Zeitschrift: Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft = Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

Band: 60 (2006)

Heft: 2

Artikel: The legitimation of Bah' ad-Dn Naqshband

Autor: Weese, Devin de

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147707

THE LEGITIMATION OF BAHĀ' AD-DĪN NAQSHBAND

Devin DeWeese, Indiana University

Abstract

The *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, a Persian hagiographical work written at the beginning of the 15th century and focused on the famous Bukharan shaykh Bahā' ad-Dīn Naqshband (d. 1389, eponym of the Naqshbandī Sufi order), includes an extended narrative of a visionary experience, and its aftermath, designed to affirm Bahā' ad-Dīn's legitimacy and authority as a Sufi shaykh. That narrative claimed for Bahā' ad-Dīn the initiatic legacy of the Khwājagān, a Central Asian Sufi current traced to ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī, while justifying Bahā' ad-Dīn's break with the chief mode of practice represented by the Khwājagān of his time. As explored here in the context of the wide variety of legitimizing strategies employed by Sufi communities from the 13th to 15th centuries, the visionary narrative affirmed broadly the *sharīʿah*-mindedness of Bahā' ad-Dīn's Sufism, a hallmark of the Naqshbandī tradition, but also dealt subtly with specific issues and controversies in the earlier history of Central Asian Sufi circles.

Between the 13th and 15th centuries, Sufi communities in the eastern Islamic world used a wide array of legitimizing strategies to assert their religious authority and often, thereby, their preeminence and superiority over other Sufi communities; these strategies typically evoked elements drawn from within the life of Sufi communities themselves, involving the ways in which the transmission of authority and succession to communal leadership were envisioned, but they might also reflect the social and political interests of the constituencies to which they were designed to appeal. By the late 15th and 16th centuries, however, the remarkable variety of legitimizing strategies had given way, in large measure, to the centrality of the *silsilah*, or chain of spiritual transmission, traced back to the Prophet himself, both as a guarantor of legitimacy and as a principle of organization and succession; this shift, while hardly uniform or complete, not only shaped the social profile of Sufi communities for several centuries, but also profoundly affected our expectations about the organizational and conceptual frameworks in which Sufism's 'public' aspect might be approached and analyzed.

The latter issue is of special importance for our interpretation of sources from the transitional period; as the *silsilah* became both the sine qua non of Sufi legitimacy and the conceptual basis for envisioning the continuity and structure

of Sufi communities in organizational and social terms, Sufi writers tended to project the centrality of the *silsilah* into the past, overlooking those earlier modes of legitimation, and misinterpreting those earlier periods when the *silsilah* appears not to have been regarded as a significant marker of legitimacy or corporate identity. As a result, they formulated *silsilah*s retrospectively, for periods, individuals, and communities for which little clear information was available (often construing the mere affirmation of a meeting or association between two figures as a master-disciple relationship), and cemented the notion that the *silsilah* had always and everywhere been a key element (and one faithfully remembered and transmitted) of legitimation and organizational continuity. This tendency, which masks both the variety of earlier legitimizing strategies and the significance of the shift toward communal structures framed in terms of *silsilah*s, has inevitably shaped the approach and analysis of modern students of the social history of Sufi groups.[1]

The aim of the present study is to explore the earliest evidence we have – and one narrative in particular – on the legitimation of Bahā' ad-Dīn Naqshband (d. 791/1389 in Bukhārā), eponym of one of the most widespread and well-known Sufi orders, for which the *silsilah* became central to its identity already by the late 15th century; that *silsilah*, traced back from Bahā' ad-Dīn, through a series of shaykhs known collectively as the Khwājagān,[2] to the figure of ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī (who died most likely at the beginning of the 13th century), and then on back to the Prophet, has been repeated in countless Naqshbandī doctrinal and hagiographical works down to the present, and marks the fundamental basis for the spiritual legitimacy, and 'corporate' self-conception, of the Naqshbandīyah. In the late 14th and early 15th centuries, however, the variety of legitimizing strategies surrounding Bahā' ad-Dīn still reflects a pattern detectable in other Central Asian hagiographical works from this era, in which saints claim (or more properly, have claimed for them) spiritual (and usually communal) preeminence based on a wide range of principles; these modes of legitimation include:

(1) natural heredity (that is, descent from a famous shaykh of the past), one of the most common legitimizing and organizational principles in Sufi communities from this era (and one that became controversial through criticism of

1 I have discussed another example of the shift, in hagiographical sources, toward legitimation and organization in terms of the *silsilah*, in DEWEESE, 1999.

2 Bahā' ad-Dīn Naqshband < Amīr Kulāl < Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī < Khwāja ʿAlī ʿAzīzān Rāmītanī < Khwāja Maḥmūd Anjīr-faghnavī < Khwāja ʿĀrif Rīvgaravī [or Rīvgarī] < Khwāja ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī.

purely 'formal' hereditary shaykhs, suspected of lacking real spiritual attainment);

(2) the possession (through some articulated mode of transmission, whether formalized or miraculous) of certain insignia of authority (e.g., a *khirqah*, Sufi headgear such as the *kulāh* or *tāj*, a staff, etc.), including the transmission of some spiritual (or tangible) legacy through one of the *muʿammarūn* popular in this period (whose long lives allowed a direct or at least shortened transmission from the Prophet);

(3) direct sanction by God, the Prophet, or some other hallowed figure of the past, sometimes framed in terms of a visionary encounter, but also increasingly framed, in this era, specifically in terms of the "Uvaysī" phenomenon of instruction and initiation by the spirit of a deceased prophet or saint;

(4) spiritual initiation by Khiżr (in some sense merely a subset of the previous mode of legitimation, but so common as to merit a separate category);

(5) the speed or efficacy of a particular shaykh's, or community's, disciplinary method;

(6) the intercessory power of a shaykh's charismatic persona, whether ascribed to a living shaykh or to a communal 'founder' (through claims that merely invoking a saint's name, or becoming part of his community, would lead one automatically to salvation or realization because of some special favor granted to the saint by God);

(7) a distinctive social stance or profile, whether the provision of 'social services,' or the maintenance of firm adherence to the *sharīʿah* in an environment of widespread disregard for it;

(8) a *silsilah*, or chain of spiritual transmission linking a given Sufi shaykh, and community, with a source of authority in the past, in an unbroken initiatic lineage (whether traced back all the way to the Prophet, or merely as far back as some locally prominent shaykh of hallowed reputation); or

(9) most commonly, some combination of these.

Echoes of these and still other legitimizing strategies may be found in early hagiographical sources, from the 15th century, focused on Bahā' ad-Dīn; some are invoked on his behalf, while some are evident through the rhetorical attacks upon them by partisans of Bahā' ad-Dīn (in particular, the principle of hereditary shaykh-hood was a favorite target of his partisans during the 15th and 16th centuries). Those invoked on behalf of Bahā' ad-Dīn include, broadly, claims of his extraordinary spiritual stature and of his devotion to the *sharīʿah*, as well as claims that he was the rightful heir to the legacies – and the communities – of several other shaykhs, whom he is nevertheless typically shown as surpassing in

spiritual virtue. The many narratives within which these claims are framed suggest that those who cultivated Bahā' ad-Dīn's memory sought to appeal to as many potential constituencies as possible.

This does not mean, of course, that the hagiographers of Bahā' ad-Dīn therefore paid no attention to lineages of transmission; *silsilah*s of varying degrees of 'completeness' are given for him in early sources as well, though it is noteworthy that the earliest hagiographical source focused on Bahā' ad-Dīn, the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, written at the very beginning of the 15th century,[3] adheres to an 'older' practice (which largely disappears by the 16th century) of tracing different lineages for different aspects of Bahā' ad-Dīn's Sufi training (with separate masters identified as responsible for particular aspects).[4] What it does suggest, rather, is that the earliest phase of the hagiographical representation of Bahā' ad-Dīn Naqshband reflects efforts to legitimize him in multiple ways, with the assertion of a *silsilah* just one among them.[5]

3 For the fullest recent discussion of this work, and its two redactions, see PAUL, 1990; cf. PAUL, 1998a:10–12. A text edition of the longer redaction, usable but marred by many errors (especially in the reading of place names), is now available: ṢALĀḤ, 1992.

4 The account of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:113–115) first affirms that Bahā' ad-Dīn received the "gaze" (*naẓar*) of Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī (whose various blessings of Bahā' ad-Dīn during the latter's childhood are recounted at length earlier in the work, ṢALĀḤ, 1992:79–81), and traces Sammāsī's lineage back only as far as the definitive figure for the tradition of the Khwājagān, ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī; then it affirms that Bahā' ad-Dīn's "affiliation in discipleship and in companionship and in the teaching of the protocols of traveling the spiritual path and in training in the *dhikr*" (*nisbat-i irādat va ṣuḥbat va taʿallum-i ādāb-i sulūk* [*sic*] *va talqīn-i dhikr*) came from Amīr Kulāl, whose master was Sammāsī, and whose lineage of transmission is thus implicitly traced through the lineage given for Sammāsī; and finally it affirms that Bahā' ad-Dīn's "affiliation of training in traveling the spiritual path (*nisbat-i tarbīyat* [...] *dar sulūk*), came from the "spiritual being" (*rūḥānīyat*) of Ghijduvānī (clearly alluding to the vision explored here). It is at this point – though we may assume that this serves as a combined account for the three transmissions so far traced back to Ghijduvānī – that Ghijduvānī's lineage is recounted, back to the Prophet.

5 In its appeal to multiple modes of legitimation, and especially to sanction by the saints and 'founders' of other Sufi communities, this hagiography devoted to Bahā' ad-Dīn resembles another work from the same period, which I have discussed elsewhere (DEWEESE, 1993), focused on an obscure shaykh of 15th-century Mawarannahr for whom an even broader array of legitimizing narratives was devised; this shaykh, Sayyid Aḥmad Bashīrī, is shown usurping the spiritual legacy of nearly every prominent shaykh of the era (including Sayyid Niʿmatullāh Valī, Aḥmad Yasavī, Sayyid Ata, Ismāʿīl Ata, Ṣadr Ata, and Abū'l-Ḥasan ʿIshqī), is cast explicitly as an Uvaysī with no living shaykh at all, and is depicted as in open hostilities with representatives of Sufi communities organized around hereditary legitimation and succession. This work, like the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, appears to reflect a much more fluid

Accounts of Bahā' ad-Dīn from the 15th century, for instance, recount how he was blessed by the Yasavī saint Ḥakīm Ata, in a dream, and was trained by (and yet surpassed) the Yasavī dervish Khalīl; yet another Yasavī saint, Qutham Ata, for whose community hereditary succession was clearly the dominant paradigm, is made to declare Bahā' ad-Dīn his tenth son, and to praise him as superior to his other nine sons.[6] These accounts claim for Bahā' ad-Dīn the spiritual blessing and sanction of a senior (or deceased) shaykh, but they also serve the competitive needs of Bahā' ad-Dīn's partisans by affirming that he was superior to them, or by implicitly undermining the claim to those saints' legacies by other constituencies (i.e., natural descendants).

Bahā' ad-Dīn is also legitimized, in early sources, by accounts affirming his direct spiritual communication with, and sanction by, deceased saints. One such account is the central narrative explored in more detail below, but in another story from the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, Bahā' ad-Dīn is quoted alluding to his visionary encounters with the spirits (*arvāḥ*) of shaykhs of the past, and noting the impact of his encounter with the "spiritual being" (*rūḥānīyat*) of each of them. This naturally brings to mind the mode of legitimation that came to be defined as "Uvaysī," involving initiation not by a living master, but by the spirit of a deceased shaykh (or prophet); however, this narrative not only fails to use the term "Uvaysī," but implicitly belittles it. After his general comments about his encounters with the deceased shaykhs, Bahā' ad-Dīn is quoted directly, first describing the effect of his encounter with the *rūḥānīyat* of Uvays Qaranī, the namesake of the Uvaysī style of initiation and training, but then – as if to distance Bahā' ad-Dīn from the Uvaysī label that was gaining currency in his time, and was soon applied to him as well – the author quotes Bahā' ad-Dīn affirming that the effect of his engagement with the *rūḥānīyat* of "Khwāja Imām Muḥammad ʿAlī Ḥakīm Tirmidhī" (i.e., the famous author of the *Khatm al-wilāyah*, who died at the beginning of the 10th century)[7] was more significant for him, and marked a higher spiritual state, than that which he experienced through his encounter with Uvays. The author of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* goes so far as to quote

---

situation in the organizational structure and social profile of Sufi communities in Central Asia that prevailed from the 13th to the 15th centuries, before the crystallization of the *silsilah* principle in the 15th and 16th centuries.

6 On these episodes, see DEWEESE, 1996:193–196. The story of Khalīl appears in the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:84–86); the story of Qutham Ata appears in the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* and in the *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah* (both were included in Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt al-uns*; see below on these works).

7 See RADTKE, 1980; SVIRI, 1993; RADTKE, 1993.

Bahā' ad-Dīn affirming, near the end of his life, that he had been "following the *ṭarīqah* of the holy Khwāja Muḥammad ʿAlī Ḥakīm Tirmidhī" for 22 years, and had gained the same status as that early saint had reached;[8] while this declaration may or may not have implications in terms of Bahā' ad-Dīn's own understanding of his relationship with the "path" or "tradition" or community of ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī and the Khwājagān, it seems clearly intended to introduce another, additional model for Bahā' ad-Dīn's spirituality. That this other model was implicitly posed as an alternative to the Uvaysī model is further suggested by the narrative that follows this one, in which Bahā' ad-Dīn is quoted affirming that he had spent eight months engaging with the *rūḥānīyat* of Uvays Qaranī, but, at the time he was speaking, had just come out of, and implicitly surpassed, the "quality" of Uvays.[9]

Somewhere in between the sanction by, and surpassing of, living shaykhs such as Khalīl and Qutham, and encounters with deceased saints such as Uvays or Ḥakīm Tirmidhī, may be placed Bahā' ad-Dīn's claims to exalted spiritual attainment involving earlier saints who serve, it would appear, not as guides or instructors, but as models – though in any case, as figures to be surpassed. In one narrative from the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*,[10] Bahā' ad-Dīn is said to have been speaking once "about his connection in spiritual journeying" (*nisbat-i sulūk-i khūd*), using a phrase that we might expect to find used to refer to a lineage of initiatic transmission (as it is indeed used in the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, shortly after this account, when Bahā' ad-Dīn's *silsilah* is reviewed); he is said to have mentioned a great many shaykhs, but is quoted specifically claiming to have reached the stages attained by Abū Yazīd Bisṭāmī, Junayd, Shiblī, and Manṣūr Ḥallāj (from these names it is clear that no *silsilah* is involved here). Finally, Bahā' ad-Dīn said, he reached the highest stage of all, which he understood to be the "Muḥammadan court" (*bārgāh-i muḥammadī*); yet "I did not boast, and I did not do what Shaykh Abū Yazīd did" (alluding, clearly, to the *shaṭḥīyāt* or 'ecstatic utterances' associated with Bisṭāmī, and with Ḥallāj as well, often condemned as blasphemous – e.g., Bisṭāmī's declaring "*subḥānī*," "glory be to me," instead of

8 ṢALĀḤ, 1992:95; the author writes that he himself was told this by Bahā' ad-Dīn, and dates the statement to 789/1387, just two years before Bahā' ad-Dīn's death (his attachment to the *ṭarīqah* of Ḥakīm Tirmidhī would thus have begun in 767/1365–66). The story appears also in the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* (MS IVRUz 2520, f. 10a; see below on this manuscript).

9 ṢALĀḤ, 1992:96.

10 ṢALĀḤ, 1992:112.

"*subḥānu'llāh*" – but here implicitly dismissed by Bahā' ad-Dīn as evidence of inferior attainment or a simple lack of self-control).

