INTRODUCTION

As nearly as can be determined, the major literary activity of Abū ʿI-Hasan ʿAlī b. Muhammad al-Daylami belongs to the latter quarter of the tenth century A.D. His Kitāb ʿatf al-alīf al-maʿlūf ʿalā al-lām al-maʿtūf is one of the earliest extant treatises on mystical love in Arabic literature. The work represents a Sunni spirituality grounded in the teachings of al-Daylami’s master Ibn Khafif of Shiraz (d. 371/982), but it reveals what may be the remnants of Shiite influence in certain of the author’s expressions.¹ In some of its theoretical passages the work is indebted to the doctrine of the extremist mystic al-Ḥusayn b. Mansūr al-Hallāj, who was executed for his controversial teachings in 309/922. Although al-Daylami’s text propounds a mysticism that includes Hallājian elements and makes room for a certain notion of union of the mystical lover with God, it seems to repudiate outright al-Hallāj’s ecstatic claims to identity with the divine essence.² The book gives a well-rounded picture of the religious, philosophical, and literary trends of the author’s time as these are reflected in theoretical discussions about love, both sacred and profane, and in the author’s selection of anecdotes, poetry, and hagiographical literature relevant to the topic. In addition, through its many valuable citations of authorities from prior generations, the text helps explain how the ideas it deals with developed in early Islamic society.

Although now surviving in only one known manuscript, the work appears to have exercised a profound and continued influence, directly and indirectly, on the later mystical tradition in Shiraz. This influence is most clearly evident in the writings of Rūzbihān Baqlī, who died in 606/1209, or some two hundred years after al-Daylami.³ Perhaps al-Daylami’s work was also of some significance for the subsequent literary flowering of Persian mysticism, a matter continuing research on Rūzbihān Baqlī

¹ The author refers to the family of the Prophet as “our leaders” or “our imāms” in his preface (cf. MS, p. 2 and n. 6 there), and on occasion he uses, or retains when narrating, the benediction “may God bless him and grant him peace” after the name of ʿAlī (cf. chapter five, MS, pp. 65 and n. 53, and MS, pp. 138, 282) and the similar formula “upon whom be peace” after the names of ʿAlī and of his son al-Ḥasan (MS, pp. 151, 282). (Page references after the abbreviation MS, here and in subsequent notes, are to pages of the manuscript given in boldface between brackets in the text of this translation at the beginning of each manuscript page and on the margins of our edition.)

² Cf. chapter seven, MS p. 108 and n. 15 there.

³ See n. 4.
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may help to elucidate.4

THE AUTHOR

Life and Times

Biographer of his teacher Ibn Khaffīf and perpetuator of the memory of many scholars and mystics whose names would otherwise have remained unknown, al-Daylamī himself, though repeatedly cited by later biographers of the city of Shiraz, ironically receives no biographical notice in any of the published biographical works we have consulted. A few facts about the life of our author and the subsequent transmission of his treatise on love can be gleaned from other sources. Most of these have been collected or pointed out by Jean-Claude Vadet in the introduction to his French translation of the Kitāb ‘af al-alīf.5

As a consequence of the silence of the biographers, we do not know when al-Daylamī was born, but we may assume that he was relatively young, possibly still a boy or a youth, when he became a disciple of Ibn Khaffīf. This was at the latest in or around 352/963–64, or some eighteen years before Ibn Khaffīf died.6 We are also ignorant regarding the date of


5 Jean-Claude Vadet, Le traité d’amour mystique d’al-Daylamī (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1980), pp. 1–23, and especially, on al-Daylamī’s biography, pp. 4–6. A number of points we touch on here are developed more fully by Vadet. In particular, Vadet gives a much fuller sketch of the memory of al-Daylamī in the Shiraz school and the transmission of his work to Rūzbihān than we have attempted here (ibid., pp. 6–23). In this connection the critical review of Vadet’s suggestions by Florian Sobieroj should also be consulted (“Ibn Ḥāfīz aṣ-Ṣārāzī,” pp. 26–27). Vadet’s translation was made from his edition of the Arabic text, Kitāb ‘af al-alīf al-ma’līf ‘alā al-lām al-ma’īf, Cairo: Imprimerie de l’Institut Français d’Archeologie Orientale, 1962. As a rule we refer in our annotations to Vadet’s edition and translation simply as Vadet, edition, and Vadet, trans.

6 Ibn Khaffīf died in 371/982. Abū Aḥmad al-Kabīr, the servant and companion of Ibn Khaffīf, died in 377/987–88. Al-Daylamī claims he saw this servant,
al-Daylami’s death. The best we can hope for is a date at which, and perhaps for some time after which, he was still active. A rather uncertain identification with an Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Daylami said by al-Qiftī to have visited the vizier Abū ʿAlī Muʿayyad al-Mulk would suggest 392/1001–1002, the year of the vizier’s investiture.7 If the identification is false, who always wore a coarse woolen cloak, for some twenty-five years, thus from approximately 352 (377 minus 25) at the latest, perhaps already earlier (Junayd Shirāzī, Shadd al-izār, p. 46; the parallel text from the Shirāznāma of Zarkūb Shirāzī, cited by Vadet, trans., p. 9, has a hiatus that doubles al-Daylami’s claim from twenty-five to fifty years). According to this reckoning al-Daylami must have been in the company of Ibn Khafīf at least nineteen years (352-371). Moreover, on one occasion (if the subject of the verb gāla introducing the report is al-Daylami himself and not someone he is quoting) al-Daylami saw Abū Aḥmad al-Kabīr when he (al-Daylami) was in the company of Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Baytār, Abū Naṣr al-Ṭūsī (whom the editors of the Shadd, Muḥammad Qazvīnī and ʿAbbās Iqbāl, identify as the author of the Kitāb al-luma’ (pp. 47, n. 2, and 49, n. 1)), and a certain al-Ḥasan al-Jawālīqī or al-Jawālīqī. This event occurred presumably after 352 and definitely before 27 Ramadān 363/974, when Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥusayn b. Aḥmad, known as al-Baytār, died. Al-Baytār was a disciple of Ibn Khafīf. Al-Daylami is said to have claimed in his mashyakha that he never saw (ma raʿaytu) anyone more cultured (akmal adaban) than him (Shadd al-izār, p. 104, cited by Vadet, trans., pp. 7–8) and that he heard Abū Hayyān, whom the editor of the Shadd considers definitely to be the philosopher al-Tawḥīdī, tell of his having seen him in Ahvaz. The important element in the dates we have is that they fit together and thus tend to confirm one another. A quotation from al-Daylami in the Shadd al-izār suggests that Ibn Khafīf, who is said to have lived one hundred and five or one hundred and fourteen lunar years (al-Daylami, Sfrat, p. 218), was considerably older than al-Daylami, and that al-Daylami must have been rather young when he became the sheikh’s follower, presumably ca. 352, when he also began to observe Ibn Khafīf’s follower Abū Aḥmad al-Kabīr. “If God had not been gracious to us by granting him [Ibn Khafīf] long life so that we could come into contact with him (adrakn̄ahu) and benefit from him,” al-Daylami is reported to have said, “he would have been numbered in the second class” (Shadd, pp. 38–39). Regarding the age of Ibn Khafīf at his death, subtracting the birth date 268 suggested below (p. xxiv and n. 42) from the generally accepted death date 371, one arrives at a maximum life span of one hundred and three lunar years. A life span of one hundred and four years is mentioned at the end of Ibn ʿAsākir’s biographical notice on Ibn Khafīf on the authority of a person who claimed to have calculated it based on the date of the sheikh’s birth written over a door in his house in his own hand (Tarīkh madinat Dimashq, XV, p. 301).

7 The Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Daylami mentioned by al-Qiftī visited the vizier Abū ʿAlī Muʿayyad al-Mulk with some companions, presumably after the latter’s
then 385/995–96, the year of the death of Ibn Khafif’s servant and follower Abū Ḥamd al-Saghīr, is the latest date at and for a time after which our author must have been active. ⁸

If we accept the date based on al-Qifti, then the minimum range for al-Daylamī’s active career is some forty years, from about 352/963–64, when he first began to frequent Ibn Khafif, until 392/1001–1002. Projecting arbitrarily fifteen years before he became Ibn Khafif’s disciple, we arrive at an approximate minimum life span of some fifty-five lunar years extending from about 337 to about 392.

Al-Daylamī’s life span, insofar as we have been able to approximate its limits, corresponds roughly to the reigns of the caliph al-Mut‘abb (334/946–363/974) and his son al-Ta‘i (363/974–381/991) and to the beginning of the reign of al-Qādir (381/991–422/1031). The author of the ‘Atf thus lived during the first half century of Buwayhid dominion in western Persia and Iraq, years during which the Buwayhids were the most powerful force in the central Islamic world.

The original Buwayhids came from Daylam, the area of Iran to which our author’s family, as the nisba al-Daylamī implies, traced its origin. Unfortunately we can only speculate regarding the relevance of al-Daylamī’s genealogy for his literary production. The name Daylam is applied loosely to the mountainous region between Gilān on the Caspian coast and the plain of Qazvīn, but it refers more properly to the valleys of the Shāh-rūd before this river joins the Safīd-rūd to break through the Alburz range to the Caspian. In Daylam stand the ruins of the remote

⁸ Junayd Shīrāzī, Shadī al-izār, pp. 46–47. The date of Abū Ḥamd al-Saghīr’s death would seem to be the latest death date in the Shadd that unquestionably comes from al-Daylamī. Al-Daylamī says of him: “I never knew him during his entire life (ṭūla ‘umrihi) to be guilty of any slip or lapse” (ibid., p. 47). Massignon (Passion, trans. Mason, II, p. 409) seems to suggest that al-Daylamī may have been involved in the Khāṭfīya’s recognizing Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawḥīdī as a mystic after his death in Shiraz in 414/1023. We have not been able to confirm this undocumented implication. Perhaps it is the result of a confusion of the kunya of Abū ’l-Ḥusayn Ḥamd b. Muhammad, known as Ibn Sālibh (Sāliba), with al-Daylamī’s kunya Abū ’l-Ḥasan. See Shadd, p. 54 and n. 6.
fortress of Alamūt, originally built by a Daylamite ruler but later famous as the headquarters of the Order of Assassins. The mountaineers of Daylam made good foot soldiers. Already in pre-Islamic times the region was known as the home of rugged mercenary infantrymen armed with swords, shields, and javelins.9

During the first two centuries or so after the Islamic conquest of Iran, as earlier under the Sassanids, the Daylamites remained largely independent, both politically and culturally. But in the latter part of the ninth century and particularly at the beginning of the tenth, as a result of the missionary efforts of the Caspian Zaydī sayyids, with whom the Daylamites for most of the period were in alliance, Zaydī Shiism gained a strong foothold in Daylam. When during this same period, for reasons that are not clear, large numbers of Daylamite men began to migrate from their homeland and enlist as mercenaries in the armies of the powers that surrounded them, it was often the Shiite faith, though not necessarily in Zaydī form, that they took with them.

In 319/931, after the Sāmānid lieutenant Mākān had suffered several defeats at the hands of Mardawīj b. Ziyār, the founder of the Ziyārid dynasty, three brothers from Daylam, ʿAlī, al-Ḥasan, and Aḥmad, who were commanders in Mākān’s army, deserted to the forces of the victor. Following a series of conquests by Mardawīj in central and western Persia, ʿAlī, the eldest of the three brothers, turned against him. Setting himself up in Arrajān in 321/933, he took Fārs, including Shiraz, the next year. As was the usual practice for successful rebels, he took the precaution of having his authority over the area recognized by the Abbasid caliphate. A series of confused events ended with his brother al-Ḥasan, although not unchallenged, in control of most of Djībāl, and his brother Aḥmad in control of Kirmān and Khūzistān and poised to enter Baghdad. Aḥmad took the city in 334/945, thus bringing the caliphate under his control. The three brothers then bestowed on themselves the honorific titles by which they were thenceforth to be known: ʿImād al-Dawla (ʿAlī), Rukn al-Dawla (al-Ḥasan), and Muʿizz al-Dawla (Aḥmad). 10 The dynasty they had founded would be called by the name of their father Buwayh (Būyah).11

9 See V. Minorsky, *EI²*, II, p. 190a–b, s.v. “Daylam,” citing the description of the “Dolomites” given by Procopius, the historian of the wars of Justinian.
11 On the rise and fall of the Buwayhids, see, in addition to the articles by Cahen and Minorsky mentioned above, the articles “ʿImād al-Dawla” (Cl. Cahen), “Mardāwīj” (C. E. Bosworth), “Mākān b. Kākt” (C. E. Bosworth),
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Buwayhid rule, which lasted in the Abbasid capital for 110 years, was an interlude of Iranian Shiite resurgence between the end of Arab domination in the early tenth century and the nearly universal ascendency achieved by Turkic groups by the middle of the eleventh. It came to an end with the Seljuk seizure of Baghdad in 447/1055. In a sense the Buwayhids brought the seeds of their downfall with them from Daylam. First, their system of succession made it difficult for them to hold their dominions together after a strong prince had died. Second, their Daylamite army, consisting primarily of foot soldiers, was insufficient alone to meet the military requirements of the time and had to be supplemented with Turkish cavalry. Moreover, recruitment from Daylam fell off with time, and the last reigning descendants of the Buwayhid princes, as Claude Cahen has remarked, “were surrounded almost entirely by Turkish soldiers.”

Although al-Daylami may conceivably have been old enough to witness from Shiraz much of the confusion that preceded the Buwayhid occupation of Baghdad in 334/945, the dominant political facts of his lifetime were the relative stability of Buwayhid rule over Iraq and most of western Iran, albeit with intermittent infighting, and the Shiite Buwayhid tutelage over the Sunni Abbasid caliphs. Though he cannot have been unaware of some of the quarrels among the princes of the dynasty, he also saw active princes like ʿAḍud al-Dawla and Bahāʾ al-Dawla unite for a time under their authority Iraq, Fārs, and Kirmān, which constituted the major part of the Buwayhid dominions.

The news he heard from other parts of the Islamic world can hardly have been encouraging for the Sunni cause, even if the reports revealed a severely split Shiite camp. By 327/939 the Abbasids had indeed been able to buy “protection” for the pilgrimage routes from the Ismaili Qarmātīs of Bahrain, who had previously sacked southern Iraq and had been robbing pilgrimage caravans. Some twelve years later, in 339/951, by this time under Buwayhid tutelage, they had also managed to buy back the Black Stone of the Kaaba, which the Bahrain Qarmātīs had carried off two decades earlier. But a more formidable Ismaili threat was rising in the West. In 358/969 the rival Fatimid caliphs conquered Egypt.

“Muʿizz al-Dawla” (K. V. Zetterstään/H. Busse), and “Rūkn al-Dawla” (Harold Bowen/C. E. Bosworth) in EI², and “Mardawīdī” (M. Nazim) and “Mākān b. Kāktī” (M. Nazim) in EI².
12 EI², I, p. 1355b. s.v. “Buwayhids or Būyids.”
13 ʿAḍud al-Dawla, according to a report in Zarkūb’s Shīrāznūma, one questioned however by Sobieroj, was a devoted follower of al-Daylamī’s teacher Ibn Khāffīf. See Sobieroj, “Ibn Ḥaffīf aš-Šīrāzī,” p. 158. Cf. also below, p. xlii.
Notwithstanding the failure of the Fatimids to win over their fellow Ismailis in Bahrain, and despite the periods of outright hostility between the two groups, the Qarīmāfī became at best extremely unreliable allies of the Abbasid/Buwayhid center.14

Likewise distressing for those Sunnis who had not become reconciled to the Buwayhid order must have been the news of the successive misfortunes of the Sāmānids, the Buwayhids' main Sunni rival in Iran. Al-Daylami most likely lived to hear of the eventual division of the Sāmānīd domains in Transoxiana and Khurasan between the Turkic Qaraqhānids and Ghaznavids in 389/999. On the other hand, the beginning of the end of the power of the Buwayhids themselves, the occupation of Rayy by the son of the Sunni Maḥmūd of Ghazna in 420/1029, may have come after his time.

In comparison with the Qarīmāfī and the Fatimids, the Buwayhids represented a moderate and accommodating form of Shiism. Although they were apparently originally Zaydi, the conqueror of Baghdad, Muʿizz al-Dawla Ahmad, rejected the opportunity to place a Zaydi Alīd claimant on the caliphal throne. Adopting a policy of pragmatic tolerance, the Buwayhids maintained close ties with the larger Twelver Shiite group, while at the same time they legitimized their rule by presenting it as derived from the authority of the Sunni Abbasid caliphs.

