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A NOTE ON DATES, QUR'ĀNIC REFERENCES, AND FOREIGN WORDS

All dates are indicated in accordance with both the Islamic ḥijrah calendar (A.H.) and the Common Era (C.E.), with the two dates separated by a slash. Verses from the Qur'ān are in italics, with the chapter and verse numbers indicated in brackets. All transliterations have been standardized in accord with the Library of Congress guidelines. Common words in Islamic studies such as Qur'ān, ḥadīth, Sufi, shaykh, sunnah, shari'ah, etc have not been placed in italics. Plurals of such words will be made so by adding an “s” as is done in English. Thus, ḥadīth is pluralized ḥadīths instead of the Arabic aḥādīth, shaykh as shaykhs instead of mashāyikh or shuyukh, and so on.
The text that is the focus of this study, the *Kitāb al-aghāliṭ* (The Book of Errors), is dedicated entirely to the mistakes that occur with the Sufis. While many books have been written by opponents of Sufism to this same end, the *Aghāliṭ* has a unique perspective in that the author, Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī (d. 412/1020), was one of the leading Sufi shaykhs of his age. The text was thus written not against Sufis but for them.

The objective of this thesis is to produce a critical edition of Sulamī’s work based on the available manuscripts, address the question of authorship, and show Sulamī as not a mere compiler of Sufi sayings and lore but as an authorized teacher of Sufism who has produced writings in this capacity. This thesis will consist of three chapters. The first chapter entitled *Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī and the Kitāb al-aghāliṭ* will consist of three sections, the first will serve as an introduction to Sulamī, surveying his life and works and emphasizing his place as a Sufi teacher. The second section will establish the correct title of the text (scholarship hitherto referred to it as *Ghalatāt al-ṣūfīya*). The third will address the charge laid by A.J. Arberry against Sulamī for plagiarizing a section of the *Kitāb al-luma’* of Abu’l Naṣr al-Sarrāj (d. 378/988).1 In doing so, it will also present a summary comparison with the *Kitāb al-luma’*. The second chapter will present a synopsis of the *Aghāliṭ*. The third chapter will deal specifically with the text, including a description of the manuscripts used in this study, the method used in presenting critical edition, images of pages from the manuscripts, and finally a critical edition of the Arabic text.

While preparing this critical edition, it was found that the oldest of the four manuscripts included the *Aghāliṭ* as a section of another Sulamī work, the *Miḥān mashāyikh al-ṣūfīya* (The

---

Trials of the Sufi Shaykhs). From the content of the two works, it is clear that they are separate books and the *Mihan* was thus not included in the critical edition of the *Aghāliṭ*. It is however presented as an appendix to the present study.

The *Kitāb al-aghāliṭ* has been edited before but the previous editor had only one manuscript at his disposal and the published edition has a number of mistakes. Since then, three more manuscripts of the *Aghāliṭ* have come to light – one coming from a collection that was copied sixty years after Sulamī’s passing, making it the oldest collection of Sulamī works available. Furthermore, Arberry’s charge of plagiarism has never been thoroughly addressed. For these reasons a new edition and study of the *Kitāb al-aghāliṭ* is justified.

---

Chapter 1

Abū ′Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī and the Kitāb al-aghāliṭ

Sulamī: Scholar and Sufi Shaykh

Abū ′Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī was one of the foremost scholars of Sufism and ḥadīth in
eleventh century Khurasān. His full name is Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn bin Muḥammad ibn Mūsā
ibn Khālid ibn Sālim ibn Zāwiyya ibn Saʿīd ibn Qabīṣa ibn Sarrāq al-Azīf al-Sulamī. Sulamī’s
student and scribe Abū Saʿīd Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Khashshāb (d. 456/1064) wrote a biography
of his teacher which is perhaps the best source for our knowledge of Sulamī’s life.1 Sulamī was
born in Nishāpūr in 325/937 to a family of Arab stock that settled in Khurasān, from the Banū Azd
on his father’s side and the Banū Sulaym on his mother’s. When his father left Nishāpūr for
Mecca Sulamī was left to the care of his maternal grandfather Abū ‘Amru Ismāʿīl ibn Nujayd (d.
366/976), who raised his grandson and saw to his education. It is for this reason that Abū ′Abd
al-Raḥmān took the name of his maternal tribe – Sulaym. When Ibn Nujayd passed away, Sulamī

