Int. J. Middle East Stud. **26** (1994), 427–442. *Printed in the United States of America*

Margaret Malamud

SUFI ORGANIZATIONS AND STRUCTURES OF AUTHORITY IN MEDIEVAL NISHAPUR

My aim here is to revise a common view of the development of Sufi organizations and practices. Sufis have generally been contrasted with the ulema to suggest that Sufism and law were incompatible and even hostile to each other: the elaboration and guardianship of Islamic law (*fiqh*) was the concern of the ulema; the inner, experiential dimension of Islam the concern of Sufis. In their quest for knowledge of God (*ma^{c}rifa*) Sufis often bypassed and at times even flouted the shari^{c}a, until reconciliation between law and Sufism became necessary and was effected by Ghazzali in the 11th century. This supposed reconciliation allowed the spread of Sufism and the development of Sufi institutions, including in the late 12th and 13th centuries the Sufi brotherhoods (*ṭarīqa*s). Until then, Sufis had formed loose circles or groups that had no institutional structure or affiliation. In the 12th and 13th centuries, these groups crystallized and autonomous Sufi institutions and practices emerged. The Sufi brotherhoods spread Sufism until it became part of Muslim social and devotional life.

There are a number of problems with this narrative. The fusion of law, theology (*kalām*), and moderate Sufism which Ghazzali articulated in his *Iḥyā$^{\supset}$ ^{c}ulūm al-dīn* was not entirely his own creation.[1] His magnum opus should be seen as a comprehensive synthesis rather than as a work that effects a reconciliation between Sufism and law. The Sufism he described had been cultivated and elaborated in the 10th and 11th centuries by a number of urban religious scholars and Sufis, many of them from Khurasan. Moreover, Sufism was integrated into the fabric of Islamic social and communal life well before the 12th and 13th centuries. In late 10th- and 11th-century Khurasan, Sufi organizations and structures of authority were closely connected with those of the ulema.

This article focuses on the practice of Sufism in Khurasan, in particular in Nishapur, in the late 10th and 11th centuries.[2] This was a crucial period and region in the history of Sufism. Up until this time, Sufis had been outside the mainstream of Islamic social life and institutions. In Nishapur, Sufism became intertwined with the activities, practices, and institutions of the ulema; Sufis were often members of the ulema and they were able to provide institutional as well as literary support for Sufism.

Margaret Malamud teaches at the Department of History, New Mexico State University, Box 3H, Las Cruces, N.M. 88003, U.S.A.

© *1994 Cambridge University Press 0020–7438/94 $5.00 + .00*

At the same time, Sufis from Khurasan began to develop specifically Sufi practices and organizations. They developed ways of defining and transmitting spiritual knowledge and authority and devised their own methods of legitimation. Practices that later came to be associated with membership in a Sufi order—such as the binding of a disciple to a master through an oath (the *akhdh al-^{c}ahd* or the *bay^{c}a*), becoming part of the master's *silsila* (spiritual chain of authority), the bestowal of the *khirqa* (cloak), and the inculcation (*talqīn*) of a method of *dhikr* (prayer)—find their first expression in the writings of Khurasanian Sufis.[3] Spiritual retreat (the *khalwa*), although known in earlier Sufi practice, became a regular part of Sufi training and discipleship. Furthermore, some Sufis began living together in *khānaqāh*s, and the earliest extant rule for *khānaqāh* life dates from this period.[4] Perhaps the most dramatic change in Sufi practice was the change in the relationship between the Sufi master (sheikh or *ustādh*) and his disciple (*ṣāḥib* or *murīd*). The bond between them became more hierarchical and formal, but also more intensely personal. Sufi writers describe a more intimate and all-encompassing relationship between master and disciple than had previously existed. Clearly this was a seminal period in the history of Sufism and deserves investigation.

In the history of Sufism, Khurasan has received special attention for a number of reasons.[5] After the collapse of the Abbasid Empire by the middle of the 10th century, local regimes and new elites replaced central governmental control throughout the provinces of the old empire. Khurasan was the first settled society encountered by the Turkish Ghaznavid dynasty (established ca. 994–998) and the Seljuqs (by 1040).[6] These foreign conquerors relied upon Khurasanian religious leaders and bureaucrats to aid them in governing. Over the centuries, the ulema and the Sufis had developed their own structures of authority and organization that were independent of the state.[7] These structures and the organized *madhhab*s (law schools) had come to represent Islam in its social and doctrinal aspects and had begun to be supported by governing officials. In exchange for providing the new elites with aid and legitimacy, the religious classes received support in the form of madrasas, *khānaqāh*s, stipends, and salaries.[8] Patterns for the government's relations with the religious classes were first worked out in Khurasan and later adopted in Baghdad and the Seljuq successor states.[9]

Sufis from Khurasan were part of a movement among Sufis to define and defend Sufi principles and practices. During the late 10th and 11th centuries, a number of Sufis composed manuals and treaties that sought to organize and systematize Sufism. All of these works served a double purpose. On the one hand, they sought to justify Sufism's existence within Islam. In non-Sufi circles of learning there was some criticism of the doctrines of the Sufis and of the reprehensible practices of some claiming the name Sufi. One of the main currents, then, in all of these writings was to correct this false impression of Sufism. In their attempts to justify Sufism's rightful place in Islamic practice, Sufis argued that Sufism was the Islam of the Prophet and his companions and it reflected the true purpose of the initial revelation; that the Prophet and the early community provided the models and sources for practices worthy of imitation; and that authority and legitimacy for these beliefs and practices go back to this period and have been transmitted from generation to generation.[10]

On the other hand, these writings also reflected a desire on the part of Sufis to outline and elucidate for themselves their own doctrines. Many Sufis felt the need to define the basic beliefs and practices to which those calling themselves Sufis should adhere. Thus, a number of works contained sections that either praised or condemned a variety of Sufi practices. The works of Sufis from Khurasan and regions close to it were part of this movement among Sufis toward greater organization and consolidation. Sufis such as Abu ʿAbd al-Rahman al-Sulami (d. 1021), Abu Nuʿaym al-Isfahani (d. 1037), Abu al-Qasim al-Qushayri (d. 1074), ʿAli ibn ʿUthman al-Hujwiri (d. ca. 1071), and Abu Hamid al-Ghazzali (d. 1111) compiled texts that quickly became authoritative expressions of Sufi doctrine and practice and they therefore provide critical information on Sufi practices and organization.[11] The Nishapuran Sufi Sulami, for example, wrote a number of Sufi texts, including a Sufi commentary on the Qurʾan, and his *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya*, one of the earliest Sufi biographical dictionaries, was an important source for later Sufi writers. Isfahani's ten-volume work, the *Ḥilyat al-awliyāʾ* is a treasury of information on early Sufis. Hujwiri's *Kashf al-maḥjūb* was the first Sufi treatise written in Persian. The Nishapuran Sufi Qushayri produced a number of Sufi works, among them a short treatise entitled *Tartīb al-sulūk*, which explains the importance of *dhikr* as a spiritual exercise. The form of technical Sufi literature achieved a certain completeness with his *Risāla fī ʿilm al-taṣawwuf*. The *Risāla* consists of biographies of leading Sufis along with an elucidation of the terms and practices of Sufism. This synthesis of the writings of his predecessors and comprehensive description of the science of Sufism (*ʿilm al-taṣawwuf*) was widely used by later Sufis. Ghazzali's magnum opus, the *Iḥyāʾ ʿulūm al-dīn*, quickly acquired the status of a classic.