Bahā' ad-Dīn is thus shown as superior, in status and attainment, to these eminent Sufis of the past, and it is significant that he himself is quoted making this claim, and doing so as an apparent alternative to discussing his *silsilah* or his *nisbat-i sulūk*. Early sources on Bahā' ad-Dīn include other, similar assertions of demonstrated attainment and spiritual prowess on his part, some of which also target the very value of a chain of spiritual transmission, and the stature of the shaykhs included in it. For instance, Bahā' ad-Dīn is shown belittling the very importance of a *silsilah* by affirming, when asked where his *silsilah* led, "No one gets anywhere through a *silsilah*."[11] There is, moreover, an implicit appeal to demonstrated attainment, rather than to lineage, in a comment ascribed to one of Bahā' ad-Dīn's disciples when asked to whom, among recent shaykhs, his method and path were connected; the disciple's answer amounts to a rhetorical dismissal not only of lineage, but of two centuries of Sufis who included, naturally, all of Bahā' ad-Dīn's spiritual ancestors in his putative *silsilah*: "You speak of predecessors! For more than two hundred years none of the recent shaykhs of the path has manifested such signs of sainthood as God's favor has bestowed upon Khwāja Bahā' ad-Dīn!"[12]

Finally, we may find an echo of yet another mode of legitimation, even further afield, that was 'floated' in connection with Bahā' ad-Dīn's reputation, in a short passage from the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, in which Bahā' ad-Dīn's own words are reported by his chief disciple and successor, Khwāja ʿAlā' ad-Dīn ʿAṭṭār.[13] Here Bahā' ad-Dīn is quoted recalling an encounter, one evening – no other chrono-

11 The comment appears in the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* (MS IVRUz 2520, f. 17a), and in Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt* (JĀMĪ, 1991:391). Elsewhere, in his 'interview' with the Kart ruler of Herat, Bahā' ad-Dīn is portrayed contrasting his own status as a Sufi, derived through direct "attraction" (*jadhbah*) from God, with that of hereditary shaykhs (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:120); the disparagement of formal, hereditary shaykhs is common in Naqshbandī sources, but here Bahā' ad-Dīn's alternative is not a 'normative' *silsilah*, but the direct 'pulling' into the Path by God (the version in the *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah* [MS Aligarh, f. 18a; see below on this work] alters this statement somewhat, presenting the alternatives as "hereditary" [*mawrūthī*] or "acquired" [*muktasab*] dervish-hood, and downplaying the affirmation of the *jadhbah* that came upon Bahā' ad-Dīn; Jāmī repeated this latter version [JĀMĪ, 1991:391]). A still earlier Khwājagānī work, the *Manāqib* of Khwāja ʿAlī ʿAzīzān Rāmītanī, includes an extended passage downplaying the importance of the *silsilah*; see DEWEESE, 1999.

12 JĀMĪ, 1991:393.

13 ṢALĀḤ, 1992:112–113; the passage was noted in PAUL, 1990:43.

logical indications are provided – with a party of "the *aqṭāb* of the age and the *awtād* of the earth" (referring to ranks in the well-known hierarchy of saints), who seated him on a piece of white felt, took hold of its edges, and raised him up and seated him on a great throne. This brief narrative in effect affirms, in a general way, the legitimation of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn by saints of the unseen world, and may have been specifically intended as a counter, or a 'supplement,' to the central legitimizing narrative explored below (in which ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī, rather than Bahāʾ ad-Dīn, is seen seated on a great throne); but the first part of this visionary 'elevation' of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn on a piece of white felt most closely recalls descriptions of the accession rites performed for newly chosen Chinggisid *khān*s, suggesting that, despite the general appeal to *sharīʿah*-mindedness evident in much Khwājagānī literature and in the narratives about Bahāʾ ad-Dīn, the latter's partisans may have seen advantages in appealing also to more tentatively Muslim constituencies, among the nomadic communities of Mawarannahr.

The early diversity of legitimizing strategies, however, did not survive for long. By the end of the 15th century, appeals to multiple sources of authority and legitimation gave way to a much narrower range of legitimizing claims, and the dominant hagiographical presentation of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn (the one adopted in such standard works as Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt al-uns* – which nevertheless preserves several echoes, from earlier sources, of other modes of legitimation – and Ṣafī's *Rashaḥāt-i ʿayn al-ḥayāt*, from the beginning of the 16th century, and repeated in subsequent Naqshbandī works down to the present) would stress his legitimacy, as noted, on the basis of his central place within the *silsilah* of the "Khwājagān," traced back from Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's master Amīr Kulāl to ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī.[14]

14 It must be remembered, however, that Bahāʾ ad-Dīn may well have held appeal outside the confines of the Khwājagānī tradition, and that different groups remembered him, and cultivated his legacy, in different ways. The range of varied portrayals of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn may be suggested by an account from a 16th-century work that emphasizes Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's role as a transmitter of a legacy through the Yasavī saint Qutham Ata (Ḥāfiẓ Baṣīr Khuzārī, *Maẓhar al-ʿajāʾib va majmaʿ al-gharāʾib*, MS IVRUz 8716/I, ff. 3b–195b [described in *SVR*, V (1960):406–407, No. 4137], ff. 4b–5a); the work, focused on a locally-prominent female saint, known as "Aghā-yi Buzurg" ("the great lady"), who died in 929/1522–23, affirms that Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's association with Qutham Shaykh came *after* his licensure by Amīr Kulāl. Similarly, the different view of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn maintained among the natural descendants of Amīr Kulāl is noted below; and there is evidence that the natural descendants of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn also formed a distinctive social group for several centuries, and may have emphasized aspects of his legacy different from those that became central to the Naqshbandī order. The

The Khwājagānī *silsilah* is in fact fraught with a number of problems that cannot be explored in full here, though they belie the orderly continuity of transmission and organizational structure that is assumed in later presentations (including much modern scholarship). These problems reflect, in all likelihood, an extended historical process of constructing and interpreting the *silsilah* for Bahā' ad-Dīn: in some cases, later systematizers backfilled the gaps left by the availability of only quite sparse information on the actual sequence of masters and disciples (if there was one) – the sparseness of information itself reflecting an environment in which other modes of legitimation were as important for Sufi communities as the *silsilah*, if not moreso – while in other cases they covered over earlier squabbles about differences in practice and succession among the communities that claimed to represent the legacy of the Khwājagānī 'founder,' ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī. Taken together, the particular discrepancies evident in early versions of the *silsilah*s given for the Khwājagān (and other groups as well), the evident absence of information on particular segments of the chain of transmission, and the currency of multiple modes of legitimation beyond, and instead of, the *silsilah*, all leave little doubt that the *silsilah* eventually settled upon for the Khwājagān and the Naqshbandīyah was a retrospective construction, rather than a hallowed and obligatory part of communal lore and ritual that was preserved and transmitted in an orderly series of masters and disciples.

The problems with the Khwājagānī/Naqshbandī *silsilah* begin with the quite doubtful (though nevertheless constantly repeated) tradition identifying Ghijduvānī's master as "Yūsuf Hamadānī;" they include different ways of linking the latter figure to earlier representatives of Khurāsānī Sufism, and of linking them all to the Prophet, as well as a number of historical and chronological discontinuities in what by rights should be an unbroken chain of transmission. For present purposes what must be stressed is that the principle of *silsilah*-based initiatic transmission and succession encounters a significant 'discontinuity' precisely with the figure of Bahā' ad-Dīn Naqshband himself. This is evident above all insofar as he broke with the practice of his immediate predecessors in what nevertheless became his *silsilah*. That is, the early history of the Khwājagānī community is marked by a split, framed in terms of succession principles and practice, with one group maintaining (we are told) the silent *dhikr* as

---

point is not that one view was more or less 'legitimate' than others, but that different constituencies – the family of Amīr Kulāl, the community that produced the 16th-century *Maẓhar al-ʿajā'ib*, the Sufi successors who produced the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* – maintained different understandings of Bahā' ad-Dīn's authority and legitimacy, most of which were lost or ignored as their social venues disappeared.

practiced by ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī (and maintaining also a principle of succession established by Ghijduvānī), and the other group adopting the vocal *dhikr* (and violating that principle of succession).

This split may be inferred from several sources focused on the early Khwājagān, including those dealing with Bahā' ad-Dīn Naqshband, but is most clearly evident from the 14th-century *Maslak al-ʿārifīn*, produced with a lineage stemming from Ghijduvānī's disciple Khwāja Awliyā;[15] the work affirms that lineage's adherence to Ghijduvānī's principles, and is critical of the other known lineage, stemming from another disciple of Ghijduvānī, Khwāja ʿĀrif Rīvgaravī, for departing from Ghijduvānī's principles by adopting the vocal *dhikr*. It is the latter lineage, however, that leads, through three intermediaries, to Amīr Kulāl, who is invariably shown as Bahā' ad-Dīn's master in the Khwājagānī *silsilah*, while it is the former group that maintained the silent *dhikr*, which is likewise shown as the method preferred by Bahā' ad-Dīn.

In other words, Bahā' ad-Dīn adopted the silent *dhikr* of the former group, traced back to Khwāja Awliyā, but 'belonged' to the *silsilah* of the latter group (traced back from his 'nominal master, Amīr Kulāl, through three intermediaries to Rīvgaravī), and he thus pointedly and explicitly broke with the method of practice – the vocal *dhikr* – that was maintained by Amīr Kulāl and most of his predecessors in that lineage. That there was real tension between Bahā' ad-Dīn and Amīr Kulāl – or at least between the partisans of each shaykh – is clear also from the evidence we have on a hereditary succession to Amīr Kulāl, apart from the spiritual lineage traced through him to Bahā' ad-Dīn Naqshband and on to the later Naqshbandīyah, in a lineage that can be traced for several generations among Amīr Kulāl's descendants; the hagiographical work focused on Amīr Kulāl produced within that hereditary lineage adopts a decidedly disparaging tone when discussing Bahā' ad-Dīn.[16]

15 On the split in the Khwājagānī community, see the preliminary comments in DEWEESE, 1996:190–191 (n. 24), 200; cf. DEWEESE, 1999:517, and PAUL, 1998:22–23. The *Maslak al-ʿārifīn* is discussed in PAUL, 1998b (but without use of the important British Museum manuscript).

16 The *Maqāmāt-i Amīr Kulāl*, compiled by a great-grandson of Amīr Kulāl most likely in the 1440s, includes a number of stories depicting Bahā' ad-Dīn in an unflattering light (the story of his role as an executioner for a Chaghatayid *khān* is only the best-known among them), and others making it clear that Bahā' ad-Dīn was only one disciple among many, with the chief line of succession passing through Amīr Kulāl's sons (SHIHĀB AD-DĪN, 1910:22–26, 30–33, 39–41, 71–72, 78–79; see also the recent Russian translation: SHIHĀB AD-DĪN, 2001); cf. PAUL, 1998a:19–21.

More broadly, in the case of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn, the *silsilah* principle was thus at odds with the principle of continuity of disciplinary method. In breaking with the practice maintained by his own living master, Bahāʾ ad-Dīn was implicitly flouting the principle of maintaining the disciplinary method of one's master, and was in effect introducing an innovation. Later Naqshbandī writers would explain this in various ways,[17] but the earlier sources suggest that the break with has master's practice marked a conscious aspect of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's 'reformist' program; as such it required justification, but both the 'reform' itself and its justifications appear to have served among his claims to legitimacy and authority. Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's departure from his master's practice thus came to be framed in terms of the claim of direct initiation and training by the spirit of ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī – a claim that, despite the implicit dismissal of the label in the narrative noted above, came to involve identifying Bahāʾ ad-Dīn as an 'Uvaysī;'[18] the 'Uvaysī' claim, asserted both separately and in conjunction with the narrative explored below, amounts to a spiritual 'shortcut,' an 'end-run' that bypasses the lineage of shaykhs in the Khwājagānī *silsilah* stemming from Ghijduvānī, and thus justifies Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's break with his living master in terms of practice.

To some extent Bahāʾ ad-Dīn appears also to have claimed legitimacy and distinctiveness, or to have had them claimed for him, on the basis of the kind of unyielding *sharīʿah*-mindedness that was invoked earlier in the Khwājagānī tradition; the claim of unwavering observance of the *sharīʿah* appears to have had special significance in the historical context of Mongol-ruled Mawarannahr,[19] and may have facilitated the assertion of a distinctive and 'elite' profile for the Khwājagānī shaykhs in comparison with other Sufi groups whose eagerness to

17 Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's change in practice could be, and was, portrayed as a 'restoration' of the original practice of Ghijduvānī (this, after all, is one of the aims of the visionary narrative explored below); this approach, however, was not entirely satisfactory, inasmuch as it merely shifted the onus of innovation in disciplinary practice from Bahāʾ ad-Dīn to the earlier Khwājagānī shaykhs who had deviated from Ghijduvānī's practice (the charge that is made, after all, in the *Maslak al-ʿārifīn*, produced in the Khwājagānī lineage that claimed to maintain the true practice of Ghijduvānī). To avoid this embarrassing problem, some Naqshbandī writers claimed, for example, that both *dhikr* styles were originally taught, and sanctioned, by various early figures in the Khwājagānī *silsilah* and could thus be 'activated' selectively by later figures in the lineage; in the 16th century, Makhdūm-i Aʿẓam would go so far as to assert that the shaykhs of the Khwājagān were all *mujtahid*s who could alter the methods of the Path to meet the requirements of the age.

18 Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's Uvaysī status is explicitly noted in the work of his disciple, Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā (see PĀRSĀ, 1975:14–15), and in Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt* (JĀMĪ, 1991:390).

19 See DEWEESE, 1999.

attract followers led them to be more 'accommodating' in terms of the lifestyle and practice demanded of their affiliates.

Significantly, however, insofar as we know of them from our sources, both the extraordinary devotion to the *sharīʿah* and the claim of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's Uvaysī-style legitimation are rooted in an extended story that was first recorded in the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*.[20] That story, too, provides justification for Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's break with his own master's method of spiritual practice; it recounts a visionary experience (and its aftermath) in which Bahāʾ ad-Dīn is instructed by the spirit of ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī directly, after being introduced to the deceased Ghijduvānī by the spirits of other deceased shaykhs of the Khwājagān, led by Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī, who was in fact the master of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's nominal, and eventual, master, Amīr Kulāl. That narrative, in addition to providing an 'end-run' around the entire Khwājagānī lineage claimed for Bahāʾ ad-Dīn, implicitly casts Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's break with his own master's practice (and that of his Khwājagānī lineage) as a restoration, in effect, of the practice taught by Ghijduvānī.

The account, more specifically, includes a description of the vision in which, we are told, Bahāʾ ad-Dīn received his training by ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī, as well as a more enigmatic narrative of the curious set of 'confirmatory' signs, notable for their distinctly low-key and even mundane character, that are expressly presented as bearing witness to the authenticity of the initiatic vision. The effect of the narrative about these signs – which bridges Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's spiritual encounter with Ghijduvānī and Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's earthly training under Amīr Kulāl (through whom he could claim a *silsilah* connection back to Ghijduvānī, but with whom Bahāʾ ad-Dīn clearly had a somewhat rocky relationship) – is crucial for situating Bahāʾ ad-Dīn in the Khwājagānī tradition that would soon be claimed as little but prologue to the emergence of the Naqshbandīyah; of particular importance in this regard are, first, the role played, both within and outside the vision itself, by a Sufi 'cap' referred to as the *kulāh-i ʿazīzān*, and, second, the brief discussion of the style of *dhikr* adopted by Bahāʾ ad-Dīn with which the account concludes. More broadly, the narrative itself, and its fate, both explored below, may remind us of the substantial shift underway in the public profile of Sufi communities in Central Asia during the 14th and 15th centuries, and in the patterns of legitimation, some more successful and enduring than others, that were employed among them.

20 ṢALĀḤ, 1992:87–93.

The account of of this pivotal vision experienced by Bahā' ad-Dīn, from the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, was presented in a French translation in a seminal article by Marijan Molé, published in 1959.[21] Molé's discussion of the account, however, and of the broader issue of Bahā' ad-Dīn's Sufi training, was marred by his adoption of by-now outmoded notions of the relationship between the Yasavī and Naqshbandī traditions, and by assumptions about the Khwājagān and the early Naqshbandīyah, and about Sufi communities of that era more generally, that I believe must be abandoned (he did not take stock, for instance, of the split in the early Khwājagānī community); he insisted, moreover, that the 'doctrinal' content conveyed to Bahā' ad-Dīn during his vision was more significant than the specific context of the vision and its aftermath, to which he devoted almost no discussion at all.[22] In fact, however, the doctrinal content is handled quite briefly in the narrative, as we will see, and I would argue that much of the 'message' of the narrative is conveyed precisely in the context of the vision, in the narrative of the experience itself, and in the story of the confirmatory signs that comprises over half the narrative text.