1 A manuscript of this work survives and is in the possession of M.J. Kister. With the exception of Khatīb al-
Baghdādi’s entry on Sulamī in the former’s Tārīkh Baghdad (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah, 1965), 2: 248-
249, biographical dictionaries have drawn heavily on Khashshāb’s work and is quoted by Shams ad-Dīn
Muḥammad al-Dhahābi in his Siyar al-ʿālam al-nubalā’ (Beirut: Muʿassasat al-Risālah), 17: 247-255 (hereafter
referred to as Dhahābi). Tāj al-Dīn al-Sūbkī builds on Dhahābi’s information on Sulamī and includes some
his own comments in his Ṭabaqāt al-shāfiʿiyah al-kubra (Cairo: ‘Isa al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī), 4:143-147 (hereafter
referred to as Subkī). The Risala of Abūl Qāsim al-Qushayrī contains a number of stories involving Sulamī
as well as sayings from him. For a list of Sulamī’s writings, see Fuat Sezgin, Geschichte Des Arabischen
Schrifttums (Leiden: E.J. Brill), 1:671-673. This information was bought together by Nūr al-Dīn Shurayba in
the introduction to his critical edition of Sulamī’s Ṭabaqāt al-ṣufiyah (Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Nafis, 1986). This
list of writings and biographical material was updated and incorporated into Suleyman Atesh’s introduction to
his Tisʿat kutub fi uṣūl at-taṣawwūf wa l zuhd li Abī ′Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī (Riyadh: al-Nāshir, 1993), 54-
64 (here after referred to as Atesh). In English see Gerhard Böwering’s “The Qur’an Commentary of al-
Sulami,” in Essays Presented to Charles J. Adams, ed. Wael Hallaq and Donald P. Little (Leiden: E.J. Brill,
1991), 41-56 (hereafter referred to as Böwering); and also Rkia Cornell’s Early Śūfī Women, (Louisville:
Fonsvitae, 2000), 31-42.
inherited his library which he turned into a lodge (duwayra) for Sufis. Sulamī was buried there years later when he too passed away.

Nishāpūr was the cultural capital of Khurasān during Sulamī's time and saw heavy internal strife amongst her scholars which was a key factor in her eventual collapse. Though Nishāpūr had virtually every school of Islamic thought in her midst, the main combatants were the Shāfī and the Ḥanafī schools who were aligned along theological lines as well, the former with the Ash‘arites and the latter with the Mu‘tazilites. A third party that was also significant in the milieu and who were popular with the lower-class of Nishāpūr and at times some very influential leaders of Khurasān were the Karrāmites – an extreme ascetic group that emphasized the literal aspects of revelation for which they were accused of anthropomorphism. The Karrāmites were found throughout the Near East and were one of a number of different forms of Islamic piety and mysticism. Another form of Islamic piety present in Nishāpūr, and that was almost indigenous to Khurasān, was the Malāmafiya (the People of Blame). Besides the Karramites and the Malāmafīs, Nishāpūr also had teachers of Iraqi Sufism. Virtually all the Sufis of Khurasān came from the Shāfī‘ī-Ash‘arī faction, of which Sulamī was a leading figure – all of his teachers were Shāfī‘ite and it is said that he met the great Ash‘arite scholar Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī (d. 403/1013) when the latter visited Shiraz. Though Sulamī was a high standing member of the Shāfī‘ite-Ash‘arite tradition, his main scholarly interests were not jurisprudence or theology but Sufism and

\[ \text{\footnotesize \begin{enumerate}
\item For more on the Shafi‘ī and Hanafi disputes, see Bulliet The Patricians of Nishapur, 28-46.
\item On the Karramites and their place in Khurasān, see C. E. Bosworth, “The Rise of the Karāmiya in Khurasān,” Muslim World (1960) 6-14.
\item On the relationship between the Sufis and the Shāfī‘ī madhhab in Nishāpūr, see Margaret Malamud’s “Sufi Organizations and structures of authority in medieval Nihsapur,” IJMES 26 (1994), 427-442.
\end{enumerate}} \]
ḥadīth, as the honorifics that Dhahabī mentions suggest: “the imām, the master of ḥadīth (al-
ḥāfiẓ), the ḥadīth scholar (al-muḥaddith), the Shaykh of Khurasān, the elder of the Sufīs.”