According to Jacqueline Chabbi, before the middle of the 10th century Sufism was a marginal phenomenon in Nishapur.[12] Other forms of mysticism had been popular, in particular the mystical piety of the Karramiyya and the Malamatiyya, but during the course of the late 10th and the 11th centuries, the mystical piety and practices of the Karramiyya and the Malamatiyya were superseded by Sufism, and Sufism became the predominant form of mysticism in Nishapur.[13] I argue that the spread of Sufism was linked to its connection with the Shafiʿi *madhhab*; Sufis in Nishapur were almost exclusively Shafiʿi. Richard Bulliet compiled a chart from two extant biographical dictionaries from medieval Nishapur that lists both the terms used to describe mystics and, where possible, their legal affiliation.[14] When the legal affiliation of mystics was given in *The Histories of Nishapur*, no Hanafis or Karramis (the other two *madhhab*s in Nishapur) were Sufis; only Shafiʿis were Sufis.[15]

The legal scholar and Sufi Qushayri clearly equated adherence to Shafiʿi law with Sufism. At the end of his *Risāla*, Qushayri appended a short treatise of advice for those embarking on the Sufi path entitled *Waṣiyya lil-murīdīn*.[16] At the beginning of the *Waṣiyya*, Qushayri advised the *murīd* to attach himself to the "Sufi" *madhhab*, for others may be ignorant of the Sufi *ṭarīqa*.[17] He claimed that the Sufi *madhhab* had secure foundations and that its sheikhs were the most learned. Sufis such as Junayd al-Baghdadi (d. 910), Abu Bakr al-Shibli (d. 946), and Shafiʿi himself (d. 820) were included as founding members, and Qushayri recommended imitation (*taqlīd*) of their lives and learning.[18] Qushayri's own spiritual chain linked him to these venerable men. He became part of his master Abu ʿAli al-Daqqaq's (d. 1014) *silsila* (one

of the earliest known[19]), which included Abu al-Qasim al-Nasrabadi (d. 977) and Abu Bakr al-Shibli.[20] According to Qushayri, there was a specifically Sufi *madhhab* (whose members were Shafiᶜi), which had its own established authoritative figures whose examples were worthy of emulation.

Qushayri was an important and influential member of the Shafiᶜi *madhhab* in Nishapur. He was a hadith scholar and a partisan of Ashᶜari theology, and he taught hadith and Sufism, eventually in his own madrasa. Clearly, in Nishapur Sufis were not at odds with the ulema, rather they were often themselves members of the ulema. As an old and established communal association, the Shafiᶜi school provided Sufism with an institutional framework in which mysticism could be taught and practiced. It is worth considering how this integration of Sufism and the Shafiᶜi *madhhab* came about.

A glance at the circle of students and teachers around virtually any well-known Sufi figure in the Shafiᶜi school may provide an answer. Consider the web of connections linking Qushayri to the leading Sufis, Ashᶜaris, and Shafiᶜis of his era: Sulami was one of Qushayri's Sufi masters and a teacher of his in hadith. The author of one of the histories of Nishapur, al-Hakim al-Naysaburi (d. 1014), was one of his teachers in Ashᶜari *kalām*. The author of the continuation of al-Hakim's history, Abu al-Hasan ᶜAbd al-Ghafir al-Farisi (d. 1134–35), was a grandson of Qushayri and one of his students in hadith. Another of his teachers in Ashᶜari *kalām* was Ibn Furak (d. 1015–16), a central figure in the history of the Ashᶜari movement in Nishapur. One of Qushayri's daughters married a grandson of Ibn Furak. Qushayri married his Sufi master Abu ᶜAli al-Daqqaq's daughter. Qushayri's friend and colleague, the Ashᶜari theologian Abu Maᶜali ᶜAbd al-Malik al-Juwayni (d. 1085), was a teacher of Abu Hamid al-Ghazzali. And Qushayri's most important Sufi disciple, ᶜAli al-Farmadhi (d. 1077 or 1084), who would be a master of both Abu Hamid and Ahmad al-Ghazzali, was his son-in-law and a grandson of Ibn Furak.

The numerous links Qushayri had with key Shafiᶜi Sufis of his era were not uncommon. Sulami, for example, was also linked to many traditionists, theologians, and Sufis of his day. He trained many important Shafiᶜis in hadith and Sufism, including Qushayri, Abu Bakr Bayhaqi (d. 1065), and the Sufi Abu Nuᶜaym al-Isfahani.[21] These connections illustrate the various ways in which the religious classes were bound together. Prominence and leadership in the Shafiᶜi community, as in all the *madhhab*s, was composed of and dependent upon a number of overlapping ties and the mutual obligations and loyalties that such ties entailed. Leading figures in the Shafiᶜi school were often bound to each other by triple ties: the powerful student–teacher bond; the tie between Sufi masters and disciples; and the family connections that often supplemented and complemented such bonds.

These were the men who either founded their own madrasas or for whom they were endowed. They were also the men who taught in these and in other religious institutions. In other words, they maintained, and to a great extent controlled, the educational system. Many of them were practicing Sufis as well as legal scholars and theologians. Shafiᶜi ulema who were inclined toward Sufism were able to incorporate Sufism into the curriculum of the madrasa.

By the late 10th century, madrasas had become the physical center of the law schools. The range of instruction in madrasas was centered upon, but not necessarily restricted to, legal knowledge and a course on Sufism might be offered as an

additional part of a curriculum. The primary focuses of the educational system were the study of the Qurʾan, hadith, and fiqh, but Sufism, like theology, was an elective educational option. In addition to teaching hadith or law in a madrasa, a Shafiʿi scholar might also, if he wished, teach Sufism or theology (*kalām*).[22] As Bulliet has pointed out, the educational system in Nishapur was more concerned with regulating who might teach than what he taught.[23] A number of Shafiʿi madrasas seem to have been connected with Sufi activities or named after Shafiʿis who were also Sufis.[24] In 1001, for example, a madrasa was founded for Qushayri's Sufi master, Abu ʿAli al-Daqqaq. Qushayri later took it over, and it came to be known as the Qushayri madrasa. Daqqaq, Qushayri, and one of Qushayri's sons were all buried there. It seems to have been known as a Sufi institution.[25]

Sufi texts were taught in at least some of the madrasas. The study of hadith was at the center of any religious curriculum, and we know of hadith collections that were specifically Sufi in nature. These collections would have been taught to those who were inclined toward Sufism. Sulami compiled such a collection, entitled *Arbaʿūn ḥadīthan fī al-taṣawwuf.*[26] The form of this work follows the established custom of gathering together forty hadith in one work. The traditions are preceded by complete *isnād*s, and each hadith is introduced by a heading that relates it to a particular Sufi custom. Sulami was a hadith teacher as well as a Sufi; and Abu Nuʿaym al-Isfahani and Qushayri were among those who studied hadith under him. Qushayri, who was a well-known traditionalist, probably transmitted to his students his teacher Sulami's hadith collection.

