb* in its content designates passivism. It should be, then, differentiated from other Sufi situations distinguished by a clear activism. Both activism and passivism were proposed by Gramlich as a way of clarifying the differences between *majdhūb* and *sālik* as part of his detailed treatment of the qualification for the status of *sheikh* in early Sufi thought.

Gramlich's short entry "*Madjdhūb*" in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* relies on his *Derwischorden* in addition to a few additional references to Arabic and Persian sources.[5] Leonard Lewisohn, who wrote the entry "*Sulūk*" in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam,* refers briefly to *jadhb* as the polar opposite of the Sufi concept of *sulūk*. The latter, as Lewisohn emphasises, has no early foundations in the oldest key Sufi works of the early stage. Neither *jadhb* as an influential concept in early Sufi thinking, nor the wider mechanism of its development parallel to the Sufi movement as a whole, has been the subject of detailed study in recent scholarship.

This article, therefore, discusses the treatment of the theoretical contents of *jadhb* in early Sufi compendia in the period from the fourth/tenth century up to the tenth/sixteenth centuries, and suggests three possible different stages in the development of this term. Among the questions that it raises are: How did *jadhb* and *majdhūb*s became essential components of later Sufi doctrines that highlighted the process of creating *sheikh*s? What were the various approaches regarding the image of *majdhūb* in early Muslim contexts? Were these approaches subordinate to different contexts of time and space?

In its very essence, the state of *jadhb* implies the mystic's arrival at his ultimate destination, that is the last stop on his arduous path, and, therefore, it disregards or marginalises the need to travel along the path through all its stages. Theoretically-speaking, the state of *jadhb* is not necessarily an outcome of this spiritual journey. Indeed, it can occur without being preceded by ascetic exercises and spiritual preparations. This idea was one of the serious challenges facing early Sufi theoreticians, and accordingly they made strenuous efforts to maintain the general theoretical structure of the Sufi path that they had started to consolidate in the course of the fourth/tenth century. This was a threefold structure beginning with difficult ascetic exercises and austerities and later turning into an intensive process of spiritual development shaped by successive states of divine grace, until the highest and most spiritually prestigious situation of achieving the final destination of the path is accomplished. This last stage is usually referred to in early Sufi writings in a variety of terms, including *ḥuḍūr*, *mushāhada*,

[2] *Sulūk*, according to Leonard Lewisohn's entry in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, could be seen from the standpoint of comparative religion as the Islamic version of the archetypal motif of the 'journey' described by the mystics of different religions as including various steps that should be taken to reach the union with God. See Leonard Lewisohn, "Sulūk", *EI2*, Brill Online, http://www.brillonline.nl/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/suluk COM_1119?s.num=1&s.q=Suluk. (accessed 14 October 2016)

[3] See Richard Gramlich, *Die Schiitischen Derwischorden Persiens* (Wiesbaden, 1976), vol. 2, pp. 189–194.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 182.

[5] See Richard Gramlich, "Madjdhūb", *EI2*, vol. 5, p. 1029.

wuṣūl, *jam'*, *maḥw*, *ṭams* and many others.[6] Sufi authors usually indicate that all stages that follow that of ascetic exercises depend completely on God's willingness to bestow His grace upon the mystic. God could, in particular cases, even keep the mystic at the preliminary stage and deprive him of the higher states of grace.[7]

Beside this general structure of the Sufi path, medieval Muslim societies witnessed the appearance of *majdhūb*s, those said to have been suddenly and intensively attracted by God without being wayfarers (sing. *sālik, pl. sālikūn*), and who had not travelled along the path of hardship and self-discipline beforehand. The authors of Sufi manuals, who became responsible for creating the general Sufi ethos, were unable to ignore the high position that those figures succeeded in gaining within their communities, and, hence, they included these exceptional cases into the general fabric of their theoretical systems, while maintaining the validity of their original threefold structure. Abū al-Qāsim al-Qushayrī (d. 465/1072), for instance, while discussing the state of *ghayba* (spiritual absence), provides an interesting story about the early Sufi character, Abū Bakr al-Shiblī (d. 334/946) in the section which he devotes to Sufi terminology. According to Qushayrī, Shiblī entered Abū al-Qāsim al-Junayd's (d. 298/910) place and found the great master of Baghdad sitting in the company of his wife. When the woman wanted to cover herself, Junayd asked her to calm down and remain seated since Shiblī at that moment was not able to identify her. Junayd started talking with Shiblī until the latter began to cry. Then Junayd asked his wife to cover herself since Shiblī had woken up from his spiritual absence (*afāq al-Shiblī min ghaybatihi*).[8] A more detailed version of this episode appeared prior to Qushayrī's work in Abū Nu'aym al-Iṣfahānī's *Ḥilyat al-awliyā'*, and with the same structure in the work of the late eighth/fourteenth century biographer, Ibn al-Mulaqqin.[9]

The absorption of the *jadhb* system into the formal Sufi ethos reached its peak when certain Sufi systems of thought, during the sixth/twelfth century, sought to integrate it into the emerging process of qualifying for *sheikh* status (*al-ta'hīl li-l-mashyakha*). Outlining the different strategies offered by early Sufi authors on how to deal with *jadhb* and *majdhūb* would provide us with a useful way of understanding the more general process of creating a Sufi ethos in the works of such authors, and so reveal just how dynamic and flexible this process was, and how creatively it responded to changing realities.

Early Foundations of *jadhb* in Classical Sufism

Early Sufi literature referred to the conceptual content of the term *jadhb,* the deep experience of spiritual intimacy and revelation, through the use of additional terms and a type of evasive language. The famous Sufi statement *jadhba min jadhbāt al-Ḥaqq turbī 'alā a'māl al-thaqalayn* (lit. "One divine *jadhba* surpasses all hardships performed by both *Jinn* and human beings")

[6]See Abū al-Qāsim al-Qushayrī, *al-Risāla al-qushayriyya* (Cairo, 1940), p. 38 (for *jam'*), p. 40 (for *ḥuḍūr*), p. 43 (for *mushāhada*). Cf. Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj al-Ṭūsī, *Kitāb al-luma'*, (ed.) Reynold A. Nicholson (Leiden, 1914), p. 355 (for *maḥw* and *ṭams*).

[7]See e.g., Qushayrī, *Risāla*, p. 34.

[8]*Ibid.*, p. 40.