In the field of ḥadīth, Sulamī traveled to various parts of the Islamic world including Rayy,
Merv, Hamādān, Baghdād, and the Hijāz. Subkī mentions that Sulamī taught ḥadīth for over forty
years through dictation and recitation. He was accused of being untrustworthy in transmitting
ḥadīth (ghayr thiqa) by a jealous opponent of the Nishāpūr’s Ḥanafi-Mu’tazilite faction,
Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Qaṭṭān. However, Subkī repudiates this charge and state that he was
indeed trustworthy. Furthermore, Sulamī composed a number of questions to the ḥadīth master
Abū’l Ḥasan al-Daraquṭnī (d. 385/995) concerning the soundness of ḥadīth narrators (jarḥ wa
ta’ḍīl) about which Dhahabī says, “They are questions of one who knows [this field] (su’āl ’ārif).”
He also compiled a collection of forty ḥadīth which the later Shafi’ī jurisprudent and ḥadīth master
Sharaf al-Dīn an-Nawawī (d. 676/1277) mentions in the introduction to his own popular
collection.

With regards to his mystical training, Sulamī’s first teachers were his father and maternal
grandfather Isma’īl Ibn Nujayd. The latter was a member of the Malāmahiya and had
accompanied Abū ‘Uthmān al-Ḥīrī (d. 298/910). Sulamī received khirqa (robe of investiture) and
permission to initiate novices from the Shafi’ī shaykh Abū Sahl al-Su’lukī (d. 369/980). He also
received the khirqa from Abū’l Qāsim al-Nasrābādhi (d. 367/977-8) and accompanied him
on the Hajj. Naṣrabādhi’s chain of teachers includes some the most prominent figures of Iraqi

---

6 Dhahabī (17: 247)
7 Subkī, (2: 144).
8 Ibid. and Khaṭīb, (2: 248).
9 Dhahabī, (17: 252). For the questions see Su’alāt Abī ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī lil-Daraquṭnī fi jarṭh wa-
10 For Sulamī’s forty ḥadīth, see Muhammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sakhāwī’s checking in the latter’s Takhrij
11 Böwering incorrectly states that al-Su’lukī was a Ḥanafi. Subkī (3:137) gives his full name as Ḥanafi due
to descent from the the Banū Ḥanīfa and not madhhab affiliation.
Sufism: Abū Bakr al-Shiblī (d. 334/946), Abū’l Qāsim al-Junayd (d. 295/910), Sarī al-Saqaṭī (d. 253/867), Ma’rūf al-Karkhī (d. 200/815) and then back to the Prophet through ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.12 Sulamī was thus not only affiliated with the Khurasānian tradition of the Malāmaṭiya and Iraqi tradition of Sufism but he was qualified by some of the highest authorities of both forms of Islamic mysticism to transmit this teaching to others.

With regards to his writings on Sufism, scholarship has seen fit to provide three categories that he contributed to.13 The first of these is Sufi hagiography, where he authored three important works: Tārīkh al-ṣūfīyah (The History of the Sufis) which is lost, though parts remain extant in the numerous later hagiographical works that draw from it; Dhikr al-niswa al-muta’ābidāt aṣ-ṣūfiyyāt (A Memorial of Female Sufi Devotees);14 and the Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfīyah (The Successive Generations of the Sufis), the latter being his most important and lasting contribution. Sulamī’s Ṭabaqāt served as an essential resource for later Sufi hagiographies.15 The second category of Sulamī’s writings is the genre of Sufi commentary on the Qur’ān, where he compiled the Ḥaqā’iq al-tafsīr (The Realities of Qur’ānic Exegesis) and an appendix to this work titled Ziyādat al-ḥaqā’iq al-tafsīr (Appendix to the Realities of Qur’ānic Exegesis).16 Sulamī’s Ḥaqā’iq is an encyclopedic collection of the Sufi commentary on the Qur’ān and incorporated much of the literature to his time. Like the Ṭabaqāt, the Ḥaqā’iq served as a major source for future works in the field, in particular the ‘Arā’is al-bayān (Brides of Elucidation) of Ruzbihān Baqlī (d. 606/1209).