Other Sufi works were also taught in madrasas. In keeping with a tendency to identify Sufism with the Shafiʿi *madhhab* are claims that Shafiʿi himself was a Sufi.[27] As we noted earlier, Qushayri holds him up as an early Sufi whose life is worthy of imitation (*taqlīd*). Sulami compiled a collection of Shafiʿi sayings having to do with Sufism. This text, the *Risāla fī kalām al-Shāfiʿi fī al-taṣawwuf,* seems a likely choice for a class in a Shafiʿi madrasa.[28] Moreover, Qushayri, who took over his master Daqqaq's madrasa, taught his *Risāla* there. He instructed his pupils in the *Risāla* and gave them a license (*sanad* or *ijāza*) to teach it to others. After his death, transmission of the *Risāla* became widely established.[29] Thus, even though the primary purpose of the madrasa remained the teaching of law and hadith, Sufi texts could and did form part of the curriculum.

The Sufi piety Qushayri and other Shafiʿi Sufis practiced was linked to the "sober" Sufism (*ṣaḥw*) of Junayd rather than the "intoxicated" Sufism (*sukr*) of Sufis such as Mansur al-Hallaj (d. 922). As we have noted, Qushayri's *silsila* connects him to Junayd by way of his Sufi master Abu ʿAli al-Daqqaq. Qushayri and his circle avoided intoxicated Sufism and the excessive behavior of certain Sufis. Qushayri found the flamboyance and extravagance of his contemporary Abu Saʿid ibn Abi Khayr (d. 1049) distasteful. Abu Saʿid was known for his lavish banquets, large gatherings where music was played, and radical devotional practices. His ostentatious behavior was not appreciated by the more sober Qushayri, who did not include him among the biographies in the first part of his *Risāla*, nor did he mention him in the rest of that work.

Whereas Qushayri's works and other 11th-century Sufi texts document the close connection between law and Sufism, they also reveal that specifically Sufi structures of authority and organization were beginning to emerge. One key development was

a change in the relationship between Sufi masters and their disciples. In this period, the Sufi sheikh becomes a spiritual guide who is intimately involved in every aspect of his disciple's life.

As Fritz Meier has pointed out, Ibn ᶜAbbad al-Rundi (d. 1390) was the first Sufi who commented on a change in the master–disciple relationship.[30] Ibn ᶜAbbad distinguished two types of sheikhs, the *shaykh al-taᶜlīm* and the *shaykh al-tarbiya*. The *shaykh al-taᶜlīm* was a teacher with whom a pupil served a relatively free academic apprenticeship. His role in the education of the disciple was primarily to transmit sacred knowledge and elucidate matters of spiritual doctrine and discipline.[31] Instruction was oriented toward textual exegesis, and the sheikh was relatively uninvolved in the private, inner life of his student. Disciples were bound to teachers by ties of respect and affection, but these ties were relatively loose, and movement from one teacher to another was common and even desirable. Sufis who were known as followers of a particular master shared a common spiritual path (*ṭarīqa*), but these associations did not require initiation rites, oaths of obedience, or extensive private training.

The *shaykh al-tarbiya* took on a new and far more encompassing role in the education of the disciple. The novice was more strictly supervised by his sheikh and received instruction from him regulating all actions. Relations between sheikhs and disciples became more formal but also more intensely personal. We can see evidence of this new dimension in the master–disciple relationship in the writings of 11th-century Sufis.[32]

It had long been acknowledged in Sufi circles that novices, like students in the religious sciences in general, needed authoritative masters to guide them. Eleventh-century Sufi writers reiterate the need of disciples for guidance on the spiritual path, but they differ from earlier writers in providing more detailed reasons for that need and in setting up certain criteria for the choice of a master. Qushayri insisted on the need for a master; indeed, it is impossible for the Sufi aspirant to have success without one.[33] Sufi sheikhs, said Hujwiri, are physicians of the soul who provide their disciples with spiritual nourishment.[34] Hujwiri also claimed that the ignorant pretenders to Sufism are those men who never associated with a spiritual director, nor learned spiritual disciplines from a sheikh.[35]

Ghazzali described a series of qualities a genuine sheikh should have:

> And the sign that the sheikh is fitted to be the substitute for the Prophet is that he be learned—not that every learned sheikh is suitable, so I will show you in general certain marks of fitness, lest anyone claim to be such a learned guide. And we say he is one who is removed far from the love of the world and rank, one who has been the follower of a discerning person who traces his successorship to the Prophet, who has excelled in disciplining himself in little food and sleep and speech and in much prayer and alms and fasting, and who, following the discerning sheikh, is making the good qualities of character his way of life; then he is a light from the lights of the Prophet, and he is worthy to be followed. . . .[36]

Ghazzali's list of the attributes a true sheikh should possess is important. For our purposes, one of the most interesting points is his suggestion that the sheikh derives both his position and his authority from the Prophet. By substitute, he implies (as other Sufis had) that, like the *ᶜālim*, the Sufi serves as a living substitute

for the Prophet. The accomplished master was one who had internalized the *sunna*: through him the Prophet was present and accessible.[37] Moreover, a genuine sheikh must have been a disciple of someone who can trace his spiritual lineage to the Prophet. By this he surely means that the sheikh must be part of a *silsila* that reaches back through time to the Prophet. During the 11th century, there was an increasing emphasis in Sufi circles on establishing ways of defining and controlling spiritual authority. By becoming a part of a *silsila*, a Sufi acquired the authority necessary to transmit sacred knowledge and a particular spiritual way. By the time Ghazzali composed this work, these methods of legitimation and of transmission of authority had become widely adopted.[38]

After the disciple attached himself to a sheikh who was part of a *silsila* and with whom he felt an innate affinity, he underwent a spiritual evaluation by the sheikh. Hujwiri stated that a sheikh had to have the ability to determine whether the novice would be able to progress along the path.[39] In the *Tartīb al-sulūk* and in the *Waṣiyya*, Qushayri referred to a testing period during which the sheikh evaluated the spiritual capacities of the disciple. This probably occurred during the *khalwa* or spiritual retreat. It was during this time that the sheikh decided whether to take on the aspirant as a disciple. If he was taken on as a disciple, he had to renounce his material goods and position in the world in exchange for a life of poverty and commitment to seek God.[40]