The account thus merits fresh attention; it is, after all, the central narrative of legitimation for Bahā' ad-Dīn Naqshband in the earliest hagiographical work devoted to him. Since Molé's time, the account has occasionally been noted, but has not received any close scrutiny, in studies of the Naqshbandī tradition.[23] It is

21 MOLÉ, 1959:38–40; Molé's account marked the first scholarly discussion of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*.

22 Molé wrote of the account that "The voyage across a desert is a commonplace initiatic motif; revelation by a dream recurs frequently in Sufi biographies; these two motifs are thus not distinctive ("caractéristique") here. The content of the revelation is more important, [for] conformity to the *sharī'ah* is in fact a distinctive trait of the Naqshbandī *ṭarīqah*" (MOLÉ, 1959:40–41). While he saw fit to observe (MOLÉ, 1959:40, n. 32) that in general, Naqshbandī sources pay much less attention to dream-visions than Kubravī sources he had explored, he thus failed to take stock of the specific content of the vision.

23 It was mentioned only briefly in ALGAR, 1990:11 (this article is an updated version of Algar's seminal survey of Naqshbandī history from 1976); Algar devoted somewhat more attention to the vision, referring to it as entailing a "second initiation" for Bahā' ad-Dīn, after that under Amīr Kulāl, in "Naḳshband," *EI²*, VII, pp. 933–934, and in "Bahā' al-Dīn Naqšband," *EIr*, III, pp. 433–435. Jürgen Paul alluded to the account, with reference to Molé's article, but without further discussion, in his *Doctrine and Organization* (see PAUL, 1998a:18); more recently the account was summarized, though without discussion (and without attention to the confirmatory signs), in TOSUN, 2002:102–103 (cf. the older, briefer summaries in ŞUŞUD, 1958:34–35, and in BAHAÎ, 1966:19-21; the latter work purports to be a Latin-script rendering of a "*Risâle-i Behaiyye*" published in Istanbul in 1328/1910, but its

translated and analyzed below, based on the version in the longer redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*,[24] with reference to similar versions found in the shorter redaction of that work, and in another 'adaptation' of the work from the mid-15th century;[25] most other works from the 15th and 16th centuries that deal with the

---

version of the narrative is much shorter than that in the *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah* discussed below).

24 The full account is found in the longer, original redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*; I have utilized Ṣārī Oghlī's edition, and have consulted additional manuscripts, as well as the draft text edition of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* prepared by Molé (I am indebted to Jürgen Paul for making a copy of this unpublished draft available to me). The additional manuscripts I have consulted are: (1) MS Patna, Khuda Bakhsh 1376 (219 ff., copied 994/1586), described in *Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian Manuscripts in the Oriental Public Library at Bankipore*, XVI, ed. Abdul Muqtadir (Calcutta, 1929), pp. 44–46 (ff. 18b–23a for this narrative); (2) MS India Office, Ethé 1851 (123 ff., dated 1008/1599–1600), described in Hermann Ethé, *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office*, I (Oxford: Oxford University Press, for the India Office, 1903), col. 1022 (ff. 11a–13b); and (3) MS Paris, Supp. pers. 968 (ff. 89b–146a, dated 1009/1601), described in *Catalogue des manuscrits persans de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, ed. E. Blochet, I (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1905), pp. 76–77, No. 113/11 (ff. 94b–97a). Cf. the Turkish translation, *Enîsü't-tâlibîn ve uddetü's-sâlikîn: Makamât-ı Muhammed Bahâüddin Nakşibend*, tr. Süleyman İzzî (first published in Istanbul in 1328/1910; repr. [in Latin script], Istanbul: Yaylacık Matbaası, 1982), pp. 42-49.

25 Essentially the same account is given in the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, for which I have relied most heavily on a 16th-century copy preserved in Tashkent (MS IVRUz 2520, ff. 1b–52a, copied, evidently in 964/1557, from a manuscript that was copied, in turn, from one transcribed by Jāmī (described in *SVR*, III, ed. A. A. Semenov [Tashkent, 1955], p. 258, No. 2402; Paul reads the date on f. 52a as 965 [PAUL, 1998a:6, n. 8]); the narrative appears on ff. 6b–8b in this copy, and the few points on which this redaction differs from the text in the longer redaction are noted below. I have also checked MS Oxford, Bodleian Pers. e. 37 (ff. 44b–144b, copied 921/1515 in Istanbul), described in *Catalogue of the Persian, Turkish, Hindustani and Pushtu Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, Part III: *Additional Persian Manuscripts*, ed. A. F. L. Beeston (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1954), p. 49, No. 2680 (Beeston identified this copy as the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, but chiefly on the basis of its length; I have not examined the entire text closely, but the narrative of interest here, which appears on ff. 53a–57a, does correspond with the version in the shorter redaction); and, more briefly, I checked MS India Office, D.P. 1185a, ff. 1–40 (uncatalogued, with the narrative on ff. 10a–14a). The version of the story found in the *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah* of Abū'l-Qāsim b. Muḥammad b. al-Masʿūd departs more often from the version of the story found in the longer redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, but does not coincide with the version in the shorter redaction; for this work, I have used MS Aligarh, Subhanullah no. 297.7/5 (uncatalogued), in which the narrative appears on ff. 9a–10b. Paul gives this manuscript's date as Ramażān 1250/January 1835 [PAUL, 1998a:12, n. 30]; however,

life of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn include only heavily abbreviated versions of, or allusions to, the narrative presented here,[26] except for the compilation of Muḥammad Bāqir from the middle of the 16th century (this version has been consulted as well).[27]

---

the date given in the manuscript (f. 84a) reads "*alf va khamsīnah va ithnā ʿasharah*," a somewhat unusual way, to be sure, of giving the date 1062 (i.e., 1000 + 50 + 12), but clearly not 1250 (the date is specified as 23 Ramażān 1062/28 August 1652). Both the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* and the *Risālah-i Bahāʾīyah* appear to date from the 1430s or 1440s, and to have been produced in circles close to, and shaped by the legacy of, Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā.

26 In his *Risālah-i qudsīyah*, Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā (d. 822/1419) referred to the vision recounted in the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, mentioning (and even expanding upon) some particulars but noting finally that an account of that vision was recorded in the work he calls simply the *Maqāmāt* of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn, written, he says, by "some of his dear companions and devoted friends" (PĀRSĀ, 1975:8–9). In the *Nafaḥāt al-uns*, Jāmī gives only the first part of the account; he omits the details of the shrines, mentions, from the vision, that Sammāsī "is your shaykh and gave you a *kulāh*," but makes no further mention of the role of the *kulāh* (and never links it with the *ʿazīzān*), and omits the entire account (in prediction and in fulfillment) of the confirmatory signs, writing simply, "After these words [i.e., the 'instruction' by Ghijduvānī], that group said to me, 'Witness to the truth of your vision is that tomorrow at dawn you will go to a certain place and do a certain thing;' and the details of this are mentioned in his *Maqāmāt*." Jāmī thus went further than Pārsā in recounting the vision, but followed him in referring his reader to another work; Jāmī also followed Pārsā in presenting what he includes of this account as confirmation of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's Uvaysī status (JĀMĪ, 1991:390–391; though focused on Jāmī's presentation of the Khwājagānī lineage, the recent article of TER HAAR, 2002, fails to examine the sources from which Jāmī drew, and in any case does not mention his treatment of this narrative at all). Similarly, in the *Rawżat as-sālikīn*, a hagiography from the late 15th century or early 16th focused on a Naqshbandī lineage traced through Saʿd ad-Dīn Kāshgharī, the beginning of the story is included in the work's account of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn Naqshband, but the details of the confirmatory predictions are omitted (MS India Office, Ethé 632, ff. 6b–7b [described in Ethé, *Catalogue*, I, cols. 260–261]); the vision is thus recounted, but the predictions are omitted, and the account resumes with reference to Amīr Kulāl's instruction in the *dhikr* (the author refers to details found in Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's *Maqāmāt*), the whole thus closely resembling Jāmī's version. In the *Rashaḥāt*, finally, from the beginning of the 16th century, the author merely alludes to the vision, in connection with affirming Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's status as an Uvaysī and his training by the *rūḥānīyat* of Ghijduvānī; he affirms, again, that the details may be found in Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's *Maqāmāt*, but in this case he repeats nothing of the account itself (ṢAFĪ, 1977, vol. I:95).

27 The work of Abū'l-Muḥsin Muḥammad Bāqir b. Muḥammad ʿAlī, compiled in 947/1540–41, is often referred to as the *Maqāmāt* of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn Naqshband (the 'title' under which an often-cited lithograph version was issued in Bukhārā in 1327/1909), but it bears no specific appellation, and is focused equally on Bahāʾ ad-Dīn and Khwāja Aḥrār, covering Naqshbandī shaykhs between these two figures, as well as the Khwājagānī predecessors of

They have related from our holy Khwāja [Bahā' ad-Dīn] that he used to recount the following. "At the beginning of the mystical states and overpowering attractions and irresolution [I experienced], I used to wander about in the environs of Bukhārā by night and visit all the shrines. One night I went to three shrines, among the blessed shrines [of Bukhārā], and at each shrine I came to, I saw a lamp lit; in the lampstand, there was plenty of oil, and there was a wick, but one had to move the wick just a bit so that it would come out of the oil and burn brightly again without going out. At the beginning of the night, I came to the blessed shrine of Khwāja Muḥammad-i Vāsiʿ[28] (may God have mercy upon him with His abundant mercy); there it was indicated that I should go to the shrine of Khwāja Aḥmad Ajgharnavī.[29]

Bahā' ad-Dīn; the work's account of the vision, like much of the work, reflects the author's consultation of various sources (it differs from Jāmī in giving the full narrative, but in some respects it parallels the longer redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, in others the shorter redaction of that work, and in still others the *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah*). I have used MS India Office Ethé 636 (Ethé, *Catalogue*, I, cols. 262–263), undated but judged to belong to the 10th/16th century; the account appears there on ff. 37b–39a.

28 Molé writes "Wasī" in his translation, but his handwritten edition gives the proper reading, "Vāsiʿ." One of the few additions to the story of this vision as discussed in the *Risālah-i qudsīyah* of Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā is a brief comment about the first of the three shrines Bahā' ad-Dīn visited on the night of the vision: it was that of "Khwāja Muḥammad b. al-Wāsiʿ," Pārsā writes, affirming further that he was one of the *tabaʿ-i tābiʿīn*, and that "his coming to the land of Mawarannahr is affirmed in a reliable report" (PĀRSĀ, 1975:8–9). This comment is repeated, not unexpectedly, in the *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah* (MS Aligarh, f. 9a), and appears also in the work of Muḥammad Bāqir (MS India Office, Ethé 636, f. 37b), but was not added in the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*; oddly enough, the 15th-century *Tārīkh-i Mullāzādah*, compiled by a pupil of Pārsā, affirms just the opposite, declaring that there was no reliable report establishing the burial of any Companion or Follower in Bukhārā, despite the city's conquest in their era, and that the popular tradition of several such figures' burial there, including Muḥammad b. Vāsiʿ, was thus doubtful (MUʿĪN AL-FUQARĀ, 1960:16; the author promises a discussion of what was said about these shrines, but then in fact includes no entry or further discussion). It is not clear whether the different evaluations of the reliability of traditions about Muḥammad b. Vāsiʿ's coming to Mawarannahr reflect a change in the classification to which he was assigned, or merely textual changes. Despite the skepticism of the author of the *Tārīkh-i Mullāzādah*, a mosque built by Muḥammad b. Vāsiʿ, near the Bukharan town of Afshinah, is mentioned in the 12th-century Persian adaptation of the work of Narshakhī (NARSHAKHĪ, 1954:16; cf. p. 116, n. 77, citing references to him in the histories of Ṭabarī and Ibn al-Athīr, on the basis of which Frye mentions his role in fighting in Jurjān, and his death in 123/740–41 or 127/744–45). From the same era, more remarkably, we have an interesting report on the shrine of Muḥammad b. Vāsiʿ in the *Laṭā'if al-adhkār*, a work tracing an itinerary of shrine visits from Bukhārā to Mecca, written in in 552/1158 by Burhān ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (d. 566/1170), who was a member of the prominent family of Ḥanafī jurists that dominated the city in the second half of the 12th century (the Āl-i Burhān); according to this work, there had been no sign of his grave at the site, outside the city, but people observed that the green grass there

did not wither during wintertime, a phenomenon that was explained only when an unidentified man of Bukhārā, departing for the *ḥajj*, had a dream in which the saint buried there was identified, and he was instructed to build a shrine at the site (MS Dushanbe, Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Tajikistan, Inv. No. 845, f. 11b; the unique manuscript, copied in 834/1431, is described in *Katalog vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii nauk Tadzhikskoi SSR*, I, ed. A. M. Mirzoev and A. M. Boldyrev [Stalinabad, 1960], pp. 200–201, No. 188; cf. *Fihrist-i nusakh-i khaṭṭī-i fārsī-i Anstītū-yi Sharqshināsī va Āthār-i Khaṭṭī-i Tājīkistān*, vol. 1, ed. Sayyid ʿAlī Mūjānī and Amr-i Yazdān ʿAlīmardān [Tehran: Markaz-i Muṭālaʿāt-i Āsiyā-yi Markazī va Qafqāz-i Vizārat-i Umūr-i Khārijah, 1376/1997], pp. 68–69). This work further links the shrine with the site of a particular *ribāṭ* that is assigned a name (*ay.b.n.k.tah*?) whose reading and identity remain uncertain, but which is clearly recognizable as that of the village linked with Mawlānā Shams ad-Dīn later in the visionary narrative, as noted below.

29 Molé's translation referred to this second shrine, without comment, as that of Khwāja Maḥmūd Anjīr-faghnavī, the third figure in the normative Naqshbandī *silsilah* leading to Bahāʾ ad-Dīn after Ghijduvānī and Rīvgaravī; however, all versions of the story I have been able to consult, while reflecting considerable uncertainty regarding the *nisbah*, agree in giving the name of the shaykh as Aḥmad, making Molé's rendering unlikely, especially insofar as the text includes the properly written name of Khwāja Maḥmūd Anjīr-faghnavī shortly afterwards, in the account of the vision. Molé's unpublished handwritten edition of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* shows his original reading of "Maḥmūd Anjīr-faghnavī" crossed out, and "Aḥmad Aj.f.r.n.vī" inserted as a correction; as variants he listed his original reading, with "Maḥmūd," as well as "Aḥmad Anjīr-faghnavī" (and the same *nisbah* with "Muḥammad"), "Aḥmad Aḥ.q.r.n.vī," and the improbable form adopted in Ṣārī Oghlī's printed text, "Aḥmad Aj.th.gh.r.n.vī" (Ṣārī Oghlī gives one variant form of the *nisbah*, *aj.ġ.r.n.vī*). The 16th-century Tashkent manuscript of the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* clearly reads "Khwāja Aḥmad Anjīr-faghnavī" (MS IVRUz 2520, f. 6b), but nearly all the other versions I have consulted agree in reading an initial *alif*, followed immediately by a *jīm* or *ḥā* or *khā* (i.e., not by a *nūn*): MS India Office Ethé 1851 (1008/1599–1600), f. 11b: *ač.q.r.n.vī*; MS Bodleian (921/1515), f. 53b: Muḥammad *aj.t.r.n.vī*; MS Paris Supp. pers. 968 (1009/1601), f. 95a: *aj.th.r.n.vī*; MS India Office, D.P. 1185a, f. 10b: *a.ḥ.f.r.n.vī*; MS Ethé 636 (the work of Muḥammad Bāqir), f. 37b: *ač.q.r.n.vī* (readable also as "*ajīq.r.n.vī*"); cf. the Turkish *Makamât-ı Muhammed Bahâüddin Nakşibend*, reading "Açkarnevî." The exceptions are MS Patna, Khuda Bakhsh 1376 (994/1586), f. 19a: *anjīr-faghnavī*; and the copy of the *Risālah-i Bahāʾīyah*, MS Aligarh, f. 9a: "Khwāja Aḥmad," followed by "*an.jīr.dh*" in the margin, but with a different version, crossed out and illegible, at the beginning of the following line. The reading "Anjīr-faghnavī" may have been influenced by the appearance of that *nisbah* shortly after the mention of the second shrine; it is attractive as a known *nisbah*, but sources of this era, and from earlier times, do not mention a place-name corresponding with it, and it is possible that the *nisbah* "Anjīr-faghnavī," as attached to the Khwājagānī shaykh Maḥmūd, may itself be a misreading of the *nisbah* "Kh.r.f.gh.n.vī" or "Khayr-faghnavī" with the Arabic definite article attached (the 15th-century *Tārīkh-i Mullāzādah* refers to a "Mawlānā Burhān ad-Dīn Kh.r.f.gh.n.vī" [MUʿĪN AL-FUQARĀ,