[9]See Abū Nu'aym al-Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-awliyā' wa-ṭabaqāt al-aṣfiyā'* (Cairo and Beirut, 1996), vol. 10, p. 367; Ibn al-Mulaqqin, *Ṭabaqāt al-awliyā'*, (ed.) Nūr al-Dīn Sharība (Beirut, 1973), p. 211.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186317000530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dates back to the fourth/tenth century.[10] Nonetheless, it should be noted that the word *jadhb* itself appears to have been quite rare in sections devoted to terminology in Sufi works and manuals of this period. Abū Saʿīd al-Kharrāz (d. 286/899), the leading figure of the Sufis of Baghdad in the third/ninth century, describes at the very beginning of his *Kitāb al-ḍiyāʾ* those whom "God attracted their inner secrets" (*jadhaba al-Ḥaqq awhāmahum*).[11]

As part of his detailed section devoted to Sufi technical terms in his *Kitāb al-lumaʿ*, Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj al-Ṭūsī (d. 378/988) singled out the term *jadhb al-arwāḥ* (lit. "the attraction of the spirits"). Sarrāj explains the term by combining it with a group of synonymous terms that, according to him, all appear to designate divine providence (*ʿināya*) and guidance (*hidāya*). Two personalities are mentioned here: Abū Saʿīd al-Kharrāz and Abū Bakr al-Wāsiṭī (d. ca. 320/928). Both are quoted by Sarrāj as having defined *jadhb*:

> The divine attraction of the spirits, as well as the hearts' elevation, the revelation of secrets, the intimate discourse (*munājāt*), conversation (*mukhāṭaba*) and other synonyms are all phrases that carry the meanings of the divine providence, and they refer to what appears to human hearts from the lights of guidance [. . .]. It was Abū Saʿīd al-Kharrāz who is alleged to have said: God attracted the spirits of His friends, and He made them enjoy the recollection of His name and the arrival to His intimacy. God, furthermore, grants their bodies in advance with all pleasures that were supposed to be granted to them on the day after; and that is why the life of their bodies is like the life of the animals (*ʿayshu abdānihim ʿayshu al-ḥayawāniyyīn*), while the life of their souls is more like a life of God's men (*ʿayshu arwāḥihim ʿayshu al-rabbāniyyīn*). Wāsiṭī is reported to have said: God caused them to observe His deep secrets through which He attracted their inner selves to Himself. He [that is Wāsiṭī] said further: When God attracts the spirits and moves them away from the bodies, He stabilises the bodies with the intellects and the [human] attributes.[12]

However, in order to understand the way in which Sarrāj conceived *jadhb* and the sophisticated system of thought that lies behind it, the information implied in this extract needs to be subdivided as follows.

First, for Sarrāj himself, *jadhb al-arwāḥ* appears to be an additional synonym for a group of terms that imply states of observation and divine revelation, all of which could be caused ultimately by divine will. Meanwhile, Sarrāj quotes Kharrāz whose definition of the term combines the state of *jadhb* with spiritual pleasure (*ladhdha*).

Second, the definition provided by Kharrāz adds the element of pleasure to the state of *jadhb*. Kharrāz refrains from referring to the bodily or even the animalistic pleasures granted to those whose spirits deserve God's spiritual pleasures. In the state of *jadhb al-arwāḥ*, according to Kharrāz, the bodies of Sufis are not deprived of their right to enjoy earthly pleasures since the latter are considered an expression of God's will to recompense certain Sufis in this world by allowing them to enjoy the otherworldly pleasures in advance.

Third, Abū Bakr al-Wāsiṭī is an interesting figure of early Sufism. Laury Silvers, who relies heavily on his sayings in her detailed discussion of the relationship between theoretical and practical Sufism, refers to Wāsiṭī's theory on the relationship between God and the world of creation. God, according to Wāsiṭī, "is manifest in everything through what He makes

[10]See Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya*, (ed.) Johannes Pedersen (Leiden, 1960), p. 514.
[11]Abū Saʿīd al-Kharrāz, *Rasāʾil al-Kharrāz,* (ed.) Qāsim al-Sāmirrāʾī (Baghdad, 1967), p. 29.
[12]Sarrāj, *Lumaʿ*, p. 368, lines 3–15.

manifest of Himself. His making manifest the things is His manifestation through them".[13] God makes His own attributes and signs manifest in everything, and He makes His own Self manifest in each self. No one in the world of creation has the right to say "myself".

In another saying preserved by Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī (d. 412/1021) in his Sufi commentary on the Qurʾān, *Ḥaqāʾiq al-tafsīr*, Wāsiṭī is alleged to have said: "Among them are those whom the Real (*al-Ḥaqq*) attracts**,** and whom He blots out from themselves through Himself; for He says: 'God blots out whatever He wills and makes firm' [Q 13, 39]". The latter statement resembles that quoted by Sarrāj. The verbal form *jadhaba* in Wāsiṭī's statement was quoted by Sarrāj and, most probably, should be understood as "blots out" (*maḥā*). In other words, God blots out the selves of human beings since they are all manifestations of His absolute Self. Meanwhile, bodies are veiled from His act of *jadhb* since they are attached to the intellect and human attributes. *Jadhb* in Wāsiṭī's metaphysics is the ultimate destiny of selves (*sarāʾir*): It serves as God's way to make manifest of Himself through people's selves.

Sarrāj seems to be satisfied with quoting Wāsiṭī's statement without following it with a comment or explanation of his own. He did the same with the previous quotation from Abū Saʿīd al-Kharrāz. Both statements, it should be noted, imply a state in which the human body is detached from the inner self amidst *jadhb*. The body is 'animalistic' and, therefore, is veiled from the divine presence. Furthermore, both statements refer to *jadhb* not as a sudden or one-time spiritual experience but rather as a permanent spiritual description of the friends of God (*awliyāʾ Allāh*).

Abū Bakr al-Kalābādhī (d. 380/990) singles out the term *jadhb* as a separate technical term. The verbal form *jadhaba* appears twice in *Kitāb al-taʿarruf*, while the infinitive forms *jadhba* and *jadhb* are introduced in four places.[14] God's attraction is perceived as a proof of the state of *wilāya* (*aʿlām wilāyatihi*),[15] or a proof of the shift from the rank of *murīd* (the one who seeks God) to the rank of *murād* (the one whom God seeks to bring close to Him).[16] *Jadhb*, according to the second identification, refers to the shift from being the subject to the state of being the ultimate object of God's actions. In two places of Chapter 63 of his *Taʿarruf*, Kalābādhī introduces the term *jadhbat al-qudra*, and he presents three examples to explain the term: Pharaoh's magicians (*saḥarat Firʿawn*), ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, and finally Ibrāhīm ibn Adham:

> *Murād* is the one whom God attracts to Him by His *jadhbat al-qudra*, and He reveals to him the secret states of grace. This intensive revelation causes the *murād* to have a total commitment to his spiritual state, and a power needed to endure its hardships. One example of this state is that of Pharaoh's magicians [that according to the *Qurʾān*] when God revealed to them the very secret of Moses' prophecy, He graced them with the power to endure Pharaoh's punishment and that is why they said: "*We choose thee not above the clear proofs that have come unto us, and above Him Who*

[13] Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī, *Ḥaqāʾiq al-tafsīr*, Ms. British Museum, Oriental, 9433, 287a. Cf. Laury Silvers, "Theoretical Sufism in the Early Period: With an Introduction to the Thought of Abū Bakr al-Wāsiṭī (d. ca 320/928) on the Interrelationship between Theoretical and the Practical Sufism", *Studia Islamica* 98/99 (2004), p. 82.

[14] The verbal form appears in: Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Kalābādhī, *Kitāb al-taʿarruf li-madhhab ahl al-taṣawwuf*, (eds.) ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm Maḥmūd and Ṭāhā Surūr (Cairo, 1960), pp. 63, 140. The nominal form appears in *ibid*., pp. 78, 119, 140, 141.

[15] *Ibid*., p. 78.

[16] *Ibid*., p. 140.