---

13 For this classification of Sulamī’s writings, see Böwering, “Qur’an Commentary of al-Sulamī,” 45.
16 For a critical edition of the latter, see Gerhard Böwering’s The Minor Qur’ān Commentary of Abū ‘Abd al-Rahmān as-Sulamī (d. 412/1021) (Beirut: Dar el-Machreq Sarl Editeurs, 1995).
The third category of Sulamī’s writings is compilations of sayings and stories of early Sufis on particular themes or manners and customs. There are a number of treatises by Sulamī to this end, of particular note are ‘Uyūb al-nafs (The Faults of the Lower-Self), Jawamī’ al-ādāb al-ṣūfiyyah (Compendium of Sufi Comportment), Adab al-suḥba (The Proper Conduct of Keeping Company), Risālat al-malāmatiyya (The Epistle of the People of Blame) and many other shorter works.17

Though Sulamī has made lasting contributions to Sufism, some experts have questioned Sulamī’s Sufi affiliations. One scholar, comparing him to Farīd al-Dīn al-‘Aṭṭār (d. 586/1190), says that ‘Aṭṭār was “like Sulamī, actually no Sufi himself.”18 He was characterized as being “not an original author, but a compiler of Sufi biographies, anecdotes and sayings, who copied his sources extensively, supplementing the materials with oral information,”19 and as “unoriginal and uninspiring.”20 Recent scholarship has re-assessed this view of Sulamī and after examining his writings closer has seen fit to add a fourth category – that of Sulamī as a Sufi master.21 Sulamī’s writings were thus aimed at specific audiences – on the one hand, a general audience for whom the text was an apology for Sufism, and on the other, a more erudite audience within the Sufi community for whom Sulamī’s writings were indeed compilations of the efforts of previous masters. This new category addresses a more specific audience: Sufi initiates.

18 Böwering, 55.
19 Böwering, 50.
As for Sulamī’s credentials as a Sufi shaykh, we have already mentioned that he was raised under the watchful eye of his Malamaṭī grandfather ibn Nujayd and that he received the *khirqah* from Naṣrabādhi and Su‘lukī, which should be sufficient to establish his authority as a Sufi shaykh. There are other facts that also show him in this capacity. Abū Sa‘īd ibn Abī‘l Khayr (d. 440/1049), who was extremely influential in the development of Sufism, was ordered by his shaykh to go to Sulamī to receive the *khirqah*.22 The celebrated Sufi Abū‘l Qāsim al-Qushayrī (d. 465/1072) was also a disciple of Sulamī after the former’s shaykh Abū ‘Alī al-Daqqāq (d. 405/1014 or 412/1021) passed away. Though Qushayrī was Sulamī’s disciple for a short period of time, his *Risāla* is nonetheless filled with sayings from Sulamī. Also, Sulamī’s contemporaries held him in high saintly esteem – Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdullah al-Naysābūrī (d. 405/1014) said, “If Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān [al-Sulamī] is not of the *abdāl*, then God has no saints upon this earth.”23 After Sulamī’s passing, his grave became a site for pious visits, Khatīb al-Baghdādī himself having traveled to it to seek its blessing.24 Furthermore, within the later Sufi tradition, Sulamī is praised by no higher a figure then Muḥyī al-Dīn ibn ‘Arabī (d. 638/1240) in the latter’s *al-Futūḥāt al-makkiya*.25 Given the above evidence, Sulamī’s position as a Sufi shaykh of high caliber should be without doubt. What remains is to consider the texts that he produced in this capacity.

Sulamī’s writings as a Sufi shaykh have yet to be studied in depth however a few general remarks can be made about them at present. The key feature of these works is that Sulamī speaks from his own authority as a Sufi shaykh and does not rely on the teachings or sayings of past masters. The main sources for these writings are the Qur’ān and hadiths. These texts are

---


23 In his introduction the *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣufiyah* (p. 46), Shurayba quotes this saying from Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, *Mirāṭ al-Zamān*, vol. 11, fol. 3, events of 412 Hijrī.