The disciple and the sheikh then exchanged pledges. The disciple promised that he would not disobey his sheikh in any way. Qushayri provided an example of what a sheikh might pledge in return: "I accept you and will lead you on the path (*ṭarīqa*) to God in the degree to which you are able to understand. For my part, I will not withhold from you what I have understood of the path."[41] The *akhdh al-ᶜahd* or *bayᶜa* in time became a ritualized part of advancement on the Sufi path. Later Sufi texts describe the exchange of promises and the taking of an oath in a more systematic fashion; in this period the practice is mentioned but not explicitly discussed.[42]

After the exchange of promises, the sheikh disclosed to the disciple a *dhikr* formula and instructed him on its proper practice.[43] Qushayri's account in the *Tartīb al-sulūk* is the earliest work we have that discusses the practice of *dhikr* at length; and it provides early, if not the earliest, evidence for the transmission of a method of *dhikr* from sheikh to disciple.[44] Starting in the late 12th century Sufi writers devoted chapters in their works to *dhikr* and maintained that the origin and model for this transmission and for the continuous instruction in *dhikr* from sheikh to disciple can be traced back to the life of the Prophet.[45] The first instruction on its proper practice is said to have been given by Muhammad to certain of his companions who in turn passed it on to others.[46] It is claimed that the Prophet's direction was continued by the transmission of *dhikr* from sheikh to disciple.

Dhikr as a spiritual exercise seems to have its origins in early Sufi practices. Groups of pious Muslims, perhaps as early as the 8th century, met and collectively and repetitively recited certain formulas, notably the first part of the *shahāda*: "There is no god but God" (*lā ilāha illā Allāh*), a process that could induce ecstatic states. The *dhikr* practice that Qushayri described, however, is somewhat different. Instead of group formulas, a sheikh privately disclosed a particular formula to a

disciple for him to repeat. In the *Tartīb al-sulūk*, the formula is the word Allah, repeated three times.[47] Qushayri described in detail the overwhelming experience the practice of *dhikr* induced. The transmission (*talqīn*) of a *dhikr* formula from master to disciple came to form part of a disciple's initiation into Sufism.

After the aspirant has received a method of *dhikr* from the sheikh he might be given the patched cloak or wool cloak (*muraqqa*ᶜ*a* or *khirqa*). Sufis explain its significance in a variety of ways, indicating that its function was not yet fixed.[48] Sufis had worn the *muraqqa*ᶜ*a* or *khirqa* from an early period, but in this period the bestowal of a cloak by a master to a disciple begins to take on an initiatic aspect. Hujwiri described a three-year training period, after which the novice was invested with the *muraqqa*ᶜ*a*.[49] The cloak could serve to certify that the novice had been trained by a master who could attest to his spiritual fitness and preparedness. It thus functioned as a kind of credential for the Sufi, indicating that he had been trained by an accredited master. The bestowal of the cloak could also signify the investiture of the disciple with the means necessary for progressing along the path. A disciple could be given the cloak at the beginning of his intensive training with a sheikh, in which case the cloak indicated that the disciple has embarked upon the way and must learn to become utterly dependent upon the sheikh as a means of learning to become dependent upon God.[50]

A novice had to be prepared to obey his sheikh and to treat him with the greatest respect and consideration. Qushayri warned against disagreement with a master for it could cause great harm, and he urged the disciple to obey the sheikh in whatever he commanded.[51] Ghazzali maintained that whoever had the good fortune to find a sheikh must honor him and defer to him in every way:

> Now outward honor is that he would not dispute nor argue with him about any question even if he knows the sheikh's mistake; that he should put down his own prayer mat in his presence only at the time of prescribed prayers, and when he finishes he should lift it up . . . ; that he should do what the sheikh commands according to his capacity and ability. But inner honor is that he should not deny inwardly what he hears and accepts from the sheikh outwardly in deed or word, lest he be branded with hypocrisy.[52]

A disciple was expected to surrender control of the mundane aspects of his life to his sheikh. The sheikh supervised and regulated the external aspects of the disciple's life, including his diet, speech, and sleep, and the disciple had to ask his permission before leaving or taking trips.[53] One of the aims of Sufi training was to replace self-will with the divine will, and learning to submit to the will of the sheikh was a step in learning to surrender to the will of God. Complete obedience and submission to the sheikh brought the novice closer to that desired end.

Not only did the disciple turn over the governance of his worldly affairs and control over his body to the direction of his master, he also opened up his inner life to the close scrutiny of his guide, including his thoughts, emotions, dreams, and visions. Not even the slightest thought or concern should be concealed from the master. It was difficult for the disciple to know whether his thoughts, dreams, and visions were of divine or demonic origin. Sheikhs had a special ability (*firāsa*) that helped them determine which of these should be heeded and which discarded.[54]

Abu Saᶜid ibn Abi Khayr, for example, who was well known for his *firāsa*, was said to have been able to discern the difference between suggestions from Satan

(*waswās*) and divine inspiration (*ilhām*).[55] Hujwiri described how he told one of his Sufi masters, Kharaqani (d. 1034), who was well known for his ability to interpret the inner life of novices, his experiences and visions;[56] and there is a short account in volume four of the *Iḥyā᾽ ᶜulūm al-dīn* (the section on hope and fear) in which Abu ᶜAli Farmadhi revealed his spiritual states to Kharaqani. Abu ᶜAli, who was also a disciple of Qushayri, regularly revealed to him his mystical states.[57] Qushayri also provided examples in his works of his master Daqqaq's ability to read his thoughts and see into his heart. This aspect of the relationship between masters and disciples called for nothing less than the complete surrender of the disciple's inner life to the discernment and direction of the master.

In the 11th century, the focus of the *adab* (behavior or etiquette) of the Sufi began to include the *adab* that should govern relations between masters and disciples. A sheikh served as an exemplar for the novice, and imitation (*taqlīd*) of his behavior (*adab*) was encouraged.[58] *Taqlīd* of an exemplar was a prerequisite to inward transformation; indeed, it was thought to bring about an elevation of the spiritual state of the imitator. As Hujwiri put it:

Now, to imitate others for the sake of ostentation is sheer polytheism, but it is different when the object of the imitator is that God may perchance raise him to the rank of those whom he has imitated, in accordance with the saying of the Messenger: "Whoever makes himself like unto a people is one of them."[59]

Disciples imitated the behavior of masters in a manner similar to the way the *sunna* of the Prophet was imitated; that is, a Sufi would imitate the mundane as well as the more spiritual aspects of his master's behavior. Qushayri, for example, refused to use a cushion behind his back because Daqqaq did not use one.[60] As we have noted, the sheikh's authority derived in part from his success in emulating the example of the Prophet. His success made his own behavior worthy of imitation. Adherence to a sheikh and imitation of his behavior constituted a way to find the path back to the Islam of the Prophet and his companions.[61] Indeed, the sheikh was considered a guide on the *ṭarīqa* in a manner similar to the way the Prophet guided men to *dīn*.[62] The elevated spiritual state of the sheikh induced an attitude of reverence and respect in the disciple. Qushayri, for example, so revered his master Daqqaq that he would fast and make a complete ablution (*ghusl*) on the days he went to see him.[63]