> *created us. So decree what thou wilt decree*" [Q. 20,72]. Another example [of *jadhbat al-qudra*] is to be found in ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb's behaviour when he became totally captured by Islam at the same moment he intended to kill the prophet Muḥammad. [The third example is] the story of Ibrāhīm ibn Adham who went outside to go hunting, and, suddenly, heard an anonymous voice calling him twice: "You have not been created for this sake, and you have not been ordered to do this".[17]

According to Kalābādhī, the divine act of *jadhb* demonstrates the state commonly combined with *tawba* (repentance) in early Sufi writings, when a dramatic and shocking incident occurs suddenly, and leaves its intensive influence on one person, causing him to change his life completely.[18]

Later, Qushayrī does not refer to *jadhb* as a separate Sufi term as he did with many other terms in the section that he devotes to Sufi terminology in his *Risālā*.[19] Meanwhile, he refers in detail to the concept of *tawba*, which gains a special position in his influential epistle, as it does in other Sufi compendia of the fourth/tenth and fifth/eleventh centuries. It is the topic of the first chapter that opens a discussion of the different ranks of the Sufi path. *Tawba*, according to Qushayrī, is the most important of all Sufi degrees in the same way that standing on the mountain of *ʿArafa* is the most important ritual during the *Ḥajj*. Qushayrī's own definition of *tawba* is distinguished by his attempt to keep it among *makāsib*, those spiritual degrees that could be attained by the mystic's own efforts. He explains in great detail how someone could initiate *tawba*, and then practise it through certain codes of behaviour and morals. After its *Qurʾānic* opening, the relevant prophetic tradition, and Qushayrī's own definition of the terms (indeed these are the structural units of all his chapters on Sufi situations and states),[20] comes the structural unit in which the author gathers sayings of Sufi masters on *tawba*. It is here where the idea is frequently raised of the unexpected incident that leads to a sincere repentance that could never be followed by recanting. This stimulus, particularly in a form of an anonymous voice (*hātif*), appears mostly when the person who repents faces a situation of coldness (*fitra*) and loses interest in all the religious commitments imposed by *tawba*. One of those Sufis who felt coldness after making *tawba* used to ask himself: What would happen if he decided to turn back to his *tawba*, what would be his legal position (*kayfa ḥukmuhu*)? An anonymous voice suddenly sounded in his ears, saying: "Oh, you nameless creature! When you obeyed us we thanked you. Later on, when you left us behind, we gave you time to repent, and when you decided to turn back to us we welcomed you". It was claimed that this voice caused the Sufi to turn to God in a state of complete repentance and he succeeded in making his way along the Sufi path.[21]

[17] *Ibid*., pp. 140–141.

[18] Böwering refers to the most famous anecdotes of this type in his article on early Sufism between persecution and heresy. See Gerhard Böwering, "Early Sufism between Persecution and Heresy", in *Islamic Mysticism Contested: Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics*, (eds.) Frederick De Jong and Bernd Radtke (Leiden, 1999), pp. 45–67.

[19] Except for one place in which the author indicates that both verbal forms '*jadhaba*' and '*jabadha*' suggest the same meaning (in the chapter of fear): Qushayrī, *Risāla*, p. 65.

[20] On this rhetorical structure of Qushayrī's chapters in his *Risāla*, see, e.g., Reuven Snir, "*Bāb al-Maḥabba* (The Chapter on Love) in *al-Risāla al-Qushayriyya*: Rhetorical and Thematic Structure", *Israel Oriental Studies* 19 (1999), pp. 131–159.

[21] See Qushayrī, *Risāla*, p. 50.

In certain cases, the spiritual stimulus takes the form of someone's statement or an influential piece of advice coming from a great master. Interestingly, this was the case of Abū ʿAmr Ismāʿīl ibn Nujayd (d. 366/976). Ibn Nujayd himself was the famous Sufi master of Nishapur, and the maternal grandfather of Sulamī who, in turn, was one of Qushayrī's masters. Qushayrī relates that even Ibn Nujayd, at the very beginning of his spiritual career, experienced spiritual coldness (*waqaʿat lahu fitra*). Having been a sincere disciple who used to attend all the lessons of his master Abū ʿUthmān al-Ḥīrī (d. 298/910), he once decided to cease doing so. One day, Abū ʿUthmān followed Ibn Nujayd and, when he got close to him, he said to him: "Oh my son! Do not accompany that who wants you to be protected from committing faults (*maʿṣūm*). It is none other than Abū ʿUthmān, who will be of great benefit for you!" The young disciple Ibn Nujayd became completely overwhelmed by the tender words of his master and, consequently, turned back to God and made progress along the Sufi path.[22]

Sufi authors who portrayed the theoretical boundaries of the *tawba* system of thought most likely had to face the following paradox: If the very meaning of the verb *tāba* (repented) indicates a human effort to begin the act of 'turning back' to God, then how can this self-initiative process harmonise with the Sufi principle according to which all human behaviours and actions, including *tawba*, are exclusively motivated and caused by the divine will?[23] Early Sufi authors suggested an ingenious solution to this essential theoretical paradox. In order to overcome it, they introduced two levels of *tawba* into the detailed discussions of the topic in their writings, the first referring to a sudden situation of repentance, usually caused by a powerful stimulus such as an anonymous voice or saying, the second requires a lengthy process of purification and ascetic hardship. The first, I would argue, provides us with the earliest foundations of *jadhb*.

Stages in the Development of the Concept: A Proposed Sketch

As this article has pointed out, the early foundations of *jadhb* theory were embedded in the discussion of *tawba*. This is despite the fact that *tawba* was considered in early Sufi ethos as one of the stations (*maqāmāt)* that the Sufi acquires by his own will through his human efforts and not as a state of grace (*ḥāl*) that expresses God's will to bestow a spiritual state of the soul upon him. Sufi writings of the late sixth/twelfth century and the beginning of the seventh/thirteenth century provide some evidence that *jadhb* gradually became an established term that could designate the final destination of the Sufi path, or the highly demanding spiritual state to which many Sufis looked forward. The writings of Abū Ḥafṣ al-Suhrawardī (d. 632/1234) and his contemporary Najm al-Dīn al-Rāzī Dāya (d. 654/1256) are the most outspoken in this regard. Abū Ḥafṣ al-Suhrawardī, the prominent Sufi master of Baghdad, discusses the state of *jadhb* as one of the outstanding components in his practical system of qualifying for *mashyakha* status. This system encompassed the whole body of characteristics and conditions that needed to exist in Sufis who succeeded in achieving the

[22] *Ibid*.