24 Khatīb, (2: 247).

25 See *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiya* (Cairo, n.d.) 1: 201 and 2: 261. Ibn ‘Arabī’s encounter with Sulamī and the high esteem that ibn ‘Arabī held him in will be looked at further in chapter 2.
generally replies to questions posed to him by disciples on fine points of belief and practice or a discussion of a particular point pertaining to the Path. In the few instances where he does use the authority of past shaykhs it is only to sum up a particular point that he is making. A good example of such a work is his *Manāḥij al-‘ārifīn* (The Paths of the Gnostics).26 In the *Manāḥij*, Sulamī outlines the general stages of the Sufi path from beginning to end in a short and concise manner, mentioning the most important developments that the novice will go through and the necessary inner attitudes at each stage. In doing this, he uses fewer then ten sayings of past shaykhs and relies extensively on the Qur’ān and ḥadīths (over 20) to make his point. The *Darajāt al-ṣādiqīn* (Stations of the Righteous)27 also covers the entirety of the Sufi path but with a stronger emphasis on the spiritual-states (*aḥwāl*) “from ‘repentance’ (*tawba*) to the loftiest degree of ‘gnosis’ (*ma’rifa*), culminating in ‘extinction’ (*fanā’*), and followed in certain cases by the return of the traveler to creation, as a guide and example to others.”28 *Zalal al-fuqarā’* (Mistakes of the Poor)29 presents a lucid discussion of one of the greatest dangers on the Path – spiritual pretension. The text was written after Sulamī saw how a number of Sufi aspirants were using their status as *fuqarā’* (poor) as a source of arrogance. He goes to great lengths in discussing mistaken notions of spiritual impoverishment (*faqār*) and the reality of being impoverished to God and its consequences with respect to belief, comportment, character, and religious practices. In the same capacity, Sulamī wrote the *Adab majālisat al-mashaykh* (The Proper Conduct of Sitting with the Shaykhs),30 which discusses the proper conduct that the aspirant must have with his shaykh. He states that the authority of the shaykh is derived from the authority of the Prophet, which in turn is derived from God Himself. The gathering of the brethren links the aspirant to the

---

27 See *Atesh*, 377-389. Also, see Honerkamp for a critical edition, synopsis, and translation of this text.
28 *Honerkamp*, 87.
29 Ibid.
30 Manuscript in possession of Dr. Ken Honerkamp of the University of Georgia-Athens.
blessing of the shaykh which links the aspirant to the blessing of the Prophet which in turn links
the aspirant to the presence of God. Throughout this text, he emphasizes the proper conduct in
the presence of a “shaykh of instruction and training” (ta‘līm wa tarbīyah). Similarly, another
work, the Maḥāsin al-taṣawwuf (The Beauties of Sufism) was written in response to someone that
complained to Sulamī about a scholar that censors Sufi practices. Unlike his Muqaddima fi’l
taṣawwuf (Introduction to Sufism) which consists entirely of sayings from past masters, the
Maḥāsin presents a detailed apology for Sufism using few sources besides the Qur’an and
ḥadīth. Lastly, the most explicit text that shows Sulamī as a Sufi shaykh is his Fuṣūl fi’l taṣawwuf
(Passages Concerning Sufism), which contain fifty-one of his discourses (mudhākarāt) on a
variety of subjects. In each of these works, Sulamī speaks largely from his own authority based
mostly on passages from the Qur’ān and the ḥadīth, and rarely the saying of a previous Sufi.
These books are perhaps best referred to as teaching texts of Sulamī.

The different writing styles that Sulamī employed – one as a collector or compiler of
sayings and the other as an original author – was done out of consideration for the audiences that
he was addressing. His original essays were certainly directed towards people that were already
initiated into the Sufi path. His writings as a compiler allowed him to serve as an apologist for
Sufism, asserting that its way is based on the traditions of the pious forefathers going back to the
Companions and the Prophet himself, as well as provide a service to the scholarly community.

There is a more subtle reason behind this use of different writing styles which is made
apparent when we keep in mind that Sulamī was also a part of the Malāmaṭī tradition. Part of the
Malāmaṭī way is to constantly blame one’s self and not to draw the attention of others in fear of
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31 When Fritz Meier wrote his article on the centrality of Khurāsān to the notion of shaykh of instruction and
training this book remained unknown. It contains a great deal of material that can further nuance Meier’s
thesis. See “Khurasan and the End of Classical Sufism.” In Essays in Islamic Mysticism and Piety. Ed. and


33 Manuscript in possession of Dr. Ken Honerkamp of the University of Georgia-Athens.
ostentation. For the general audience, Sulamī thus emphasized the Malāmaṭī ethic and acted as a compiler, thus not drawing attention to his own spiritual rank. For his specialized audience however we see Sulamī making full use of his rank and authority as a Sufi shaykh. It would seem that these teaching texts of Sulamī – texts that draw attention to his authority – were perhaps not circulated as widely as his other works and were perhaps even limited to his direct students. It is in this capacity, as a Sufi scholar as well as a Malāmaṭī, that Sulamī penned the Aghāliṭ.