Despite the religious strife that raged around the domains of the Buwayhids, tolerance and intellectual inquiry seem to have been to a striking degree the hallmark of the central Islamic regions under their control. The pagan Sabaean Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm b. Hilāl al-Ṣabi3 (d. 384/994) was appointed chief secretary of the Dīwān al-Inshā' (Department of Letters and State Documents, previously the Dīwān al-Rasā'il) in 349 by Muʿizz al-Dawla, and although he resisted to the end the prince’s attempts to convert him to Islam, it was a dynastic squabble between Īzz al-Dawla, the son and heir of Muʿizz, and the ambitious Aḵūd al-Dawla that led to his downfall, not his loyalty to his pagan faith.15 The Buwayhids were the benefactors of some of the most celebrated figures in Islamic cultural history. The author of the voluminous literary collec-

---

14 See Wilferd Madelung, EI², IV, pp. 660b–64a, s.v. “Qarmatī.”

15 See F. Krenkow, EI¹, VII, pp. 19b–20b, s.v. “al-Ṣabi’.” The pagan Sabaecans, with few exceptions, experienced considerable tolerance on the part of their Muslim rulers. They shared the name al-Ṣabi’īn/al-Ṣabi’a with the Judaico-Christian Mandaeans. The pagan Sabaean sect mentioned in the Koran among “the People of the Book” (B. Carra de Vaux, EI¹, VII, pp. 21b–22a, s.v. “al-Ṣabi’a”; cf. Koran 2:62, 22:17).
Kitāb al-aghānī, the Shiite Abū ʿl-Faraj al-Isfahānī (d. 356/967), who lived for many years in Baghdad and died there, was among the recipients of Buwayhid patronage. As a sign of their support for science and culture, the Buwayhids were active library builders, although their libraries could naturally also be used to spread Shiite doctrine. (The library at Rayy was burnt by the Sunni Ghaznavids after they took the city in 420.) In al-Daylamī’s own city Shiraz a great library was established by ʿAdud al-Dawla.16

Perhaps representative of the age were the Twelver Shiite brothers al-Sharīf al-Radī (d. 406/1016) and al-Sharīf al-Murtadā (d. 436/1044). Al-Sharīf al-Radī succeeded his father as naqīb of the Taḥlībīs (formal head of the descendants of ʿAlī through Fāṭima) in Baghdad, and on his death his brother al-Murtadā followed in his footsteps. The two men were as a rule on cordial terms not only with the Shiite Buwayhid sultans but also with the Sunni caliphs. Recognized as both scholars and poets, they authored odes in praise of their Abbasid rivals, and the intellectual and literary gatherings they held were open to men of more or less every persuasion.17 Al-Sharīf al-Radī, who is generally considered the compiler of the sayings of ʿAlī contained in the Nahīj al-balāgha, wrote elegies on the secretary Abū ʿIsāq al-Sabī’, whom he considered a close friend, his pagan belief notwithstanding.18

Al-Daylamī, despite the possible traces of Shiite expressions referred to at the beginning of this introduction, appears in our text as a firm adherent of Sunnism.19 We can do no more than surmise that any propensities for Shiism he may have had owed their origin to the Daylamite background that he had in common with the Buwayhids. In any event, he shared the cosmopolitan spirit of his times, and it was presumably not a difficult task for him to accommodate himself to the fact of the Buwayhids’ relatively tolerant rule and to the cultural symbiosis they encouraged, a civilization greatly enriched by the contribution of Shiite intellectuals and to a very great extent under Shiite control, but still deriving its ultimate legitimacy from the authority of the recog-

---

16 See D. Sourdel, EI², II, p. 127a–b, s.v. “Dār al-ʿIlm.”
17 Cf., e.g., al-Sharīf al-Murtadā, Dīwān al-Sharīf al-Murtadā, I, introduction by Muḥammad Rīḍā al-Shaybī, pp. 8–9, and introduction by Rashīd al-Ṣaffār, pp. 55–58, 80–81, 94–96.
18 The poems did arouse some misgivings on the part of his brother. See F. Krenkow, EI², VII, p. 330b, s.v. “al-Sharīf al-Radī.”
19 See MS, pp. 281–82 (on the caliph ʿUthmān), the author’s preface, n. 6, and chapter five, n. 53.
nized Sunni establishment.

Intellectual Personality

Of al-Daylami’s intellectual personality we know little more than what can be gleaned from the few passages we have already made use of and the internal evidence provided by his two extant works, particularly the treatise at hand, and the citations from him in later compilations. His devotion to the mystical teaching of his master Ibn Khafif and his particular interest in aspects of the doctrine of al-Hallaj were accompanied by an eclectic curiosity that expressed itself in a wide range of other concerns. The references we have to his activity are too few and too uncertain to give a reliable picture of the man and his immediate milieu. But the outline they suggest is confirmed by numerous passages in our text.

We may never know to what extent, or in some cases even whether, he was in fact influenced by figures named in the sources like the philosopher Abū Hayyān al-Tawhīdī (d. 414/1023), the blind astrologer Shakāh, and the polymath Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Bayṭār (d. 363/974). Al-Tawhīdī is apparently cited by al-Daylami directly in the ‘Aif, and he is also almost certainly the Abū Ḥayyān whom al-Daylami is cited quoting directly in the Shadd al-īzār. The connection with Shakāh, however, depends upon a text in which the identification with al-Daylami himself is uncertain and which in any case implies no more than that al-Daylami together with others consulted him before a visit to the vizier Abū ʿAlī Muʿayyad al-Mulk. Regarding al-Bayṭār, who was definitely a student of Ibn Khafīf and who is said to have mastered numerous branches of learning, including belles-lettres, asceticism, mysticism, Koranic criticism and exegesis, medicine, and law, the text of the Shadd leaves little room for doubt that al-Daylami actually saw him and admired his learning. Moreover, while al-Bayṭār himself is not cited in the text of the ‘Aif, a hagiographic work by his father, his mashyakha, is apparently cited twice in the last chapter of the treatise. Al-Bayṭār’s father, Abū ʿI-ʿAbbās Ahmad b. Mansūr (d. 382/992), was according to the Shadd learned in jurisprudence, grammar, and medicine, and appears to have

---

20 MS, p. 56. Cf. below, p. lxiv.
22 See n. 7.
23 See n. 6.
24 MS, pp. 287, 299–300 (the last report recorded in the ‘Aif).
25 Junayd Shīrāzī, Shadd al-īzār, p. 104. Al-Bayṭār was a Zāhirite in law before turning to Shāfī‘ism, and it is reasonable to assume that his father was also a Zāhirite, although he had a number of Shāfī‘ite connections. Zāhirism, more-
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set an example for his son. He and his son may also have served as models for al-Daylami. Evidently a generous benefactor of the Sufis of Shiraz, Abū ʿAbbās Aḥmad contracted numerous debts in his efforts to support them. When he allowed a student of his suspected of radical Shiism (rafd) to settle a debt for him, he was obliged by the Sufis to leave the city and moved to Ahvaz, where he lived until his death.26

Whatever the nature of al-Daylami’s contacts with these men, the text of his treatise reflects aspects of most of the sciences in which they specialized. We see an instance of his eclecticism in the ‘Atf when he concludes a series of prophetic sayings on beauty with the words “Beauty is the breaking forth of the light of the rational soul on the physical form,” which he ascribes to “a certain philosopher.”27 Chapter four of the ‘Atf provides numerous examples of al-Daylami’s lexicographical and linguistic learning and of his awareness of the importance of linguistic science for mystical theology and psychology. Another example of the variety of disciplines on which he draws is his inclusion in his treatise of a long pseudo-Aristotelian medical dialogue that represents an expanded version of what has been called “the most systematic and consistent account of the malady of love given in humoral medicine.”28

Travels

Al-Daylami’s intellectual curiosity seems to have led him to travel in

over, was especially prominent in Shiraz in this period (Sobiroj, “Ibn Ḥaṭīf aš-Širāzī, pp. 163–66, 169). We are not in a position to speculate about the significance of a possible Zāhirite influence (an influence of Muḥammad b. Dāwūd [d. 297/910]) on al-Daylami’s doctrine of love, however, beyond the references to Ibn Dāwūd in the text (MS, pp. 116, 124–25, 143). These are no more numerous than might be expected in a medieval Muslim treatise on love. It should be added, perhaps, that the ẓarf ideal of refined, “courtly” love of which Ibn Dāwūd was a hero and for which al-Washshāʾ (d. 325/936) wrote the textbook (al-Muwashshāʾ) is not quite the same thing as the mystical eros al-Daylami was investigating, even if the loaded word ʿishq is often used for both. Cf. Bell, “Avinenna’s Treatise on Love and the Nonphilosophical Muslim Tradition,” pp. 85–89.

26 Junayd Shīrāzī, Shadd al-izār, p. 104.


search of knowledge. In this he would have been following the example of his master Ibn Khafif, who was a great traveler, despite the considerable discomfort and many perils associated with travel at the time. Ibn Khafif, according to the Sīrat, made the pilgrimage at least four, and perhaps as many as six or more times, taking his mother with him on his fourth pilgrimage.29 In the ‘Aṭf, al-Daylamī refers to a trip, or trips, of his own to Mecca,30 as well as a visit to the closer by Arrajān,31 perhaps while he was on his way to Mecca. Moreover, if the text is to be understood as implying that al-Daylamī himself was present, a visit to the “Elephant House,” mentioned in chapter nineteen, would seem to have taken place in Baghdad.32 Likewise the visit to the vizier Muʿayyad al-Mulk mentioned above must have taken place in the Abbasid capital. From al-Qushayrī, assuming once again that our author is identical with an Abū ʿl-Hasan al-Daylamī mentioned in the Risāla, we hear of a trip to Antioch in Syria. He visited Antioch in order to meet a gnostic of black race of whom he had heard, and he stayed there until the man came down from Mount Lūkkam, a favorite place of retreat for ascetics, to sell a few edibles. Al-Daylamī wished to see something of the man’s clairvoyance, and the story reveals a little of his technique in dealing with such saintly recluses. Although he had not eaten for two days and apparently had no money, he pretended to bargain with the man over the price of the food in order to achieve his purpose.33

In order to derive a more complete picture of al-Daylamī’s life, it would be necessary, in view of the scarcity of information on him in the sources, to describe the last years of the life of his master Ibn Khafif, about whom, to a great extent thanks to al-Daylamī himself, much more is known. However this would involve a separate study, the scope of which would exceed the ambitions of this introduction.


30 Al-Daylamī relates the behavior of two courting pigeons he saw while he was in the Holy Mosque in Mecca and the story of a camel he had observed, when he was in the desert with the pilgrims, that died of love (MS, pp. 227–28).

31 In Arrajān al-Daylamī heard a story that a sheikh related from an old woman in Mecca (MS, pp. 244–49).

32 See MS, p. 229 and n. 4.
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Works
Two of al-Daylami’s works are extant. The present treatise, which as mentioned above survives in only one known manuscript,34 was first published by Jean-Claude Vadet in 1962 and subsequently translated by him into French.35 Al-Daylami’s biography of his celebrated teacher Ibn Khafif has reached us only in Persian translation, the Arabic original having disappeared. It has been edited by Annemarie Schimmel under the title Sīrat-i Abū ʿAbdullāh Ibn al-Ḥaṣīf as-Ṣīrāzī.36 Many fragments of a work by al-Daylami on the lives of scholars and Sufi masters—his mashyakha—and perhaps of other biographical works by him, have been cited in published biographical compilations.37 Another work, which is mentioned by al-Daylami himself in the ‘Atf, his Asrār al-maʿārif (The secrets of knowledge),38 has been lost.

Teachers and Sources

Ibn Khafif and al-Ḥallāj
Al-Daylami’s spiritual master in Shiraz, Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad b. Khafīf b. Iskafshadh?39 al-Shīrāzī (268/882?–371/982), although he is among the authorities most often cited in the ‘Atf, does not appear to have been the author’s single most important source for material on love. He may nevertheless be assumed to have had a profound influence on al-Daylami’s spiritual and intellectual development and thus also on the theoretical concerns reflected in his treatise on love and the selection of material it includes. More specifically, it seems that Ibn Khafīf himself

34 Tübingen, Ma VI 82.
35 See n. 5 and the Bibliography. Our edition, from which the present translation has been made, is forthcoming.
38 MS, p. 281. Sezgin (GAS, I, p. 664) mentions no such work. In addition to the works we have mentioned here, Ritter, in his introduction to the Mashāʾirīq anwār al-qulūb of Ibn al-Dabbāgh (p. 281), ascribes a Risālāt al-ʾaqīda as-ṣaḥīḥa to al-Daylami, but he does not name his source.
39 Various spellings of this name are given. The form we have adopted here is that given in the text of Qazvīnī’s edition of Junayd Shīrāzī’s Shadd al-īzār (p. 38). Cf. ibid., n. 1, and al-Sulamī, Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfīya (ed. Pedersen), p. 485, n. 3.
authored at least two short works as well as a tract on the subject of love, and there can be little doubt that one or more of these compositions, all now lost, influenced the content, if not necessarily the form, of the ʿAtf.

Partly because of his significance for studies on al-Ḥallāj, and partly because of his importance for the later history of mysticism in Shiraz and thus in the Persian- and Turkish-speaking world generally, Ibn Khaṭṭīf has attracted the attention of a number of western scholars. The most complete exposition of his life and teaching is now the study prepared by Florian Sobieroj in connection with his edition and translation of Ibn Khaṭṭīf’s \textit{Kitāb al-iqtisād}.\footnote{“Ibn Ḥaffīf aš-Širāzī un seine Schrift zur Novizenerziehung (Kitāb al-Iqtisād),” doctoral dissertation, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität zu Freiburg, Freiburg, 1992. The study has since been published in the series Beiruter Texte und Studien. Sobieroj’s study was not available to us at the time the main body of this introduction was being written. The few facts about Ibn Ḥaffīf for which we have made space here are therefore based in large part on Schimmel’s work. Later, however, Sobieroj kindly provided us with a copy of his dissertation, and we were thus able to make use of his work while revising our original draft.} Sobieroj’s valuable study adds significantly to the information collected earlier by Annemarie Schimmel in the introduction and copious appendix to her edition of al-Daylāmi’s biography of the mystic.\footnote{Earlier contributions to our knowledge of Ibn Khaṭṭīf are discussed in some detail by Schimmel in her introduction (pp. 3–5). Notable among these are the studies of Louis Massignon on al-Ḥallāj, which situate Ibn Khaṭṭīf primarily in the context of the prosecution of al-Ḥallāj for heresy, Fritz Meier’s introduction to his edition of the \textit{Vita} of the later Shirazi mystic Abū Ishāq al-Kāzarānī (d. 426/1035), and the edition with copious footnotes of \textit{Shadd al-izār} by Muḥammad Qazvīnī and ʿAbbās Ḥqāʾī. Schimmel also deals at length with other Oriental primary sources for the life and teaching of Ibn Khaṭṭīf (introd., pp. 5–12), many of which are reproduced in the appendix to her edition. Her introduction is given in both German and Turkish versions in the edition. There are some problems with Schimmel’s references to the places she has made use of in the sources, and our references may therefore not always agree with hers. The Persian text of al-Daylāmi’s biography of Ibn Khaṭṭīf, along with Schimmel’s introduction, has been translated into Arabic by Ibrāhīm al-Dusūqī Shītā (see the Bibliography), and there also exists an Iranian issue based on Schimmel’s edition that has not been available to us (\textit{Ṣīrat al-Shaykh al-Kabīr Abū ʿAbd Allāh ibn al-Khaṭṭīf al-Shirāzī}, ed. A. Shimīl-Tārī, \textit{bi-kāshish-i Tawfīq Subhānī}, Tehran: Intishārāt-i Bābak, 1363 [1984]). See also the article on Ibn Khaṭṭīf by Jean-Claude Vadet in \textit{EI2}, III, pp. 823a–24a, s.v. “Ibn Khaṭṭīf,” and the comments on the arguments presented there in Sobieroj, “Ibn Ḥaffīf aš-Širāzī,” pp. 25–26.}
If one accepts the information provided by al-Daylamī, Ibn Khafīfī was born in Shiraz in or not long after 268/882, when the Ṣaffārīd ʿAmr b. al-Layth of Sijistān occupied the city. Ibn Khafīfī’s father was a Daylāmite commander in the service of ʿAmr. Sometime during or after ʿAmr’s campaign to reoccupy Fārs he had brought his wife to Shiraz. Ibn Khafīfī’s roots thus lay in the Daylāmite warrior class that within his lifetime would come to dominate the central Islamic world. As we have already noted, the nisba of his disciple ʿAlī b. Muḥammad, the author of the Ṣafī, suggests that he descended from this same stock. Al-Hujwīrī’s Kashf and some other sources state that Ibn Khafīfī belonged to the “sons of kings” (abnā-yi mulūk) but that God granted him repentance and he forsook worldly concerns. According to Schimmel this allusion to the mystic’s exalted lineage reflects his Daylāmite origins. It can thus be reconciled, at least in part, with what Schimmel considers to be more reliable reports to the effect that Ibn Khafīfī’s family suffered considerable poverty during his childhood and that his ascetic tendencies—perhaps encouraged by his mother, who was from the pietistic Karrāmiya sect—were evident from a tender age. Whatever the age at which Ibn Khafīfī began to show his saintliness, it is in any event not unlikely that the mixed fortunes of his father’s master ʿAmr b. al-Layth, who lost control over Fārs in 274/887, influenced the material situation of his family when he was a child.

42 Most of al-Daylamī’s report is presented as Ibn Khafīfī’s own words. His source for the report, whom he considers trustworthy, adds that, according to Ibn Khafīfī’s mother, her son was eight months old when ʿAmr b. al-Layth returned to Khurasan (Ṣirāt, p. 9). Schimmel opts for 268/882 as the year of the mystic’s birth (ibid., intro., p. 13). The latest date that can conceivably be reconciled with al-Daylamī’s report is late 278/891–92 or 279/892–93, not long before ʿAmr, in Ramādān of the latter year, was invested for the third time with the governorship of Khurasan. Sobieroj, arguing that there are no established dates for Ibn Khafīfī’s contacts with his ḥadīth authorities prior to 298 and that the mystic is known to have begun his travels while he was young, regards 280 as the earliest likely year of birth (“Ibn Ḥaḍīfī as-Ṣīrāzī,” p. 221).


44 Ṣirāt, p. 9.


46 Cf. W. Barthold, Elī, I, pp. 452b–53a, s.v. “ʿAmr b. al-Layth.” ʿAmr succeeded his brother Yaʿqūb, the founder of the Ṣaffārīd dynasty, in 265/879. He was executed in Baghdad in 289/902, a year after having been defeated by the Sāmānid ʿIsā’il and sent in captivity to the Abbasid capital.
Ibn Khafif’s early education in mysticism took place in Shiraz under the guidance of the extravagant ecstatic Aḥmad b. Yahyā, whom he names as his first master. Aḥmad b. Yahyā and his associates practiced the spiritual concert (samā’), and Ibn Khafif was on occasion witness to some extraordinary things during these performances. Once having gone into a state of ecstasy (vajd, ḥālat), Aḥmad picked up some burning coals with his hands, drew his sleeves over them, and held them under his shirt until they went out. Afterwards, apparently unhurt, he went to the mosque and performed the prayer until morning. Another time, one of his fellow sheikhs who was in attendance had laughed with a follower of his at Aḥmad’s behavior when the singer began to sing. Aḥmad threw a candlestick at the man and knocked him unconscious. When the man came to himself, Aḥmad reprimanded him for not observing the etiquette required of dervishes. “I have seen many ecstacies,” al-Daylami quotes Ibn Khafif as saying, “but I have never seen anyone like him.”

In Shiraz Ibn Khafif unquestionably came in contact with authorities who exercised a more moderate influence, in particular traditionists with Hanbalite connections or under Hanbalite influence and students of the comparatively restrained mystic al-Junayd. The sheikh who seems to have been the most important among the latter was the illiterate Mu’ammil b. Muhammad al-Jaṣṣāṣ (d. 322/933-34). Mu’ammil, who incidentally is not cited in the ‘Aṭṭ, was a great admirer of the ecstatic Abū Yazīd al-Bistāmī, whose doctrine of intoxication (sukr) al-Hujwiri contrasts with al-Junayd’s stress on sobriety (ṣaḥw). Mu’ammil’s leanings are apparently reflected in Ibn Khafif’s own special attachment to mystics like al-Bistāmī and Shāh al-Kirmānī.