The close supervision of disciples that Qushayri and other writers described suggests that Sufis were living together, at least during periods of spiritual retreat, probably in *khānaqāh*s. The association of Sufism with *khānaqāh*s marks another important stage in the development of Sufi organizations. As Jacqueline Chabbi and others have shown, until the late 10th century, the *khānaqāh* in Khurasan had been associated with the Karramiyya.[64] Over the course of the 11th century, *khānaqāh*s in Khurasan became increasingly linked with Sufism. Sufis in Nishapur, as well as in other parts of Khurasan, adopted the institution of the *khānaqāh* and adapted it for their own purposes. In the first half of the 11th century, there was an increase in the founding and organization of *khānaqāh*s in Nishapur, and Sufis belonging to the Shafiᶜi school began to be identified with them.[65] For example, the Sufi Sulami had a *khānaqāh* (sometimes referred to in the sources as a *duwayra*, a kind of lesser *khānaqāh*), and Qushayri's master, Daqqaq, built one in 1001.[66]

Qushayri also had a *duwayra*, where he trained disciples in Sufism. Qushayri's disciple Abu ᶜAli al-Farmadhi spent time in this establishment.[67]

Initially, private benefactors and well-to-do Sufis founded these establishments. These communal residences often belonged to a Sufi and his family (such as the *khānaqāh* of the Sulami family), but they sometimes were the property of a donor, who placed them at the disposal of the Sufis.[68] During the second half of the 11th century, Seljuq officials began to found and patronize *khānaqāh*s. In addition to founding a number of madrasas, the Seljuq vizier Nizam al-Mulk also founded a string of *khānaqāh*s throughout the Seljuq domains.[69] In Isfahan, for example, he appointed the director of a *khānaqāh* and each year the director would present the needs of the *khānaqāh* to him.[70] He may have been replicating a policy similar to his policy regarding the madrasa: namely, attempting to gain influence and control over an important group among the conquered population (in this case the Sufis) through patronage of its institutions and usurpation of its administrative autonomy.[71]

A variety of activities took place in these Sufi establishments. Teaching and spiritual training took place in the *khānaqāh*s. The period when the sheikh was most closely involved in monitoring the spiritual progress of the disciple was during the *khalwa* (retreat; also called the *ᶜuzla* or *arbaᶜīn*). During the retreat (which usually lasted forty days), the sheikh interpreted the disciple's dreams, visions, thoughts, and spiritual states. Spiritual retreats were part of the disciple's training;[72] and by the middle of the 11th century, these retreats were often performed in *khānaqāh*s.

The *khānaqāh* also provided lodging for resident and traveling Sufis. Sufi writers wrote chapters on the proper etiquette and rules for companionship (*ṣuḥba*) in such residences. Hujwiri, for example, included a section in the *Kashf al-maḥjūb* on proper behavior in Sufi establishments, and the Sufi Abu Saᶜid ibn Abi Khayr founded a number of *khānaqāh*s and composed the first known rule for communal life in one.[73]

CONCLUSION

The affiliation of Sufism with *khānaqāh*s and madrasas in late-10th- and 11th-century Khurasan signaled a new phase in the organizational development of Sufism. Prior to this period, Sufism had existed at the margins of Muslim social life. The practice of Sufism had been limited to small circles, and teachers and disciples met in mosques or private homes. The spread of *khānaqāh*s and the integration of Sufism into madrasas where it could be practiced and taught indicates that Sufism was rapidly becoming part of the fabric of Muslim devotion. These buildings are physical evidence of the growing importance of Sufism in the Muslim religion. The increasing involvement of government officials and rulers in the patronage of these institutions is a further indication of their significance in Muslim communal life. These organizational and institutional developments reflect and are related to changes in Sufi practice.

By the 11th century, as we have seen, Sufism in Nishapur was intimately connected with the Shafiᶜi *madhhab*. Many religious scholars were also Sufis, and Sufi texts were taught in some Shafiᶜi madrasas. As we have noted, this meant that

Sufism had become an acceptable, if elective, part of the curriculum of the Shafi^ci *madhhab*. Shafi^ci scholars who were Sufis were able to teach Sufism within the framework of the institution of a law school, thereby providing institutional as well as literary support for Sufism.

Similarly, the *khānaqāh* enabled Sufis to live together and devote themselves more completely to mystical practices and training. The *khānaqāh* came to supplement the Sufi training available in mosques and Shafi^ci madrasas. Communal residences and financial support provided the opportunity for more private and extensive training and interaction between sheikhs and disciples. The close supervision of disciples that Qushayri and other writers described took place in the *khānaqāh*. From one perspective, the Sufi *khānaqāh* is an institutional expression of a more intensely personal relationship between masters and disciples.

In the 11th century, a new dimension was added to the practice of Sufism and to the function of the sheikh when he became a spiritual guide (*shaykh al-tarbiya*) for those who wished to pursue Sufi training in greater depth. This involved, among other things, a stronger tie between master and disciple that took the form of private instruction and training. In addition to the sheikh's role as an exegete of sacred texts, he became the sine qua non for progress on the spiritual path. Sufis such as Qushayri and Sulami combined the roles of teacher (*shaykh al-ta^clīm*) and spiritual guide (*shaykh al-tarbiya*). Instruction in the religious sciences remained the foundation of Sufi education, but spiritual retreat and training under the supervision of a sheikh were also recommended. While on retreat, the novice revealed his inner life to the discerning scrutiny of the sheikh. Novices were advised to pledge complete obedience to the will and direction of the sheikh in their affairs.

The increasing emphasis on the need for intensive study with a sheikh, the development of chains of authority, and the elaboration of initiation rites and investiture ceremonies parallel similar structures and developments in the law schools. The evolution of Sufi education and Sufi structures of authority can best be understood by comparing them with those of the law schools. As we have shown, the history of Sufism and the legal schools is intertwined.

By this period, the law schools had developed ways of establishing authority and legitimacy and a means of certifying the abilities of individual scholars. Briefly, in ulema circles authority to teach was given after a student had been examined by a teacher (who was himself part of an established authoritative chain of students and teachers) who could certify that he had mastered a critical text. When a student demonstrated that he had read and understood a certain text, he was given a license (*ijāza*) to teach that text. Initially, *ijāza*s were given for the transmission of hadith. As Muslim law developed, authorization was also needed to issue a legal opinion (fatwa) and to teach law. The *ijāza* guaranteed the accurate transmission of authoritative religious knowledge. They were awarded after an oral examination, and a student could and often did go from one scholar to another to collect *ijāza*s for different texts. The *isnād*, the *ijāza*, and the evolution of the legal schools all reflect the development of specific ways by which the ulema could define and structure legitimate religious knowledge and education. The elaboration of these forms of legitimation and certification served to organize and define as well as control legal education.