**Title of the Aghāliṭ and its Relationship to Other Sulamī Texts**

Before the present study, scholarship on the Aghāliṭ had access to one manuscript of the text from the Dār al-Kutub library in Cairo. This particular manuscript comes from compilation of works on Sufism and contains a copy of the Sulamī’s Risālat al-malāmaṭiyya. At the end of the Risāla, a section appears titled Ghalaṭāt al-ṣūfiyya (The Errors of the Sufis), and presents the text of Kitāb al-aghāliṭ. Two studies have been carried out on the Dār al-Kutub manuscript, one by Abu’l ‘Alā’ al-‘Affīfī, titled al-Malāmaṭiyya wa’l ṣūfīyah wa ahl al-futūwa, which presented a critical edition of Sulamī’s Risāla but did not include the Ghalaṭāt al-ṣūfiyya in it. A second study was carried out on the same manuscript by ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ Ahmed al-Fāwī Maḥmūd and published under the title Usūl al-malāmaṭiyya wa ghalaṭāt al-ṣūfiyya. As it is clear from his title, he considered the Ghalaṭāt to be a section of the Risāla. The focus of both of these studies however was not the text of the Ghalaṭāt but the Risāla. The correct position with regards to whether the Ghalaṭāt is a section of the Risāla is ‘Affīfī’s, namely that it is not. The main evidence for this comes from the fact that editions of the Risāla based on other manuscripts end where ‘Affīfī
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34 See chapter 2 for information on all of the manuscripts mentioned in this section.
ended his.\textsuperscript{37} However, Maḥmūd’s position is not without foundation – the \textit{Ghalatāt} starts abruptly without the \textit{basmallah}, preamble, opening supplication, or anything of the sort, which is very uncharacteristic of Sulamī’s books. Also, the \textit{Ghalatāt} does start off as a \textit{faṣl} (section) and is followed by three more, suggesting that the \textit{Ghalatāt} is an addendum of sorts to the \textit{Risāla}.

The issue of whether or not the \textit{Ghalatāt} was a separate text by Sulamī is further complicated when we look at the Sulamīyāt manuscript (see next chapter for description). This collection includes the \textit{Ghalatāt} but gives a different title to the book – \textit{Fi'l ghalat al-ladhī waqa' li'l-qawm} (Concerning the Errors that Occurred with the Sufis) – and is given as a section of another of Sulamī’s works, not the \textit{Risāla} but a previously unknown work \textit{Miḥan mashāyikh al-ṣūfiya} (The Trials of the Sufi Shaykhs). Even though this collection treats the books as being a part of the \textit{Miḥan}, it is clear from their content that they should not be treated as one book. The \textit{Miḥan} lists the trials of twenty-six Sufi shaykhs and should be considered another contribution by Sulamī to hagiographical literature.\textsuperscript{38} The \textit{Aghāliṭ}, however, is not hagiographical in the least bit and like a number of other Sulamī works (such as \textit{Jawāmi’ ādāb al-ṣufiyah}, \textit{'Uyūb al-nafs}, \textit{Risālat al-malāmatīya}, and other) presents its contents in list form.

That the text is to be treated as a separate work by Sulamī, one not attached to any other of his writings, is made clear when looking at the two remaining manuscripts, the Moroccan and the Bin Yusuf manuscripts. Both present the text as an independent work and also clarify the correct title of the book. The Moroccan manuscript has the title \textit{Gharā’ib min 'ulūm al-ṣufiya}, and the Bin Yusuf manuscript gives a fuller title: \textit{Kitāb al-aghāliṭ fihi gharā’ib min 'ulūm al-ṣufiya} (The Book of Errors, Containing Oddities from the Science of the Sufis). \textit{Kitāb al-aghāliṭ} then is the proper title because this is the only manuscript that actually refers to it as a book. Also, \textit{Ghalatāt} (which was used in the Dār al-Kutub manuscript) is an incorrect form of the plural of the Arabic

\textsuperscript{37} Hartmann’s edition of the \textit{Risālah}, in \textit{Der Islam}, (8) 157-203.