[23] See e.g., one of the famous statements of the renowned female mystic, Rābiʿa al-ʿAdawiyya of Baṣra (d. 185/801) who is reported to have said: "It is only when God grants you the ability to repent, then you repent" ("*law tāba ʿalayka la-tubta*") (Qushayrī, *Risāla*, p. 52).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186317000530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

final destination of the Sufi path (the rank of *intihāʾ* according to Suhrawardī) so that they qualified for *mashyakha*. According to Suhrawardī, if the effortless attraction of the Sufi seeker by God (his *jadhba*) is followed by arduous spiritual training, the seeker reaches the path's final destination and becomes *muntahī*. Sufis who began as *majdhūb*s and later endured the hardships of the mystic path along its various stages are regarded as the preferred group to qualify for *mashyakha*.[24] A biographical note made by ʿAfīf al-Dīn al-Yāfiʿī (d. 768/67-1366) is very interesting here. Yāfiʿī in his *Rawḍ al-rayāḥīn fī ḥikāyāt al-ṣāliḥīn* discusses the category of the 'wise fools' (*ʿuqalāʾ al-majānīn*), and refers to a personality named ʿAlī al-Kurdī, a wise fool of Damascus. Yāfiʿī describes this man as follows: "He used to hold sway over the people of Damascus in the same way that a king was able to hold sway over his people".[25] Yāfiʿī, moreover, mentions the following anecdote: when the renowned master of Baghdad Abū Ḥafṣ al-Suhrawardī visited Damascus as the envoy of the Abbāsid *khalīfa* al-Nāṣir to the court of the Ayyūbī ruler al-Malik al-ʿĀdil in 604/1207, he asked his companions to take him to see ʿAlī al-Kurdī. His companions tried to convince him not to do so since Kurdī was "a man that used not to pray and to appear in public while uncovering his private parts" ("*hādhā rajul lā yuṣallī wa-yamshī makshūf al-ʿawra akthar awqātihi*"). It was narrated that Suhrawardī insisted on visiting the controversial figure in spite of his antinomian behaviour. When he arrived at Kurdī's place, the Baghdadi master dismounted and approached the fool who, after identifying Suhrawardī, exposed his private parts before him ("*kashafa ʿawratahu*")! Suhrawardī, according to the story, succeeded in controlling his shock, and even told the man that this strange behaviour did not affect his sincere will to visit him and talk to him. As a result, as Yāfiʿī relates, Kurdī allowed Suhrawardī to sit with him.[26] The same story was later mentioned by ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (d. 898/1492) in his biographical account of ʿAlī al-Kurdī.[27] The figure of ʿAlī al-Kurdī appears in the historiographies of Ibn Kathīr (d. 774/1373) and, later on, of Najm al-Dīn al-Ghazzī (d. 1061/1651). Ibn Kathīr refers to this man among those who died in 622, and indicates that the people of Damascus had disagreed about his character due to his strange behaviour.[28] Najm al-Dīn al-Ghazzī mentions ʿAlī al-Kurdī on two occasions in his *al-Kawākib al-sāʾira:* the first time, Ghazzī indicates that he was one of the famous defenders of traditional (*sunnī*) Islam who would denounce heretical tendencies in his days even though he used to "conceal his spiritual state from public eyes through *tajādhub* at the beginning of his career" ("*kāna yatasattar bi-l-tajādhub fī bidāʾat amrihi*"). The term *tajādhub* here, as the context indicates, refers to certain asocial actions that this man apparently used to carry out in public, such as riding on a cane and carrying another cane with a fox's tail attached to its top.[29] Elsewhere in Ghazzī's work, a reference is made to another figure also named ʿAlī al-Kurdī who died in 925 and who was,

[24]See A. Salamah-Qudsi, "The Everlasting Sufi: Achieving the Final Destination of the Path (*intihāʾ*) in the Sufi Teachings of ʿUmar al-Suhrawardī (d. 632/1234)", *Journal of Islamic Studies* 22, 3 (2011), pp. 330–331.

[25]ʿAbd Allāh b. Asʿad Abū al-Saʿādāt al-Yāfiʿī, *Rawḍ al-rayāḥīn fī ḥikāyāt al-ṣāliḥīn*, (ed.) Muḥammad al-Jādir and ʿAdnān ʿAbd Rabbihi (Damascus, 1995), p. 480.

[26]*Ibid*., p. 481.

[27]See ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī, *Nafaḥāt al-uns*, (ed.) Mahdī Pūr (Tehran, 1918), p. 581. Jāmī does not indicate al-Kurdī's date of death.

[28]See Abū al-Fidāʾ Ismāʿīl ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya*, (ed.) ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Lādhiqī and Muḥammad Bayḍūn (Beirut, 1999), vol. 13, p. 127.

[29]See Najm al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Ghazzī, *al-Kawākib al-sāʾira bi-aʿyān al-miʾa al-ʿāshira*, (ed.) Khalīl al-Manṣūr (Beirut, 1997), vol. 1, p. 284.

according to Ghazzī, one of the famous "three perfect *majdhūb*s" ("*al-majādhīb al-thalātha al-kummal*").[30] The latter reference creates the impression that two different figures bearing the same name lived in Damascus and acted as wise fools in two different periods.

Whether the story of the encounter between Suhrawardī and the wise fool of Damascus was authentic or fabricated by later biographers, its appearance in the sources has important implications as it appears that both Yāfiʿī and Jāmī believed that referring to this story would provide an effective instrument with which to defend the *jadhb* system of their day. Examining the works of Suhrawardī, the renowned master of Baghdad, who himself offered a level-headed approach towards *jadhb* and *majdhūb* in his writings, could defend *jadhb* and the fame of wise fools who most probably were targets for traditionalists' condemnation and accusation, more than anything else. According to Yāfiʿī, for instance, ʿAlī al-Kurdī was only one example of a larger group of wise fools who used to act anarchically in public, such as uncovering their private parts, so as to claim that they had abandoned the rituals of Islam, and that they would no longer pray nor fast, while in practice they prayed and fasted and observed all the rituals.[31]

Such antinomian codes of behaviour were common among *majdhūb* figures and deviant dervish groups known in the history of Islam as the *qalandariyya*. The latter were referenced in detail for the first time in Arabic writings in Suhrawardī's *ʿAwārif al-maʿārif*. *Qalandarī* Sufis, who intentionally violated social norms of behaviour and dress and did not submit themselves to masters of instruction and training, were a well-known phenomenon in Suhrawardī's time, as shown by the pioneering work by Ahmet Karamustafa on *qalandariyya* and other deviant dervishes.[32] *Qalandariyya*, however, had made their appearance before Suhrawardī's days. The earliest work that documents them is—most probably—ʿAbd Allāh Anṣārī of Herāt's *Qalandar-nāmeh* dating from the fifth/eleventh century.[33] In the early part of the seventh/thirteenth century, *qalandariyya* got as far as Anatolia as implied in Aflākī's biographical work *Manāqib al-ʿārifīn*.[34]

The anarchist and anti-social appearances of *qalandariyya* left their marks on Muslim landscapes during the seventh/thirteenth century. Karamustafa points out that Suhrawardī's contemporary Jamāl al-Dīn al-Sāwī (or al-Sāwjī) (d. ca. 630/1232-33)—the man who took responsibility for crystallising the theoretical system of the *qalandariyya*—used to uncover parts of his body in public.[35] Suhrawardī himself was not able to conceal his positive attitude towards the *qalandariyya* in the same way as he did not hide his respect for *majdhūb*s. *Taṣawwuf* of the two categories, according to him, could not be considered the ultimate manifestation

[30] *Ibid*., vol. 1, p. 63.

[31] See Yāfiʿī, *Rawḍ al-rayāḥīn*, pp. 482–483.

[32] See Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period 1200-1550* (Salt Lake City, 1994), pp. 34–36.