When I reached that shrine, two persons came and bound two swords to my waist; they put me on a horse, turned the reins of the horse toward the shrine of Mazdākhan,[30] and sent me off. At the end of the night, when I reached the shrine of Mazdākhan, the wick and the lampstand were just as [I described]. I sat facing the *qiblah*, and a vision from the unseen world (*ghaybatī*) came upon me in that circumstance. In that vision, the wall in the direction of the *qiblah* was seen to be split open; there was a great throne, and upon it was seated a holy man (*buzurgī*), with a green veil drawn in front of him. All around the throne was a great throng in attendance. I saw Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā in the group, and I knew that

---

1960:56], whose *nisbah* is rendered "Anjir-faghnavī" in a later shrine-guide for Bukhārā, the *Tuḥfat az-zā'irīn* [lithograph, Bukhārā, 1328/1910, p. 17]; it is also possible that there were two separate villages, Anjīr-faghanah and Khur-faghanah or Khayr-faghanah, as are indeed mentioned in the 16th-century Jūybārī documents [see the following note], which were simply confused, but our knowledge of Bukharan localities in the 14th and early 15th centuries remains rudimentary). As for the second shrine listed here, if the *nisbah* is not to be emended to read "Anjīr-faghnavī," the consistent appearance of the initial *alif*, as well as the absence of a *fā* or *ghayn* (or both) following the *rā*, would seem to preclude linking it directly with the "Kh.r.f.gh.n.vī" of the *Tārīkh-i Mullāzādah*, while the preponderence of versions without a following *nūn* favors interpreting the basic shape of the word as "*aj.f.r.n.vī*" or "*akh.f.r.n.vī*" or "*aj.gh.r.n.vī*" or some other variant; none of these forms is attested, either, but I have conjecturally adopted the form "Ajgharnavī."

30 The name of this shrine (evidently drawn from the name of a locality rather than a proper name) is written with great consistency as "*m.z.dākh.n*" in the manuscripts (Molé writes "Mazdākhān" in his translation, but his edition gives the form "*m.z.dākh.n*"), but it does not appear in this form in other sources of the era; another account in the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, this one involving a certain Darvīsh Muḥammad Zāhid, is set at the *mazār-i Mazdākhan* (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:93–94), while yet another, summarizing Bahā' ad-Dīn's initiatic lineages, refers back to his "training in *sulūk*" by the *rūḥānīyat* of Ghijduvānī (a term not used in the narrative itself) during "the vision at the *mazār-i Mazdākhan*" (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:113). The name Mazdākhan (or Mazdākhīn, or Mazākhīn), referring to a village west of Samarqand, and to a canal that irrigated its lands (see CHEKHOVICH, 1974:344, 406, n. 274), is clearly the same name, but seems far too distant from the places Bahā' ad-Dīn frequented in the environs of Bukhārā to be the site intended here; Bartol'd vowelled this name "Muzākhīn," noting "Mazdākhīn" as a variant (BARTOL'D, 1977:89). However, the form "Mazākhan" is also found, with reference to a village in the vicinity of Ghijduvān, in the 16th-century documents on the estates of the Jūybārī shaykhs (*IZ ARKHIVA*, 1938:336 [text]; IVANOV, 1954:260 [translation]); see its location, southeast of Ghijduvān, plotted in SCHWARZ, 1999:81. It is not impossible that in referring to the "*mazār-i Mazdākhan*," the account has in mind the shrine of Ghijduvānī himself, since it is after all he who figures prominently in the vision that occurs there; the use of this designation, instead of simply referring to Ghijduvān, leaves this quite doubtful. In any case, I have not come across other references to "Mazdākhan."

they were deceased.[31] But I wondered who the saint was, and who the group was. Someone from the throng said to me, 'That saint is the holy Khwāja ʿAbd al-Khāliq, and the group is his successors (*khulafā*);' and he enumerated the names of the successors, pointing to each one: Khwāja Aḥmad-i Ṣiddīq, Khwāja Awliyā'-i Kalān, Khwāja ʿĀrif Rīvgaravī, Khwāja Maḥmūd Anjīr-faghnavī, Khwāja ʿAlī Rāmītanī (may God hallow their souls). When he came to Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī, he pointed and said, 'You met him while he was alive; he is your *shaykh*, and he gave you a *kulāh*. Do you recognize him?' I said, 'I recognize him, but' – some time had passed since the story of the *kulāh* – 'I don't know anything about *that*.' He said, 'That *kulāh* is at your home. And they gave you this wondrous power (*karāmat*), such that if some affliction (*balā*) occurs, it may be removed through your *barakah*.'

Thereupon the group said, 'Listen well and pay attention, for the holy Khwāja-yi Buzurg [i.e., Ghijduvānī] (may God hallow his spirit) will say things that will be essential for you in traveling the path of God.' I asked that party that I be allowed to greet the holy Khwāja; they drew away the veil from before him. I greeted the Khwāja, and he explained to me sayings connected with the beginning of spiritual voyaging (*sulūk*), and with its middle and its end. One of the things he said was this: 'Those lamps that you were shown in that vision (*kayfīyat*) were good tidings for you, and an indication that you have talent and ability for this path; but you must move the wick of your talent in order for it to become bright and manifest mysteries. You must act in accordance with your ability, in order to obtain your goal.' And he said further, and stressed, 'You must in all circumstances adhere to the road of the *sharīʿat* and be steadfast in commanding [the good] and forbidding [the evil]; and you must act according to rigor (*ʿazīmat*) and [the Prophet's] *sunnah*, and keep far away from indulgence (*rukhṣat*) and innovation (*biḍʿat*). [And you must always] hold the *ḥadīth*s of the Prophet (may God bless and give peace to him and his family and his Companions) as your guide, and be a diligent researcher and investigator of accounts and traditions of the Prophet and his noble Companions.'

After the completion of these words, the Khwāja's successors said to me, 'The witness to the truth of this experience of yours is this: Go to Mawlānā Shams ad-Dīn Ībankatavī,[32]

31 Molé translates, "I knew he was dead;" the plural may indeed be honorific here, but the phrase "*dānastam ke īshān gudhashtagān-and*" seems to refer to the whole group.

32 This obscure place-name appears three times in the text, once as a *nisbah* and twice more in its basic form. Molé's handwritten edition lists no variants for the *nisbah*, and only two for each subsequent occurrence, though the manuscripts I have consulted give a much wider range of variants. Molé's translation gives the forms "Aibankatawī" and "Aibankata;" the printed edition of Ṣārī Oghlī, however, adopts the reading *as.k.tūʾī* for the *nisbah* and *as.k.tah* for the place name, giving as variants "*ay.t.k.vī*," then "*a.č.t.kah*" and "*ay.n.k.tah*," and then *ay.t.k.tah* and *ay.n.k.nah* (the Turkish *Makamât-ı Muhammed Bahâüddin Nakşibend* reads "Eskiyûti" and "Eskite"). The basic and 'original' form indeed appears to show an *alif*, then three *markaz*es, then a *kāf*, then a single *markaz* (with one or two dots above it), and finally a *hā*; it would not be unreasonable to find three dots together below three *markaz*es being construed either as a simple *sīn* or as a *b.y/y.b* ligature, but Ṣārī Oghlī's reading leaves out the third *markaz*, which typically appears with a dot above it. A

and tell him, "A certain Turk is making a legal claim against a certain water-carrier (*saqqā*); the truth is on the side of the Turk, but you are favoring the side of the water-carrier." If the water-carrier rejects the legitimacy of the Turk's claim, you say to the water-carrier, "Hey, thirsty water-carrier!"[33] He will understand these words.'

---

reading as "*ay.b.n.k.tah*" thus appears preferable to a reading with *sīn*. Additional manuscripts of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* suggest both the range of variants and a 'consensus' regarding the basic shape of the name: MS Patna (994/1586), f. 20b, *ay.b.n.k.t.vī*; f. 21a, *ay.b.n.k.tah*; f. 22a, *ayb.n.k.tah*; MS India Office, Ethé 1851 (1008/1599–1600), f. 12a, *as.k.t.vī* (crossed out, corrected by "*ay.m.k.t.vī*" in the margin); f. 12b, *ay.n.k.nah*; f. 13a, *ay.m.k.tah*; MS Paris, Supp. pers. 968 (1009/1601), f. 96a, *ay.t.b.k.t.vī*, then *b.n.k.tah*; f. 96b, *ay.b.n.k.tah*; MS Bodleian (921/1515), f. 54b, explicitly vowelled as "*ībnaktavī*" (!); f. 55b, *ay.n.b.k.tū*; f. 56a, *ay.b.n.k.tū*. Cf. the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* (MS IVRUz, No. 2520, f. 7b, explicitly vowelled as *ībankatavī*; f. 8a, *ay.b.n.k.tah*; f. 8b, *ay.b.n.k.tah*, partially vowelled, as *aybankatah* or *ībankatah*); the *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah* (MS Aligarh, f. 9b, *ay.b.n.k.n.vī* or *ay.b.n.k.t.vī*; but f. 10a, *as.k.nah* [the third occurrence is apparently *ay.n.k.nah*, but the text is damaged here]; my notes indicate, for the first occurrence, the reading *a.y.n.b.k.t.vī* in a 16th-century copy of the *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah* in Tashkent, MS IVRUz 11399, f. 37a); and the work of Muḥammad Bāqir (MS Ethé 636, f. 38a, *āy.š-k.n.vī* or *āb.š-k.t.vī* (!), written in two parts; f. 38b, *as.n.k.tah* or *an.s.k.tah*; then *ay.š.k.tah* or *ay.t.n.k.tah*). Both the spellings in early manuscripts and the content of the narrative suggest the site's identification with a place-name, of equally uncertain reading, mentioned in the 12th-century *Laṭā'if al-adhkār* (MS Dushanbe, f. 11b), which, in referring to Muḥammad b. Vāsiʿ, as noted above, mentions a place "connected" with him, outside the city of Bukhārā, called *ribāṭ-i abīnkatah* (or *ay.b.n.k.tah*, written: *alif*, then three *markaz*es, a dot beneath the first, the second with none, and the third with a dot above it; then a *kāf*; then clearly a *tā* and *hā*). The 12th-century reference thus confirms the site's name but does not help with its reading, or with its identification. The spelling in some copies suggests identifying it with the village of "Īmkatah" (a form perhaps understandable as a 'contraction' of "Ībankatah"), in the vicinity of Ghijduvān, mentioned in the Jūybārī documents (*Iz Arkhiva*, 1938:440–441; Ivanov, 1954:309–310; cf. Schwarz, 1999:81, showing Imkata to the south-southwest of Mazākhan); seemingly less suitable, orthographically, is the nearby place called "Ābgīnah."

33 The comment plays on the irony of calling a water-carrier "thirsty;" by extension "*tashnah*" means "greedy" as well. The wording is somewhat different in the *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah*, which omits mention of the Turk's claim here, and says simply, "If the water-carrier taunts you, say to him, 'Hey, greedy [?] water-carrier" (*agar saqqā tashnīʿ zanad, be-gūyesh ay saqqā-yi jašnah* [*sic*] [...]; the last term, *jašnah* or *čašnah*, makes no sense, unless it is linked somehow to "*jashn*," "banquet"). For the most part the work of Muḥammad Bāqir follows the version of the longer redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* (here much the same as the shorter version), but in this case it gives the shorter account noted here, though correcting the final word (*agar saqqā tashnīʿ zanad, be-gūyesh ay saqqā-yi tashnah* [...] [MS Ethé 636, f. 38a]).

'Another witness is that the water-carrier has had illicit relations with a woman, and when the result[34] became evident, they had it aborted and buried it in a certain place beneath a vine.'

They said further, 'When you have conveyed this message to Mawlānā Shams ad-Dīn, at dawn on the next day you should quickly take three raisins and set off toward Nasaf by the road through the 'dead sands,'[35] to go to Sayyid Amīr Kulāl.[36] When you reach the hill of Farājūn,[37] you will meet an old man, and that old man will give you a warm loaf of bread; take that bread from him, and say nothing to him. When you have passed him, you will come upon a caravan; and when you have passed the caravan, a man on horseback will ap-

34 A manuscript variant reads "*baccčah*," more explicit than "*natījah*."

35 The printed text of Ṣārī Oghlī reads, for both occurrences, "*zang-murdah*," taken as a place name, evidently; that this reading might indeed be correct is suggested by its appearance also in the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, which, in the 16th-century manuscript used here, is explicitly vowelled "*zang-murdah*" (MS IVRUz 2520, ff. 7b, 8a; at the first occurrence, the first word is clearly vowelled as "*zang*," but the second word could be read "*mardhah*," since the mark interpreted as a *dhamma* could be a *fatḥa*, while the *sukūn* could be a dot; the second occurrence is not vowelled, but clearly reads "*z.n.k m.r.dah*"). I have not been able to identify any such toponym, however, or a suitable 'generic' meaning for the phrase thus read, and nearly all the additional manuscripts and versions I have consulted read *rīg-i murdah* (the exception is the first occurrence in the work of Muḥammad Bāqir, which gives "*rīg-i marv*" [MS Ethé 636, f. 38b], with a recognizable place-name, but one clearly inappropriate here; the second occurrence reads "*rīg-i murdah*"). Molé's edition reads *rīg-i murdah*, and he translates "le sable mort;" I have followed him in this, but it is possible that this generic-sounding phrase, "*be-rāh-i rīg-i murdah*," i.e., "by the road to," or "by the road across" the Dead Sands, might refer to a specific place-name (the phrase may also play on the meaning of the term "*murdah-rīg*," meaning not only a kind of sand or fine gravel, but the minor effects, of little value, left by a dead person).

36 The *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah* adds, "and take the *kulāh-i 'azīzān* with you" (MS Aligarh, f. 9b).

37 The edited text reads "*pushtah-i farājūn*;" Molé's edition reads *pushtah-i farājūn*, but he translates "desert of Farājūn." In his geographical survey of Mawarannahr, Bartol'd cited a manuscript of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* for the reading "*bīshah-i farājūn*," i.e., "wood of Farājūn" (suggesting that pre-Mongol references to "Qarāchūn" between Bukhārā and Nasaf might be read instead as "Farājūn," though an emendation in the other direction is equally likely: see BARTOL'D, 1977:137, n. 5); nearly all the the additional manuscripts and versions I have consulted agree on reading the first word as "*pushtah*" (which I understand as a "hill" rather than a desert), though there is considerable variety in the rendering of the second word, with the form "*f.rājūn*" predominating (but "*farākhūn*" is common, appearing, for instance, in the work of Muḥammad Bāqir [MS Ethé 636, f. 38b], which gives "*qarākhūn*" at the second occurrence [f. 39a]). The 12th-century *Laṭā'if al-adhkār* (MS Dushanbe 745, f. 12a) refers to a shrine, outside Bukhārā, at a place called "Sarājūn," which some say is the grave of Usāmah b. Zayd (the author rejects this, because Usāmah b. Zayd was left in the Ḥijāz; on this figure, who died ca. 54/674, see V. Vacca, "Usāma b. Zayd," *EI*^{2}, X, p. 913); the text quite unambiguously gives an initial *sīn*, however, and probably refers to a different place.

proach you. You will give counsel to the horseman, and he will perform his repentance at your hand. And give the *kulāh-i ʿazīzān*, which you have, to Sayyid Amīr Kulāl.'[38]

After this, that party sent me off, and brought me back to consciousness.[39]

Early that morning, I went in all haste to Rīvartūn, to my home, and asked my relatives about the *kulāh*. They said that the *kulāh* had for some time been in a certain place; when I saw the *kulāh-i ʿazīzān*, my condition changed, and I wept profusely. That very hour, I went to Ībankatah, and performed the morning prayer in the mosque of Mawlānā Shams ad-Dīn. After the prayer, I rose and said, 'I have been commanded to deliver a message;' I told the Mawlānā the whole story, and the Mawlānā was astonished. The water-carrier was present, and denied the legitimacy of the Turk's complaint; I said to the water-carrier, 'One of my witnesses is that you are a thirsty water-carrier, and have no share in the spiritual world.' He became silent. 'And my other witness is that you committed fornication with a certain woman; you had the [child] that resulted from this act aborted, and buried it in a certain place beneath a vine.' The water-carrier denied what I said. The Mawlānā and the people of the mosque went to that place and investigated, and they found the discarded child there. The water-carrier became apologetic; the Mawlānā and the people of the mosque began to weep, and a powerful state ensued.[40]

When that day had passed, the next day at sunrise, in observance of what I had been commanded in the vision, I took three raisins and [prepared to] set off, by way of the 'dead sands,' toward Nasaf. The Mawlānā learned that I was leaving and asked for me; he showed me much kindness, and said, 'The pain of [mystical] seeking has come upon you. The cure for that pain of yours lies with me. Stay here so that I can fulfill the duty of training you.' In

38 The *Risālah-i Bahāʾīyah* omits this last instruction, as the text proceeds directly from the prediction of the horseman's repentance to the Khwājagān sending him off.