\textsuperscript{38} See the appendix of this thesis for an edition of the \textit{Miḥan}. 
word *ghalaṭ*, the correct plural of which is *aghāliṭ*. Lastly, this title is corroborated by an external source, namely a reference to the book by Ibn ‘Arabī in his *Jawāb al-mustaqīm*, where he mentions a work by Sulamī titled *Aghāliṭ al-ṣufiya*. Because ibn ‘Arabī does not mention the *Miḥan* along with it, this provides further support that the *Aghāliṭ* is a separate work of Sulamī.

**Authorship and a Comparison with Sarrāj’s Kitāb al-luma**

Khurasān in the 3rd/9th century saw the writing of the earliest apologies for Sufism, one of the earliest being Abu'l Naṣr al-Sarrāj’s (d. 378/988) *Kitāb al-luma* (The Book of Flashes). Sarrāj’s *Luma* ends with a section titled “Chapter: Mentioning those that erred in Sufism, from whence the error occurred, and how one cures this.” When comparing the *Luma* to Sulamī’s *Aghāliṭ*, A.J. Arberry wrote that the latter was “to be described as a wholesale plagiarism of Sarrāj’s text, committed without the slightest acknowledgement or excuse,” and then gives samples of the similarity that “amply prove the charge of plagiarism.”

Before addressing this charge, let us first point out that the concept of plagiarism does not fit the medieval era or Islamic scholarship in particular. Traditional Islamic scholarship emphasizes orthodoxy through the transmission of knowledge from recognized authorities as opposed to the development of innovations. Because of this, making extensive use of one’s authorities in no way takes away from one’s scholarly acumen. For example, Qushayrī copied the biographical entries in his *Risālah fi’l taṣawwuf* almost word for word Sulamī’s *Ṭabaqāt* without this affecting his reputation as a scholar in the slightest. We should also remember that Sulamī
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40 I would like to acknowledge the assistance rendered by Jean-Jacques Thibon in this section for providing a chapter from his doctoral thesis at the University of Aix-en Provence, France (proposed date of defense, 2002). Though he did not have access to the manuscripts that I worked with, his comments on Arberry’s charge of plagiarism and his comparison with *Luma* have been extremely valuable.

41 Arberry, 461-462.
was a recognized and accomplished scholar of his time who was accepted by scholars, the masses, and even political rulers. With the exception of the accusations of Muhammad ibn Yusuf al-Qaṭṭān (which, as I noted earlier, were considered baseless), Sulamī’s reputation is flawless. Lastly, while he is in the habit of being quite liberal in copying his sources, we see from his other writings that he never copied them in toto.

With these points in mind, we shall see that Sulamī was not plagiarizing Sarrāj but was in fact presenting an abridgement of the latter’s text. As Arberry noted, the two works cover the same material and there is a high degree of correspondence in terms of how the material is presented and even how the text is phrased. What Arberry failed to note however is that the section of Luma’ is significantly longer and contains much more material then is found in Aghāliṭ. To illustrate this point, a translation of the beginning sections of the Luma’ and the Aghāliṭ is given below. The section from Luma’ begins:42

The Shaykh said (God have mercy with him): I heard ibn ‘Alī al-Karkhī say: I heard Abū ‘Alī al-Rudhbārī (d. 322/935) (God have mercy with him) say: “We have come to a place in this matter like the edge of a sword: if we said like this, we are in the Fire; and if we said like that we are in the Fire!” He means that if we make a mistake in the states that we are in then we will become people of the Fire. [The reason for this] is because an error in everything is of lesser consequence then an error in Sufism and its science, because it consists of spiritual-stations (maqāmāt), states (aḥwāl), volitions (irādāt), degrees (darajāt), and indications (ishārāt). Whosoever advances in this with what he does not [properly] have has acted adversely to God and God becomes his enemy. If He wills He will forgive him and if He wills He will punish him, with what He wants and how He wants. Everyone that takes on the way of this faction [i.e. the Sufis], claims for himself a foothold in this matter, or thinks that he has some of the proprieties (ādāb) of this group but does not establish his foundations upon three things is deluded, even if he floats in the air, speaks with wisdom, or is accepted by the elect and the common-folk. These three things are: firstly, distancing ones self from that which is forbidden, the major and minor of it. Secondly, fulfilling all of the religious obligations, the easy and the difficult of them. The third is leaving the world (dunya) to the people of the world, the