[33] Karamustafa mentions an early work which is attributed to Bābā Ṭāhir ʿAryān who died in the first half of the fifth/eleventh century. Since the word *qalandar* appears in this work, it might be possible to assume that *qalandarī* teachings entered Persian literature in the course of the late fourth/tenth century, that is before the work of Anṣārī. See Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, pp. 32–33.

[34] See Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad Aflākī, *Manāqib al-ʿārifīn*, (ed.) Taḥsīn Yāzajī (Ankara, 1959-1961), vol. 2, p. 596.

[35] *Ibid*., pp. 14–17.

of the Sufi mode of life as Suhrawardī conceived of this; however, for him it was still legitimate and acceptable.[36]

Suhrawardī's tolerant approach did not harmonise with the severely critical voices against both *jadhb* and the social deviance of *qalandariyya* that existing during his time. The *Ḥanbalī* scholar Ibn al-Jawzī (d. 597/1200), who interestingly did not mention the term *qalandariyya* in his *Talbīs Iblīs*, criticises the *malāmatiyya* (Sufis of blame) and their customs of concealing their piety and drawing the blame of the world by committing faults.[37] In his *Kitāb al-mawḍūʿāt*, Ibn al-Jawzī refers to a group of men who "fall asleep flat on their faces out of wandering in pious travel".[38] Such textual evidence suggests that even if wandering groups of *qalandariyya* were not known to practise a distinct mode of piety in Iraq in Ibn al-Jawzī's time, similar features and customs among other deviant individuals were undoubtedly present prior to the seventh/thirteenth century in that region. Suhrawardī, most likely, encountered deviant Sufis—who abandoned social norms and undertook anarchistic behaviour—belonging to both categories: *qalandariyya* and general *majdhūb*s. He might have also been acquainted with Anṣārī's aforementioned work on *qalandariyya*, and so, when he encountered deviant Sufis himself, he introduced the term *qalandariyya* to describe them.

Having said this, the suggested shift in approaching *jadhb* in Sufi writings drew upon the teachings of Suhrawardī and his contemporaries over the course of the late sixth/twelfth century and the beginning of the seventh/thirteenth century. Another Sufi author of that period was Najm al-Dīn al-Kubrā (d. 618/1221). Kubrā provides an additional theoretical basis to the legitimate position of *majdhūb* in his *Fawāʾiḥ al-jamāl wa-fawātiḥ al-jalāl*. Though *majdhūb* enjoy a high spiritual position according to Kubrā, they are not, in fact, qualified to act as a Sufi *sheikh*. In order to guide his novices effectively, a Sufi *sheikh* should 'taste' the difficulties along the path. *Majdhūb*, according to Kubrā, tastes the final destination of the path without enduring the pains of the journey that leads to it ("*fa-inna al-majdhūb wa-in dhāqa al-maqṣūd wa-lākin lam yadhuq al-ṭarīq ilā al-maqṣūd*").[39]

Richard Gramlich has discussed the differences among Sufi authors in Suhrawardī and Kubrā's time in relation to how they handled *jadhb* and the act of travelling along the path (*sulūk*). He presents two theoretical ways in which the two concepts were approached: the first way includes Suhrawardī and those who followed him, such as ʿIzz al-Dīn Kāshānī (d. after 735/1352–53) and ʿAzīz Nasafī (d. 686/1287); while the second way includes Kubrā and his famous disciple Najm al-Dīn al-Rāzī Dāya. Suhrawardī's category conceives of *jadhb* and *sulūk* as two separate situations that can each precede one other in terms of timing.

[36]See Abū Ḥafṣ al-Suhrawardī, *ʿAwārif al-maʿārif*, in Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī, *Iḥyāʾ ʿulūm al-dīn* (Cairo, 1967), vol. 5, p. 100.

[37]ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Jawzī, *Talbīs Iblīs*, (eds.) ʿIṣām al-Ḥarastānī and Muḥammad al-Zughlī (Beirut, 1994), p. 478.

[38]Ibn al-Jawzī, *Kitāb al-mawḍūʿāt*, (ed.) ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ʿUthmān (Al-Madīna al-Munawwara, 1386–8/1966–8), vol. 1, p. 32. The English translation of this quotation was made by Jonathan A. C. Brown in his article "Even If It's Not True It's True: Using Unreliable *Ḥadīth*s in Sunnī Islam", *Islamic Law and Society* 18 (2011), p. 20.

[39]Najm al-Dīn al-Kubrā, *Die Fawāʾiḥ al-Ǧamāl wa-Fawātiḥ al-Ǧalāl des Naǧm ad-Dīn al-Kubrā: Eine Darstellung Mystischer Erfahrungen in Islam aus der Zeit um 1200 N. Chr.*, (ed.) and translated Fritz Meier (Wiesbaden, 1957), p. 91.

Kubrā and Dāya, in contrast, prefer to integrate *jadhb* with *sulūk*, and to consider *sālik* as one who has a weak *jadhb* while considering *majdhūb* as a *sālik* who enjoys a strong *jadhb*.[40]

The integration of *jadhb* into detailed discussions of *mashyakha* over the course of the sixth/twelfth and early seventh/thirteenth centuries reached its peak in the writings of Abū Ḥafṣ al-Suhrawardī, Kubrā and their successors. I would argue here that after the first part of the seventh/century, references to *jadhb* in Sufi and non-Sufi biographies were intended to place the focus on certain aspects that differed from those of the previous phase. Early medieval literature began to devote greater space to *majdhūb* figures. Groups of *qalandariyya* succeeded in reaching the central Arab territories of Iraq and Syria and making a stronger impact on Muslim life there. Damascus may have played a fundamental role as one of the key centres of *majdhūb*s' activities. Scholarly attempts to moderate *jadhb* by identifying its connection with *sulūk*, such as in the biographical work of Junayd Shīrāzī and Yāfiʿī during the eighth/fourteenth century, reflect a reality in which *jadhb* could not maintain its previous position as an integral part of *mashyakha* system, and instead became an integral part of a general fabric of antinomianism that involved *majdhūb*s and *qalandar*s together.

This article now outlines the three stages in the development of *jadhb* conceptual systems. But since a detailed discussion of the first stage was presented earlier in this paper, I will treat it very briefly here while looking at the second and third suggested stages in more detail.