39 Molé translates, "les assemblés me congédièrent et je revins à moi," but the text is of interest for crediting the assembled Khwājagān with both "setting me in motion" and "bringing me to [normal] consciousness" (*ān jamʿ marā ḥarakat dādand va be-vujūd āvardand*).

40 Molé translates, "le véritable état des choses se révéla," but the text implies the manifestation of a wondrous or 'fine' (i.e., spiritually intense) state (*aḥvālī-yi shigarf ẓāhir shod*). The *Risālah-i Bahāʾīyah* abbreviates this part of the account substantially (MS Aligarh, f. 10a). After Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's reference to the message he was commanded to deliver, the text says, "I told the story of the water-carrier and the Turk; the water-carrier was present." At this point the text appears to allude to the culprit's taunt or rude response; it then affirms that Bahāʾ ad-Dīn addressed him as he was told to in the visionary 'prediction' (including the strange wording), and told "the story of his fornication and the burial of someone" (the text is thus probably corrupt here: *man tashnīʿ guftam ay saqqā-yi jashnah* [*sic*], *va qiṣṣah-i fasād-i vayrā va fulānī-rā dafn kardan-rā guftam*). The account says, "At once the Mawlānā and the congregation went to that place; they investigated and found [it];" the weeping and the water-carrier's apology are mentioned, but the final comment on the *aḥvālī-yi shigarf* is omitted. In this case the work of Muḥammad Bāqir follows the versions from the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, giving a fuller account of the encounter with Shams ad-Dīn's congregation.

response to his words, what came from my mouth was,[41] 'I am the son of someone else;[42] if you place the breast of training in my mouth, I should not bite the nipple!'[43] The Mawlānā became silent and gave me leave to depart.

That same morning, I bound my waist; I told two men to pull my belt with all their strength as tightly as possible, and set out on the road. When I came to the hill of Farājūn, I met the old man; he gave me a warm loaf of bread. I took it from him and said nothing to him. When I had passed him, I came upon the caravan. The people of the caravan asked me, 'Where have you come from?' I said, 'From Ībankatah.' They said, 'What time did you leave?' I said, 'At sunrise.' Now the hour when I overtook them was midmorning; they were amazed,[44] and said, 'There are four *farsang*s from that village to this place, and we left at the beginning of the night!'

When I left them, the horseman[45] came before me. When I went up to him, I greeted him; the horseman said, 'Who are you that I feel afraid of you?' I said, 'I am the person at whose hands you are supposed to perform your repentance.' At once he dismounted and humbled himself, and he performed his repentance. He had with him a load of wine in skins; he poured it all out.[46]

When I left him and reached the outskirts of Nasaf, I went to the place where Sayyid Amīr Kulāl (may his soul be hallowed) was staying. I was honored to see him, and I set before him the blessed *kulāh* of the *ʿazīzān*. The Amīr became silent, and after a time said, 'Is this the *kulāh-i ʿazīzān*?' I said, 'Yes.' The Amīr said, '"The directive was that you should keep this *kulāh* between two veils.' I accepted and took the *kulāh*. Then the Amīr gave me instruction in the *dhikr*, and with prohibitions and affirmations made me engage in it in the

41 The text implies a response unexpected even by Bahā' ad-Dīn himself (*dar javāb-i sukhan-i īshān bar zabān-i man gudhasht ke* [...]).

42 Or, "I am the son of others" (*farzand-i dīgarānam*), if the Khwājagān are meant collectively; but the phrase seems to allude to Bahā' ad-Dīn's spiritual 'adoption' as the son of Sammāsī.

43 Molé's translation is curiously misleading here: "si vous tendez le sein de l'éducation sur mon chemin, il ne faut pas que je le saisisse." The reference to the "road" suggests that he originally read "*rahān*" instead of "*dahān*" and understood the former as a plural of *rah*/*rāh*; in any case, the reading, and meaning, of the text seem clear (*agar pistān-i tarbīyat dar dahān-i man nihīd, nabāyad sar-i pistān-rā gazam*).

44 The version in the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* adds, after affirming that the people were amazed, that "they said 'This man is crazy'" (*va guftand īn mard dīvānah ast*; MS IVRUz 2520, f. 8b); the same addition appears in the work of Muḥammad Bāqir (MS Ethé 636, f. 39a), but the *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah* lacks it, following the longer redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*.

45 The shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* specifies, "that horseman of whom they had spoken" (*ān suvār ke gufte būdand*), as does the work of Muḥammad Bāqir (the text in the manuscript of the *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah* is illegible at this point).

46 The *Risālah-i Bahā'īyah* (MS Aligarh, f. 10a) adds here, "and he became one of the saints of God" (*va az awliyā' allāh shod*).

> silent fashion.[47] For a time I followed this, and in accordance with what I was commanded in that vision, to practice rigor (*ʿazīmat*), I did not practice the *dhikr-i ʿalānīyah*."[48]

Such is the account.[49] It may be divided into two basic parts. The first involves the visionary narrative itself, set in the shrine, and including first the 'introduction' of the saints, then the summarized 'instruction' by Ghijduvānī, and finally the more detailed prediction of the confirmatory signs that would, by coming true, bear witness to the trustworthiness of the vision, and of the instruction. The second part involves Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's own journey, first from the scene of the vision to his home, and then from his home to Amīr Kulāl, in Nasaf, following the itinerary, and fulfilling the predictions, outlined in the vision itself.

Before considering the broader point of this extremely rich narrative, there are a number of specific issues deserving of comment.

47 Molé's translation is again misleading here: "L'Amīr m'enseigna ensuite le *dhikr* et me fit réciter secrètement [...] le négation et l'affirmation." Though its phrasing is of interest for separating the "teaching" from the specific reference to the "silent fashion," there can be little doubt that the text clearly understands the *dhikr*, and not the "prohibition and affirmation," as being performed silently (*marā sabaq-i talqīn-i dhikr guftand va be-nafī va ithbāt be-ṭarīq-i khafīyah mashghūl kardand*).

48 Here as well Molé's translation obscures the meaning; he writes, simply, "Pendant un certain temps il me fit suivre cette voie. Comme j'en étais occupé, je n'entrepris pas le *dhikr* public." His rendering thus obscures the key connection between "rigor" (*ʿazīmat*) and rejecting the public *dhikr* (the text reads *muddatī barīn mutābaʿat kardam, va ba-mūjib-i ānki dar ān vāqiʿah maʾmūr būdam be-ʿamal be-ʿazīmat kardan, be-dhikr-i ʿalānīyah ʿamal nakardam*). After the last phrase affirming that "I did not practice the public *dhikr*," the shorter redaction of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* adds, "and I rejected the public [way]" (*va tark-i ʿalānīyah guftam*: MS IVRUz 2520, f. 8b); the work of Muḥammad Bāqir includes this addition, but earlier adds also an insertion affirming that the command, in the vision, to maintain "rigor" came to Bahāʾ ad-Dīn "from Khwāja Kulāl" (!). The *Risālah-i Bahāʾīyah* lacks these additions, but proceeds into a longer discussion on two classes of Sufi "attainers."

49 It is followed by a brief report that appears to be related to it, but adds little of substance: "They have related from our holy Khwāja (may God hallow his spirit) that he said, 'After that time, every one of the sayings that the holy Khwāja-yi Buzurg [i.e., Ghijduvānī] had spoken to me left its own trace within me; and at that point, the result of acting in accord with it became a clear legacy. And since I was commanded to investigate the accounts of the Prophet (may God's blessings and peace be upon him and upon his Companions) and the traditions of the noble Companions (may God be pleased with them all), I served the *ʿulamā*, and recited *ḥadīth*s, and made known the traditions of the Companions, and I acted in accordance with each one; and through divine favor, I witnessed the result of this within myself.'"

(1) *The narrative's textual environment*: The context of the narrative within the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* is significant. The narrative stands as the culmination of a series of accounts,[50] within the second part of the work (out of four parts), dealing with Bahā' ad-Dīn's early spiritual development; indeed, the narrative, recounting the vision and its aftermath, not only provides the definitive climax to the series of brief stories related prior to it in the work, but also encapsulates the two directions evident in those earlier stories, which alternate between affirmations of Bahā' ad-Dīn's exalted status and accounts of what Bahā' ad-Dīn needed to do, himself, to actualize that status (including the experiences of spiritual 'ruin' and irresolution that had reached a critical juncture just before the visionary narrative recounted above).[51] The climactic narrative not only ends with Bahā' ad-Dīn's formal entrance into the path under the guidance of Amīr Kulāl;[52] with its account of Ghijduvānī interpreting the lamps and the wicks by

50 ṢALĀḤ, 1992:79–87.

51 First we are told how Bahā' ad-Dīn was honored, as a newborn child, with the blessed gaze (*naẓar*) of Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī, who affirmed to his disciples, including Amīr Kulāl, that Bahā' ad-Dīn was his 'son;' the passage affirming this is followed by a narrative, ascribed to Bahā' ad-Dīn's grandfather, recounting how Sammāsī had reported 'smelling' the scent of a man as he passed through the village where Bahā' ad-Dīn was soon to be born, and, as the growing intensity of the scent indicated that the person had indeed been born, had predicted that he would become "the spiritual guide of the age." These accounts, which amount to spiritual sanction of Bahā' ad-Dīn's status, are followed (after a brief childhood wonder recounted by his mother) by a narrative in which Bahā' ad-Dīn himself recalls his experience of humility and inadequacy when presented to Sammāsī at the age of 18. Next, a narrative also recounted by Bahā' ad-Dīn himself tells how his grandfather took him to see other dervishes in Samarqand and then Bukhārā; the account culminates in his receipt of the *kulāh-i ʿazīzān* – on which see below – and his meeting with his formal master, Amīr Kulāl, who told him that Sammāsī had commissioned him to train Bahā' ad-Dīn. This account, again of affirmation, is followed by the story of Bahā' ad-Dīn's dream of Ḥakīm Ata and the story of Khalīl, which ends with Bahā' ad-Dīn despairing of "the affairs of this world;" a series of short narratives follows, recounting several seemingly minor experiences that seem to reflect a growing frustration, indecision, and desolation, which directly precedes the climactic visionary account explored below (one involves a voice he heard during a *khalvat*, implicitly criticizing him for delaying his repentance; another recounts an internal 'debate' over whether Bahā' ad-Dīn can enter the path on his own terms; the third relates an exchange in a mosque that left Bahā' ad-Dīn even more unsettled than before).

52 While there is indeed a spiritual 'progression' in these accounts, their literary sequence in the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* cannot be assumed to correspond exactly with a chronological sequence of Bahā' ad-Dīn's spiritual experiences (caution in this regard is suggested also by the various attributions of the narratives, as noted below). Nor can the sequence of associations

praising Bahā' ad-Dīn's talent but calling upon him, in effect, to 'get moving,' it also joins an affirmation of his status with an exhortation to action, and through the latter puts an end to the indecision that had plagued him up to that point. The stories that follow this climactic narrative, moreover, conclude, at the end of the second section of the work, with a summary of Bahā' ad-Dīn's lineages of transmission, including a final reference to the vision at the shrine;[53] this reference underscores that vision's central place in Bahā' ad-Dīn's legitimation. For present purposes what is most significant in the narrative's placement is its clearly pivotal character as the decisive 'statement' about Bahā' ad-Dīn's legitimacy and authority as a *shaykh*.

---

proposed for Bahā' ad-Dīn in Algar's encyclopedia articles, cited above (first 'son-ship' under Sammāsī, then discipleship under Amīr Kulāl, then the vision, then associations with Mawlānā ʿĀrif Dīg-garānī, Qutham Shaykh, and Khalīl Ata, in that order) be accepted as historically accurate. The notion that Bahā' ad-Dīn's vision of Ghijduvānī and the other Khwājagān came "during his association" with Amīr Kulāl (as Algar writes) is likewise at odds with the central point of the visionary narrative: while that story indeed follows accounts affirming that Sammāsī conferred Bahā' ad-Dīn's training upon Amīr Kulāl, and that Amīr Kulāl mentioned his intention to fulfil this charge when Bahā' ad-Dīn first met him, the visionary narrative explored here clearly presents Bahā' ad-Dīn's training, and sanction, by Ghijduvānī and the other Khwājagān as prior to his formal discipleship under Amīr Kulāl.

53 Following the narrative explored here, the remainder of the second part of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:93–115) includes a series of accounts, nearly all identified as reflecting the early stage of Bahā' ad-Dīn's mystical career, but again, in most cases, without a clear chronological sequence. Several are localized (one is set, again, at the shrine of Mazdākhan, another at a mosque in Rīvartūn, and another in a garden where his own shrine was later established; several are set in Bukhārā, including one specified in the Fatḥābād district, while others involve Bahā' ad-Dīn journeying again to Nasaf, and one mentions his return from the *ḥajj*). Several were noted earlier among the different modes of legitimizing Bahā' ad-Dīn (i.e., the one stressing Ḥakīm Tirmidhī over Uvays [p. 95], the one affirming that he had surpassed the stations reached by several earlier saints [p. 112], and the one noting his 'elevation' by the *aqṭāb* and *awtād* on a piece of white felt [pp. 112–113]). The second section of the work ends with the account, also noted above, in which Bahā' ad-Dīn's various modes of spiritual sanction – his 'son-ship' under Sammāsī, his *irādat*, etc., with Amīr Kulāl, etc. – are summarized, including a reference back to the narrative of the vision at the shrine of Mazdākhan; this account concludes with an account of Bahā' ad-Dīn's 'normative' *silsilah*, traced from Ghijduvānī back to the Prophet (pp. 113–115). The entire section dealing with Bahā' ad-Dīn's early spiritual development thus concludes by placing the vision at the center of Bahā' ad-Dīn's relationship with the Khwājagānī tradition.