Also in Shiraz, Ibn Khafif had the opportunity to study law under the noted Shāfi‘ite jurist Abū l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad b. ʿUmar b. Surayj (d. 306/918-9 in Baghdad), who had been a student in mysticism of both al-Muḥājībī and al-Junayd. Ibn Surayj was judge in Shiraz from 296 or 297 to 301. According to Ibn Khafif, as cited by al-Daylami in the Sirat, he used his influence with the religious scholars of Shiraz, who before his

---

49 Ibid., pp. 133–34.
50 Ibid., pp. 68, 70, 138.
53 Ibid., p. 175.
coming had been contemptuous of the Sufi sheikhs of the city, to convince them to respect the mystics. The fact that Ibn Khāfīf studied under Ibn Surayj, along with other perhaps not entirely conclusive pieces of evidence, supports the statement of al-Sulami, recorded by Junayd Shīrāzī, that he was a follower of al-Shāfī′ī in jurisprudence.

Wishing to learn from the spiritual masters in other places, Ibn Khāfīf undertook a number of long journeys. Our information on his travels, however, is rather unsatisfactory. Reports given in some sources of trips to Egypt and Asia Minor are not confirmed in al-Daylami′s biography, while tales of trips to such distant places as Ceylon are almost certainly legends. More reliable, we may assume, is the information contained in the Sīrat. Ibn Khāfīf, as has been mentioned above, made the pilgrimage to Mecca at least four and possibly six or more times. On one of his trips—the story is told by the master himself—he had the misfortune of being arrested on suspicion of theft and would have lost his hand, had he not been recognized by the local ruler, who had earlier been in the service of his father.

While in Basra during the earlier part of his life he met the theologian Abū ʿl-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī (d. 324/935–367). The reports of their meeting differ somewhat. That in the Sīrat, which is attributed by al-Daylami to Ibn Khāfīf himself, asserts that it was al-Ashʿarī who first came up to Ibn Khāfīf with questions, although the latter likewise wished to hear the theologian. According to the reports related by al-Subkī, on the other hand, Ibn Khāfīf went to Basra specifically to meet al-Ashʿarī. Despite discrepancies of this kind, the upshot of the various reports is that Ibn Khāfīf came away from the meeting with a positive assessment of al-Ashʿarī. According to one tradition, when towards the very end of the mystic′s life the Ashʿarite theologian al-Bāqillānī was in Shiraz, he visited Ibn Khāfīf and found him teaching his disciples...

---

55 Cf. Shadd al-izār, p. 41. It is only in the later Shāfī′ite biographical literature, however, as Sobieroj has pointed out, that Ibn Khāfīf is listed among the followers of the Shāfī′ite school ("Ibn Ḥafīf aš-Šīrāzī," pp. 170–71).
57 Ibid., pp. 109–11; intro., p. 16.
from al-Ash'ari’s *Luma*.

Al-Daylamî devotes separate chapters in the *Sîrat* to the teachers Ibn Khafîf met in Mecca, those he met in Iraq, and those he met in Fârs. Of interest here are those whom al-Daylamî also names in his treatise on love. From the list given in the *Sîrat* of the teachers Ibn Khafîf met in Mecca, those cited or mentioned in the *’Aṯf* are Abû ‘Arîf al-Rûdhbâri, who is quoted three times, in each case for his verse; 60 Abî b. Muhammad al-Muṣayyin (the Barber), who despite his importance in the *Sîrat* is quoted only once in the *’Aṯf*, 61 and Abû Ya’qûb al-Aq̲aṭa, 62 the story of whose death al-Muṣayyin relates. 62 Also among the masters Ibn Khafîf met in Mecca was Abu Sa’dîd b. al-A’râbî, who, however, is not listed in the chapter in the *Sîrat* on Ibn Khafîf’s Meccan sheikhs. As we shall see later on, Abu Sa’dîd was among the chief sources used by al-Daylamî in the *’Aṯf*. 63 From the list of the teachers Ibn Khafîf met in Iraq, those cited in the *’Aṯf* include Abû Muḥammad Ruwaym, who according to Ibn Khafîf’s own words was his first master there, 64 Abû ‘Il-‘Abbās Aḥmad b. ‘Aṭā, 65 Abû Bakr al-Shibli, 66 and the controversial al-Ḥallâj, whose influence is particularly apparent in al-Daylamî’s treatise. The reports of Ibn Khafîf’s having met al-Junayd, also a major source for the *’Aṯf*, would seem to be incorrect. 67 None of Ibn Khafîf’s teachers

---


60 MS, pp. 70, 88, 143.

61 MS, pp. 296–97.

62 Ibn Khafîf says that Abû Ya’qûb al-Aq̲aṭa had a special affection for him and insisted that regardless where he might go during the day, he should spend the night with him (*Sîrat*, p. 74).

63 See below, pp. 1x–lxii and nn. 227–33.

64 Twice cited (MS, pp. 70, 87); see *Sîrat*, pp. 85–91, esp. p. 85. Sobieroj sees in Ruwaym rather than al-Ḥallâj the most significant spiritual master of Ibn Khafîf ("Ibn Ḥafīf aṣ-Ṣīrāzī," pp. 7, 46–48). Ibn Khafîf’s first teacher in mysticism, Ahmad b. Yahyâ, was a great admirer of Ruwaym, valuing his statements on mysticism above those of Junayd. Ibn Khafîf shared Ahmad b. Yahyâ’s high opinion of Ruwaym’s statements on esoteric knowledge (ibid., p. 46, citing *Sîrat* pp. 118, 134).

65 Twice cited (MS, pp. 87, 238); see *Sîrat*, pp. 91–93.

66 Cited three times (MS, pp. 38, 88, 142); see *Sîrat*, pp. 103–4.

67 Schimmel (*Sîrat*, intro., p. 16) considers it unlikely that Ibn Khafîf actually met al-Junayd, despite reports to the effect that he did meet him (e. g., *Shadd al-izār*, p. 41) and is said to have argued with him—an apparent anachronism—about the merits of al-Ḥallâj (*Akhbâr al-Ḥallâj* [1936], no. 61, Arabic, p. 92,
listed in the chapter on his sheikhs in Fārs is cited in the ‘Atf.

Ruwaym, Ahmad b. ʿAṭāʾ, and al-Junayd were held in particularly high esteem by Ibn Khafīf. According to al-Daylāmī they were among the five spiritual masters who Ibn Khafīf recommended should be chosen as models. The other two were al-Junayd’s teacher al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī and ʿAmr b. ʿUthmān al-Makkī. These five combined canonical knowledge (ʿilm) and esoteric truth (ḥaqīqāt). Other teachers had at times uttered in moments of engulfment (istighrāq) things that were not in accordance with divine law (sharʿ) and that they regretted when they came back to themselves.68 Of the five masters Ibn Khafīf singled out as models, it is al-Junayd and ʿAmr b. ʿUthmān al-Makkī who are of special importance in al-Daylāmī’s treatise on love.

The Teachings of Ibn Khafīf

The doctrines that pervade al-Daylāmī’s treatise on love may to a considerable degree reflect the views of Ibn Khafīf or developments of positions towards which he was tending. The text of the ‘Atf should of course be allowed to speak for itself, but in the virtual absence of external evidence concerning the author’s own opinions, it is first to the teachings of Ibn Khafīf that one must turn to ascertain the dogmatic context within which al-Daylāmī’s work was produced. Sobieroj has made a thorough study of the sources we have for Ibn Khafīf’s mystical doctrine and has likewise given a useful assessment of his attitude towards political authority and his stance on theological issues.69 Schimmel, earlier, in the introduction to her edition of the Sīrat, pieced together an outline of Ibn Khafīf’s doctrine and practice based on the two short works by him she edits in the appendix to the edition—his Waṣḥat al-shaykh Ibn al-Khafīf (Sīrat, pp. 274–83) and his Muʿtaqad al-shaykh Ibn al-Khafīf (Sīrat, pp. 284–308)—as well as on a considerable number of reports gathered from other sources.70 For the most part we rely here on

French, p. 99 and n. 2). Sobieroj likewise argues that Ibn Khafīf did not actually meet al-Junayd, the main evidence being a report according to which Ibn Khafīf asked Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Bundār al-Ṣayrafī to precede him because he had met al-Junayd whereas Ibn Khafīf had not (ʿIbn Ḥafīf aš-Ṣirāzī,” p. 43; al-Sulāmī, Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfīya [Pedersen], p. 535).


70 Waṣḥat al-shaykh Ibn al-Khafīf (Sīrat, pp. 274–83) and Muʿtaqad al-shaykh Ibn al-Khafīf (Sīrat, pp. 284–308).

71 Sīrat, intro., pp. 25–46.
the studies of Sobieroj and Schimmel. We depend somewhat more on Schimmel’s earlier work and the materials she cites, since this introduction was largely complete before Sobieroj’s study became available to us. Sobieroj’s most significant addition to Schimmel’s material is his edition and translation of Ibn Khafif’s Kitāb al-iqtisād, but he has also found important citations of the mystic in other sources, in particular a long excerpt from his Kitāb al-i’tiqād, also referred to as Kitāb al-mu‘aqad al-ka'bīr (Major creed), recorded by the Ḥanbalite Ibn Taymiyya (d. 728/1328).72

Imamate. On the imamate Ibn Khafif gives in his Minor Creed the standard Sunnī position. One must believe that the best of mankind since the Prophet’s death have been the first four caliphs, in order—Abū Bakr, then ‘Umar, then ‘Uthmān, and then ‘Alī.73 However Ibn Khafif seems to have retained remnants of pro-Alid sentiment similar to those we find in al-Daylāmī’s ‘Aṣīf. In the Sīrat he relates the story of a dream a certain Muḥammad Ishāq74 had after the death ofĀḥmad b. Ḥanbal. The man, having fallen asleep while worrying about a possible resurgence of heresy, beheld Ibn Ḥanbal strutting by in a pair of golden slippers. He asked the imam what God had done with him, and Ibn Ḥanbal answered that God had given him the golden slippers and a crown because he had held that the Koran was God’s speech and that it was eternal (qadīm) and uncreated (nā-afarīda). He added, however, that God had reprimanded him for relating traditions from a certain ‘Uthmān (apparently reflecting the name ofHarīz b. ‘Uthmān al-Ḥimsī [d. 163/779–80] in an earlier version of the story).75 When Ibn Ḥanbal had answered that this ‘Uthmān was a

72 See n. 156.
74 See n. 76.
75 Cf. al-Tanūkhī, Nishwār al-muhādara, VIII, p. 109, where in a different, apparently earlier version of this story, the name Harīz b. ‘Uthmān is corrupted to ‘Uthmān b. Jarīr. In this version it is Yazīd b. Hārūn (d. 206/821) rather than Āḥmad b. Ḥanbal who appears in the dream. Ibn ‘Adī (277/890–365/976) and Ibn Ḥajar relate an abbreviated version of the story about Yazīd b. Hārūn in their notices on Harīz b. ‘Uthmān (Ibn ‘Adī, al-Kāmil fī ḥu‘aṣī al-rījāl, II, p. 857; Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdhib al-Tahdhib, II, p. 239). Harīz was noted for his dislike of ‘Ālf. Āḥmad b. Ḥanbal is reported to have praised Harīz and to have said that he was a reliable authority (thiqa) in hadīth, although he is likewise said to have taken exception to his attacks on ‘Alī (Kāmil, II, p. 857; Tahdhib, II, pp. 238–39). According to al-Khaṭṭāb al-Baghdādī, the story of Yazīd b. Hārūn’s telling in
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A reliable authority in hadith, God had said: “That he was, but he was an enemy of ‘Ali b. Abī Ṭālib, upon whom be peace. Didst thou not know that any enemy of his is an enemy of mine?”76

Theology. In his Spiritual Testament Ibn Khafīf defines his conservative theological position by specifying its adversaries. His disciples are advised to avoid religious discussions with extreme free-willers (qadarfya), extreme predestinarians (jabarfya, jabrīya), Mu’tazilites, and radical Shiites (rāfīda).77 In his Major Creed, according to the text cited by Ibn Taymiya, he repeats conservative scripturalist doctrine in the traditional style: God is seated upon his throne, the Koran is his uncreated speech, believers will see him at the Resurrection, the acts of men are brought about by his omnipotence rather than their free will, all spirits

a dream that God had rebuked him for narrating tradition from Ḥarīḍ (the text has the graphically similar “Jarīr”) was related in the presence of Ahmad b. Hanbal (Ta’rīkh Bagdād, XIV, pp. 346–47; cf. Ibn Abī Ya’lā, Ṭabaqāt al-Hanābīlā, I, p. 167, which has “Hurayz”). Al-Tanūkhī’s version is a combination of this and a subsequent story recounted by al-Khaṭīb. We are indebted to Wilferd Madelung for calling our attention to the identity of the “Uthmān” referred to in al-Daylami’s version of the dream story and to the sources we have cited here. Sobieroj, using different sources, arrives at the same conclusion regarding the identity of the “Uthmān” referred to in the Sīrat (“Ibn Ḥaḍīf as-Sīrat,” pp. 85–87).

76 Sīrat, pp. 169–70; cf. Schimmel, intro., p. 26. The wording here seems too strong to be merely a reflection of the typical orthodox opposition to ḥaqqīf (stopping after naming the first three caliphs and giving no opinion on ‘Abī), although this may be the issue Ibn Khafīf was addressing. See Ibn Baṭṭā, al-Sharḥ wa-t-ibāna, French, p. 115, n. 2. The story is related to Ibn Khafīf by an Abū l-Qāsim, presumably Abū l-Qāsim al-Qāsīrī as suggested by Sobieroj (“Ibn Ḥaḍīf as-Sīrat,” pp. 85–87), about a Muḥammad Ishāq Kh-z-y-m? Iskandarānī, whom Sobieroj identifies with Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. Ishāq b. Khuzayma al-Sulāmī al-Nisābūrī, who died in 311/923–24 (ibid., pp. 86–87, citing Ibn al-Jawzī, Manāqīb Ahmad b. Hanbal [1349/1930], p. 439; cf. Sezgin, G4S, I, p. 601.) Cf. the report of a Muḥammad b. Ishāq in the first tabaqā of Ḥanbalītes, who related a vision of the Day of Resurrection in which he was asked by God what he believed about the Koran. “It is thy speech, O Lord of the Worlds,” he had replied, citing Ibn Hanbal as his authority. (The report goes on to make the point that it is God himself—through Gabriel to the Prophet—who is the ultimate authority for the doctrine that the Koran is God’s speech.) See Ṭabaqāt al-Hanābīlā, I, pp. 270–71. Al-Daylami’s story seems to combine elements of this story with that discussed in the preceding footnote.

77 Waṣḥīya, in Sīrat, p. 279. The Arabic words are in the singular in the text.
are created beings.78 Again the statements contained in his Minor Creed leave little doubt that what he is advocating is a moderate form of traditionalist Sunnism. But in this work, which conceivably dates from a later period than the Major Creed,79 Ibn Khafîf’s teaching is expressed in a language that reveals the influence of the speculative method of al-Ash’âri or early Ash’arism.80 Muslim creeds like those of Ibn Khafîf were written in such a way as to exclude a patchwork of doctrines considered heretical by their authors. The creeds of Ibn Khafîf admit only those beliefs that are associated with the scripturalists, the ahl al-sunna, of whom the stricter Hanbalites are often considered paradigmatic.

But it was these very same beliefs that the theologian al-Ash’ârî was attempting to defend. After his conversion from Mu’tazilism, said to have taken place in 300/912–13, theology had become for al-Ash’âri a means of upholding the dogma of scripturalist Islam. It was thus not his doctrine as such, but his language and mode of argumentation, that led the militant Hanbalite al-Hasan b. ‘Alî al-Barbahârî (d. 329/941) to condemn his teaching and to reject his Kitâb al-ibâna, which the theologian is said to have written to placate him.81 Al-Ash’âri’s reply to al-Barbahârî and his followers came in his Risâla fi istihsân al-khawj fi ‘ilm al-kalâm (On the endorsement of engaging in speculative theology).82 Postulating opponents who accepted the doctrine of the uncreated Koran, by whom he surely intended the Hanbalites, he argued that Ahmad b. Ḥanbal and the early ‘ulama’, when they affirmed the doctrine of the uncreated Koran, were themselves making use of the methods of specu-

78 Ibn Taymîya, al-Fatwâ al-Ḥamawîya al-kubrâ, pp. 45–46, 49. For a succinct review of the scripturalist doctrine that all spirits (arwâh) are created (as represented by ‘Abd al-Qâhir al-Baghdâdî and Ibn Qayyîm al-Jawzîya), as well as some opposing views, cf. E. E. Calverley, EP2, VII, p. 881â–82b, s.v. “Nafs.”

79 See pp. xlvi–xlviii and n. 159 below.

80 Sobieroj points out not only that Ibn Khafîf taught al-Ash’ârî’s Luma‘ but also that he gave a personal welcome to the Ash’arite theologian al-Bâqillâni when he visited Shiraz in 370 or 371 (980–82) (“Ibn Ḥafîf aš-Šîrâzî,” pp. 161–62). Sobieroj hesitates, however, to see in Ibn Khafîf a representative of an Ash’arite rationalism, in part because his documented contacts with Hanbalites and other scripturalists far outnumber his Ash’arite contacts and in part on the basis of his writings (ibid., pp. 214–18, esp. pp. 217–18).


lative theology. Al-Ashʿarī, who had included in his Maqālāt al-Islāmīyīn a creed of Ḥanbalite type, to which he appended a statement that he subscribed to the beliefs set forth in it, was attempting in his defense of theology to influence the form rather than the content of scripturalist teaching. Despite deep differences over method and terminology, and a correspondingly different range of concerns, the true doctrinal rift between Ḥanbalism and Ashʿarism, which was never intended by al-Ashʿarī himself, can hardly have developed before Ibn Khafīf and the theologian met. In situating Ibn Khafīf’s Minor Creed in the context of the religious polemics of his age, therefore, the vocabulary and style of the creed and the nature of the concerns it reflects can be as important as the doctrines it asserts.