The first stage

From the fourth/tenth century to the first half of the sixth/twelfth century, the concept of *jadhb* was not discussed as a separate Sufi term. Rather it was generally integrated into the detailed discussions of repentance in addition to other contexts such as the discussions of the concept of *irāda* which technically designates the starting point of adopting the Sufi path. Early Sufi sources provide a theoretical differentiation between *murīd* (the one who desires to be a Sufi), and *murād* (the one who is desired by God's will).[41] In the chapter on *irāda* in his *Risāla*, Qushayrī states that Sufis of his day use the active participle *murīd* for the beginner Sufi and the passive participle *murād* for those who achieve the final destination of the Sufi path (*muntahī*).[42] Interestingly, Qushayrī, before Suhrawardī, refers to the possible situation according to which certain men could be granted mystic revelations and become initiated into God's knowledge and secrets at the very beginning of their spiritual careers, even without any previous intention or ascetic preparation. In this case, Qushayrī, like Suhrawardī later on, insists on the need for them to turn back to the path of hardship and ascetic austerities. *Murād* is beautifully described by Qushayrī as 'a flyer' (*ṭā'ir*), a famous

[40]See Gramlich, *Derwischorden*, vol. 2, p. 191. Kubrā's doctrinal system in reference to the two categories of *sālik* and *majdhūb* could be deduced from his *Risālat al-uṣūl al-ʿashara* ("*ahl al-maḥabba al-sālikīn bi-l-jadhba*"): Najm al-Dīn al-Kubrā, *Risālat al-uṣūl al-ʿashara*, MS. Rāghib Bāshā, 1453, fol. 276b; also MS. Leiden, Or. 1294, fol. 104b. In another treatise, *Risāla ilā al-hā'im*, Kubrā points out that *majdhūb* should not be qualified for *sheikh* status. See Kubrā, *Fawā'iḥ*, Meier's Introduction, p. 95 referring to *idem*, *Risāla ilā al-hā'im*, MS. Ayā Ṣūfyā, 2052, fol. 70b.

[41]For Suhrawardī's differentiation between *muḥibb* and *maḥbūb*, see also his untitled treatise, MS. Jagiellońska, 3994, fols. 45a–45b. On the terms *murīd* and *murād*, see e.g., Kalābādhī, *Taʿarruf*, pp. 107–108; Sarrāj, *Lumaʿ*, pp. 341–342.

[42]Qushayrī, *Risāla*, p. 102.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186317000530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

metaphor that was frequently used in later Sufi writings.[43] Here, we come across a colourful lexicon of treating the *jadhb* state without introducing the term itself.

Abū Yaʿqūb Yūsuf b. Yaḥyā al-Tādilī, known as Ibn al-Zayyāt (d. 617/1220), in his biographical work on the Sufis of North Africa—*Kitāb al-tashawwuf ilā rijāl al-taṣawwuf*—frequently describes his pious hero as a person who "became motivated by an intensive impulse, turned back to God, and left behind all worldly affairs" ("*thumma nazaʿat bihi ilā Allāh himma ʿāliya, fa-tajarrad min al-dunyā wa-takhallā ʿanhā*").[44] The same expression appears in the biography of Abū ʿAlī Manṣūr al-Ṣanhājī, whose biographical account goes as follows:

> Abū ʿAlī was preoccupied with his lower soul (*kāna musrifan ʿalā nafsihi*) while singing at wedding parties and amusing himself during those parties; he then became motivated by an intensive impulse (*nazaʿat bihi ilā Allāh himma ʿāliya*), and started accompanying pious men.[45]

Abū Yaʿqūb Tazūlī's *tawba* story includes the element of a sudden incident that caused the person to leave his previous life in pursuit of a pious mode of life. He was a thief who experienced a dramatic change after listening to a group of men whom he was about to attack.[46] A similar anecdote is told about Abū Wakīl Maymūn al-Aswad.[47] One of the long biographical accounts in Ibn al-Zayyāt's work refers to Abū Ibrāhīm Ismāʿīl al-Rajrājī (who died, according to Ibn al-Zayyāt, in 595/1198). The author describes in detail the strange behaviour of this man, who had no disciple of his own and who used to lose consciousness while speaking in a very ambiguous manner. One of his contemporaries relates that when he planned to meet the *sheikh*, Abū Ibrāhīm, he prayed to God asking Him to make the *sheikh*'s common sense keep him away from any strange behaviour at the time of their meeting, so as to allow him enjoy their association.[48]

This first stage in the development of *jadhb* theory needs to be considered in the light of a parallel development of another Sufi, concept *sulūk*. This term is absent from classical Sufi texts produced between the third/ninth and fourth/tenth centuries, which explains why *sulūk* as a key technical term within the Sufi lexicon does not appear in Louis Massignon's *Essai sur les origins du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane* (1928). It is interesting to note that when Sufi authors of the later period started dealing with *sulūk* as a methodical progress in which both the ethical and spiritual aspects of the mystic's life are combined together, the doctrine around the opposite state of being attracted without any methodical progress, namely that of *jadhb*, started to gain its special position in the history of Sufi thought.

[43] ʿUmar al-Suhrawardī, *Risālat al-sayr wa-l-ṭayr*, MS. Jagiellońska, 3304, fols. 58b-61b; ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad Najm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya, *Mirṣād al-ʿibād min al-mabdaʾ ilā l-maʿād*, (ed.) Ḥusayn al-Ḥusaynī al-Niʿmatullāhī known as Shams al-ʿUrafāʾ (n.p.: Majlis, 1312 shamsī), pp. 135–136.

[44] See Yūsuf b. Yaḥyā al-Tādilī Ibn al-Zayyāt, *Kitāb al-Tashawwuf ilā rijāl al-taṣawwuf wa-akhbār Abī al-ʿAbbās al-Sabtī*, (ed.) Aḥmad al-Tawfīq (Casablanca, 1997), p. 175.

[45] *Ibid*., p. 419. Cf. *ibid*, pp. 175, 229, 311, 305, 365.

[46] *Ibid*., p. 131.

[47] *Ibid*., p. 234.

[48] *Ibid*., p. 354.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186317000530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The second stage

The period from the late part of the sixth/twelfth century up to the early part of the seventh/thirteenth century witnessed the appearance of Sufi manuals that contributed to the embedding of *jadhb* into the discussions of *mashyakha* for the first time in the history of Sufi theory. Indeed, descriptions of *jadhb* experiences came to be one of the hallmarks in the process of establishing the saintly image of the great Sufi masters.

During this second stage, Sufi authors attempted to moderate the problematic aspects of *jadhb*. It should be noted here that the abnormal behaviour of mystics who claimed to be "attracted by the divine will" was witnessed in the public space of Muslim early medieval societies. Michael Dols indicates that in the course of the sixth/twelfth century, the Sufis of Islam adopted the term *ʿuqalāʾ al-majānīn* (the wise fools), and started introducing it into their own milieu although it was a general term without any particular Sufi connotations.[49] Dols points out that from the fifth/eleventh century Sufism succeeded in gaining a very wide popularity in Muslim societies, and that is why the religious insanity of the *majdhūb* Sufis was commonly witnessed and, thereby, became less shocking, and more sympathised with. Ibn al-Jawzī, the great scholar of the sixth/twelfth century, for one, refers remarkably sympathetically to several characters who were known as reasonable fools in their communities.[50] If this was the general scene, we might well understand why most of the famous authors of this period felt an urgent need to reconsider the system of thought that supported *jadhb* and its representatives in these Muslim contexts. The aforementioned Abū Ḥafṣ al-Suhrawardī along with others such as Najm al-Dīn al-Kubrā and Najm al-Dīn Dāya attempted to integrate *jadhb* into their discussions of master status (*mashyakha*). The general approach towards *jadhb* in their writings is distinguished primarily by the authors' insistence on the idea that *jadhb* is strongly embedded within the Sufi doctrinal system that treats the *sheikh* status and its requirements and conditions as a whole.