(2) *The question of attribution*: The narrative is attributed to Bahāʾ ad-Dīn himself, and thus has the character of a first-hand account, but unlike most of the stories that precede it in the section on the early part of his life, this one is transmitted anonymously. That is, of the ten narratives that precede the account of the vision in the second part of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, six are presented as transmitted according to the recollection of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's chief disciple and successor, Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn ʿAṭṭār (i.e., "Khwāja ʿAlāʾ al-Ḥaqq va'd-Dīn related, from the blessed utterances of our Khwāja [Bahāʾ ad-Dīn], that he said, [...]."); two of the ten are presented as the words of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's grandfather and mother, respectively, transmitted without further attribution, while two others – the account of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's association with the 'dervish-king' Khalīl, beginning with the dream of Ḥakīm Ata, and a much shorter recollection of internal conflict over the 'terms' under which he would enter the Path – are presented with the same anonymous attribution as in the case of the long visionary narrative of interest here. The anonymity of the transmitter naturally precludes any specific conclusion regarding the multiple perspectives on Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's spiritual formation included in the work; yet given the prominence of Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn – not only as the successor of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn in leading his Sufi community, but as a central figure in the 'compositional history' of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*[54]

54 The account of the work's compilation, indeed, suggests further divergence by referring to another disciple's plans to compile the sayings and deeds of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn. In the introduction (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:66–68), the author of the work, Ṣalāḥ b. Mubārak al-Bukhārī (a pseudonym?), tells us that after he entered the service of Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn ʿAṭṭār in 785/1383 and through him met Bahāʾ ad-Dīn and associated with his dervishes, he conceived a desire to assemble the evidence of sainthood he saw in Bahāʾ ad-Dīn. However, he tells us, Mawlānā Ḥusām ad-Dīn Khwāja Yūsuf, "who was among the descendants of Mawlānā Ḥāfiẓ ad-Dīn-i Kabīr-i Bukhārī" (i.e., Ḥāfiẓ ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Naṣr al-Bukhārī [d. 693/1294]), was "the master (*ustād*) of the *ʿulamā* of Bukhārā," and had spent considerable time in the company of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn, "was wanting to undertake the compilation of these *maqāmāt*;" Bahāʾ ad-Dīn told this Mawlānā Ḥusām ad-Dīn that he did not give permission for this "at this time," but that "afterwards" – i.e., after his death – the decision would be up to Mawlānā Ḥusām ad-Dīn (the latter is identified more specifically elsewhere in the work, as a grandson of Ḥāfiẓ ad-Dīn-i Kabīr [p. 183], and as a paternal uncle of Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā [p. 229]; he is hailed as the first among the *ʿulamā* of Bukhārā to attach himself to Bahāʾ ad-Dīn [pp. 183–184], and other stories involving him [pp. 229–231, 258. 307–308, 323–324, 326–329] consistently highlight his status among the *ʿulamā*). "For this reason," the author writes, "I waited." Then, when Bahāʾ ad-Dīn died on 3 Rabīʿ I, 791/2 March 1389, and Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn became his successor, the author received the permission he had sought. He affirms further that some of the "signs of sainthood" he wished to assemble regarding Bahāʾ ad-Dīn had already been recorded on the basis of

– the mere distinction between narratives specifically ascribed to Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn and accounts not thus ascribed[55] suggests that there may already have been considerable divergence in the ways Bahāʾ ad-Dīn was remembered, and in the ways his spiritual development was found meaningful. This in turn reminds us, again, that the accounts of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn preserved in the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* reflect a quite fluid stage in the development of both his Sufi community and his hagiographical image; subsequent developments would entail a winnowing of accounts, preserving only those significant, and meaningful, in the context of the fully developed Naqshbandī order.

(3) *The setting for the vision*: Bahāʾ ad-Dīn is visiting the shrines of deceased saints when he has the vision of Ghijduvānī and the host of the Khwājagān (all of whom he recognizes as deceased). The confirmation of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's status, and the completion of his 'work,' are thus closely linked, in

---

Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn's accounts, but that the latter had been left unfinished; he was thus asked to complete them, and he did so, but he also notes that he utilized other narratives as well, referring to what he had gathered, and what he had received permission to divulge, of "relations from servants and intimates and dervishes" of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn. It can hardly be supposed that the author wished to distance himself from his own master by his inclusion of accounts transmitted by others – after all, he affirms his hope to attach a supplement to the *maqāmāt* of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn dealing with the mystical states and impressions manifested by Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn – but the circulation of different stories about Bahāʾ ad-Dīn among other disciples is nevertheless significant in terms of the multiple voices that must have left accounts of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn; the author implies, after all, that Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn himself had already recorded some narratives about Bahāʾ ad-Dīn, and refers to the wish, at least, to do the same on the part of Mawlānā Ḥusām ad-Dīn. The diversity of the images of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn that did survive, through inclusion in the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, suggests the even greater diversity, of alternative images, that might have been evident in tales about Bahāʾ ad-Dīn that were *not* selected – or 'permitted' – for inclusion in the work.

55 There is also a striking difference in the narrative 'presence' of Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn in the different sections of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*: in the second section, on the beginning of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's spiritual development (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:79–115), he is identified as the transmitter for just under half of the separate narratives (23 out of 48); in the third and fourth parts of the work (pp. 115–386), covering Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's career as a shaykh, Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn is named as the transmitter of only 30 narratives, out of nearly 200 (the first section, "on the saint and sainthood" [pp. 71–79], contains no attributed narratives). Whether this reflects the purely fortuitous circumstances of Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn's unfinished compilation of accounts about his master, as mentioned by Ṣalāḥ b. Mubārak – i.e., his work had not yet progressed to the later stages of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's life, leaving more material prepared by him for use in the early section of the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* – or implies some more systematic difference in the selection or focus of narratives transmitted by Khwāja ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn remains unclear.

general terms, with the realm of the dead: the dead are responsible for his instruction and blessing, and the dead also impart knowledge of the dead child who figures among the confirmatory signs, as discussed below. This is in keeping with the close association between Sufi meditation and experience, on the one hand, and the imagery and status of death (e.g., the disciple as a corpse in the hands of the 'master' who washes the body, the ability to see the dead in their graves, etc.), an association that rests ultimately on the famous Sufi injunction to "die before you die."

More specifically, the motif of 'final' or definitive spiritual attainment during meditation at a saint's shrine is a familiar one in Sufi literature, with the graves of earlier Sufis generally serving as the venues for realization. It is unfortunate that in this case we cannot be more certain of the identities or possible significance of the three shrines mentioned by name in the account as those visited on the night of the vision; yet their very obscurity is suggestive, not only for paralleling the obscurity of the local settings for the confirmatory signs, but also for the implicit contrast with the many shrines that might have been mentioned in order to link Bahā' ad-Dīn with specific Sufi or juridical currents. Just two generations after Bahā' ad-Dīn, a disciple of Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā would produce the so-called *Tārīkh-i Mullāzādah*, a guide to the shrines of Bukhārā and its environs, listing scores of holy sites where scholars and jurists (whether the 'founder' of Ḥanafī preeminence in Bukhārā, Abū Ḥafṣ-i Kabīr, or much later Ḥanafī figures from the 12th and 13th centuries), as well as Sufis (e.g., the more recently established shrine of Sayf ad-Dīn Bākharzī), were buried; yet aside from the shrine of Muḥammad b. Vāsiʿ – whose authenticity is questioned in the work, as noted above – the other two that figure in the narrative find no mention at all, at least under the names by which they are identified in the account of the vision.

Finally, in connection with the shrine venue, the account of the vision itself includes an allusion to Bahā' ad-Dīn's own shrine, in affirming that he had been granted the miraculous power (*karāmat*), through his *barakah*, to "relieve afflictions;" the wording provides the basis for, but must already reflect the currency of, the popular appellation – *khwāja-i balā-gardān*, the "remover of troubles" – by which Bahā' ad-Dīn's shrine is known to this day. The inclusion of this comment in the account of the vision, set at the shrine and managed by the deceased saints, thus provides an element of spiritual symmetry, as what happens to Bahā' ad-Dīn at a shrine near Bukhārā shapes what will happen to his devotees at Bahā' ad-Dīn's own shrine near Bukhārā.

(4) *Visionary boundaries*: There is an additional bit of interesting visionary symmetry in the account, in terms of the crossing, in narrative terms, of the boundaries of the visionary experience: the account begins with Bahā' ad-Dīn noticing a 'sign' in the physical world, in the form of the dimmed lamps and their wicks in need of 'assistance' in order to burn brightly; this sign is then brought into the vision, through Ghijduvānī's metaphorical explanation of its meaning. The account then relates the visionary predictions of the confirmatory signs, and these then rhetorically 'move out' of the visionary experience into the physical world as Bahā' ad-Dīn journeys toward his living master. The discursive crossing of these signs into and out of the visionary experience is paralleled, to some extent, by the handling of the *kulāh*, which is spoken of in the vision, but is understood there, like the sign of the lamp and the confirmatory signs, as existing wholly within the physical world, without itself crossing over into, or out of, the visionary environment;[56] we will return shortly to the role of the *kulāh*.

(5) *Instruction vs. validation*: The confirmatory signs are discussed further below, but it is worth noting the stark difference in the treatment of Ghijduvānī's teaching about the Sufi path, on the one hand, and the handling of the confirmatory signs. The account is as reticent in describing the content of Ghijduvānī's instruction of Bahā' ad-Dīn as it is detailed when recounting the signs that would confirm the vision; Ghijduvānī's teaching is simply summarized, with reference to "the beginning, the middle, and the end" of the mystical Path and his charge to adhere to the *sharīʿah*, while the signs that would confirm the vision are described in remarkably concrete detail. The specificity of the account of these signs is underscored not only by their repetition – once as predicted in the vision, again as coming to pass, as predicted, in the ordinary world – but also by their grounding in local topography, as the itinerary that would bring Bahā' ad-Dīn to Amīr Kulāl is likewise rehearsed twice. The night-time itinerary in-

56 The handling of the *kulāh* here thus contrasts with the handling of a Sufi *tāj*, and other insignia, in an account, from the *Maqāmāt* of Amīr Kulāl, about another visionary encounter with a deceased saint that figures prominently in the *silsilah* of the Khwājagān, namely the relationship between Abū'l-Ḥasan Kharaqānī and Abū Yazīd Bisṭāmī; in the account, Bisṭāmī is portrayed physically manifesting himself to Kharaqānī out of his grave, and investing Kharaqānī with the insignia of Sufi succession (SHIHĀB AD-DĪN, 1910:76–77; SHIHĀB AD-DĪN, 2001:262–264). The relationship between Bisṭāmī and Kharaqānī is to some extent a model for the relationship between Ghijduvānī and Bahā' ad-Dīn; a separate study of the accounts of Bisṭāmī and Kharaqānī in Khwājagānī and Naqshbandī sources is in preparation.

volving the three shrines is unfortunately obscure, as are the particulars of his journey from the shrine where his vision occurred to his home in Rīvartūn, and then on to the site of his dealings with Mawlānā Shams ad-Dīn and his congregation, and finally his encounters as he crosses the desert between Bukhārā and Nasaf; in general the journey appears to take him from the northeastern environs of the oasis of Bukhārā southeastwards to Nasaf, but undoubtedly the localities mentioned would have been familiar to those hearing the itinerary in the early 15th century. In any case, the specificity of the itinerary, as well as of the confirmatory signs, contrasts sharply with the generalities of Ghijduvānī's instruction.

(6) *Unforeseen events*: There are only two significant events that occur in the second half of the narrative that are *not* predicted, insofar as we are told, in the first half, by the Khwājagān assembled in his vision (indeed, nearly everything else is not only predicted, but is foretold, in the account of the vision, with as much detail as is employed in recounting its fulfillment).[57] One is the conclusion, in which Amīr Kulāl gives the *kulāh* back to Bahā' ad-Dīn, and teaches him the *dhikr*; these issues are taken up below, but the only part of this concluding section that is mentioned in the vision appears there in the form of the command to Bahā' ad-Dīn to give the *kulāh* to Amīr Kulāl. The other 'unforetold' event comes at the end of his stay with Mawlānā Shams ad-Dīn, whom Bahā' ad-Dīn had been instructed to meet; Shams ad-Dīn asked Bahā' ad-Dīn to stay there with him, as his disciple, in effect, prompting Bahā' ad-Dīn to reject the offer in rather stark terms. The imagery of a disciple nursing at the breast of the master is indeed found in other Central Asian contexts as a symbol for spiritual transmission and legitimation, but Bahā' ad-Dīn's explicit reference to his status as the "son" of another shaykh – who he had in mind is not said, but undoubtedly the allusion is to Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī's declaration that Bahā' ad-Dīn was his son – appears again to allude to the controversial issue of hereditary sanctity. Perhaps more significant is what Mawlānā Shams ad-Dīn says in 'tempting' Bahā' ad-Dīn away from his *sharī'ah*-bound mission: he claims to be the cure for the 'pain' experienced by his guest, thus alluding, in the account, to the increasing internal affliction and unease described by Bahā' ad-Dīn in the narratives that lead up to the climactic vision. Mawlānā Shams ad-Dīn is thus shown playing on his guest's evidently manifest spiritual crisis, offering him a normative

57 The details of the comments by the people of the caravan encountered by Bahā' ad-Dīn, and of the horseman's wine skins, were likewise omitted from the visionary prediction by the Khwājagān.

Sufi solution to a typical consequence of an early stage in the Sufi path; Bahā' ad-Dīn rejects the offer not only because he was "the son of another," but because he had been instructed to follow a specific itinerary, and Mawlānā Shams ad-Dīn's role in that itinerary was finished. In any case, it is interesting that this important section – reflecting an effort to lure Bahā' ad-Dīn away from the Khwājagān and into another Sufi community, and thus offering Bahā' ad-Dīn an opportunity to affirm his loyalty, in effect, to the Khwājagān – is one of the few things omitted by the Khwājagān in their prediction of confirmatory events.

We may turn now to the broader message of the narrative as a whole. Molé insisted that the point of the story was to underscore the *sharīʿah*-mindedness of the Naqshbandīyah, a familiar theme indeed throughout Naqshbandī history. There is certainly merit in this understanding, although as noted, Molé's emphasis on the 'doctrinal' instruction by Ghijduvānī, during the vision, was misplaced; indeed, it may be argued that the point of attention to the *sharīʿah*, and of employing the spiritual achievements of Sufism in the service of the *sharīʿah* and the Muslim community's 'public' needs, is affirmed, to be sure, in the encapsulated summary of Bahā' ad-Dīn's visionary 'instruction' by Ghijduvānī, but is much more firmly and directly communicated in the series of confirmatory signs, the account of which, in prediction and fulfillment, occupies so much of the narrative as a whole. That is, the account presents, twice, the sequence of quite small-scale events that serve as an embedded legitimizing story, within the larger legitimizing project of the narrative as a whole; the confirmatory signs are expressly identified as evidence that legitimizes the vision itself, and in this way 'public' signs are made to affirm the validity of a visionary experience, while a visionary experience is in turn put to use in public and juridical contexts. The narrative thus underscores Ghijduvānī's emphasis, in the vision, upon rigorous observance of the *sharīʿah* by rehearsing some small-scale practical moral examples of that observance, couched in the framework of confirmatory 'hidden signs' that legitimize the vision itself.

We may have here, in effect, a variation on the pattern of legitimation through 'social profile' suggested for the earlier Khwājagānī tradition; yet it is remarkable that there is no specific mention of any Sufi ritual or contemplative activity, aside from allusion to the "beginning, middle, and end" of *sulūk*, in the account of the vision. Ghijduvānī is never credited, in this narrative, with teaching the *dhikr* or enjoining any kind of specifically Sufi ritual or devotional practice (or, for that matter, speaking of any obligations entailed by the *adab* of master and disciple within a functioning Sufi community). What is stressed there, rather, is the *sharīʿah*-mindedness of Ghijduvānī's counsel, and his quasi-

juridical recommendation that Bahāʾ ad-Dīn pay close attention to the Prophet's sayings and deeds. This, of course, is hardly revolutionary, but it is nonetheless significant how little of Sufism's distinctive profile is addressed in this account; this is no doubt in keeping with the critique of Sufism evident in earlier Khwājagānī literature. Even Ghijduvānī's interpretation of the lamps and wicks that caught Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's attention in the shrines, while acknowledging his aptitude for the spiritual path, calls him not to contemplation or to the need for spiritual retreats or austerities, but to action, and putting in motion the "wick of predisposition" (*fatīlah-i istiʿdād*).

It is perhaps the *type* of 'action' envisioned here that is the subject of the strange confirmatory 'miracles' recounted in this narrative, which are remarkable for their small scale, and perhaps moreso for the obscurity of their referents and implications. The confirmatory signs, identified specifically as a series of proofs by which Bahāʾ ad-Dīn would know the veracity of what he had seen in his vision, involved a series of encounters and revelations of some quite mundane wrongdoings, and while the specific import of each remains quite enigmatic, they seem to conform, together, to the model of careful observance of the *sharīʿah* as enjoined by Ghijduvānī.