Ibn Khafīf’s Minor Creed, while setting forth essentially the same articles of belief as the creeds of conservative Ḥanbalites like al-Barbahārī and Ibn Baṭṭa (d. 387/997), indeed at times using precisely the same traditional wording, is none the less different in tone and terminology. (It also differs from his own Major Creed in these respects.) The Ḥanbalites would not have had much trouble with Ibn Khafīf’s declaration in the Minor Creed that the believer is to accept all the divine attributes affirmed by the Koran, the sayings of the Prophet, and the consensus of believers without trying to interpret them. But there is much in this creed that does not remind the reader of al-Barbahārī and Ibn Baṭṭa. Thus, when in the Minor Creed it is affirmed that God is knowing, this means, according to Ibn Khafīf, that he knows with an attribute (ṣifā) of knowledge. Likewise when God is said to be mighty, it means he is mighty by an attribute of might. While the word ṣifā itself is used by

---

85 For example the sentence Al-ʾīmān gawīl wa-ʿamal wa-nīya, yazīd wa-yamanṣ (Faith consists in speech, deeds, and intentions; it increases and decreases). Cf. Muʿtaqad, in Sīrat, p. 297; al-Barbahārī, Sharḥ kitāb al-sunna, extract in Ibn Abī Yaʿlā, Tabaqāt al-Hanābila, II, p. 20; and al-Ashʿarī, Maqālāt, I, p. 293. The words are based on a definition of faith given by Ahmad b. Hanbal (Ibn Baṭṭa, al-Sharḥ wa-l-ibāna, p. 78, n. 1), which is in turn based on sayings attributed to the Prophet (cf. Wensinck, Concordance, I, p. 109b; al-Muttaqī al-Hindi, Kanz al-ʾummāl, I, p. 9, hadīth no. 422; Zaghūl, Mawsīʿat aṭrāf al-hadīth, IV, p. 224a).
86 Muʿtaqad, in Sīrat, pp. 288–90.
87 Ibid.
al-Barbahârî and Ibn Baṭṭa, they do not go into the relationship between descriptive verbs, participles, or adjectives and the names of God’s attributes when listing examples of them. They content themselves instead with minimal statements or direct quotations from the Koran. Thus Ibn Baṭṭa writes, “God is living, speaking, hearing, seeing, ‘he knows the secret and that which is yet more hidden,’ 88 ... he closes and opens [his hand],”89 he takes and gives, he is on his throne.”90

Equally alien to the creeds of the early Hanbalites is Ibn Khaffî’s preoccupation with a number of other theological subtleties. God is a thing, but he is not like other things. An attribute is not the same as the thing it qualifies, but rather something inherent in it. When God is said to have created Adam with his hand, the word hand is not a symbol for the power to create but refers to an attribute. God’s descending to the heaven of this world is to be understood as an attribute rather than as movement.91 In the Ash’arîte defense of the “traditional” attributes of God, those affirmed by tradition rather than by reason, God’s having a hand, or hands,92 and his descent to this world are two of the attributes on which the argument focuses.93 In a summary confession of faith like Ibn Khaffî’s Minor Creed it is sufficient to point out that such anthropomorphic properties or acts are to be ascribed to God only as attributes (ṣīfāt), any suggestion of a comparison (tashbîḥ) with creatures being excluded by the use of this carefully defined technical term. Al-Barbahârî, on the other hand, had asserted more bluntly that merely to discuss (al-kalâm fī) the Lord is innovation and error, and that to ask how (kayfa) or why (li-—

88 Koran 20:7. Our translation, based on Arberry.
89 Cf. Koran 2:245.
91 Mu’taqqad, in Sīrat, pp. 288–90.
92 Cf., e.g., Koran 5:64.
ma) with respect to the divine attributes is to doubt God himself.94

Another aspect in which Ibn Khafif’s Minor Creed differs from the creeds of the Ḥanbalites can be seen in the mystic’s treatment of human accountability and the care he takes to stress that man’s ‘‘acquisition’’ (iktisāb) of responsibility for his acts is God’s creation (khalq), not man’s. On the question of human responsibility, the mystic follows the fine line of Ash’arite acquisition (kasb) between the doctrines of free will and predestination. All human acts are willed by God. Sins, however, although willed by God (bi-murādhi), are not in accordance with his good pleasure (ridā).95 God being the creator of all acts, it is only the ‘‘acquisition’’ of them in the moral sense that belongs to man. But also this acquisition is God’s creation, not man’s.96 Ibn Khafif’s apology here is meant to support rather than to assail the scripturalist-Ḥanbalite doctrine of the divine omnipotence (qadar), which allows little effective room for human will or creative power.97 It is aimed against Mu‘tazilite notions of free will,98 and in its insistence on God’s being the ‘‘creator’’ of man’s acquisition of moral responsibility for his acts it would seem to be directed at al-Jubbārī (d. 303/915–16) in particular.99 But the concerns and the language of Ibn Khafif are other than those of the strict Ḥanbalites, who are uninterested in the lexicographical details of how moral responsibility is acquired. When Ibn Batta, for example, speaks of ‘‘acquisition’’ or kasb, he is using the term in the everyday sense of ‘‘earning a living,’’ in which meaning the word is also common in doctrinal literature.100

95 Mu‘tāqad, in Sirat, p. 290.
96 Ibid., p. 292. The corollary view that it is not reason but only divine law that determines which acts are good and which reprehensible is also affirmed in the Mu‘tāqad (ibid., p. 302).
97 Cf. Ibn Batta, al-Sharḥ wa-l-ibāna, Arabic, pp. 52–53, French, pp. 90–93, especially Laoust’s notes.
99 The majority of the Mu‘tazilites did not admit that man could properly be spoken of as ‘‘creating.’’ On al-Jubbārī, see L. Gardet in EF, II, pp. 569b–70b, s.v. ‘‘al-Djubbārī, Abū ʿAlī Muhammad b. ‘Abd al-Wahhab.’’ For an example of al-Jubbārī’s view of man as ‘‘creator,’’ see al-Ash’arī, Maqālāt, I, p. 195.
100 Al-Sharḥ wa-l-ibāna, Arabic, p. 88, French, pp. 160–61. Al-Barbahārī’s creed mentions acquisition (iktisāb) of intellect, the possibility of which it denies, saying that each person is born with that portion of intellect God has
Aspects of mystical doctrine. In his mystical doctrine Ibn Khāfif acknowledged the subordination of mysticism to revealed religion. This is inferred by his affirmation in the Minor Creed that the rank of prophet is higher than that of saint and that prophethood cannot be attained through deeds. But submission to the revealed law must be balanced by a commitment to spiritual or esoteric reality. While Ibn Khāfif’s Sufism places particular stress on asceticism, fasting, and frequent prayer, as Schimmel has pointed out, the Minor Creed makes it clear that Sufism is attainable neither by works nor through exoteric knowledge. It is not the same as spiritual poverty or asceticism (faqr), nor is it to be equated with piety (taqwā). The world of the mystic is another. He “may be transported through the various states (a‘twiil) until he reaches a degree of spirituality that allows him to see the unknown, to cover great distances in a single step, to walk upon water, and to disappear from people’s view.”

Along the path await perilous states such as spiritual intoxication (sukr), which may be tolerated in a novice (murīd) but is beneath the level of the spiritually advanced. Sobriety and clarity of mind (sahw) are to be preferred to intoxication. Ecstasy (wajd) is a higher state than the intoxication of the novices. The true ecstatic is preserved from unbelief and depravity when he is in this state, though he may not always observe the obligations of the religious law (wiṣābi). When he comes to himself, he will return to their observance, but if he remains in his ec-
Two methods adopted by a number of mystics for inducing ecstasy were listening to music—the “spiritual concert” (samā‘)—and gazing at a beautiful object (naṣṣar), on occasion among some controversial mystics a comely, still beardless youth. The two methods could in practice be combined into one by engaging a good-looking singer. Ibn Khafṣ speaks out strongly against the spiritual concert in his Major Creed, and he censures gazing by implication in the same work when he affirms that God does not indwell in visible things. He likewise protests indignantly against an assertion he attributes to al-Ṭabarî to the effect that Sufis in general claim it is possible to see God in this world. Even if one assumes that the Major Creed is an early work and represents a somewhat more conservative position than Ibn Khafṣ held in his later years, there is nothing in the mystic’s other extant writings to suggest that he substantially altered his view on these two questions.

Ibn Khafṣ had been introduced to the spiritual concert in the circle of his first master, Ahmad b. Yahyā, and had thus been aware of its dangers from his youth. He continued to be witness to the perils of the practice throughout his life. A friend of his with ecstatic tendencies, Abū Bakr Ushnānī, fell off a roof and was killed while in a state of ecstasy brought on by listening to a singer with a pretty face and an exceedingly beautiful voice. It is worth noting that Ibn Khafṣ reportedly pretended not to know that the concert at which this happened was to take place and purposely stayed away. Again, the premature death of his student al-Bayṭār, while recovering from an illness in 363/974, was apparently the result of a relapse brought on by the excitement he had experienced on hearing a singer. Ibn Khafṣ had presumably formed his opinion on the practice long before these casualties occurred. The text of the Minor Creed, in any event, reflects an assessment of the spiritual concert that may well be

---

105 Mu‘taqad, in Sīrat, p. 306.
107 Sīrat, pp. 157, 109, intro., p. 43. The addition cited by Schimmel to the effect that Ibn Ḥaṣṣ later had the singer repeat the verses he had sung and himself went into a trance for (four) days and thus knew nothing of Ushnānī’s burial is not from al-Daylamī’s biography but is based on al-Anṣārī’s Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya and Jāmi’s Nafahāt al-uns, which are later sources (Sīrat, p. 157n).
109 One of Ibn Ḥaṣṣ’s teachers, Abū Ẓ-ul-Husayn al-Darraj, died during a spiritual concert in 320/932, but this was most likely also after Ibn Ḥaṣṣ had formed his opinion on the practice. See Sobieroj, “Ibn Ḥaṣṣ aš-Šīrāzī,” pp. 61, 153.
Introduction

Based on the author’s experience. The practice is allowable for the spiritually advanced, but it is wrong for novices. Because of its many hazards, it should best be avoided altogether. \footnote{Mu’taqad, in Sīrat, p. 306. Cf. Sobieroj, “Ibn Ḥaḍīf aš-Šīrāzī,” pp. 153–54, for a more detailed exposition of this view of Ibn Khafīf’s on samā’.

Regarding Ibn Khafīf’s opinion of the practice of gazing we are less well informed, but it is unlikely that he was more lenient towards it than towards the spiritual concert. He warns novices to avoid “looking at (al-nazar ilā) those who deck themselves out, pretending to be dervishes and wearing patched robes, those beggars who refuse to work and make a profession of dancing and capering like catamites.” \footnote{Kitāb al-iqtisād, section 38, in Sobieroj, “Ibn Ḥaḍīf aš-Šīrāzī,” Arabic, p. 32, German, p. 336. Our translation here is somewhat freer than Sobieroj’s. A similar stricture against attending gatherings at which there is dancing is found in section 39, Arabic, p. 33, German, p. 338. Both passages are cited by Sobieroj in his discussion of samā’ (see preceding note). The various references recorded by Sobieroj in his discussion of Ibn Khafīf’s teachers to associating with or looking at young boys and to seeing God in this life are not sufficient to give a complete picture of the mystic’s opinion on gazing. In any event, they do not point in a different direction than the information cited here. Cf. “Ibn Ḥaḍīf aš-Šīrāzī,” pp. 63 (Darrāj), 68 (Mu’ammi), 71 (Hishām b. ʿAbbān), and 90 (Abū ʾl-ʿAdyān).} This warning, very likely, although not necessarily, reflects disapproval of most or all forms of ritual gazing and dancing. It is essentially the view expressed in the Major Creed. If any contradiction or paradox is to be found, it is not in the teaching of Ibn Khafīf, but in the extent to which the spiritual concert, dancing, and perhaps gazing seem to have gone on in circles fairly close to the spiritual master of Shiraz, and in the sophistication with which one of his disciples set forth a theory that may be related to the last of these practices.

That we do not know more about al-Daylarn’s reaction to the recorded views of Ibn Khafīf on gazing is unfortunate, as chapter twenty of al-Daylarn’s treatise on love, on the meaning of the word shāhid (“witness,” contextually: “token of the divine beauty”) constitutes one of the most important theoretical passages on the question of the contemplation of divine beauty through physical manifestation that have come down to us. Al-Daylarn does not explicitly link his thoughts in this chapter to the mystical practice of gazing, and it is possible that the primary reason he included the chapter in the Ḍaf, despite its coming near the end of the work, was to complement the theory of beauty he outlines in chapter three as an introduction to his observations on love. On the other hand,
al-Daylami’s silence regarding the context of his remarks concerning the word *shahid* may possibly be explained by the rigor of the attacks against mystical gazing. These often involved accusations of pederasty, suspicions of which the practice of gazing at beardless youths inevitably aroused.\(^\text{112}\) It is difficult to escape the conclusion that al-Daylami was aware of the relevance of his remarks to the practice, although it is unlikely that it was allowed in the immediate entourage of his master Ibn Khafif. There can be no doubt, in any event, that al-Daylami in principle approved the contemplation of beauty as a means to spiritual advancement. He makes this clear in chapter three of the *Mufaddal*:

> Since the lover, on the other hand, is a perceiver of beauty, [loving] according to the proper conditions of love as we have mentioned, namely the avoidance of vitiating accidents, he is also one who draws lessons from the evidence God has shown forth in this world. And one who draws such lessons is unanimously praised by the Book, the Sunna, and the consensus of the community. Let this be understood.\(^\text{113}\)

According to both of Ibn Khafif’s creeds, and in agreement with the standard doctrine of the Ḥanbalite scripturalists and that of al-Ashʿarī, believers will see God on the Day of Resurrection, but in this life the beatific vision does not occur.\(^\text{114}\) While the **Major Creed** states that God cannot be seen with men’s eyes in this world and that he does not indwell (*yaḥūl*) in visible beings,\(^\text{115}\) the **Minor Creed** stresses that nothing in the world of contingency can serve as a locus (*muḥāl*) for God’s indwelling. “He does not indwell (*lā ḥāl*) in things, nor do things indwell in him. He does not manifest himself in any thing, nor has he veiled himself in contingent being.”\(^\text{116}\) The reference, as Ibn Khafif’s use of the words *yaḥūl*, *maḥāl*, and *ḥāl* indicate, is to the doctrines that go

\(\text{\textsuperscript{112}}\) See chapter twenty, n. 1.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{113}}\) MS, pp. 27–28.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{115}}\) Ibn Taymiyya, *al-Fatwā al-Ḥamawiyya al-kubrā*, p. 47.
\(\text{\textsuperscript{116}}\) *Muṭṭaqad*, in *Ṣirat*, pp. 286.
under the name *ḥulūl*, namely, the Christian doctrine of incarnation and the views of some Muslim mystics on divine indwelling or substantial union with God. Thus, although neither the Minor Creed nor the Major Creed takes up the question of gazing directly, neither leaves room for a theory of the practice that asserts the possibility of a substantial manifestation of the divine in the object of contemplation.

On the other hand, there is no reason to assume that Ibn Khafīf opposed the contemplation of the beautiful as a reminder of the divine. Schimmel mentions as evidence for the sheikh’s view on looking or gazing his statement that the spirit takes pleasure in three things: a sweet smell, a beautiful voice, and looking (*naẓar*).\(^{117}\) Alone this pronouncement may not be of much help, and in any case it cannot be taken to mean that Ibn Khafīf allowed looking at beloved persons other than those normally permitted (wives, concubines, immediate family). But we know that al-Daylamī himself made use of the same theme when describing the exclusive remembrance of the beloved that is a sign of man’s love for God:

Moreover, a lover does not perceive with his senses anything other than his beloved when he is together with him and unencumbered by division, for he himself has become his beloved in togetherness. Thus, if he sees something beautiful, it becomes one of the beloved’s visible signs, if he hears something pleasant, it becomes a report about him, and if he smells something fragrant, it becomes a trace of him.\(^{118}\)

Going further with the idea of the “trace” (*āthar*) of the divine revealed in the beautiful, al-Daylamī, in his chapter on the meaning of the word *shāhid*, approaches the limits set by his master’s creeds, but stays well within them. His boldest statements regarding the “tokens of divine beauty” are that “the beauty that a work acquires through the skill of its maker is something from the artisan himself, . . . something he has given it,” and that “when you see in something a manifest beauty, this tells you . . . that it has been present at the scene of the universal beauty and has acquired from it a clear trace.”\(^{119}\)

The word *ḥulūl* was often used more or less synonymously with *ittiḥād*, the more specific term for mystical union.\(^{120}\) What was meant by words like these and how they were to be used was a highly sensitive issue in mystical circles. One of the most damaging accusations against
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\(^{117}\) Cf. *Ṣirat*, p. 214, intro., p. 31.

\(^{118}\) MS, p. 207.

\(^{119}\) MS, pp. 231, 233. Emphasis here ours.

\(^{120}\) See L. Massiғnon/G. C. Anawati in *EJ²*, III, pp. 570b–71b, s.v. “Ḥulūl.”
al-Ḥallāj had been that he had claimed substantial union with the godhead. Ibn Khafif insists on the absolute transcendence of God, and it is in this context that he denies the possibility of the divine inhabiting any created form. Textual evidence to suggest that it was he who influenced his disciple al-Daylami to preserve and to some extent to incorporate the ideas of al-Ḥallāj on love, the \textit{via unitiva}, is lacking. We have a report in which Ibn Khafif is said to have defined another term for union, \textit{wuṣla}, as “being joined together (\textit{ittaṣala}) with the beloved to the exclusion of all else and forsaking everything but him.”\textsuperscript{121} But the noun \textit{wuṣla} and the verb \textit{ittaṣala} do not imply union of natures or indwelling. For the equivocal terms \textit{ittahada} and \textit{ittiḥād}, which can denote either of these two meanings or can simply mean the same as \textit{wuṣla} and \textit{ittasala},\textsuperscript{122} we know of no definition ascribed to Ibn Khafif. In any event, the hypothesis that he might have given a favorable definition of \textit{ittiḥād} is difficult to reconcile with the other texts we have from him. Al-Daylami, notwithstanding the considerable influence of al-Ḥallāj on his thought, is presumably giving utterance to the view of Ibn Khafif on union when he denounces in the \textit{Af} those who express the culmination of mystical experience as an identity of natures.\textsuperscript{123}

\textit{Views of Ibn Khafif in the Sources}

Despite his apparent sympathy for al-Ḥallāj, Ibn Khafif is usually described in both primary and secondary sources as an orthodox mystic faithful to the revealed law.\textsuperscript{124} The precepts set forth in his two creeds tally with this description, and while we have made only a cursory examination of the reports in the \textit{Sīrat}, there is nothing in al-Daylami’s \textit{Af} \textit{al-alif} to suggest the image is false. For the record, however, it should be noted that there were some who did not share the general view of Ibn Khafif as a staunch advocate of orthodox practice.