Very occasionally in the writings of this period, we come across stories that celebrate that *majdhūb* who, after the act of the divine attraction itself, was recognised by God to guide others along the Sufi path. The late sixth/twelfth century author ʿAmmār al-Bidlīsī (d. between 590/1194 and 604/1207),[51] for instance, discusses the exalted degree of the *muḥaddath* (lit. the one with whom God conversed), the one to whom God chose to grant His secret knowledge. The *muḥaddath*, according to Bidlīsī, gains divine revelations and his heart turns into "a throne where God manifests Himself".[52] Later in his work, Bidlīsī describes the degree of *umanāʾ* (lit. 'Trusteeship'), which is a higher rank than that of *muḥaddath*. The trustee is originally a *muḥaddath* whom God allows to control the worlds of creation (*taṣarruf fī al-akwān*) so as to guide others.[53] Bidlīsī's work, like others from the same

[49]See Michael Dols, *Majnūn: The Madman in Medieval Islamic Society*, (ed.) Diana E. Immisch (Oxford, 1992), p. 376.

[50]See Abū al-Faraj ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Ibn al-Jawzī, *Ṣifat al-ṣafiwa* (Ḥaydarābād al-Dukn India, 1969), vol. 2, pp. 112–113.

[51]According to Edward Badeen, the editor of al-Bidlīsī's *Bahjat al-ṭāʾifa wa-ṣawm al-qalb* [*Zwei Mystische Schriften des ʿAmmār al-Bidlīsī*], (Beirut, 1999), the editor's introduction, p. 6.

[52]*Ibid.*, pp. 76–79.

[53]*Ibid.*, pp. 132–133.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186317000530 Published online by Cambridge University Press

period and prior to it, manages to consolidate the theoretical basis of *jadhb* and the elevated position of those who claimed to have experienced it.

Najm al-Dīn Dāya, in one place in his *Mirṣād al-ʿibād*, indicates that obtaining the higher ranks of the Sufi path is possible through the act of *jadhb*; however, this is very difficult and very rare. The most effective method is through commitment to a Sufi master. Dāya provides an example of a Sufi of Khawārazm named Sheikh Abū Bakr who told Dāya that he had gained his Sufi status through *jadhb*, albeit after forty-five years of hard *sulūk*.[54]

The third period

The later middle period that ranged from the late seventh/thirteenth up to the tenth/sixteenth century witnessed the antinomian appearances of the *qalandariyya* and other deviant anti-social groups such as *Ḥaydariyya* in different Muslim regions, who were both increasingly widely recognised and criticised. Ibn Kathīr refers to 655 as the year when *Ḥaydariyya* groups appeared in Syria.[55] Karamustafa's comprehensive work on these groups points to the period from 600/1200 to 900/1500 as the one that witnessed the appearance of the first clear manifestations of this "new renunciatory piety" in the form of "identifiable social collectivities".[56] Before the end of the seventh/thirteenth century, as Karamustafa indicates, other dervish groups began also to appear, and during the eighth/fourteenth and ninth/fifteenth centuries, more deviant movements in Asia Minor, India and other territories found their own ways to affect Muslim landscapes and culture.

At the end of the seventh/thirteenth century, Ibn Baydakīn al-Turkmānī wrote about the antinomian customs of the group of *qalandariyya* whom he chose to entitle *ṭāʾifat al-qarandaliyya* in his *Kitāb al-lumaʿ fī al-ḥawādith wa-l-bidaʿ*. Among those customs he highlights, for instance, the act of piercing of one's urethra (*thaqb al-iḥlīl*), and being shackled with chains of iron (*al-takbīl bi-l-salāsil wa-l-ḥadīd*).[57] By the end of the eighth/fourteenth century, the traditionalist and *Qurʾān* commentator Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashī (d. 794/1392) composed a work on the legal prohibition of *ḥashīsh*. He writes that taking *ḥashīsh* had become a widespread custom in his day, and so closely related to *qalandariyya* and *Ḥaydariyya* that their names were synonyms with *ḥashīsh* itself.[58] Taqī al-Dīn al-Maqrīzī (d. 845/1441) indicates that what was known as *ḥashīshat al-fuqarāʾ* began to appear in the regions of Iraq after the year 628/1231.[59] Later on, during the tenth/sixteenth century, ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Nuʿaymī (d. 978/1570) refers to the impact of *qalandariyya* in Damascus particularly during the days of their leader Jamāl al-Dīn al-Sāwī. The latter's impact stretched to Egypt so that even the Qāḍī of Dimyāṭ and all his sons starting following him.[60]

[54]See Najm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya, *Mirṣād al-ʿibād*, p. 130–131.

[55]See Abū al-Fidāʾ Ibn Kathīr, *al-Bidāya wa-l-nihāya* (Beirut, 1990), vol. 13, p. 196.

[56]See Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, p. 3.

[57]See Idrīs b. Baydakīn al-Turkmānī, *al-Lumaʿ fī al-ḥawādith wa-l-bidaʿ*, (ed.) Ṣubḥī Labīb (Cairo, 1986), vol. 1, pp. 191–193.

[58]See Badr al-Dīn al-Zarkashī, *Zahr al-ʿarīsh fī taḥrīm al-ḥashīsh*, (ed.) Sayyid Aḥmad Faraj (Al-Manṣūra, 1990), p. 89.

[59]See Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. ʿAlī al-Maqrīzī, *Kitāb al-mawāʿiẓ wa-l-iʿtibār bi-dhikr al-khuṭaṭ wa-l-āthār* (Cairo, 1987), vol. 2, p. 126.

[60]See ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Nuʿaymī al-Dimashqī, *al-Dāris fī tārīkh al-madāris*, (ed.) Ibrāhīm Shams al-Dīn (Beirut, 1990), vol. 2, p. 165.

During this stage the character of *majdhūb* became integrated with that of the *qalandars* and other deviant groups. Sufi and non-Sufi biographies refer to an increasing number of *majdhūb* figures. The reference to *qalanadariyya* in Suhrawardī's *ʿAwārif al-maʿārif* during the previous stage does not necessarily mean that Suhrawardī met Jamāl al-Dīn al-Sāwī. Rather, it implies a reality that witnessed the increasing impact of spiritual antinomianism and pious deviance that continued affecting Muslim societies during the following centuries. In response, authors of Sufi manuals sought to defend *jadhb* by following earlier attempts to include *jadhb* under the doctrinal system of *mashyakha* as well as emphasising the necessity of *sulūk* after the occurrence of *jadhba*.

ʿIzz al-Dīn Kāshānī, during the later seventh/thirteenth and the early eighth/fourteenth centuries, followed Suhrawardī's doctrine in reference to *majdhūb* and *sālik* in his *Miṣbāḥ al-hidāya wa-miftāḥ al-kifāya*. Though Kāshānī relies on Suhrawardī, he develops the discussion and adds new interesting insights. The spiritual essence of the prophet Muḥammad (*rūḥ Muḥammadī*), for instance, appears as the first prototype of the state of *maḥbūb* (beloved) who is also *majdhūb*. The act of *jadhba*, according to Kāshānī, contributes to turning wayfaring *sayr* into flying *ṭayr*,[61]

Paradoxically, what was claimed to be a moderate discourse of treating *jadhb* in the works of Suhrawardī, Kubrā, Dāya and Kāshānī during the previous stage and the early part of the third stage could grant the *majdhūb* and their followers a strong theoretical basis that supported their existence and activities as no one else could do. Though the original purpose of these authors was to portray the moderate and ethical boundaries of *jadhb*, they, in fact, contributed to extending the legal coverage of the Sufi institution to *majdhūb*s and, consequently, helped to elevate the venerated image of the 'Sufi madman' within medieval Islamic culture.