Like the legal scholars, Sufis also began to articulate their own chains of authority (*silsila*) and a means by which mystics could acquire certification to transmit spiritual knowledge and authority. After a disciple bound himself to a sheikh and submitted himself completely to his training, he received a method of *dhikr* from him. This was essentially his initiation into the spiritual path. A sheikh's close supervision of the disciple's spiritual capacities and his progress along the path enabled him to testify to the disciple's spiritual fitness and abilities. The disciple might later receive the patched cloak (*khirqa* or *murraqaᶜa*) from his sheikh, which signified his preparedness to embark fully on the spiritual path and even to instruct others. Training under the guidance of a sheikh meant that a Sufi became part of a spiritual chain that stretched back to the lifetime of the Prophet. The *silsila* and the *khirqa* served the same purposes as the *isnād* and the *ijāza* in ulema circles: they certified that the Sufi had studied and trained under an authoritative master whose spiritual pedigree could be traced back to the Prophet, and they gave him the authority to transmit a particular spiritual way.

By focusing on the development of Sufism in a particular place and during a specific period, we have illuminated an important transitional period in the history of Sufism. We were able to document the close connection of Sufism and law and at the same time discern the emergence of specifically Sufi structures of authority and organization. The next phase in the institutional development of Sufism begins when disciples focus on a sheikh in a new way and form schools to perpetuate a particular sheikh's name, type of teaching, mystical exercises, and way of life. This next step—the formation of the urban Sufi *ṭarīqa* in the late 12th and 13th centuries—evolved from and was dependent upon changes and developments in Sufi practice and organization in 11th-century Khurasan.

NOTES

Author's note: I thank Hamid Algar, Julia Clancy-Smith, Ira Lapidus, Barbara von Schlegell, and the anonymous readers for *IJMES* for helpful comments on earlier drafts. A version of this article was presented at the 1990 Middle East Studies Association meeting.

[1]For a discussion and critique of western interpretations of the relationship between Sufism and law, particularly Hanbali law, see George Makdisi, "L'Islam Hanbalisant," *Revue des études islamiques* 42 (1974): 211–44; ibid., 43 (1975): 245–76.

[2]Key studies of Sufism in Khurasan include Jacqueline Chabbi, "Remarques sur le développement historique des mouvements ascétiques et mystiques au Khurasan," *Studia Islamica* 46 (1977): 5–72; and the following studies by Fritz Meier: "Hurasan und das Ende der klassischen Sufik," *Atti del Convegno internationale sul Tema: La Persia nel Medioevo* (Rome, 1970), 545–70; and *Abū Saᶜīd-i Abū l-Ḫayr (357–490/967–1049): Wirklichkeit und Legende* (Leiden, 1976). For brief discussions of the importance of the late 10th and 11th centuries in the history of Sufism, see Albert Hourani, *A History of the Arab Peoples* (Oxford, 1991), 154–55; and Ira Lapidus, *A History of Islamic Societies* (Cambridge, 1988), 169–71. For general treatments of Sufism in the medieval period, see Marshall Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam*, 3 vols. (Chicago, 1974), vol. 2, *The Expansion of Islam in the Middle Periods*, 201–54; Annemarie Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1975); and J. Spencer Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam* (Oxford, 1971).

[3]Sufi manuals from the 13th century on will describe in detail at least three essential elements that made up a disciple's initiation: *akhdh al-ᶜahd, talqīn al-dhikr*, and the *libs al-khirqa*. These elements are discussed, although not systematically, in a number of 11th-century texts.

[4]This is the rule of the Sufi Abu Saᶜid ibn Abi Khayr (d. 1049). A translation of this rule can be found in Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, 243.

[5]Richard Bulliet's *The Patricians of Nishapur: A Study in Medieval Islamic Social History* (Cambridge, Mass., 1972) gives a detailed account of the social and political history of Nishapur and provides biographies of key ulema families in Nishapur. Bulliet did not give an account of Sufism in Nishapur, but his work does provide important data and context for such a study. The studies of Wilferd Madelung are also helpful, especially his *Religious Trends in Early Islamic Iran* (Albany, N.Y., 1988). Fritz Meier ("Hurasan") discussed the changing relations between masters and disciples in Khurasan; and Jacqueline Chabbi ("Remarques") showed that Sufism was one among a number of mystical tendencies and movements in 9th- and 10th-century Khurasan.

[6]For a history of the Ghaznavids, see C. E. Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids: Their Empire in Afghanistan and Eastern Iran 994–1040* (Edinburgh, 1963); and for the Seljuqs, see *The Cambridge History of Iran*, (Cambridge, 1975), vol. 5, *The Saljuq and Mongol Periods*, ed. J. A. Boyle.

[7]The two realms had diverged by the middle of the 9th century. For a discussion of the separation of political and religious authority in Sunni Islam, see Ira Lapidus, "The Separation of State and Religion in the Development of Early Islamic Society," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 6 (1975): 363–85.

[8]Key institutions such as the madrasa and the urban *ribāṭ* (an Arabic term for the Persian *khānaqāh*) seem to have originated in Khurasan. For a discussion of the Khurasanian origins of the madrasa, see George Makdisi, "Muslim Institutions of Learning in Eleventh-Century Baghdad," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 24 (1961): 1–56; and for the early history of the *ribāṭ*, see Jacqueline Chabbi, "Le fonction du ribāṭ à Baghdad du Ve siècle au début du VIIe siècle," *Revue des études islamiques* 42 (1974): 101–21.

[9]For a brief discussion of the importance of Khurasan and Nishapur in medieval Islamic political and religious history, see Richard Bulliet, "The Political-Religious History of Nishapur," in *Islamic Civilization: 950–1150*, ed. D. S. Richards (Oxford, 1973), 71–93.

[10]Abu Nasr al-Sarraj, for example, devoted an entire section of his *Kitāb al-lumaᶜ* to the imitation of the Prophet, and another to accounts demonstrating the piety of the Prophet's companions. Kalabadhi (d. 994) claimed that the Sufis existed in the era of the Prophet and were the elect of Muslim society: "These [the Sufis] were deposited by God among His creation, and chosen out of those whom God made: they were the people of his bench (*ahl al-ṣuffa*), and after his death they were the best of his community." Abū Bakr Muḥammad al-Kalābādhī, *Kitāb al-taᶜarruf* (The Doctrine of the Sufis), trans. A. Arberry (Cambridge, 1977), 2.

[11]When used with care these texts can tell us much about our period. Key Sufi sources used here are the following: Abū Qāsim al-Qushayrī, *Risāla fī ᶜilm al-taṣawwuf*, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1966), and Fritz Meier, ed., "Qushayri's Tartīb al-sulūk," *Oriens* 16 (1963): 1–39; Abū ᶜAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya*, ed. J. Pedersen (Leiden, 1960); Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazzālī, *Ayyuhā al-walad*, ed. George Scherer (Beirut, 1951); idem, *Iḥyāʾ ᶜulūm al-dīn*, 4 vols. (Cairo, 1939); and ᶜAlī ibn ᶜUthmān al-Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, ed. V. A. Zukovskij (Leningrad, 1926; reprint, Tehran, 1957).