While the noted Ḥanbalite scholar Ibn Taymiya, as we have seen, elected to cite the mystic in support of his conservative views,\textsuperscript{125} the ear-

\textsuperscript{121} \textit{Sīrat}, intro., p. 30, appendix, p. 273, citing al-Subkī (\textit{Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿīyya}, II, p. 154) and others.

\textsuperscript{122} See R. Nicholson/G. C. Anawati in \textit{EI} \textsuperscript{2}, IV, pp. 282b–83b, s.v. “\textit{ittiḥād}.”

\textsuperscript{123} MS, p. 108: “This group says, ‘We are God, and God is we.’ But God is far too exalted and glorious for this to be the case.” The concluding comment may be part of a longer quotation from Abū Saʿīd b. al-Ārābī, but al-Daylami could have suppressed it had he wished.

\textsuperscript{124} See, for example, the remarks by his elder contemporary Jaʿfar al-Khuldī (ca. 252/866–348/959) (\textit{Shadd al-izār}, p. 39); also Sezgin, \textit{GAS}, I, p. 663.

\textsuperscript{125} See pp. xxx–xxxii and n. 78 above.
lier Ḥanbalite Ibn al-Jawzī (510/1126–597/1200), who was the author of one of the major sources of biographical information on Muslim mystics, was among those who doubted Ibn Khafīf’s orthodox credentials. “Ibn Khafīf is not a trustworthy narrator,” he asserts, commenting in his Talbīs Ibnīs on what he considers a suspect report that has Ibn Khafīf in its chain of narrators. Further on in the same work he quotes a report from the judge Abū ʿAlī al-Muḥassīn b. ʿAlī al-Tanūkhī (329/940–384/994) in which Ibn Khafīf is accused of sanctioning orgies among his followers. The report, which Ibn al-Jawzī says is confirmed by an isnād going back to the judge through his son, is found in virtually identical form in al-Tanūkhī’s Nishwār al-muḥādara. The judge had it from a number of scholarly sources that in Shiraz the master of the Sufis was a shrewd and clever man known as Ibn Khafīf al-Baghdādī. His circle was attended by thousands, and he had enticed many into the Sufi sect. The following was told of him:

A certain man among them, who was one of his companions, died, leaving behind him a wife who was also a Sufi. The Sufi women, of whom there were a great many, met together, and no one except them attended their funeral ceremony. When they had finished burying the man, Ibn Khafīf and the elite among his companions, who were many in number, came into the house and began to give their condolences to the woman after the manner of the Sufis. At length she said, “I am consoled.” Ibn Khafīf then said to her, “Is there anyone else here?” “No one else,” she answered. Whereupon he said, “Why should we burden our souls with the plague of sorrow and torment them with the pain of care? Why should we not mingle, so that lights may come together and spirits may be serene, so that [God’s] recompense may occur and his blessings descend.” [The narrator] continued: The women said, “If you wish.” [The narrator] said: So the men mixed with the women the entire night and left just before dawn.

Al-Tanūkhī interpreted Ibn Khafīf’s question “Is there anyone else here?” to mean: Is there anyone here who is not in agreement with our sect? The term “mingle” (imtīzāj), which along with the word “lights” (anwār) is an obvious play on Sufi vocabulary, he took to denote copulation. “[God’s] recompense” he understood as referring to surrogates for the women’s departed or absent husbands.

Allegations of sexual immorality are a commonplace in the polemical literature against Sufism. Al-Tanūkhī, possibly with this fact in mind, states that he would not have related the report of such an enormity had

126 Talbīs Ibnīs, p. 334.
127 Ibid., pp. 369–70.
his informants not been people whose word in his opinion was beyond suspicion. (Since this remark is itself a commonplace, the judge’s documentation is of course left open to the same suspicion as his charge.) Al-Tanūkhī adds that the incident mentioned in the report, as well as similar things, had become such common knowledge in Shiraz that the Buwayhid ruler, ʿAḍūd al-Dawla, had had a group of Ibn Khafīf’s followers arrested and flogged, after which they had desisted.

Without trying to unravel truth from falsehood in al-Tanūkhī’s accusation, we can at least infer the likelihood of some troubles between Ibn Khafīf’s followers in Shiraz and the authorities. Al-Tanūkhī, who was a contemporary of al-Daylāmī, was well positioned to know what was happening in Fārs. He was close to ʿAḍūd al-Dawla (d. 372/983), who had inherited the rule of Fārs in 338/944 from his father Rukn al-Dawla (al-Ḥasan) and had also gained control of Iraq by 366/977. Although the relationship was not without turbulence, al-Tanūkhī seems to have spent much time in the company of the Buwayhid prince, and he served as a go-between between him and the caliph al-Ṭāʾī in the matter of the latter’s marriage with ʿAḍūd al-Dawla’s daughter. This task involved a trip to Shiraz in 369/979, about two years before the death of Ibn Khafīf. Sobieroj suggests that the troubles to which al-Tanūkhī refers between the Sufis of Shiraz and the authorities occurred in the context of the quelling of the unrest that took place in the city that year by the judge Bishr b. Husayn. It could be at this time that al-Tanūkhī heard the reports about Ibn Khafīf and his followers. But the report concerning the mystic’s alleged immorality, which is based on second-hand information and suggests little personal knowledge of Ibn Khafīf (“I have been informed . . . that in Shiraz there is a man named Ibn Khafīf al-Baghdadī”), may conceivably have been recorded some years before al-Tanūkhī became involved with ʿAḍūd al-Dawla. In any event, al-Tanūkhī presumably heard it while he was still working on his Nīshawr al-muhādara, which is said to have been begun in 360 and completed twenty years later. No reason for personal enmity on the part of al-
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129 Sobieroj considers this report, which unquestionably presents a picture of Ibn Khafīf that is very different from that found in most other sources, to be a fabrication (“Ibn Ḥaffīf aṣ-Ṣirāzī,” pp. 17–18, 160). While this assessment is almost certainly correct, it is at least conceivable that the story represents an exaggeration or embellishment rather than an outright fabrication.


Tanūkhī against Ibn Khaffīf has come to our attention, but the judge lived in an environment in which intrigue and personal rivalries were everyday fare. Moreover, his attack on the mystic, who was opposed to Mu'tazilism, may be a reflection of his doctrinal leanings, which were presumably Mu'tazilite, and at best skeptical towards Sufism.\textsuperscript{132}

\textit{Followers}

In the first generation of a teacher's disciples it is often difficult to determine what kind of contact and what degree of attachment or sympathy is to be associated with being numbered among his students. Thus Ibn Abī Ya'qūb's inventory of the first generation of narrators from Ahmad b. Hanbal includes not only the mystic al-Junayd, of whose master al-Hārīth al-Muḥāsibī Ibn Ḥanbal had said, “Beware of al-Hārīth, for he is the source of affliction,”\textsuperscript{133} but also the imam Muḥammad b. Idrīs al-Shāfi'ī.\textsuperscript{134} No such exhaustive catalogue of those who heard Ibn Khaffīf has come down to us, although much information is available in the \textit{Ṣirāt} and later biographical works. As one might expect, the kind of relationship many who are named as his students actually had with him is unclear.

By far the most comprehensive treatment of the followers of Ibn Khaffīf and those who narrated material from him is that given by Sobierojk in his “Ibn Ḥaffīf aṣ-Ṣīrāzī und seine Schrift zur Novizenerziehung (Kitāb al-Iqtisād).”\textsuperscript{135} Sobierojk, drawing on al-Daylami's \textit{Ṣirāt} and a wide range of other sources, has established a list of forty-eight persons who were in some way directly dependent on Ibn Khaffīf. These he divides into two main groups: those who narrated material directly from Ibn Khaffīf, but who cannot be considered his students, and his immediate disciples. The latter group he further divides into four sub-groups: (1) an outer circle, (2) an inner circle, (3) mystics who constituted a link

\textsuperscript{132} Cf. ibid., p. 161, also p. 18. Mu'tazilism was probably a family tradition. Ibn Khallikān mentions that al-Tanūkhī's father, Abū ʿl-Qāsim ʿAlī b. Muḥammad (d. 342/953), was a Mu'tazilite (\textit{Wafayāt al-a'yān}, III, pp. 48, 51). Cf. also al-Tanūkhī's poem, recorded by Ibn Khallikān, on how a certain sheikh had prayed for rain on a cloudy day and the skies had cleared before he finished praying (ibid., p. 302).

\textsuperscript{133} Ibn al-Jawzī, \textit{Talbīš Iblīs}, p. 167.


\textsuperscript{135} “Ibn Ḥaffīf aṣ-Ṣīrāzī,” pp. 187–213. Unless otherwise noted, the material from the next paragraphs is from this source. Schimmel pointed earlier to some of the significant figures who derived material from Ibn Khaffīf (\textit{Ṣirāt}, intro., p. 22).
between Ibn Khafif and Abū Ḥishāq al-Kāzarūnī (d. 426/1034), and (4) others, the nature and extent of whose relationship to the master is difficult to determine. In addition, Sobieroj mentions a number of indirect disciples of the sheikh.

Those who narrated directly from Ibn Khafif include the renowned Sufi authors Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī (d. 412/1021–22), who says of the reports he has from Ibn Khafif in his Taḥaqāt al-sūfiyya that he received them all from the mystic himself with written permission to transmit them,136 and Abū Nuʿaym al-Isfahānī (336/948–430/1038), compiler of the voluminous mystical biographical work Hīyat al-awliyāʾ,137 who also had a written ijāza for the material he relates from Ibn Khafif. In addition, the celebrated Ashʿarīte theologian al-Bāqillānī (d. 403/1013), who had come to Shiraz at the invitation of ʿAḍud al-Dawla and met Ibn Khafif in the period between 369/979–80 and 371/981–82, is cited as an authority for the story of Ibn Khafif’s meeting with al-Ashʿarī.138 The outer circle of the mystic’s students included Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj al-Ṭūsī (d. 378/988), author of the Kitāb al-lumāc,139 Ibn Bākūya (Bākawayh) (d. 428/1036–37), familiar to those interested in al-Ḥallāj,140 and Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. Bakrān al-Shirāzī, the first narrator mentioned on the title page of al-Daylāmī’s Aṣf.141 The inner circle of disciples, that of Ibn Khafif’s personal servants (those given the name khādīm), consisted of figures like Abū ʿAḥmad al-Kabīr (d. 377/987–88)

137 Hīya, X, p. 385.
139 Al-Daylāmī relates from Abū Naṣr al-Ṭūsī, apparently directly, the report of the death of Ibn Khafif’s son ʿAbd al-Salām and a report in which al-Ṭūsī describes himself as present in the sheikh’s circle or as being together with him (Ṣirat, pp. 37–38, 204–5). We have in addition al-Daylāmī’s statement in the Shadd al-izār that he himself had been together with al-Ṭūsī (cf. n. 6 above; Ṣirat, appendix, p. 222).
140 On Ibn Bākūya, who is responsible for much information on the process against al-Ḥallāj, see Shadd al-izār, pp. 380–84 and 380, n. 3. Ibn Bākūya is also the authority for much of Ibn ʿAsākir’s material in his biographical notice on Ibn Khafif. Cf. Taʾrīkh madinat Dimashq, XV, pp. 291–301.
141 See below, pp. lxv–lxvi.
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and Abū Aḥmad al-Ṣaghīr (d. 384/994 or 385/995). Of the intermediaries between Ibn Khafīf and al-Kāzarūnī, the most significant seems to have been Abū ʿAlī al-Ḥusayn b. Muḥammad al-Akkār (d. 391/1000–1), who is credited with having passed on the patched robe of Sufism from the great master in Shiraz to al-Kāzarūnī.143

Among the various other followers of Ibn Khafīf, Sobieroj numbers Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Maqrīzī (d. 411/1020–21), founder of a Sufi line in Shiraz that derived its authority from Ibn Khafīf, and al-Maqrīzī’s son ʿAbd al-Salām (d. 424/1032–33). To this line belonged Abū Shujāʿ Muḥammad b. Saʿdān al-Maqrīzī, the second transmitter named on the title page of the ʿAṣf.144 Also into this group fall two figures characterized by their broad education and their universal curiosity, Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Baytār145 and our author ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Daylāmī. It may be surprising to find the student and biographer of Ibn Khafīf placed outside the inner circle of his followers. But since the reports on the last period of Ibn Khafīf’s life are not related by al-Daylāmī on his own authority, Sobieroj reasons that al-Daylāmī may have left Ibn Khafīf before his death and collected the reports on his master’s latter years on a return trip to Shiraz.146 Al-Daylāmī’s statement that he observed Ibn Khafīf’s “servant” Abū Aḥmad al-Kabīr for some twenty-five years—from about 352 to 377, when Abū Aḥmad died (some six years after Ibn Khafīf’s demise), if the information on which our reckoning is based is correct147—would not seem to be consonant with the theory of a long absence from Shiraz on al-Daylāmī’s part in the latter part of Ibn Khafīf’s life. But Sobieroj’s argument, taken together with the suspicions he has raised regarding al-Daylāmī’s reliability in reporting his teacher’s views on al-Ḥallāj,148 make it difficult to conclude with any certainty that our author belonged to the inner circle of Ibn Khafīf’s disciples.

Ibn Khafīf is often referred to by his later followers in Shiraz simply

142 Cf. pp. xii–xiv and nn. 6, 8 above.
144 See below, pp. lxv–lxvi.
145 See above, p. xix–xx and n. 25.
146 “Ibn Ḥafīf aṣ-Ṣīrāz,” p. 209. An example of al-Daylāmī’s collecting reports about Ibn Khafīf after his death is the story he relates from an Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, whom he calls a trustworthy authority (thiqa amīn), of a dream in which the latter beheld the departed Ibn Khafīf (Ibn ʿAsākir, Ta’rikh madinat Dimashq, XV, p. 296.
147 See n. 6.
148 See n. 159.
as al-shaykh al-kabır, a title that recognizes in him the greatest master of the Shiraz line. His first followers seem to have formed themselves into a group known to al-Hujwiri (d. between 465/1072 and 469/1077) as the Khăffīya.\textsuperscript{149} The \textit{ribāṭ} or hospice that Ibn Khaffīf founded was still in existence, as Vadet has remarked, in the time of Ibn al-Jawzi (d. 597/1200), and it presumably remained active long thereafter.\textsuperscript{150} However the Khăffīya order was soon after its founding to be absorbed into a larger grouping. The militant Sufi Abū ʻIṣlāq Ibrāhīm b. Shahriyār al-Kāzarūnī (352/963–426/1034), who had been initiated into Ibn Khaffīf’s path by al-Akkār, had begun his proselytizing and charitable activity in Kāzarūn, not far from Shiraz, already as much as half a century before al-Hujwīrī recorded his remarks on the Khăffīya in the \textit{Kashf al-mahjūb}, a work written most likely during the last years of the author’s life.\textsuperscript{151} The order al-Kāzarūnī founded, which is said to have established sixty-five hospices outside Kāzarūn before his death, and which was to spread west to Anatolia and east as far as India and China, apparently absorbed Ibn Khaffīf’s following. The abstruse ecstatic Ruzbihān Bāqī of Shiraz (522/1128–606/1209), who is of special interest here because of the extensive use he made of al-Daylamī’s \textit{‘Aṭf al-alīf} in his own works, was initiated into Ibn Khaffīf’s line by the Kāzarūnī sheikh Sīrāj al-Dīn Māhīmūd b. Khālīfa b. ʻAbd al-Salām b. Sālib (Sāliha) (d. 562/1166–67).\textsuperscript{152} Ruzbihān is said to have established a branch of the Kāzarūnīya, the Ruzbihānīya, that lasted for a little over a hundred years in Fārs. The Shi‘ī Safavids suppressed the central hospice of the Kāzarūnīya at the beginning of the tenth/sixteenth century, and during the course of the following century the order largely died out in Anatolia.\textsuperscript{153} Ibn Khaffīf is named as a pivotal figure in the chain of succession of the present-day Uwaysiya order in Iran. The \textit{silsila}, through Najm al-Dīn Kubrā (d. 618/1221), includes also, along with other successors of Ibn


\textsuperscript{151} See Hidayet Hosain/H. Massé in \textit{EJ}\textsuperscript{2}, III, p. 546a, s.v. “Hujwīrī.”