In light of the popularity of *majdhūb*s, some effort was invested during this third stage to emphasise the integration between *jadhb* and *sulūk*, and, thereby, to maintain the *majdhūb*'s ability to act as a spiritual guide, although *jadhb* itself became separated from the theoretical discussions of the system of *mashyakha*. *Shadd al-izār fī ḥaṭṭ al-awzār ʿan zuwwār al-mazār*—the biographical work of the late eighth/fourteenth century Sufi author, Muʿīn al-Dīn Junayd Shīrāzī—includes several stories of *jadhb* where the idea that the mystic turned to *sulūk* after getting *jadhba* is celebrated.[62] Tūrān b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Turkī, as Junayd Shīrāzī describes him, "was at the beginning of his career a soldier. When he experienced one *jadhba* whose significance exceeds the worships of all men and *jinn* together, he repented and followed the great Sufi masters".[63] Jamāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad of Fasā experienced *jadhba* and, consequently, abandoned his work and became completely committed to *sulūk* ("*lazima sulūk ṭarīq al-rijāl*").[64]

Besides these attempts, the material presented by Sufi and non-Sufi biographies of the period between the eight/fourteenth and tenth/sixteenth centuries leaves a strong impression that the wish to moderate *jadhb* by integrating it with *sulūk* (as shown in Junayd Shīrāzī's work)

[61] See ʿIzz al-Dīn Maḥmūd Kāshānī, *Miṣbāḥ al-hidāya wa-miftāḥ al-kifya*, (ed.) Jalāl al-Dīn Humāyī (Tehran, 2002), pp. 107–114.

[62] See, for example, Muʿīn al-Dīn Abū al-Qāsim Junayd Shīrāzī, *Shadd al-izār fī ḥaṭṭ al-awzār ʿan zuwwār al-mazār*, (ed.) Muḥammad Qazwīnī and ʿAbbās Iqbāl (Tehran, 1328 shamsī), pp. 75, 156, 189, 160.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 75.

[64] *Ibid.*, p. 156.

was not always the agenda of the biographers. This material reflects a reality that witnessed an unparalleled popularity of *majdhūb* figures whose antinomian customs could be presented and even celebrated without any problem. During this period, *majdhūb*s succeeded in gaining public fame and prestigious positions among the authorities. Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt al-uns*, dating from the late ninth/fifteenth century, offers many examples of *jadhb* stories that referred to antinomian behaviour including the custom of abandoning ritual prayers and other religious duties. For instance, in the biography of Sulaymān al-Turkmānī (who died, according to Jāmī, in 714/1314), Jāmī tells us that this figure was *a majdhūb* who abandoned Muslim ritual prayers and did not fast during the holy month of Ramaḍān.[65] In the biography of Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Kūsawī al-Jāmī, the author relates that, at the very beginning of his spiritual career, this man experienced *jadhba* with the result that he disappeared from the eyes of the people for several days and missed the ritual prayers.[66] Similar stories are told in the text of *Nafaḥāt* about Jamāl al-Dīn al-Lūrī (who was accused of heresy),[67] Ibrāhīm al-Majdhūb,[68] and many others.

The work of Ghazzī likewise provides us with numerous examples of *majdhūb*s, many of who were to be found in Damascus and other Syrian towns. Muḥammad al-ʿAryān (lit. Muḥammad the Naked) lived in Aleppo. Ghazzī tells that after his repentance, he remained naked and uncovered the whole of his body with the exception of his private parts.[69] Abū Sanqar al-Baʿlī, the *majdhūb* of Damascus, was a man of Sufi knowledge, and thereby enjoyed the position of the spiritual protector of the city (*khafīr Dimashq*) and even the protector of all Syria (*khafīr al-Shāmm*).[70] Very frequently in Ghazzī's work, the *majdhūb* figure is portrayed as the one who was committed to Muslim rituals amidst his *jadhba*: Ismāʿīl b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Ṣāliḥī lost his sanity because of his addiction to *Qurʾān* recitation (*jaffa dimāghuhu bi-sabab kathrat al-qirāʾa*)! During his *jadhba*, he even used to recite the *Qurʾān*.[71] The Egyptian *majdhūb* Abū al-Khayr al-Kulaybānī used to associate with dogs and even take them to prayers in the mosque. Ghazzī explains that although many attacked him for this behaviour, he was venerated by the men of political authority.[72]

Interestingly, Muḥammad ʿAlī al-Tahānawī (d. after 1158/1745), the author of the famous lexicon *Kashshāf iṣṭilāḥāt al-funūn wa-l-ʿulūm*, writes at the end of the entry '*sulūk*' that the unacceptable behaviour of those who were granted God's closeness and intimacy would bring about the deprivation of their exalted spiritual state and, if they did not repent, then they might reach the rank of *tasallī*, which meant that their hearts would become accustomed to the situation of being distant from God. This dangerous situation, as Tahānawī defines it, leads to the worst situation in which God turns His love for the mystic into a feeling of complete hostility (*ʿadāwa*).[73]

[65] See Jāmī, *Nafaḥāt al-uns*, p. 579.
[66] *Ibid.*, pp. 496–497.
[67] *Ibid.*, p. 479.
[68] *Ibid.*, p. 477.
[69] See Ghazzī, *Kawākib*, vol. 1, p. 83.
[70] *Ibid.*, pp. 122–123.
[71] *Ibid.*, p. 163.
[72] *Ibid.*, pp. 121–122.
[73] See Tahānawī, *Kashshāf iṣṭilāḥāt*, vol. 1, p. 970.

Conclusion

Studying the development of *jadhb* and the shifts in the image of *majdhūb* in Sufi teachings and practices between the fourth/tenth and tenth/sixteenth centuries sheds light on developments that played a fundamental role in shaping the cultural and social structures of medieval Muslim societies. In addition to examining the influence of *jadhb* on Muslims' lives, this article has sought to reconstruct the various strategies that medieval Sufi authors employed to confront a reality that witnessed the growing status of *majdhūb*s and, later, the integration of *jadhb* with antinomianism and deviant movements. From two viewpoints—one focussing on *jadhb* as a social factor and the other looking at the pragmatic strategies to treat it among Sufi theoreticians—*jadhb* passed through some interesting shifts in this period. While its early foundations were integrated into the general fabric of Sufi discussions of *tawba*, *ghayba* and other related concepts, from the end of the sixth/twelfth up to the early seventh/thirteenth century *jadhb* succeeded in becoming one of the significant features of the status of a Sufi master. But this mode of integration between *jadhb* and master-status began to lose its impact in Sufi circles after the early seventh/thirteenth century, a shift that coincided with the appearance of various antinomian groups in the Muslim landscapes.

arinsq@gmail.com

Arin Salamah-Qudsi
University of Haifa

https://doi.org/10.1017/S1356186317000530 Published online by Cambridge University Press