In the first, involving Mawlānā Shams ad-Dīn, the water-carrier, and the Turk, Bahāʾ ad-Dīn speaks words, specified in the vision, that for some unknown reason silence a sinful man who is being unwittingly championed, evidently, by a respected local leader; then he guides that leader and his flock to the place where they dig up the remains of a buried child, further condemning the man. The episode thus ends with the discovery of the buried fetus, leaving the people weeping and the water-carrier apologetic; but nothing more is said of the situation (nor are we told explicitly that Mawlānā Shams ad-Dīn changed his position regarding the Turk's claim, though this is perhaps implied by the exposure of the water-carrier's greed and fornication). Nevertheless, it is no doubt significant that the first confirmatory sign concludes as Bahāʾ ad-Dīn puts his mystical vision in the service of upholding juridical propriety, using his spiritual insight to reveal an otherwise unpunished and unrepented crime, and to prevent (we may presume) an unjust outcome to a lawsuit. There is perhaps a model here, of the use of spiritual insight not in the service of what we may regard as typically 'Sufi' concerns (i.e., advancing mystical attainment), but in the service of the *sharīʿah*, and this of course fits the profile articulated for Bahāʾ ad-Dīn; the aftermath of this episode is instructive here, as noted above, inasmuch as it shows Bahāʾ ad-Dīn resisting the local shaykh's effort to lure him into his service, maintaining instead his focus on the course he was instructed to follow. At the

same time, the fact that the local shaykh of the village, Shams ad-Dīn, and the unidentified water-carrier, are on the wrong side, and that the wronged party is a Turk, is also significant, since it upends the social expectations of the era, whereby the label "Turk" often signals inattentiveness to the *sharīʿah* and poor or incomplete Islamization.

Next, Bahāʾ ad-Dīn has a series of brief encounters on the way toward his master Amīr Kulāl, with figures who otherwise play no role in his life, so far as we are told (the raisins, by the way, are never explained, but we are nevertheless assured that he did exactly as he was told in taking them with him; their significance undoubtedly lies in the fact that they would be scant provisions for the journey Bahāʾ ad-Dīn was called upon to make, thus highlighting either his ascetic prowess, or, more likely, his *tawakkul*, i.e., his faithful reliance upon God alone to provide). While we cannot rule out the possibility that some local audience, or local agenda, now forgotten, was being addressed in these stories, these elements of the account remain enigmatic, and opaque, in their simplicity. The significance of the old man with the warm bread, or of the slow-moving caravan, is not clear, beyond the minor 'wonder' of the bread still being warm despite having been carried far from where it was baked, and the intimation of remarkable speed in Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's travel; he takes the bread, but says nothing to the old man, as instructed, but then has a brief verbal exchange with the members of the caravan.[58] In the third encounter, he effects the repentance (*tawbah*) of another traveler, and this is the closest we come to a specific evocation of Sufi ritual, or of a specific 'stage' on the Path; yet there is, again, little that is specific to Sufism in this encounter: it is not a *murīd* he gains,[59] but merely a traveler who repents and rids himself of a temptation to himself (and others) by pouring out his wineskins, again reinforcing the *sharīʿah*-mindedness of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's program.

Even the double recounting of these confirmatory signs, however, plays a larger role in the narrative, beyond underscoring Ghijduvānī's emphasis upon rigorous observance of the *sharīʿah*: they bring Bahāʾ ad-Dīn spatially from the site of his vision to his master in-the-flesh, Amīr Kulāl. In this regard there is, in

58 In taking bread from the old man by himself, and yet exchanging only words with a presumably well-stocked caravan, there may be an echo of the Qurʾānic story of Moses and his companion, identified with Khiżr, with the latter enjoining unconditional acceptance of his instructions and the former bewildered by seemingly unjust actions; but the echo is faint, and the implication, of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn in the role of Moses, is undeveloped.

59 In one adaptation of the story, to be sure, the horseman who repented is indeed said to have become one of God's saints, as noted.

my view, a much more important argument being made in this narrative – more important, that is, from the perspective of the specific 'local' circumstances of the Khwājagānī tradition in the late 14th and early 15th centuries, than affirming careful observance of the *sharīʿah*, as important as this no doubt was. Both the visionary content of this story, and the confirmatory signs, together emphasize Bahā' ad-Dīn's direct instruction by ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī, and identify Ghijduvānī's path as one of strict adherence to the *sharīʿah*; but taken as a whole, the narrative also makes important statements about Bahā' ad-Dīn's relationship to the Khwājagānī tradition, and it is the creative 'definition' of this relationship, rather than simply the renewed identification of Ghijduvānī's community with *sharīʿah*-mindedness (which we hear of in many other sources) that is the hallmark, and significant contribution, of this narrative.

In this regard, the identities of the deceased representatives of the Khwājagān who figure in the vision are of special significance. In addition to ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī, those identified by name are Khwāja Aḥmad-i Ṣiddīq, Khwāja Awliyā-i Kalān, Khwāja ʿĀrif Rīvgaravī, Khwāja Maḥmūd Anjīr Faghnavī, Khwāja ʿAlī Rāmītanī, and Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī; the first three were direct disciples of Ghijduvānī, while the last three comprise the lineage descending from one of those disciples, Rīvgaravī, down to Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī (it was this lineage that was claimed as Bahā' ad-Dīn's *silsilah*, and it was this lineage whose practice of the vocal *dhikr* Bahā' ad-Dīn repudiated).[60] This brief passage within the visionary narrative thus integrates the Khwājagānī *silsilah* horizontally and vertically, and in effect, as suggested, heals the split in the Khwājagānī tradition, setting the stage for Bahā' ad-Dīn to be identified as the culmination of a unified Khwājagānī tradition (rather than as a Sufi who claimed the *silsilah* of one faction but broke with its practice).

The missing figure in the vision, of course, is Amīr Kulāl, who provides the link between Sammāsī and Bahā' ad-Dīn; in the logic of the story, Amīr Kulāl was not dead yet, and so did not belong among the spirits of the deceased Khwājagān who presided over Bahā' ad-Dīn's vision. Amīr Kulāl does appear late in the story, to be sure, but as Bahā' ad-Dīn's 'living' shaykh, he is cast in a

60 In light of the 'end-run' around Amīr Kulāl, by claiming direct ties with Amīr Kulāl's master, Sammāsī, it is not surprising the the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* preserves a story claiming that Sammāsī's master, in turn, Khwāja ʿAlī ʿAzīzān Rāmītanī, had transmitted two styles of *dhikr*, vocal (*jahr*) and silent (*khafīyah*), and affirming that Bahā' ad-Dīn declared, "I have chosen the *khafīyah* because it is more powerful and fundamental" (*aqvā va avvalī*) (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:145).

clearly subordinate role; the story makes it clear, indeed, that to the extent that a *silsilah* is invoked in this account at all, implicitly, Bahā' ad-Dīn is legitimized not by the master who actually trained him in Sufism – Amīr Kulāl – but by Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī. The story is, in effect, an end-run around Amīr Kulāl, all in the context of a larger end-run that appeals not to Muḥammad Bābā or the rest of the Khwājagān, but directly to ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī. As a whole, moreover, the visionary narrative makes it clear that even if the Khwājagān (in any lineage) had not been 'with' Bahā' ad-Dīn in life, as part of a regular transmission from living master to living disciple, leading to Bahā' ad-Dīn, they were nevertheless with him after their death, in the spiritual realm.

The narrative, in addition, links the form of the *dhikr* adopted by Bahā' ad-Dīn with the "rigor" (*ʿazīmat*) enjoined upon him by Ghijduvānī; this not only applies the juridical principle of *ʿazīmat* to the context of the Sufi *dhikr*, but, of more significance, justifies Bahā' ad-Dīn's break with the vocal *dhikr* employed by Amīr Kulāl and his predecessors in the branch of the Khwājagānī *silsilah* nevertheless 'claimed' by, or for, Bahā' ad-Dīn. Those predecessors were indeed portrayed blessing and approving Bahā' ad-Dīn in the vision, in effect erasing the split in the Khwājagānī tradition. This in itself is remarkable, insofar as it implicitly confirms the critique leveled by the 'other' Khwājagānī lineage, reflected in the 14th-century *Maslak al-ʿārifīn*, which insisted that the lineage formally claimed by Bahā' ad-Dīn had strayed from Ghijduvānī's method by adopting the vocal *dhikr* (by Bahā' ad-Dīn's time, however, we no longer have any evidence that that other Khwājagānī lineage was represented by a functioning Sufi community, its apparent absence facilitating an appropriation of its method, and its critique, by Bahā' ad-Dīn and his partisans). The simultaneous confirmation of that critique of the 'innovation' of the vocal *dhikr*, and the appropriation of the communal legacy of those who introduced the innovation, is the key to the entire narrative, and the narrative is in turn the key, I would argue, to understanding Bahā' ad-Dīn's role in Khwājagānī history.

The fundamental aim of much of the visionary content of this story thus seems clear: as a project of legitimation, the story sets the stage for Bahā' ad-Dīn's unique place as the 'reformer' of the Khwājagānī tradition, a place that depends, in part, on rejecting the importance of the *silsilah* (not to mention hereditary transmission). To some extent, the story resembles others told about Bahā' ad-Dīn in which he is shown laying claim to a tradition that he nevertheless parted from, as in the case of his relationship with the 'Yasavī' dervishes Khalīl and Qutham; but in this case, the tradition he claims, through his formal discipleship under Amīr Kulāl, and his 'reform' or surpassing of that tradition,

through his encounter with Ghijduvānī, is that of the 'unified' Khwājagānī community as it existed in Ghijduvānī's time, before the split in the era of his successors, and before the divergence of Bahā' ad-Dīn's lineage of practice from his lineage of initiation and communal continuity.

If the sequence of confirmatory signs brings Bahā' ad-Dīn from his vision of Ghijduvānī to his service to Amīr Kulāl, two final elements in the narrative are of special significance in bridging the two diverging lineages, and in 'uniting' the two branches of the Khwājagān. These elements – the *dhikr* and the *kulāh* – are important, generally, for returning the focus of the narrative to an environment that is recognizable in terms of the distinctive hallmarks of a Sufi community. None of the confirmatory signs, after all, appears to have anything to do, even remotely, with Bahā' ad-Dīn's mystical training, or with the community that would form around his legacy; what is perhaps most revealing in these signs is precisely the implicit 'withdrawal' from the miracles and wonders and saintly interventions that mark other legitimizing stories for other shaykhs. With the conclusion of the narrative, however, we reenter the world of an actual, functioning Sufi community, as the issue of the *dhikr* is raised for the first time in the story, and as the *kulāh* is revisited one last time.

In specific terms, however, the discussion of the *dhikr* and the *kulāh* that concludes the narrative is again crucial in 'erasing' the split in the Khwājagān, because it implicitly addresses the two central issues in terms of which that split had been framed, i.e., the mode of practice, and the mode of succession. As noted, Bahā' ad-Dīn was claiming the *dhikr*-method of one group and the succession lineage of another; the conclusion of the narrative thus marks a definitive statement on both issues, addressing the former directly in terms of the transmission of the method of practice, and addressing the latter through one traditional marker of the transmission of 'organizational' authority.

That is, the itinerary involving the confirmatory signs comes to an end as Bahā' ad-Dīn reaches the region of Nasaf and enters the service of Amīr Kulāl; there, as instructed, he presents to Amīr Kulāl the *kulāh-i ʿazīzān*. The entire narrative culminates as Amīr Kulāl gives it back to him for safekeeping, instructing him to keep it hidden; then Amīr Kulāl begins to train Bahā' ad-Dīn in the *dhikr*, which is specifically identified as the *dhikr* of the silent type. We will return to the *kulāh*, but the latter affirmation regarding the *dhikr* is important in two regards. First, as noted, there was no mention at all of the *dhikr*, in any form, during the vision of Ghijduvānī; his instruction of Bahā' ad-Dīn may have included training in the *dhikr* as part of the "beginning, middle, and end" of the Sufi path, but it is remarkable that the account nowhere explicitly ascribes to

Ghijduvānī any sort of training in the *dhikr*, silent or vocal. Second, the affirmation is, of course, problematical, because most accounts, including the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* itself on several occasions, affirm that Amīr Kulāl and his disciples performed the vocal *dhikr*, and that Bahā' ad-Dīn broke with Amīr Kulāl on this issue.[61] The implication of this concluding passage is that ascribing one form of the *dhikr* or another to Ghijduvānī directly would have run contrary to the aim of portraying Bahā' ad-Dīn as the simultaneous reformer and continuator of the Khwājagānī community; the account thus 'divides' its description of what Amīr Kulāl did with regard to the *dhikr*, first affirming that he taught Bahā' ad-Dīn the *dhikr*, without specifying its type, and then declaring that he made Bahā' ad-Dīn perform the *dhikr* "in the silent fashion." In the end, the explicit choice of avoiding the 'public *dhikr*' is formally ascribed to Bahā' ad-Dīn himself, as his interpretation of what Ghijduvānī meant by enjoining "rigor" upon him.

The account concludes, as noted, with Bahā' ad-Dīn affirming that from then on, he endeavored to adhere to what Ghijduvānī had told him in that vision, and to put it all into practice. It also ends, however, with Bahā' ad-Dīn confirmed in possession of the *kulāh-i ʿazīzān*, and this issue requires some further discussion. The *kulāh* was evidently transmitted within the Khwājagānī lineage claimed for Bahā' ad-Dīn, but Bahā' ad-Dīn is shown learning of this cap only through the vision of Ghijduvānī and the earlier Khwājagān; then when Amīr Kulāl begins his 'normal' Sufi training, he confirms Bahā' ad-Dīn's extraordinary talents by handing over the *kulāh* that had been given to him by Amīr Kulāl's own master, Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī. I would argue that the role of this *kulāh* is of particular significance in the story, insofar as the *kulāh* was typically an important element of the Sufi insignia whose transmission from shaykh to disciple marked the transmission of authority and legitimate succession. The *kulāh*'s centrality is signaled in the narrative's very structure: the *kulāh* is mentioned at the outset of the vision, as something given to Bahā' ad-Dīn in his childhood by Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī; it recurs at the end of the litany of signs by which Bahā' ad-Dīn is to know the authenticity of his vision, as recounted to him by the Khwājagān; then it immediately appears again, at the beginning of what Bahā' ad-Dīn actually does in compliance with their instruc-

61 One story from the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, for instance, depicts Bahā' ad-Dīn refusing to engage in the *dhikr-i jahr*, to the point of leaving the place where Amīr Kulāl and his followers were performing it (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:222); another affirms that Amīr Kulāl, near his last illness, consigned his companions to Bahā' ad-Dīn despite their objections that he did not follow Amīr Kulāl in performing the *dhikr-i jahr* (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:224).

tions as he goes home and finds the *kulāh* there; and it seals the entire story, as Bahāʾ ad-Dīn presents it to Amīr Kulāl, but receives it back from him.

The *kulāh* thus appears as a key element in the narrative itself, and its importance is underscored by its identification as the *kulāh-i ʿazīzān*, a phrase that may link it specifically to Khwāja Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī's own master, Khwāja ʿAlī *ʿAzīzān* Rāmītanī[62] (signaling yet another "end-run" around Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's living master), or to the entire lineage of the Khwājagān; in either case, it seems clear that the *kulāh* is being handled in the story in much the same way as the *silsilah* of the Khwājagān: its presence, like that of the assemblage of the Khwājagān who stage-manage Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's vision, signals Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's legitimacy, but does so in the context of overturning the normative understanding of what these things mean within Sufi communities, since what they are sanctioning in each case is a break with normative transmission. That is, Bahāʾ ad-Dīn is legitimized by the Khwājagān who appear in his *silsilah*, but what they do in fact is connect him directly with the founder, Ghijduvānī, not transmit lineally between the two; and Bahā ad-Dīn is legitimized by possessing the *kulāh-i ʿazīzān*, but receives it from an earlier figure in the transmission line, not from his direct master, Amīr Kulāl.