\textsuperscript{152} \textit{Shadd al-izār}, pp. 244, 299–300. The comments of Junayd Shirāzī, the author of \textit{Shadd al-izār}, on Ruzbihān’s complicated style (ibid., p. 244) confirm the impressions of modern readers of the mystic’s writings.
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Khaṭṭī, al-Akkār, al-Kāzarūnī, Ibn Sālibi, and Rūzbihān.154

Ibn Khaṭṭī’s Works on Love

Ibn Khaṭṭī’s first book was a youthful work on the “dignity of poverty” (Kitāb sharaf al-faqr). It had aroused such great admiration at a gathering of Sufi sheikhs, as he himself later admitted, that they had entreated him to act as their leader in prayer.155 According to the Sīrat, Ibn Khaṭṭī’s long works (tafānīf-i muṭavva), of which this was one, numbered in all fifteen titles, while his short works or digests (mukhtaṣaraṣaṣ) likewise numbered fifteen. The various tracts, or “questions” (masāʿīl), he had authored could not be numbered.156

One of Ibn Khaṭṭī’s tracts, according to the ‘Atf, dealt with the use of the controversial term ʿishq to refer to love between God and man. Al-Daylami tells us in chapter two of his treatise that his teacher had at first been opposed to this use of the term, but that he had changed his mind after coming across a tract (masʿāla) on the question by al-Junayd and had himself composed a masʿāla supporting the usage.157 In his Major Creed (Kitāb al-iʿtiqād), if the text cited by Ibn Taymiyya is authentic, Ibn Khaṭṭī clearly rejects the use of the word ʿishq with reference to

---

155 Sīrat, p. 21.
156 Sīrat, p. 213. Only fourteen works in each of the first two categories are actually named by al-Daylami in the Sīrat (pp. 212–13). The shorter list in the Shadd adds two titles, a Kitāb sharḥ al-fadāʾil (p. 42) and a Kitāb al-maṣnaḥaf fī l-fiqḥ (p. 43). Ibn Khaṭṭī’s Waṣṣīīa and his Muʿtāqad (= al-Muʿtāqad al-ṣaghīr), as mentioned above, have both been edited by Schimmel in the appendix to her edition of the Sīrat (see n. 70). This appendix also includes many valuable quotations from or about Ibn Khaṭṭī (ibid., pp. 220–73). The longest of his surviving works, his manual for novices entitled Kitāb al-iʿtiqād, has been edited and translated by Sobieroj in his “Ibn Ḥaṭṭī Ḥāṣīr al-Sīrāzī und seine Schrift zur Novizenerziehung (Kitāb al-Iṣṭiṣāḥ),” Arabic, pp. 1–46, German, pp. 276–357. Sobieroj (ibid., pp. 19, 266) has also pointed out an excerpt from Ibn Khaṭṭī’s Kitāb al-muʿtāqad al-kabīr in Ibn Taymiyya’s al-Fatwā al-Ḥamaviyya al-kubrā (Beirut; Dār al-Kutub al-ʿIlmīyya, ca. 1984), pp. 42–50, and his al-Ḥaṣr wa-l-sifāt (ed. Muṣṭaʿfī ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAtā [Beirut, 1408/1988]), pp. 56–66. Ibn Taymiyya refers to this work as “a book by Ibn Khafif that he named Iʿtiqād al-tawḥīd bi-ikhbār al-ṣamāʿ wa-l-sifāt” (al-Fatwā al-Ḥamaviyya al-kubrā, p. 42), by which he presumably intends Ibn Khafif’s Kitāb al-iʿtiqād mentioned by al-Daylami in the Sīrat (p. 212). Cf. also, on Ibn Khafif’s works, Sezgin, GAS, I, p. 664.
157 MS, pp. 9–10.
God. The usage, which is without linguistic or scriptural justification, represents pure “innovation and error.” There is no need to go beyond God’s own words in the Koran, which refer to his love as mafzabba (or, more precisely, by means of forms of the root h-b-b.) If both al-Daylami’s statement about his master’s change of heart regarding the word ‘ishq and the text quoted by Ibn Taymiya are to be accepted as they stand, we must conclude that the Major Creed was written before Ibn Khafif came across the tract by al-Junayd on ‘ishq. The apparent absence of Ash’arite influences in the work, moreover, whereas they are hardly disguised in the Minor Creed, would seem to render the idea that the Major Creed is an early work plausible. More information is needed, however, before this hypothesis can be taken beyond the realm of conjecture.

From the list of Ibn Khafif’s works given by al-Daylami in the Sīrat

---


159 Sobieroj suggests that it is possible to doubt the accuracy of al-Daylami’s account of Ibn Khafif’s change of heart regarding the use of the word ‘ishq in the sacred context. He mentions as reasons (1) that the discussions of ‘ishq he describes as occurring close to the circle of Ibn Khafif seem to have bypassed Ibn Khafif himself, (2) that any such change of heart, if it occurred at a relatively late date in Ibn Khafif’s life, is inconsistent with the view that he was converted to Hallajian doctrines (such as the permissibility of using the word ‘ishq) when he witnessed the miracles performed by al-Hallaj in prison (some sixty years before he himself died), (3) that Ibn Khafif consistently uses mafzabba rather than ‘ishq to denote religious love in the quotes we have from him on the subject, and (4) that in the quotation from his Kitāb al-i’tiqād recorded by Ibn Taymiya Ibn Khafif unquestionably censures the use of the word ‘ishq for sacred love (“Ibn Khafif as-Sirazi,” pp. 7, 144-48). The mas’ala on ‘ishq, by this reasoning, may never have existed. Since al-Daylami, when he speaks of his master’s change of heart, acknowledges that Ibn Khafif had previously opposed the use of ‘ishq, the third and fourth points raised by Sobieroj do not necessarily conflict with his assertion. Regarding the second point, the narratives we have used of Ibn Khafif’s visiting al-Hallaj in prison suggest an attempt on his part to be objective, rather than an uncritical acceptance of al-Hallaj’s views (see below, p. lii). He need not have been converted to al-Hallaj’s (or, more precisely, al-Junayd’s) opinion on the use of ‘ishq at this time. On Sobieroj’s first point, that the discussions of ‘ishq bypassed Ibn Khafif, we do not have the necessary evidence to exclude the possibility he raises. But it does not seem improbable to us that al-Daylami’s information on the views of the Damascus school regarding ‘ishq (on this he quotes Ibn Khafif directly in MS, p. 71), as well, perhaps, as much of his material on ‘ishq from al-Junayd, is taken from a mas’ala composed by Ibn Khafif on the subject.
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we learn that he also composed a Kitāb al-mahabba (Book on love) and a Kitāb al-wudd wa-l-ulfa (Book on fondness and closeness), both of which are classified by al-Daylamī as “digests” (mukhtasarāt).160 Neither of these titles would seem to refer to the tract on ʿishq, which apparently was a separate work. On the other hand, the Kitāb al-wudd wa-l-ulfa may be identical with the masʾala on wudd, which Abū Saʿīd b. al-Aʿrābī, one of al-Daylamī’s most important sources in the ʿAfīf, is reported to have showed great interest in when Ibn Khafīf visited him in Mecca.161

As can be seen from the texts collected by Schimmel, the quotations from Ibn Khafīf in the biographical literature provide little to compensate for the loss of his works on love.162 Of greatest interest perhaps, after the passages cited by Ibn Taymīya, is Ibn Khafīf’s report of a session when he was studying fiqh under the Shāfiʿite jurist Ibn Surayj at which his teacher brought up the question of whether love for God and his Prophet is a religious obligation. Ibn Khafīf quotes the texts he adduced in answer to the jurist’s question to prove that love is indeed an obligation.163 The texts he cites are more or less the standard ones. What is significant is that Ibn Khafīf was making clear his stance on a controversial theological issue, since by asserting that love is an obligation he was likewise asserting that it is possible for men to love God.164

160 Sirat, p. 213. The first of these two works is missing from the list of Ibn Khafīf’s writings given in the Shadd (pp. 42-43), while the second is misspelled as Kitāb al-radd wa-l-ulfa.

161 See n. 228 below.

162 Sirat, intro., pp. 29-30.

163 Ibid., appendix, p. 258, citing Māhmūd b. Sulaymān al-Kaffāwī (d. 990/1582), Katāʾib aʿlām al-ukhayrār (İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi 3216), fol. 111b, and al-Dhahabī, Taʾrīkh al-Islām (Ayasofya 3008), III, fol. 114a. The texts cited by Ibn Khafīf are Koran 9:24: “Say: ‘If your fathers, your sons, your brothers, your wives, your clan, your possessions that you have gained, commerce you fear may slacken, dwellings you love—if these are dearer to you than God and his Messenger, and to struggle in his way, then wait till God brings his command; God guides not the people of the ungodly’” (trans. Arberry), and the saying of the Prophet, “No one of you can be a believer until I am more beloved to him than himself, the members of his household, his property, his children, and all mankind.” (Forms of this ḥadīth, with some variation in wording are to be found in a variety of sources, including al-Bukhārī and Muslim. See Zāghilib, Mansāʿat qariʿf al-ḥadīth, VII, p. 312.) Al-Daylamī cites the argument, without the ḥadīth, in chapters six (MS, p. 97) and fifteen (MS, p. 197) of the ʿAfīf.

164 Fundamental objections raised against the idea that men can love God in any true sense were (1) that love is based on a similarity between lover and beloved and (2) that love, being in the definition of many speculative theologians
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The most important information we have on Ibn Khaffif's views on the subject of love are provided by al-Daylami in the 'Atf. The mystic is first cited in the treatise in the passage mentioned above concerning the permissibility of using the word 'ishq in speaking of love between God and man. Next he is quoted on the derivation of the word hubb, which he takes to be derived from God's attribute of love mentioned in the Koran, and then on the lexicographic distinction between love (mahabba) and bosom friendship (khulla). Later he is cited in the chapter on the origin of love and eros (chapter five), first quoting the followers of the mystic 'Abd al-Wahid b. Zayd in Damascus to the effect that 'ishq proceeds from hubb, and subsequently arguing that men's love (mahabba) comes about without acquisition on their part through their hearts' being clothed with, or enveloped by, God's love. On the essence of love, a subject on which mystics often tend to wax eloquent, two definitions that correspond to Ibn Khaffif's view of the origin of love are mentioned by al-Daylami. A few pages later the mystic's argument affirming that love is an obligation of faith is borrowed, although he is not mentioned as the source. The argument is used once more in chapter fifteen, which deals with the signs of man's love for God. After this, Ibn Khaffif is quoted again in the last chapter of the 'Atf relating reports of the deaths of saintly persons and a story he had personally investigated of a pious shepherd boy who, while resting outdoors with a fever, had floated up and disappeared into the sky.

equivalent to will, must have as its object a nonexistent or the continued existence of something that can cease to exist. The denial of the reality of man's love to God, originally a Jahmite position, received its classical formulation in the works of the celebrated Ash'ari theologian Imam al-Harani al-Juwayni (419/1028–478/1085). Statements by mystics that define love as conformity (muwafaqa) or obedience (cf. the definitions attributed to al-Muhasibi [MS, p. 86] and to Abu 'l-Abbas b. 'Ata' [MS, pp. 87-88]) often reflect their hesitations on this issue. Cf. Bell, Love Theory, pp. 56–59, 109–10, 204–5.

165 MS, p. 36; cf. Koran 5:24: "a people whom he loves (yuhibbuhum)."
166 MS, p. 38. On the relevance of this distinction in mystical thought, see MS, p. 38, n. 29.
167 MS, pp. 71, 73.
168 MS, p. 92.
169 See n. 163.
170 The first of these reports, which tells the story of the death of Sha'wana al-Ubulliya (MS, pp. 289–91), is introduced thus: "I found the following in a book by Sheikh Abū 'Abd Allāh b. Khaffif, God's mercy be upon him, and in his own hand." Two more reports, that on the death of Abū Ya'qūb al-Aqta' and the
Al-Daylamī acquired his material from Ibn Khaffīf either directly as his student,\textsuperscript{171} or from other immediate disciples who had been with the master longer,\textsuperscript{172} or again from recent or original copies of works by him to which he had access.\textsuperscript{173} The material must therefore be considered as reliable, but it may not represent very well the full range of Ibn Khaffīf’s thoughts on love because it was selected according to the requirements of al-Daylamī’s own treatise. Until more evidence comes to light, however, we must be satisfied with the temporary conclusion that Ibn Khaffīf’s influence on al-Daylamī’s treatment of love lies chiefly in the areas mentioned here. It was perhaps also Ibn Khaffīf who first interested al-Daylamī in al-Ḥallāj and who was responsible for his cautious regard for him. There is, on the other hand, little to suggest that the wide range of interests al-Daylamī shows in such areas as belles-lettres, poetry, philosophy, astrology, and medicine were inspired by Ibn Khaffīf.

\textit{Al-Ḥallāj}

We must leave unresolved here the complicated question of what it meant to be a Ḥallājīan and to what extent the mystical doctrine al-Daylamī acquired from Ibn Khaffīf may have been influenced by al-Ḥallāj.\textsuperscript{174} We will also pass over the details of al-Ḥallāj’s life, the peculiarities of his obscure teachings, his bold and unguarded statements, his

\textsuperscript{171} Explicit examples in the \textit{Sīrat}. Cf., e.g., p. 10: “Abū Ḥasan Daylāmī related as follows: I heard from the Sheikh, relating from his father, that . . . .”

\textsuperscript{172} Explicit examples in the \textit{Sīrat}. Cf., e.g., pp. 25–27.

\textsuperscript{173} See n. 170.

\textsuperscript{174} The question of whether and to what extent Ibn Khaffīf may be called a Ḥallājīan is the subject of a forthcoming study by Sobieroj. In the introduction to his \textit{“Ibn ḤaSSF aṣ-Ṣīrat”} Sobieroj remarks that Ibn Khaffīf seems to have “disassociated or clearly distanced himself from Ḥallāj—if he in fact ever was tied to Ḥallāj in the form of a special loyalty” (p. 7). Against the view put forward by Massignon that Ibn Khaffīf remained a faithful follower of al-Ḥallāj, Sobieroj argues that it is equally plausible to conclude that Ibn Khaffīf distanced himself from al-Ḥallāj after an initial enthusiasm (ibid., pp. 24, 50–54). He remarks further that al-Daylamī, in view of his own pro-Ḥallājīan statements, cannot be totally relied on for an assessment of Ibn Khaffīf’s stance with regard to al-Ḥallāj. It is more appropriate, according to Sobieroj’s argument, to reconstruct Ibn Khaffīf’s point of view on the basis of the opinions (mostly negative, often damning) expressed by the teachers he sought out and recognized as his authorities (ibid., pp. 50–54).
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troubles with the authorities and with many of his fellow mystics, his trials for heresy, and his eventual execution in 309/922. These matters have all been the subject of considerable study.175 It will be sufficient here to cite several reports that reflect the basic problems of the nature of Ibn Khafif’s relation to al-Ḥallāj. Since one of our sources for these reports is al-Daylamī himself, they must be considered as reasonably reliable.

First, it is clear that Ibn Khafif did relate miracles he witnessed when he visited al-Ḥallāj in prison in Baghdad176 (the mystic’s predicting—or bringing about—the acquittal of his jail keeper, who had been accused of corruption, and his picking up with his hand a towel or cloth177 that could not have been within his reach). However Ibn Khafif was sufficiently objective to recognize that, whatever he himself may have thought of these wonders, it was feats of this sort that had led others to accuse al-Ḥallāj of sorcery.178 We are also told by al-Daylamī that Ibn Khafif, being asked about al-Ḥallāj, called him a “true monotheist” (muwaḥhid). When the inquirer remarked that some people held al-Ḥallāj to be an unbeliever, Ibn Khafif is said to have answered, “If what I have witnessed in him is not true monotheism, then who in this world is a true monotheist?”

On the other hand, when someone in the same gathering mentioned that al-Ḥallāj had spoken of the human and divine natures of God (nāsīt and lāhūt), Ibn Khafif asked him if he had in mind the following verses, which were commonly attributed to al-Ḥallāj:

Praise to him whose humanity has manifested
the mystery of his radiant divinity!
And who afterwards has appeared in his creation openly
in the form of one “who eats and drinks.”

When the inquirer answered that he did indeed have these verses in mind, Ibn Khafif exclaimed, “May God’s curse be upon the one who composed this and who has this belief, and upon anyone else who says

175 See the sources cited in here and in the Bibliography under al-Ḥallāj and Louis Massignon.
177 Or “handkerchief” (minshafa in the Arabic; dastārcha, sutra in the Persian versions).
or believes the like!”179

In a similar report, which could conceivably be construed as the record of an earlier occasion, it is not clear that Ibn Khäfif already knows of the verses before he is asked about them. After he has invoked God’s curse on their author, he is told that the author is al-Ḥallāj. In his answer he expresses doubts about their ascription to him. “If this is his belief,” he replies, “then he is an unbeliever, but they may be a fabrication.”180

Al-Daylāmi, for his part, does not seem to doubt that al-Ḥallāj spoke of a human as well as a divine nature in the godhead. In the Āṭf he names this as the point that distinguishes the doctrine of al-Ḥallāj from that of the other Sufi masters.

What distinguishes his doctrine is that in his spiritual allusions he calls eros one of the attributes of essence, absolutely and wherever it appears. The other teachers, for their part, allude to the uniting of lover and beloved when love comes to its extreme limit in the extinction of the totality of the lover in the beloved. They do not (like al-Ḥallāj) speak of the divine and human natures.181

The report from Ibn Khäfif mentioned above left the issue of whether or not al-Ḥallāj was to be considered an unbeliever unsettled. Those who, like al-Daylāmi, believed that he indeed had attributed a human as well as a divine nature to God would be obliged to conclude, in accordance with Ibn Khäfif’s condemnation as related in the report, that al-Ḥallāj was an unbeliever. It is clear from our text, however, that al-Daylāmi did not draw this conclusion. The apparent ambiguity of Ibn Khäfif’s attitude towards al-Ḥallāj and how his assessment of the mystic may have changed was to remain a puzzle.

We can see an example of how the later tradition dealt with the problem in Rüzbiḥān Baqlī’s observations on the version of the report that he knew. Rüzbiḥān’s goal was to counter the presumption of any real disagreement between Ibn Khäfif and al-Ḥallāj, while at the same time salvaging the verses ascribed to the latter. He achieved this by separating the report of Ibn Khäfif’s endorsement of al-Ḥallāj from the report of his

179 Sīrat, pp. 100–101. In translating the second hemistich of the first line we have followed the reading in al-Ḥallāj, Le diwān d’al-Ḥallāj (ed. and French trans. Louis Massignon [1955], p. 41), which has sirra sanā‘ for satra manā‘ (error for sanā‘) in the Sīrat.


181 MS, p. 91.
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denunciation of the verses. Ibn Khaffī’s comments on the poetry, he suggested, should be attributed either to his not knowing that al-Ḥallāj was their author or to his regard for the limited spiritual advancement of his audience.