[12]For important information on the early history of Sufism in Khurasan and a discussion of other mystical movements present in that region, see Chabbi, "Remarques."

[13]A discussion of the process by which Sufism became the main form of mysticism in Nishapur is beyond the scope of this essay. For one discussion of the various strands of piety in Khurasan and a possible explanation for the ultimate success of Sufism, see Chabbi, "Remarques."

[14]Bulliet used the *Taʾrīkh Naysābūr* by al-Ḥakīm al-Naysābūrī (d. 1015) and its continuation, known as the *Al-Siyāq li-taʾrīkh Naysābūr* (*Sequel to the History of Nishapur*) by ᶜAbd al-Ghāfir al-Fārisī (d. 1134–35). These biographical dictionaries have been published in facsimile form by Richard N. Frye in *The Histories of Nishapur* (London, 1965); for Fārisī, see also Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad Ṣarīfīnī (d. 1243), *Al-Muntakhab min al-siyāq li-taʾrīkh Naysābūr* (Beirut, 1989).

[15]See the evidence assembled in Bulliet, *Patricians*, 41–42. Other prominent Sufis from nearby regions who were Shafiᶜi include Abu Nasr al-Sarraj of Tus, Abu Nuᶜaym al-Isfahani, and Ahmad and Hamid al-Ghazzali of Tus. Two exceptions are Abu Bakr Muhammad al-Kalabadhi and ᶜAli ibn ᶜUthman al-Hujwiri of Ghazna who were Hanafi.

[16]This can be found in Qushayrī, *Risāla*, 731–52.

[17]Qushayrī, *Risāla*, 731–32.

[18]Ibid., 734–35.

[19]Louis Massignon, *Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane*, rev. ed. (Paris, 1968), 128–29.

[20]Qushayri's *silsila* is as follows: Abu ʿAli al-Daqqaq, from Abu al-Qasim al-Nasrabadi, from Abu Bakr al-Shibli, from Junayd al-Baghdadi, from Sirri al-Saqati, from Maʿruf al-Kharkhi, from Daʾud al-Taʾi, from Habib al-ʿAjami, from Hasan al-Basri, from ʿAli ibn Abi Talib, from the Prophet.

[21]For a list of Sulami's teachers and students, see Sharība's introduction to his edition of Sulamī's *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya* (Cairo, 1953), 20–27.

[22]George Makdisi described how Ashʿari theology acquired a wider audience by being adopted and disseminated within certain circles of the Shafiʿi *madhhab*. Although his focus is on how theological movements achieved legitimacy, the process he describes is similar to the way in which Sufism became more widespread. See his "Ashʿari and the Ashʿarites in Islamic Religious History," *Studia Islamica* 17 (1962): 44–46.

[23]Bulliet, *Patricians*, 54.

[24]For example, Abu Saʾd al-Astarabadi (d. 1048–49) was a Shafiʿi-Sufi who built a madrasa. And Abu Sahl al-Suʿluki, who was a prominent leader of the Shafiʿi party and a Sufi who initiated Sulami, took over the madrasa of Abu al-Walid al-Naysabūri (d. 960). For Abū Saʿd, see Abū Naṣr al-Subkī, *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyya al-kubrā*, (Cairo, 1964), 4:293–94. For Abū Sahl, see E. Kohlberg, ed., *Jawāmiʿ ādāb al-ṣūfiyya* and *ʿUyūb al-nafs wa-mudāwātuhā* (Jerusalem, 1976), 8.

[25]Bulliet, *Patricians*, 152, 250; Frye, *Histories of Nishapur*, 1:5b, 82b; 2:123a, 36a, 106a–b, 69a, 135b, 121b.

[26]Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Sulamī, *Arbaʿūn ḥadīthan fī al-taṣawwuf* (Hyderabad, 1950).

[27]Madelung pointed out that Ibn Munawwar, the biographer of the Sufi Abu Saʿid ibn Abi Khayr, claimed that all Sufi masters since Shafiʿi had been Shafiʿis. Although Ibn Munawwar acknowledges that the founders of the law schools were all pious, he suggests that Hanafism, the *madhhab* associated with Muʿtazili theology which denied the miracles (*karāmāt*) of Sufis, was inappropriate for Sufis. See Madelung, *Religious Trends*, 46; and Muḥammad ibn Munawwar, *Asrār al-tawḥīd fī maqāmāt al-shaykh Abū Saʿīd*, trans. M. Achena (Paris, 1974), 36–39. There is also now an English translation of the *Asrār*; see John O'Kane, *The Secrets of God's Mystical Oneness, or the Spiritual Stations of Shaikh Abū Saʿīd* (Costa Mesa, Calif., 1992).

[28]The manuscript of this work is incomplete; however, 94 hadith of and about Shafiʿi are retrievable and are available in Fritz Meier, "Ein wichtiger Handschriftenfund zur Sufik," *Oriens* 20 (1967): 91–106.

[29]For a list of those authorized to teach the *Risāla*, see Richard Gramlich, *Das Sendschreiben al-Qushayrīs über das Sufitum* (Wiesbaden, 1989), 17.

[30]Meier, "Hurasan," 546–47. I am indebted to Meier's insights for some of the following. For the relevant passages in Ibn ʿAbbad, see Paul Nwyia, *Ibn ʿAbbād de Ronda (1333–1390), Lettres de direction spirituelle (ar-Rasāʾil aṣ-Ṣughrā)* (Beirut, 1958), 106–15, 125–38.

[31]A student might, for example, ask a master about the meaning of a spiritual state such as *tawakkul* (complete reliance on God for sustenance), and the master's words would be committed to memory, passed on, and eventually written down.

[32]It should be noted that these roles were not necessarily performed by different masters. Qushayri, for example, combined both functions: he taught texts and directed the spiritual training of novices.

[33]Qushayrī, *Risāla*, 735. In the same passage he also repeats the well-known saying of Abu Yazid al-Bistami (d. 874): "The one who has no master has Satan as his *imām*."

[34]Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, 62.

[35]Ibid., 19–20.

[36]Ghazzālī, *Ayyuhā al-walad*, 16–17.

[37]Al-Suhrawardi put it this way: "The characters (*akhlāq*) of the masters have been polished through their perfection in modeling themselves after the Messenger of God, peace and blessings be upon him. They are the most successful of people in revivifying his *sunna*, in all that he commanded and commissioned, censured and enjoined," Abū Ḥafṣ ʿUmar al-Suhrawardī, *ʿAwārif al-maʿārif* (Beirut, 1983), 380.

[38]This work most probably belongs to the period after Ghazzālī had acquired an intensive experience of Sufism: that is, after 1095. These topics are taken up again later.

[39]Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, 62.

[40]Qushayrī, *Tartīb*, 15; and *Risāla*, 736.

[41]Qushayrī, *Tartīb*, 15–16.