More precisely, there may in fact be two possible implications of the *kulāh*'s role in this story, and they may be complementary rather than mutually exclusive. In the first regard, what happens is that Bahāʾ ad-Dīn receives the *kulāh* in his youth; it is kept by his family; as a result of instructions from the spirits of the Khwājagān, it is handed over to Amīr Kulāl, who then returns it to Bahāʾ ad-Dīn. The immediate question that may arise here is, what is Bahāʾ ad-Dīn doing with the *kulāh* in the first place? The implication is that the *kulāh* is a legacy of the Khwājagān; why did Amīr Kulāl, the chief shaykh of that tradition, not have it himself? The story can thus be read as another end-run around Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's direct, living master, signaling his direct sanction, as a child, by Amīr

62 This is the implication of the only other reference to the *kulāh-i ʿazīzān* in the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, in a slightly earlier passage that amounts to a summary of the chief external events culminating in Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's entry into the service of Amīr Kulāl (ṢALĀḤ, 1992:83): Bahāʾ ad-Dīn is quoted affirming that "at that time," the "blessed *kulāh* of the *ʿazīzān*" came to me, my state changed, and I began to serve Amīr Kulāl, who stated that Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī had charged him (Amīr Kulāl) to train "my son Bahāʾ ad-Dīn." The account here does not explicitly say that he received the *kulāh* from Amīr Kulāl; it is nevertheless significant that in this other reference to the *kulāh-i ʿazīzān*, Bahāʾ ad-Dīn speaks of it coming to him at the time he began to serve Amīr Kulāl, not when he was a child, as in the longer story of his vision.

Kulāl's master, Muḥammad Bābā Sammāsī; we might even suppose that this end-run, as a strategy of legitimation and competitive one-upmanship, preceded the story of the end-run all the way back to ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghijduvānī, and was later subsumed within it when the need to legitimize the reversion to, or adoption of, the silent *dhikr* became more important than the simpler need to set apart, and thereby legitimize, Bahāʾ ad-Dīn himself vis-à-vis his master Amīr Kulāl. The role of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's family in keeping the *kulāh* until he comes of age here seems to be a subtle challenge to the prominent familial legacy of Amīr Kulāl (in this regard it is noteworthy that the formal 'exchange' that happens at the end of the narrative entails Bahāʾ ad-Dīn first setting the *kulāh* before Amīr Kulāl, effectively reversing the relationship implied by their respective places in the *silsilah*).

On the other hand, what also happens in this story, regarding the *kulāh*, is that the *kulāh* is something ignored and forgotten; its mere possession may serve as one signal, among many, to Amīr Kulāl (and the reader), of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn's spiritual sanction, but it is essentially irrelevant to what he derives from his vision of the Khwājagān. Bahāʾ ad-Dīn is himself unaware that he has it, and when he realizes that he does, he takes it and gives it away to Amīr Kulāl – who, as noted, should have had it in the first place if a normative transmission of authority and Sufi insignia were at work here. Amīr Kulāl gives it back to Bahāʾ ad-Dīn, to be sure, and we might argue that the proper sequence of transmission has thereby been restored, but in fact we hear nothing more about this *kulāh*: it is returned with instructions, in effect, to keep it hidden ("between two veils"), and its transmission plays no role in subsequent stories about the succession to Bahā ad-Dīn or other saints of the Naqshbandīyah. The net result of the story, then, from this perspective, seems to be the effective abandonment of the transmission of the *kulāh*, and by extension of further Sufi insignia (we hear nothing of a *khirqah* or a staff or even a prayer-rug) such as were passed down (and fought over) in other Sufi communities of the era. Once again Bahāʾ ad-Dīn is cast in the role of an interiorizer, and in particular an interiorizer of what had become the standard trappings of Sufi life; the *kulāh* itself, after all, was hidden when the story begins, and remains hidden when it ends.

* * *

We may note more broadly, finally, the place of this narrative in the array of legitimizing methods invoked in accounts of Bahāʾ ad-Dīn Naqshband; other stories invoking other modes were noted earlier, but this particular narrative

itself includes echoes, at least, of several of these modes. The repertoire quite clearly includes direct sanction by an earlier saint, but also includes the role of Sufi insignia, through the *kulāh*; Bahā' ad-Dīn's intercessory power, through the promise of removing afflictions; a distinctive social and religious profile, through the affirmation of *sharī'ah*-mindedness; heredity, obliquely, through affirming Bahā' ad-Dīn's status as a "son" of another shaykh; and the *silsilah*, undermined at first by the end-run around Amīr Kulāl, but ultimately solidified (albeit in an ahistorical and largely self-contradictory fashion) through the appearance of the Khwājagān in the vision, and through the 'resolution' of the separate lines of practice and succession.

It seems likely, on the one hand, that the diversity of legitimizing claims surrounding Bahā' ad-Dīn Naqshband reflects the broader political and social environment of 14th-century Central Asia. His lifetime saw the waning of Chinggisid authority in the remnants of the western reaches of the Chaghatay khanate; the dominance of new 'tribal' elites emerging among the nomadic groups brought into Mawarannahr through the Mongol conquest and in transition, during the 14th century, from their military organizational basis to more territorially defined spheres of influence; the gradual Islamization of the nomads through ties with local communities; shifting patterns of relations between the nomads and the sedentary agricultural and urban populations; and the reshuffling of local elites, including groups claiming social and political authority on the basis of various modes of formal and charismatic religious prestige. These developments added up to a social environment that provided diverse constituencies to which different types of legitimizing appeals might be addressed; they also shaped ongoing internal debates within Muslim society about the nature of religious authority, and about the role of claimants to religious authority in social and political affairs. In the new, and shifting, political environment of 14th-century Mawarannahr, these internal debates addressed older questions about the proper stance of the Muslim, and the Sufi, toward the non-Muslim elements brought into the midst of Mawarannahr by the Mongol conquest, as well as toward broader problems of political, social, and religious governance entailed by the involvement, and indeed dominance, of those non-Muslim elements in political affairs. It is clearly against the backdrop of such debates that the '*sharī'ah*-mindedness' affirmed by some circles in the Khwājagān, and stressed by the hagiographers of Bahā' ad-Dīn, must be understood, and a particular position in those debates is implicit, I would argue, in the narrative of Bahā' ad-Dīn's legitimizing vision; at the same time, the social and political environment of the era produced a wide range of potential constituencies, representing different

points along the spectrum of Islamization – or, perhaps more properly, groups marked by a broad selection of permutations of cultural elements drawn from the Inner Asian and Islamic worlds – toward which various claims of legitimacy and authority might be addressed.

What is less clear, on the other hand, is whether, from a perspective within Muslim society in Central Asia, and indeed within Sufi circles there, the wide diversity of legitimizing claims evident in this era should be understood as a reflection of a newly 'experimental' religious environment, in which novel modes of demonstrating spiritual sanction and asserting religious authority were proliferating as a result of the new challenges and opportunities entailed by Mongol rule, or as a continuation of earlier patterns of legitimation employed even before the Mongol era, which had not yet coalesced or been subsumed under the increasingly formal and domesticated structures of Sufi life. In other words, was this multiplicity of legitimizing and organizational paradigms a new phenomenon, unheard of in pre-Mongol times, or was it an older tradition reflective of the earlier diversity of mystical movements that coalesced under the rubric of Sufism, and was still in the process of winnowing out extraneous elements found no longer useful (or defensible) and 'contracting' to a coherent core? The answer is difficult to determine given the rudimentary state of historical studies of Sufi communities before the Mongol era (and during it as well); in all likelihood both experimentation and the conservation of traditional diversity were at work in the 14th and 15th centuries. In either case, there is little doubt that the political and social disruptions entailed by Mongol rule contributed to an environment in which such diversity, whatever its roots, might flourish, whether by fostering new 'experimental' diversity as a creative response to the new regime, or by prolonging the usefulness of an earlier traditional diversity of multiple modes of legitimation and organization; and in either case, substantially less diversity is evident later, in the modes of legitimation employed by the socially successful Sufi groups of the 16th century, including above all the Naqshbandīyah itself.

It is in the latter regard, finally, that the fate of the story reviewed here is itself especially revealing: despite Bahā' ad-Dīn's central role in the Naqshbandī tradition, this fundamental, and dramatic, account of the source of his authority and legitimacy was soon dropped altogether from the repertoire of Naqshbandī hagiographical lore. Subsequent Naqshbandī writers adapted material from the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn*, but the full visionary narrative was only rarely repeated in full; while it was included in the compilation of Muḥammad Bāqir in the mid-16th century, Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā said little about it (beyond 'domesticating' it

under the Uvaysī rubric), Jāmī included only part of it (likewise in the course of confirming Bahā' ad-Dīn's Uvaysī status), and the *Rashaḥāt*, typically regarded as the definitive presentation of the Khwājagānī and early Naqshbandī traditions, ignored it altogether. In later Naqshbandī literature, then, the story of Bahā' ad-Dīn's encounter with Ghijduvānī is reduced, at best, to a mere mention of Bahā' ad-Dīn's "extra" Uvaysī-style relationship with Ghijduvānī, alongside the *silsilah* links that had come to provide the normative confirmation of his legitimacy. This suggests, in turn, that organizational developments of the 15th century within and among Sufi communities in Central Asia served in effect to reduce the range of acceptable, and competitively useful, legitimizing strategies. The fate of the narrative thus in itself signals the dominance of the *silsilah* principle; the story nevertheless remains in the *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn* as an artifact of specific developments in the organizational and legitimizing principles for Sufi communities in this era.

Bibliography

ALGAR, Hamid

1990 "A Brief History of the Naqshbandî Order," in *Naqshbandîs: cheminements et situation actuelle d'un ordre mystique musulman* (Actes de la Table Ronde de Sèvres, 2–4 mai 1985), ed. Marc Gaborieau, Alexandre Popovic, and Thierry Zarcone (Istanbul/Paris: Éditions Isis, 1990; Varia Turcica, v. 18):3–44.

BAHAÎ, Nasrullah

1966 *Büyük İslâm Velisi Muhammed Behaeddin Şah Nakşibendî: Hayatı, Şahsiyeti, Menkıbeleri* (Istanbul: M. Şevket Eygi Matbaası, 1966).

BARTOL'D, V. V.

1977 [W. Barthold], *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion*, tr. V. and T. Minorsky, ed. C. E. Bosworth, 4th ed. (London: Luzac & Co.).

CHEKHOVICH, O. D.

1974 *Samarkandskie dokumenty XV-XVI vv. (O vladeniiakh Khodzhi Aḥrāra v Srednei Azii i Afganistane)* (Moscow: Nauka).

DEWEESE, Devin

1992 "Sayyid ʿAlī Hamadānī and Kubrawī Hagiographical Traditions," in *The Legacy of Mediaeval Persian Sufism*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn (London: Khaniqahi Nimatullahi Publications/School of Oriental and African Studies, 1992; reprinted as *The Heritage of Sufism*, vol. II, *The Legacy*

of Medieval Persian Sufism (1150–1500) [Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 1999]):121–158.

1993 "An 'Uvaysī' Sufi in Timurid Mawarannahr: Notes on Hagiography and the Taxonomy of Sanctity in the Religious History of Central Asia," in *Papers on Inner Asia*, No. 22 (Bloomington: Indiana University, Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, 1993).

1996 "The *Mashā'ikh-i Turk* and the *Khojagān*: Rethinking the Links between the Yasavī and Naqshbandī Sufi Traditions," in *Journal of Islamic Studies*, Oxford, 7/2:180–207.

1999 "Khojagānī Origins and the Critique of Sufism: The Rhetoric of Communal Uniqueness in the *Manāqib* of Khoja ʿAlī ʿAzīzān Rāmītanī," in *Islamic Mysticism Contested: Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics*, ed. Frederick De Jong and Bernd Radtke (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999):492–519.

IVANOV, P. P.

1954 *Khoziaistvo dzhuibarskikh sheikhov: K istorii feodal'nogo zemlevladeniia v Srednei Azii v XVI-XVII vv.* (Moscow/Leningrad).

IVRUz Institut of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences of Uzbekistan (Tashkent)

IZ ARKHIVA

1938 *Iz arkhiva sheikhov Dzhuibari: Materialy po zemel'nym i torgovym otnosheniiam Sr. Azii XVI veka* (Moscow/Leningrad).

JĀMĪ, Nūr ad-Dīn ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān

1991 *Nafaḥāt al-uns*, ed. Maḥmūd ʿĀbidī (Tehran: Intishārāt-i Iṭṭilāʿāt, 1370/1991, second printing 1373/1994).

MOLÉ, Marijan

1959 "Autour du Daré Mansour: l'apprentissage mystique de Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband," in *Revue des études islamiques*, 27:35–66.

MUʿĪN AL-FUQARĀ, Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd

1960 *Tārīkh-i Mullāzādah*, ed. Aḥmad Gulchīn-i Maʿānī (Tehran, 1339/1960).

NARSHAKHĪ

1954 *The History of Bukhara*, tr. Richard Frye (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Medieaeval Academy of America, 1954).

PĀRSĀ, Khwāja Muḥammad

1975 *Risālah-i qudsīyah*, ed. Muḥammad Ṭāhirī ʿIrāqī (Tehran, 1354/1975).

PAUL, Jürgen

1990 "Hagiographische Texte als historische Quelle," in *Saeculum*, 41:17–43.

1998a *Doctrine and Organization: The Khwājagān-Naqshbandīya in the First Generation after Bahā'uddīn* (*Anor*, 1; Halle/Berlin).

1998b "Maslak al-ʿārifīn. Ein Dokument zur frühen Geschichte der Ḫwāǧagān-Naqšbandīya," in *Erlesenes*, special volume of *Hallesche Beiträge zur Orientwissenschaft*, 25:172–185.

RADTKE, Bernd
1980 *Al-Ḥakīm at-Tirmidhī – Ein islamischer Theosoph des 3./9. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg: Klaus Schwarz Verlag, 1980; Islamkundliche Untersuchungen, Bd. 58).
1993 "The Concept of *Wilāya* in Early Sufism," in *Classical Persian Sufism: From its Origins to Rumi*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn (London/New York: Khaniqahi Nimatullahi Publications, 1993):483–496.
ṢAFĪ, Fakhr ad-Dīn ʿAlī b. Ḥusayn
1977 *Rashaḥāt-i ʿayn al-ḥayāt*, ed. ʿAlī Aṣghar Muʿīnīyān (Tehran, 2536/1356/1977), 2 vols.
ṢALĀḤ b. Mubārak Bukhārī
1992 *Anīs aṭ-ṭālibīn va ʿuddat as-sālikīn*, ed. Khalīl Ibrāhīm Ṣārī Oghlī (Tehran: Sāzmān-i Intishārāt-i Kayhān, 1371/1992).
SCHWARZ, Florian
1999 "Bukhara and its Hinterland: The Oasis of Bukhara in the Sixteenth Century in the Light of the Juybari Codex," in *Bukhara: The Myth and the Architecture*, ed. Attilio Petruccioli (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Aga Khan Program for Islamic Architecture at Harvard University and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology).
SHIHĀB AD-DĪN b. bint-i Amīr Ḥamzah
1910 *Maqāmāt-i Amīr Kulāl* (lithograph, Bukhārā, 1328/1910).
2001 "Shikhab ad-din b. bint amir Khamza: Zhitie Amira Kulala (Makamat-i amir Kulal)," tr. O. M. Iastrebova, in *Mudrost' sufiev* (St. Petersburg: Azbuka/Peterburgskoe vostokovedenie, 2001):33–279.
SVIRI, Sara
1993 "Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the *Malāmatī* Movement in Early Sufism," in *Classical Persian Sufism: From its Origins to Rumi*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn (London/New York: Khaniqahi Nimatullahi Publications, 1993):583–613.
SVR *Sobranie vostochnykh rukopisei Akademii nauk Uzbekskoi SSR*, ed. A. A. Semenov (Tashkent), vol. III (1955); vol. V (1960).
ŞUŞUD, Hasan-Lûtfi
1958 *İslâm Tasavvufunda Hâcegân Hânedânı* (Istanbul: Doğan Kardeş Yayınları A. Ş. Basımevi).
TER HAAR, Johan G. J.
2002 "'Wondrous Caravan Leaders who take the Caravan to the Sanctuary through a Hidden Path:' The Naqshbandī Order According to ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī," in *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 26/1 (= *Barbara Flemming Armağanı*, I, ed. Jan Schmidt):311-322.
TOSUN, Necdet
2002 *Bahâeddîn Nakşbend: Hayatı, Görüşleri, Tarîkatı (XII-XVII. Asırlar)* (Istanbul: İnsan Yayınları).