The master said [of these verses]: “May God curse whoever composed this, and whoever believes the like.” Perhaps the master did not know that the one who composed the verses was Ḥusayn. He may have thought the author was an incarnationist (hulūlī), and this is why he invoked God’s curse on him. For otherwise the master knew what he believed and what his doctrine was. He knew that he was the greatest monotheist of his time. Thus the master said, “Ḥusayn Manṣūr was a divine sage (ālīm-i rabbānī). He was executed in Baghdad at Bāb al-Ṭāq.” Also “All b. Muḥammad Daylamī, may God have mercy upon him, related that the master once was asked, “What is your opinion of Ḥusayn Manṣūr?” and he replied, “He was a Muslim.” When the inquirers objected, “They accused him of unbelief,” he said, “If what I have witnessed in him is not true monotheism, then there is no true monotheist in this world!”182 Then again it is possible that the master knew of the weakness of the faith of the people in the gathering and took this into consideration, and that he said what he said because spiritual leaders are obliged to observe the outward form of [religious] knowledge. As for the spiritual reality to which the first of the two verses alludes (ishārat-li bayt), it is well known to the adepts of spiritual revelation and contemplation in the station of ambiguity (iltībās). It needs no further elucidation, because ample explanation has already been given in the passages on the laudable and the odious.183

The reservations his readers may have had about al-Ḥallāj’s orthodoxy did not keep al-Daylamī from citing the mystic on crucial issues in his treatise on love. Al-Ḥallāj is first named together with other Sufis who permitted the use of the word ʿishq to refer to love in the sacred con-
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Next al-Daylamî quotes an important and lengthy passage in which al-Ḥallāj accounts for the origin of eros perceived in this world in the primordial discourse within the unified divine essence that arose from God’s contemplation of his attributes in preeternity. Through this discourse, reality, expressible in terms of the triad agent (active participle), act (verbal noun or infinitive), and object of act (passive participle), emerged into the realm of the knowable. It is in this same passage that al-Ḥallāj speaks of a personification of the attribute of eros.

And God willed to see this attribute of eros alone, looking upon it and speaking to it. And he contemplated his preeternity and displayed a form that was his own form and his own essence. For when God contemplates a thing and manifests in it a form from himself, he displays that form, and he displays in that form knowledge, power, movement, will, and all his other attributes. Now when God had become thus manifest, he displayed a person who was himself, and he gazed on him for an age of his time.

This passage was significant for the formulation of al-Daylamî’s own account of the origin of love, which is given at the end of the same chapter, although the term used there is mahabba, not ʿishq.

Al-Ḥallāj is cited again on the essence of eros, which in a complicated description he portrays as preeternal fire. In this same context al-Daylamî cites some verses by him on the eternal nature of eros. We shall return shortly to these, because they include the verse that seems to have inspired the title of al-Daylamî’s treatise. Later al-Daylamî relates a story explaining the circumstances in which al-Ḥallāj had composed two lines on obliteration. He had been told of the simultaneous death of two youths whose affection for each other he had been wont to observe in the mosque in Ahvaz. Further on al-Daylamî reports a statement by al-Ḥallāj on the elimination of all conceivable relationships in the culmination of mystical longing and how this condition alternates with the awareness implicit in the state of longing. Finally in the twenty-first chapter, “On the Extreme Limit of the Perfection of Love,” al-Daylamî quotes some verses by al-Ḥallāj on union, pointing out that they consti-
tute an example of his doctrine of essential union (ittihād).\textsuperscript{191}

\textit{Al-Hallāj’s Poem and the Title of al-Daylamī’s Treatise}

There seems to be no reason to question Massignon’s suggestion that in choosing the title of his treatise al-Daylamī was thinking of the verses by al-Hallāj on the preeternal nature of eros that he cites in chapter six.\textsuperscript{192} Further, he may have had in mind a work ascribed to al-Hallāj by al-Nadīm, a \textit{Kitāb khazā‘īn al-khayrāt}, known as \textit{al-Alif al-maqtū‘ wa-l-alif al-ma‘lūf} (The \textit{alif} in isolation and the \textit{alif} in union).\textsuperscript{193} Letter symbolism in Islamic mysticism, and particularly the symbolism of the \textit{alif} (A) and the \textit{lām} (L) is a complicated subject, and the meaning ascribed to the various letters can vary considerably. Thus the \textit{alif}, a vertical line (\textit{I}) that when used as a number means \textit{one}, is generally taken to symbolize the divine unity. But it may be assigned other meanings. For example, because of its erect form it has on occasion been taken to symbolize Satan, since Satan, alone among the angels, refused out of pride to bow down to Adam.\textsuperscript{194} There can be little doubt that \textit{alif} in al-Daylamī’s title is to be understood in the more usual sense as referring to God in his preeternal unity,\textsuperscript{195} while \textit{lām} probably represents contingent existence, or man. The title is almost certainly also a play on the saying ascribed to the Prophet that begins “The believer befriends and is befriended,” \textit{al-mu‘min ilf ma‘lūf} in the form cited by al-Daylamī.\textsuperscript{196} The words \textit{ilf} and \textit{alif} when \textit{hamza} and the vowels are not written, are homographs.

But the Hallājīan verses quoted in the text are our surest clue to the meaning intended by al-Daylamī. We give here the relevant fourth and fifth verses:

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{191} MS, p. 239.
\textsuperscript{193} Massignon mentioned this title in his list of the works of al-Hallāj and equated it with chapter eight of the mystic’s \textit{Tawāsīn} (Passion [1922], II, p. 819). Cf. al-Nadīm, \textit{Fihrist}, ed. Flügel, p. 192.
\textsuperscript{195} Cf. al-Hallāj, \textit{Kitāb al-tawāsīn} (ed. Nwyia), \textit{tāshīn} VIII, p. 211, l. 1. For other examples of al-Hallāj’s statements on the \textit{alif} and the \textit{lām-alif}, see \textit{Akhbār al-Hallāj} (1936), no. 34, Arabic, p. 51, French, p. 79, and no. 64, Arabic, pp. 95–96, French, pp. 100–101.
\textsuperscript{196} See MS, p. 115, and the note in our edition.
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Lammā badā 'l-bad'u abdā 'ishqahū sifatan
fi-man badā, fa-tala' lā fīhi la' lā'ū.
Wa-l-lāmu bi-l-alif 'l-ma'tūfī mu'talifun,
kilahumā wahādun fi 'l-sabqi ma'nā'ū.

When the beginning appeared, he displayed his eros as an attribute
in the one who appeared, and there shone in him a glistening light.
And the lām was in union with the conjoined alif:
the two in preeternity were one thing.

The second of these two verses contains not only the names of the two
letters alif and lām but also both roots on which al-Dāylamī plays in the
title of his treatise, 't-f and 'l-f. The title has been understood and
translated in different ways, and precisely because it plays on the various
meanings implied by the roots 't-f and 'l-f, most of the translations that
have been given of it can be justified. The basic meaning of 'l-f is “to
keep to” or “to cleave to” (alifā), while that of 't-f is “to incline” or “to
bend” (tāfā). 197 Both roots can imply the joining together of two persons
or things, and both can mean affection on the part of one for the
other (cf. alifā/alifā, tāfā tālā). In the context with which we are con-
cerned, moreover, some forms seem to be interchangeable with uncertain
consequences for the meaning. Thus we have al-alif al-ma‘līf in the title
of al-Dāylamī’s treatise and al-alif al-ma‘tīf in al-Hallāj’s poem.

The last hemistich of the verses cited defines what is meant by the use
of the participle mu‘talif in al-Hallāj’s poem, namely, to be “one thing.”
This would seem to reflect an intuitive sense that forms from the root
'l-f can be used to refer to an essential unity, while those from 't-f imply
a relationship between two essentially different things. Al-Dāylamī’s
title, then, may be suggesting two different kinds or degrees of union,
while at the same time evoking the sense of fondness and inclination
which the words also can mean. 198 The verbal noun ‘atf, without the
preposition ‘alā, is defined by Rūzbihān Bāqī some two hundred years
later as God’s preserving one who desires him from stopping at anything
beneath him. 199 Graphically, the joining of the alif to the lām, or its “in-
clination” towards it, would seem to refer to the combination of the two
letters in the double letter lām-alif. 200 Since it was not possible to find a

197 Lane, s.vv.
198 The concept of a relationship of spiritual love between the letters alif and
lām finds expression, for example, in the work of Ibn al-‘Arabī (Futūḥāt, I, p.
259).
199 Rūzbihān Bāqī, Mashrah al-arwāh, pp. 104–5.
200 Massignon suggests the definite article al-, but the alif and the lām are not
solution that would accommodate all these nuances, we have chosen in rendering the words of the title page of the manuscript a translation that underscores certain of the different types of union the title implies but that has the admitted disadvantage of being at least as cryptic as al-Daylamî’s original. A play on syntactic as well as graphic conjunction, moreover, while not anachronous, may not have been intended by the author. Vadet’s translation, which stresses the sense of inclination in the verb ‘atafa, remains conceivably a more felicitous solution.

Other Mystical Sources

In addition to Ibn Khafif and al-Ḥallāj, al-Daylamî relied particularly heavily on two other mystics of the generation of al-Ḥallāj, ʿAmr b. ʿUthmān al-Makkî and Abū ʿl-Qāsim al-Junayd, both of whom are among the five Sufi masters Ibn Khafif ranked above all others. He also owes much to an elder contemporary of Ibn Khafif, Abū Saʿīd Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Ziyād al-Aʿrābî, known as Ibn al-Aʿrābî.

Abū ʿAbd Allāh ʿAmr b. ʿUthmān al-Makkî (d. ca. 297/910, according to some 291 or 296) was a companion, among others, of al-Junayd and Abū Saʿīd al-Kharraz. He was the author of a number of works on mysticism, none of which is extant. Al-Hujwîrî quotes from ʿAmr a passage he says is from a Book on Love (Kitāb-i mahbbat). The quotations attributed to ʿAmr in Ḥilyat al-awliyya and Tabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya reveal a concern for rendering as nearly as possible through highly eloquent speech the subtle emotions of the mystic. The passages bear on the subject of love at several points.

Along with al-Junayd and the Zâhirîte Muḥammad b. Dâwûd, ʿAmr

joined graphically in this combination (“Interférences philosophiques,” p. 229).

201 “Book of the Conjunction of the Cherished Alif with the Conjoined Lām.”

See the title page of the manuscript in our translation.


203 Sezgin, GAS, I, p. 650. For a list of works attributed to ʿAmr and some surviving excerpts, see Sobieroj, “Ibn Ḥaṭîf as-Ṣîrāzî,” pp. 44–45.


condemned the controversial views of al-Hallāj. Considering his own evident preoccupation with elocution, the form his opposition to the mystic is reported to have taken is interesting. Al-Ḥallāj had visited him in Mecca, and ʿAmr had asked him where he came from. Al-Ḥallāj’s response had called into question his extrasensory powers and thus the authenticity of his spirituality. ʿAmr, after long having harbored a grudge against al-Ḥallāj, finally accused him openly of claiming he could equal the eloquence of the Koran.206

ʿAmr b. ʿUthmān, although not without a certain amount of repetition, is cited at eight different places in our text. He is quoted regarding the etymology of the word love,207 the definition of the emotion and its inception, God’s creation of the gnostics to serve as signs of his love and his engendering love in their “hearts” before the creation of their bodies on the day of the a-last covenant,208 the signs that constitute proof of love,209 and the total annihilation of the lover’s attributes when he reaches the final goal.210 ʿAmr is also the source of a lengthy passage containing two reports of dreams associated with the intervention of departed saints.211

Abū ʿl-Qāsim al-Junayd (ca. 215/830–298/910), who is known in Sufi circles as “Lord of the Sect” (Sayyid al-Tāʾīfā), has been the subject of numerous studies.212 At a tender age he became the disciple of the noted mystic Sārī al-Saqātī (d. 253/867), who was his maternal uncle. Later he also numbered among his teachers such figures as al-Ḥārīrī al-Muḥāsibī, who like al-Junayd was among the five masters Ibn Khāfīf held in highest esteem, and the ecstatic Abū Yazīd al-Biṣṭāmī. Along with his teacher al-Muḥāsibī, al-Junayd is considered one of the most important exponents of “the ‘Sober’ type of Sūfism.”213

207 MS, p. 35.
208 According to a view held by many mystics, the covenant mentioned in Koran 7:172–73, which was sealed with God’s words “Am I not your Lord? (a-lastu bi-riḥbikum?)” and men’s answer “Yes,” refers to a pact between God and the souls of men in their prior existence.
210 MS, pp. 240–41.
211 MS, pp. 291–97.
213 A. J. Arberry, EI², II, p. 600a–b, s.v. “al-Ḍjunayd.” See also Abū Nuʿaym,
Many of al-Junayd’s writings have come down to us, including a number of letters to various contemporaries. One of his most important contributions is his transmission of material from al-Ḫārith al-Muḥāsibī. His style is known for its difficulty and obscurity. Thanks primarily to the efforts of A. H. Abdel-Kader, quite a few of his surviving writings can be read in English translation. Perhaps it was under the combined influence of al-Muḥāsibī, who was the author of a long passage on love (mahābbā) quoted in Abū Nuʿaym’s Ḥilya, and of al-Bisṭāmī, who was counted among those who allowed the use of the controversial term ‘ishq (eros) in the sacred context, that al-Junayd wrote the tract on ‘ishq that convinced Ibn Khafīf to accept the use of the word.

The material from or about al-Junayd recorded in the Ḍaf deals primarily with ‘ishq and may in part represent extracts from his tract on the subject. Al-Junayd is first named in connection with this tract. Subsequently he is cited on the etymology of the word ‘ishq, the progress of mahābbā to ‘ishq, the definitions of mahābbā and ‘ishq, and the deceptiveness of facial beauty. A story is also told of his having sought out a man who had been coming to his circle regularly but who had begun to stay away because he was ashamed at having been seduced by a beautiful face. Following this story some verses by or related by al-Junayd are recorded that describe the total union of the spirits of lovers. The mystic is likewise cited as the narrator of three lines of poetry

---

Hilya, X, pp. 255–87; al-Sulamī, Ṭabaqāt (ed. Pedersen), pp. 141–50; and Ibn al-Jawzī, Sifat al-ṣafwa, II, pp. 416–24. For the record we may recall here what we noted above, namely, that the champion of orthodoxy, Ahmad b. Ḥanbal, is reported to have said: “Beware of al-Ḫārith [al-Muḥāsibī], for he is the source of affliction” (Ibn al-Jawzī, Taḥbīs Ḥīlīs, p. 167).


215 Hilya, X, p. 76ff. One of the two main transmitters is Amr b. ʿUthmān al-Makkī.

216 MS, p. 9.

217 Cf. pp. xlvi–xlviii above.

218 MS, p. 9.

219 MS, p. 35

220 MS, pp. 65–66.

221 MS, p. 87.

222 MS, p. 141.

223 MS, pp. 139–40.

224 MS, p. 140.
his uncle Sarī al-Saqāṭī had written down on the emaciation and skeletal appearance that identify true lovers. Of greatest interest, however, is a long and rather obscure ode al-Daylāmī records from al-Junayd on the progression of love to its culmination in the utter annihilation of the attributes of the lover.

Abū Saʿīd Ahmad b. Muḥammad b. Ziyād al-ʿArabī, known as (Abū Saʿīd) Ibn al-ʿArabī (246/860–341/952) represents a younger generation than ʿAmr b. ʿUthmān and al-Junayd, being only about twenty-two years older than Ibn Khāffīf, if we have interpreted al-Daylāmī’s report on the latter’s birth correctly. Of Basran origin, Abū Saʿīd settled in Mecca and died there. He compiled works on fiqh, hadith, biography, and, it is said, history, as well as on asceticism and mysticism. As we have mentioned above, Abū Saʿīd is not among the teachers Ibn Khāffīf met in Mecca to whom separate sections are devoted in the Širāt, but al-Daylāmī does record that Ibn Khāffīf encountered him in the holy city. Once while sitting in a gathering of Sufis at which Abū Saʿīd happened to be present, Ibn Khāffīf had found himself alone in protesting against the assertion that existence and non-existence are alike to the gnostic. He wished to make it clear that this assertion should be understood as applying only to the realm of mystical experience, not to the aspect of existence governed by religious law or shariʿa. When the others in the gathering pressed Ibn Khāffīf to show indulgence, Abū Saʿīd, apparently siding with Ibn Khāffīf, intervened to ensure that he would be allowed to complete his argument.

Abū Saʿīd b. al-ʿArabī was one of al-Daylāmī’s most important sources on the theory of love. Chapter seven of the ʿAīf consists in its entirety of a summary of, or conceivably a long extract from, a work by him entitled The Diversity of Opinions about Love (Kitāb ikhtilāf al-nās

---

226 MS, pp. 66–67. The poem is cited immediately after al-Junayd’s comment on the origin of ʿishq in the section of the ʿAīf that deals with the opinions of the Sufis on the origin of eros and love.
228 Širāt, pp. 66–67. Another occasion on which Ibn Khāffīf encountered Abū Saʿīd in Mecca is recorded by Ibn ʿAsākir. Abū Saʿīd is reported to have showed particular interest in a masʿala on wudd (friendship) apparently authored by Ibn Khāffīf. See Taʾrīkh madīnat Dimashq, XV, p. 298. Communication from Florian Sobieroń.
Perhaps this work is to be identified with the book on love (Kitāb al-maḥābba) ascribed to Abū Saʿīd by Ibn Khayr al-Iṣbīlī. No work on love by Abū Saʿīd is known to survive, and al-Daylami’s chapter seems to constitute our best record of his writing on the subject. The chapter in the ‘Athf consists of an exhaustive breakdown of the advocates of the various Islamic teachings on sacred love into forty-four distinct groups. It covers non-conformist views, ranging from Ismaili doctrines to extreme mystical doctrines, as well as more conventional opinions.

Apart from the extensive passage contained in chapter seven, Abū Saʿīd is cited at length in chapter four on the terms for the various stages of the evolution of passionate love (‘ishq) and their definitions. The quotation is a superb example of the attempts of contemporary mystics to match as closely as possible the elusive degrees of emotional and religious experience with corresponding subtleties of language. Near the middle of the ‘Athf, Abū Saʿīd is cited once again explaining a statement attributed to Rābi‘a al-Adawīya, who, when she was asked about her love for the Prophet, is said to have replied that love for the Creator had distracted her from love for the created.