[42]Oaths were an important way in which social bonds were formed in medieval Islamic society. For an analysis of the function of oaths in Buyid society, see Roy Mottahedeh, *Loyalty and Leadership in an Early Islamic Society* (Princeton, 1980), 40–62. His work focuses on the centrality of oaths in Islamic political life, but is also suggestive for other areas of Islamic social life.

[43]Qushayrī, *Risāla*, 737; and *Tartīb*, 16–22.

[44]Ibn ᶜAṭāᵓ Allāh al-Iskandarī (d. 1309), claimed in his introduction to his *Miftāḥ al-falāḥ wa miṣbāḥ al-arwāḥ* (Cairo, 1961), that his monograph on *dhikr* is the first known to him. Qushayri's treatment of *dhikr* in the *Tartīb*, however, seems to be the earliest extensive treatment of *dhikr* as a spiritual practice transmitted from master to disciple. See Meier's introduction to his edition of the *Tartīb*, 5–13.

[45]Najm al-Dīn al-Rāzī, for example, devoted three chapters to *dhikr* in his *Mirṣād al-ᶜibād min al-mabdaᵓ ilā al-maᶜād* (The Path of God's Bondsmen from Origin to Return), trans. Hamid Algar (New York, 1982), 268–78.

[46]Najm al-Din al-Razi wrote: "It is related of the Prophet that he once assembled a group of the foremost companions in a room and ordered them to close the door. He then said aloud, three times, *lā ilāha illā Allāh*, and commanded the companions to do likewise. They did so, and he then lifted up his hands and said: 'O God, have I conveyed that which was to be conveyed?' Then he said, 'Glad tidings be unto you, that God Almighty has forgiven your sins.' The sheikhs of the Path have derived the transmission of *dhikr* from this *sunna*"; ibid., 277–78.

[47]Qushayrī, *Tartīb*, 16.

[48]Suhrawardi seems to have been the first to discuss systematically and distinguish between the various types of *khirqa*s. See the section in his *ᶜAwārif al-maᶜārif* on the *khirqa*.

[49]"The adept, then, who has attained the perfection of saintship takes the right course when he invests the novice with the *muraqqaᶜa* after a period of three years during which he has educated him in the necessary discipline." *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, trans. Reynold Nicholson, *The "Kashf al-maḥjūb," the Oldest Persian Treatise on Sufism by al-Hujwīrī*, Gibb Memorial Series, no. 17 (1911; reprint, London, 1959), 54–55. Hujwīrī devotes an entire chapter to the wearing of the patched cloak, *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, 49–65.

[50]For example: "Investment with the *khirqa* establishes a bond between the sheikh and the *murīd* and makes the *murīd* subject himself to the discipline of the sheikh . . . the *khirqa* is the symbol of the oath of investiture (*mubāyaᶜa*)" (Suhrawardī, *ᶜAwārif*, 95).

[51]Qushayrī, *Risāla*, 736. A later writer put it this way: "The *adab* of the *murīd* towards the sheikh is that he is stripped of his own choice and does not act independently, either with respect to himself or his possessions, only upon the advice and command of the sheikh." Suhrawardī, *ᶜAwārif*, 364.

[52]Ghazzālī, *Ayyuhā al-walad*, 17.

[53]Details can be found in both the *Waṣiyya* and Qushayrī, *Tartīb*.

[54]See the section on *firāsa* in Qushayrī's *Risāla*.

[55]Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, 206–8. There are also plentiful examples of his talents in this area in Muḥammad ibn Munawwar, *Asrār al-tawḥīd*.

[56]Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, 211–12.

[57]A reference to their relationship can be found in an anecdote about Farmadhi recounted in Muḥammad ibn Munawwar, *Asrār al-tawḥīd*, 136–37.

[58]This was a common injunction. Qushayri, for example, specifically advised the *murīd* to imitate the behavior (*adab*) of his sheikh. Qushayrī, *Risāla*, 735.

[59]Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-maḥjūb*, 229–30; trans. Nicholson, 184.

[60]See the section on *adab* in Qushayrī, *Risāla*.

[61]One Sufi put it this way: "The righteous disciple regards and knows that the master is a reminder of God and His Messenger. The disciple who cleaves to the master accustoms himself to that which existed in the time of the Messenger and cleaves to the Messenger of God" (Suhrawardī, *ᶜAwārif*, 369).

[62]This is summed up in the well-known saying attributed to the Prophet: "The master in the midst of his disciples is like the Prophet among his people."

[63]On this point, see Hamid Algar's introduction to Barbara R. von Schlegell's partial translation of Qushayrī's *Risāla: The Principles of Sufism* (Berkeley, Calif., 1990).

[64]Chabbi, "Remarques," 38–45, and her article "Khānḳāh" in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd ed.; see also Madelung, *Religious Trends*, 44–46. For a good general introduction to the Karramiyya, see C. E. Bosworth, "The Rise of the Karamiyyah in Khurasan," *Muslim World* 50 (1960): 5–14.

[65]The transformation of the older Karramiyya strongholds into Shafi^ci Sufi centers cannot be fully treated here. For further discussion of the Karramiyya and their *khānaqāh*s, see Bosworth, "The Karamiyyah"; Chabbi, "Remarques," and "Khanḳāh"; Madelung, *Religious Trends*; and Bulliet, *Patricians*.

[66]For Sulami's *khānaqāh*, see the references in Bulliet, *Patricians*, 299, and the article on Sulami by Gerhard Böwering in the *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. For Daqqaq's *khānaqāh*, see Muḥammad ibn Munawwar, *Asrār al-tawḥīd*, 57, and Bulliet, *Patricians*, 250.

[67]Muḥammad ibn Munawwar, *Asrār al-tawḥīd*, 136–37.

[68]Muhammad ibn Munawwar describes one such foundation in his biography of the Sufi Abu Sa[c]id. After meeting Abu Sa[c]id, a wealthy man bought a house that he transformed into a *khānaqāh* and then installed forty Sufis in it, Muḥammad ibn Munawwar, *Asrār al-tawḥīd*, 180–81.

[69]See A. Bausani, "Religion in the Saljuq Period," in *Cambridge History of Islam* (1970), 5:300; and Chabbi, "Khanḳāh."

[70]Muḥammad ibn Munawwar, *Asrār al-tawḥīd*, 183.

[71]For the policies of Nizam al-Mulk regarding the madrasa, see Makdisi, "Muslim Institutions."

[72]For example, Qushayri strongly recommended that the disciple go on retreat; Qushayrī, *Risāla*, 738.

[73]Abu Said was associated with the founding of a number of *khānaqāh*s. From about 1016 on, he maintained a *khānaqāh* in Nishapur. The ten basic rules he recorded for *khānaqāh* life recommend ritual purity, frequent prayer, and charity, but no details are given on the organization or administration of the *khānaqāh*. For evidence on the way of life in the *khānaqāh*, see Muḥammad ibn Munawwar, *Asrār al-tawḥīd*, 79, 81, 97, 165, 180, 356. For a study of Abū Sa[c]id's life, see Fritz Meier, *Abū Sa[c]īd*.