Among other mystics frequently cited by al-Daylami are such earlier authorities as Abū Sulaymān al-Dārānī (d. 215/830–31), whose sayings are related by his companion and disciple Ahmad b. Abī Ḥawārfī (d. 230/844–45), and Dhu al-‘Nūn al-Miṣrī (d. 246/861). The sayings recorded from Abū Sulaymān dwell on the nature of selfless love and the insignificance for the true mystic of the pleasures and pains of both this world and the next. The reports from Dhu al-‘Nūn, which tend to be somewhat theoretical, concentrate mostly on terminology and the definition of mystical states, although some lines of his poetry are also

---

231 In the text as it now stands one group may have fallen out, since al-Daylami gives the total number of groups as forty-five at the end of the chapter (MS, p. 109).
232 MS, pp. 36–37. “All these stations and halts,” remarks al-Daylami of the stages of love enumerated by Abū Saʿīd in this quotation, “are subsumed under the name ḥawā (passion, love, appetite), which applies to them all” (MS, p. 37).
233 MS, p. 152. An Abū Saʿīd is also cited in MS, p. 70, but we have not been able to identify him.
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Likewise frequent authorities are the ascetic Kufan traditionist Ṣufyān al-Ṭawrī (d. 95/713) and the mystic Sumnūn, a contemporary of al-Junayd, who was known as al-Muḥibb, “the Lover.”

The list of mystics cited by al-Daylāmī two or more times is long, but the quotations vary greatly in length. Some especially interesting authorities are cited only one or two times. Despite his master Ibn Khafīf’s apparent opposition to Ibn Sālīm and his school,236 al-Daylāmī quotes the teacher of the first Ibn Sālīm, Sahl b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Tustarī (203/818–283/896), on the creation of Adam out of the light of the primordial Muḥammad.237 Sahl is cited once again on the definition of love, and a report is given regarding his death, according to which, just as ʿUmar b. Wāṣil was about to wash his corpse, he had exclaimed “There is no god but God!”238 In the final chapter of his treatise, towards the end, al-Daylāmī twice cites the mashyakha of ʿAlī b. Manṣūr, the father of his acquaintance al-Bayṭār.239 But the influence of al-Bayṭār’s erudite father on al-Daylāmī’s method and thought may have been far greater than these two hagiographic reports suggest.

Non-Mystical Sources

The division into chapters followed by al-Daylāmī in the ‘Aṭf al-alīf is thematic, and especially in the earlier part of the book each chapter is subdivided so as to place together the opinions of particular groups whose views the author considers relevant to the subject of the chapter—the lexicographers, the belles-lettres, the Bedouin Arabs, the ancient Greek philosophers, the physicians, the astrologers, the speculative theologians, and the mystics. But while al-Daylāmī often names the ultimate authority whom he is citing, he seldom identifies his immediate source. He introduces the section on the opinions of the astrologers in chapter five, for instance, as follows:

I read in a book by a certain scholar that he had read in a book by Abū Maṣḥār, reporting from someone else, that this person had asked Ibn al-Ṭabarī about the nature and character of eros and that he had replied: . . .240

235 Cf. MS, pp. 65, 86, 140, 208, 176–77.
236 A “Refutation of Ibn Sālīm” (Kitāb al-radd ʿalā Ibn Sālīm) is listed by al-Daylāmī in the ʿAṭr among Ibn Khafīf’s longer works (p. 212). Cf. references to the mystic’s opposition to Ibn Sālīm or his school in Schimmel, ʿAṭr, intro., p. 32, and Vadet, EI2, III, p. 823a–b (citing Massignon, Essai, p. 315).
237 MS, pp. 67–68.
238 MS, pp. 87, 291.
239 MS, pp. 287, 299.
240 MS, p. 56.
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In the preceding section of the same chapter, he relates a statement on eros directly from a philosopher whom he had met:

Once a certain philosopher was asked in my presence about the origin of eros. “The first to love with eros,” he replied, “was the Creator. He loved himself with eros when there was nothing other than him. He appeared to himself through himself, in his beauty, his glory, and all his attributes. And thus he loved himself with eros.”

It has been speculated that the author of this near Ḥallājian statement was the philosopher Abū Ḥayyān al-Tawhīdī. But al-Daylami’s silence leaves us ignorant of the identity of a thinker who one suspects is the direct source of much of his philosophical material.

The statements on eros ascribed by al-Daylami to the theologians, despite considerable variations in both wording and attribution, are so close to the statements given by the historian al-Mas‘ūdī (d. 345/956) in an account of a symposium said to have been held by the vizier Yaḥyā b. Khālid (d. 190/805) that it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the author is using a version of al-Mas‘ūdī’s account or, more likely, has drawn on a common source. But again he leaves us in ignorance.

Al-Daylami makes a precious exception to his usual silence regarding his immediate authorities when he cites the history of al-Ṭabarī (d. 310/923) in the final chapter of his treatise, which deals with the deaths of “divine lovers,” that is, prophets and saints. This reference to al-Ṭabarī was of considerable use to us in the process of controlling uncertain readings in the manuscript. While variations in style and wording make it impossible to determine the precise extent of al-Daylami’s direct debt to the historian, it is unquestionably considerable throughout much of the lengthy last chapter of the ‘Atf.

Later Reflections

We have come across little information regarding the transmission and
influence of al-Daylami’s treatise on love other than the names of the transmitters given on the title page of the manuscript and the citations of the book in the works of Rûzbihân Baqlî. Much of the introduction to Vadet’s French translation of the ‘Atf is devoted to the transmission of the text, and Vadet’s arguments have been examined in some detail by Sobieroj.245 Subsequently Sobieroj has called our attention to the occurrence of the chain of transmission given on the title page of the ‘Atf in several reports in Ibn ʿAsâkir’s biographical notice on Ibn Khâffî in his history of Damascus.246 Ibn ʿAsâkir’s isnâds support the authenticity of the chain given in the ‘Atf and confirm the identity of the first transmitter from al-Daylami.

Named in the ‘Atf as the first transmitter of the text is Abû ʿl-Hasan b. Bakrân b. Faḍl. As is clear from Ibn ʿAsâkir’s isnâds, Vadet was right in identifying this person with the Abû ʿl-Hasan ʿAlî b. Bakrân of Shiraz whom al-Hujwîrî describes as one of the major Sufis of Fârs.247 Al-Hujwîrî states that he met this mystic and that he heard from him the story of how several of Ibn Khâffî’s wives, once when talking among themselves, were amazed to discover that he had never sought to be intimate with any of them and how his favorite wife had confirmed that this was also the case with her.248 We have found no dates for Abû ʿl-Hasan ʿAlî b. Bakrân, and al-Hujwîrî does not tell us when he met him. But if al-Hujwîrî, whose death Nicholson puts between 465 and 469 A.H., spent the last years of his life in Lahore,249 then it may be assumed that he met Ibn Bakrân earlier, at some time during the period extending roughly from 415 to 450. That Ibn Bakrân should have been active in this period is most likely not inconsistent with his having been a disciple of al-Daylami. Moreover, in Ibn ʿAsâkir’s isnâds Ibn Bakrân cites al-Daylami without an intermediary. There is thus little reason to doubt that his transmission of the text of the ‘Atf from its author was direct.

From Abû ʿl-Hasan b. Bakrân, according to the title page of the manu-
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script, the Kitāb ‘ṣaf al-alīf was transmitted by Abū Shujā’ Muhammad b. Sa’dān al-Maqārīḍī. Al-Maqārīḍī also follows Ibn Bakrān in the ānicds of Ibn ‘Asākir’s reports. We do not know the birth date of al-Maqārīḍī, but he is said by the authors of the Shīrāznāma and the Shadd al-izār to have died in 509/1115–16. The time span is long, but assuming that both Ibn Bakrān and al-Maqārīḍī heard the ‘ṣaf and the reports quoted by Ibn ‘Asākir at a relatively young age, the chain of direct transmission from al-Daylāmī to al-Maqārīḍī is plausible.

The biographical information on Ibn Khafīf that Ibn ‘Asākir had from al-Daylāmī through al-Maqārīḍī represents a second field in which al-Maqārīḍī was the intellectual heir of the author of the ‘ṣaf. He was not only a transmitter of al-Daylāmī’s treatise on love, he was also the author of a biographical work, a mashyakha, in which he included three generations or “classes” (tabaqāt) of the Sufi sheikhs of Fārs. Junayd Shīrāzī names al-Maqārīḍī along with al-Daylāmī among the biographers of Shirāz in whose footsteps he says he is following in writing the Shadd al-izār. Another work of which Junayd Shīrāzī made considerable use, the Ta’rīkh mashiyikh Fārs (History of the sheikhs of Fārs) of Sā’īn al-Dīn Ḥusayn b. Muhammad (d. 664/1265–66), was patterned on the works of al-Daylāmī and al-Maqārīḍī.

The borrowings from the ‘ṣaf in Rūzbihān Baqlī’s writings make it clear that Rūzbihān had access to al-Daylāmī’s work or to extensive extracts from it, although the text at Rūzbihān’s disposal may have differed slightly from that of our manuscript. Rūzbihān seldom acknowledges his debt to al-Daylāmī. In his Mashrab al-arwāh (The drinking fountain of spirits) he cites al-Daylāmī by name, quoting an abridged version,

250 Zarkūb Shīrāzī, Shīrāznāma, p. 113; Junayd Shīrāzī, Shadd al-izār, p. 101.

251 Al-Maqārīḍī must have lived a relatively long life. He is mentioned in the biography of Abū ʿIshāq al-Kāzarūnī as having been a “pole” (qutb) of the path for nearly fifty years. Cf. Mahmūd b. ʿUthmān, Firdaws al-murshidīya fī asrār al-ṣamādiyya (Die Vita des Scheich Ābu ʿIshāq al-Kāzarūnī), ed. Fritz Meier, p. 32; cited by Vadet, trans., intro., p. 18.


253 Sā’īn al-Dīn was a Shāfi’ite jurist and a follower of the orthodox mystic Shihāb al-Dīn ʿUmar al-Suhrawardī (d. 632/1234) (ibid., p. 177).

254 See chapter five, nn. 7, 11, 12. Cf. Vadet’s speculations on possible alternate routes of transmission of the text of the ‘ṣaf to Rūzbihān (trans., intro., pp. 18–22); see also Sobieroj, “Ibn Ḥaffīṣ as-Šīrāzī,” p. 156, on the founding of the Maqārīḍī ribāṭ.
with slight variations in wording, of his definition of eros (‘ishq) as “the boiling up of love” and “the loss of the lover’s portion from everything except his beloved.”\footnote{Mashrab al-arwāh, p. 135; MS, p. 47.} In the same context he cites four other statements about eros that are clearly borrowed from the ‘Afīf, namely, the definitions of eros attributed to Abū Ḥaṣṣ al-Ḥaddād and al-Junayd, the second of two statements attributed to Heraclitus, and Ibn Khaffīf’s report concerning the progression of eros according to the mystics of Damascus. In each case the wording is either precisely the same or sufficiently close to indicate borrowing.\footnote{Cf. Mashrab al-arwāh, p. 135, and MS, pp. 25–26, 35, 49, and 71. A similar example is the definition of ṣabāḥa attributed to Abū Sa’īd b. al-A’rābī (Mashrab, p. 115; MS, p. 37).} Rūzbihān’s borrowings in his Kītāb-i ʿabhar al-ʿāshiqīn (The jasmine of the adepts of love) are more extensive and reveal a considerable degree of indebtedness to the ‘Afīf.\footnote{Vadet, trans., intro., pp. 13–14. Cf. Rūzbihān Baqli, Kītāb-i ʿabhar al-ʿāshiqīn, pp. 9–10; MS, p. 9. Masataka Takeshita has subsequently investigated the relationship between the ‘Afīf and Rūzbihān’s Kītāb-i ʿabhar al-ʿāshiqīn in considerable detail. See n. 4 above.} He has also remarked the importance of the earlier sections of the ‘Afīf for aspects of the structure of Rūzbihān’s book on love and pointed out several other borrowings.\footnote{Vadet, trans., intro., pp. 13–15.} The titles of sections four and five of ʿAbhar al-ʿāshiqīn, which evoke the virtues of lovers who become close, of beauty, of the beautiful, of the perceiver of beauty, and of the one whose beauty is perceived, remind us of section titles in chapter three of the ‘Afīf. The content of Rūzbihān’s sections, however, while reflecting an awareness of the ‘Afīf, is rather rhapsodic and differs considerably from al-Daylāmī’s treatment. Section six of ʿAbhar al-ʿāshiqīn, on “the nature and essence of human love,” includes what is an obvious adaptation and abridgment of al-Daylāmī’s eleven stages of love. Even some of the poetic examples given in the ‘Afīf for the various stages are repeated by Rūzbihān. These contain only minor variants, and none that would suggest that Rūzbihān was following a source other than al-Daylāmī.\footnote{Rūzbihān Baqli, Kītāb-i ʿabhar al-ʿāshiqīn, pp. 40–42; MS, pp. 40–48. From Rūzbihān’s clear dependence on al-Daylāmī in this section it may be concluded that the word ʾistishād (ʿAbhar, p. 41, l. 12) is to be read ʾistiḥār, as in the notes, and perhaps that ʿshaghaf (ibid., l. 9) should be read ʿshāʿaf. Cf. MS,}
following section of Rūzbihān’s work we find a reflection of al-Daylami’s transmission of the teaching of al-Ḥallāj. Eros (‘ishq) is pro-
claimed to be a divine attribute, and the function of the preeternal attrib-
ute is described in terms of the triad agent, act, and object of act: ‘āshiq, ‘ishq, and ma’shuq.260

In his Sharḥ-i shaṭḥiyāt (Commentary on the ecstatic utterances of the Sufis) Rūzbihān quotes a long passage by al-Ḥallāj on the origin of eros in God’s self-love. Although he does not acknowledge his source, Rūzbi-
hān apparently extracted the passage from al-Daylami’s ‘Atf.261 Mas-
signon reproduced and translated Rūzbihān’s incomplete and somewhat altered Persian version of the passage in 1922 in his Essai sur les ori-
gines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane, long before the edition of the Sharḥ-i shaṭḥiyāt appeared in 1981. In an article published in 1950 he also gave a translation of the passage as it appears in the ‘Atf, again while his source was still available only in manuscript form.262 Rūzbihān’s text has variants that could conceivably have their origin in an intermediary between al-Daylami’s work and his commentary or in a separate manuscript tradition of the ‘Atf. On the other hand, the changes may have been the work of Rūzbihān himself while copying or translat-
ing.263

Our information allows us to take the story of the influence of al-
Daylami’s ‘Atf no further. But as Rūzbihān Baqli’s debt to al-Daylami is so extensive, it is possible to hope that future research will extend the narrative. Rūzbihān is a difficult but original and inspired author, and he is a figure of some importance in the history of Persian mysticism. A great deal of attention has been devoted to him already,264 but little to his

260 Rūzbihān Baqli, Kitāb-i ‘abhar al-‘āshiqīn, p. 44; cf. MS, p. 66, n. 61, and pp. 51, 11 and n. 1, 40–41 and n. 35, 74 (beginning of section six).


262 We have used later editions of both the Essai and the article. See Mas-

263 Cf. MS p. 52, nn. 11, 12. We understand that an edition of the Arabic original of Rūzbihān’s Sharḥ-i shaṭḥiyāt, his Manṭīq al-asrūr, by Paul Ballanfat and Carl W. Ernst is forthcoming. The Persian version is Rūzbihān’s own much amplified translation (cf. Sharḥ-i shaṭḥiyāt, intro., pp. 4–5, 33–34).

264 In addition to the editions of Rūzbihān’s works and the studies already
influence and to his following. When the spiritual heritage of Rūzbihān Baqli has been more thoroughly investigated, perhaps new signs of al-Daylami’s significance for the history of the idea of love in Islamic mysticism will come to light.265

THE TRANSLATION

The present translation renders our edition of al-Daylami’s Arabic text. If there are occasional divergences, these are accidental and are most likely the result of our having changed our minds about how a given passage should be emended or translated during the various stages of our involvement with the work. The substantive footnotes that accompany the two versions are not identical. In particular, more attention is given in the edition to the identification of persons mentioned in the text and to technical observations regarding hadiths cited by the author. Our initial purpose was to provide an English translation of the Arabic text as established by Vadet. However, since the one manuscript of the work is replete with textual problems, only some of which could be solved by recourse to parallel texts, there were numerous passages that might be emended in more than one way, according to the judgment of the editor. Moreover, Vadet’s Arabic text contains a relatively high number of misprints and inadvertent deletions that would have added to the difficulty of comparing our translation with his edition. We concluded that it would be useful to prepare a new edition that more nearly represented the text as we read it and understood it.

Our edition nevertheless owes much to Vadet’s, both in a great many individual readings, and in the division into paragraphs, where we have in general, but not systematically, followed Vadet. To facilitate use of our work together with Vadet’s, we have also followed him in referring to pages rather than folios of the manuscript. The draft of our translation was complete before the appearance of Vadet’s French version, but we have since compared our renderings of problematic passages with his.


265 Cf. n. 4 above.
Translations of passages from the Koran are taken from A. J. Arberry’s translation *The Koran Interpreted* unless otherwise noted. The references to verses, however, are to the widely accepted Egyptian standard edition of 1924, which was used by Muhammad Fuad ‘Abd al-Baqi as the basis for his concordance (*al-Mu’jam al-mufahras li-alfâz al-Qur’ân al-karîm*). Arberry uses Fluegel’s numeration and does not distinguish clearly between the verses, since he numbers only every fifth verse. Capitalization has been changed to conform to our usage in the rest of our translation of al-Daylamî’s treatise. In some cases we have altered Arberry’s and others’ translations of Koranic passages to suit the meaning understood by the author of the ‘Atf or the authorities he cites. Alterations are pointed out in the notes.

In sections of the text where the words *hubb* (or *maḥabba*) and ‘*ishq* occur together, and especially in more technical passages, we have rendered the former by love and the latter by eros. The result, admittedly, is not always felicitous. As on other linguistic matters, the Bedouin Arabs were often consulted about the passionate form of love known in Arabic as ‘*ishq*. The word *eros*, because of its Neoplatonic and modern psychoanalytic resonances, is not an entirely suitable translation of ‘*ishq* in this context.266 We feel, however, that the advantages of rendering *hubb* and ‘*ishq* more or less consistently by two distinct words in English are such that the stylistic problems that result can be tolerated. Where we have wished to specify that verbal forms in the translation reflect forms of the Arabic verb ‘*ashiqa*, we have used expressions such as *to love with eros* or *to love passionately*.267

Brackets in the text mark additions made in our edition of the Arabic text, while parentheses denote additions made only in the translation. References to al-Daylamî’s text in the notes are to page numbers of the manuscript, which are printed in the translation between brackets in boldface at the beginning of each page.

---

266 Cf. MS, pp. 112–13, 128.
267 Cf. MS, p. 128.