42 Sarrāj, 409-410.
large and small portions of it, except what is necessary from it for the believer, which is
what is narrated from the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace) that he said, “Four
things are in the *dunya* but not of it: a portion of food with which you satisfy your hunger,
clothing that covers your nakedness, a home that you reside in, and a pious wife that you
find repose with.” Everything else besides this – from gathering, prohibiting, clinging to,
love of increase and boastfulness – all of this is a severing veil that cuts the slave off
from God. Anyone that claims a state of the elect, or thinks that he has traversed a
station of the people of the Bench (*ahl al-ṣafwa*), and he has not established his
foundations on these three things, then he is closer to error then he is to his objective
with respect to all that he invites to, claims, or gives as an example. The knowledgeable
one (*ālim*) is established while the ignorant one makes claims.

Now compare Sulamī’s presentation of the same passage:43

[1] He [i.e. Sulamī] said: Ecstatic utterances (*shaṭḥ*) occur with the Khurasanians because
they speak about their states and about the realities (*ḥaqā`iq*), [whereas] the Iraqis
describe the states of others while the describer is not ecstatic. The error that occurs
with the Sufis is due to their attaining a place in knowledge (*ʿilm*) and spiritual-state (*ḥāl*)
one slip therein would drop them from their rank, as Abu `Alī al-Rudhbārī said: “We have
come to a place in this matter like the edge of a sword – if we said like this, then we are in
the Fire!” This is because of the fineness of station (*maqām*) and fineness of spiritual-
state. [2] The foundations of this matter are built on three things: the first of which is
distancing ones self from that which is forbidden, the second, fulfilling religious
obligations (*farā`iḍ*), and the third, leaving the world (*dunya*) to its people.

From this sample we see a number of features of both texts. The discussion in the *Luma’*
contains greater detail, including words or phrases for emphasis or explanation (such as when
discussing the foundations of the path), explaining key words and concepts (the saying of
Rudhbārī and the meaning of the word *dunya*), as well as adding segue ways to the next issue
discussed (the move from Rudhbārī’s saying to the foundations of the path) adding to the overall
size and readability of the text. What is significant to note regarding the *Aghāliṭ* is its conciseness
and focus: Sulamī leaves out all of the glosses and explanatory material and retains only the
discussion points. What Sarrāj spends an entire page discussing, Sulamī summarizes in two paragraphs. Throughout Sulamī’s recension of the text he adopts this method – all anecdotes and sayings of the Sufis of the past are cut out with little exception, as are the explanatory sections that Sarrāj includes. While Arberry is correct in noting that there is a relationship between the two texts, he was too quick to level the charge of plagiarism and failed to notice the differences between the works, namely how Sulamī is presenting an abridgement of a section of Sarrāj’s *Luma’*.

Fuat Sezgin, who lists the *Aghāliṭ* in his *Geschichte Des Arabischen Schrifttums*, was of the opinion that Arberry was mistaken in his charge of plagiarism. According to Sezgin, Sulamī and Sarrāj were presenting recensions of a book by Abū ‘Alī al-Rudhbārī. Sulamī does narrate from Rudhbārī regularly in his other writings, as does Sarrāj in the *Luma’*. Sezgin’s position would settle the issue of authorship by attributing the text to Rudhbārī but Sezgin does not present any evidence for his claim. Presumably he came to this conclusion from the fact that both Sulamī and Sarrāj quote Rudhbārī in the beginning of their texts and he assumed that everything that followed was part of that quote. However, it is clear from both texts that Sarrāj and Sulamī are quoting only one saying of Rudhbārī’s and that the remainder of the text is not from him.

The only question that remains is why Sulamī saw a need to abridge Sarrāj’s work instead of composing his own text? Perhaps the only real answer that can be posited at this point can come from remembering Sulamī’s Malāmaṭī ethic when composing his books. His other works written with this ethic came from a desire to hide his state as a Sufi shaykh. To discuss the mistakes of the Sufis – and not simply mistakes made at the beginning of the path, but mistakes made at the highest levels – would certainly call to mind his own degree and spiritual state,

something that the Malāmatī ethic seeks to lower. By giving his abridgement of Sarrāj’s book Sulamī manages to get his ideas across without being pretentious and making claim to having the rank of someone so advanced that they are able to point out the mistakes of others.

Conclusion

This chapter has given a sketch of Sulamī’s life and when looking at his scholarly contributions has sought to show Sulamī as being more then a compiler and collector of Sufi lore but a recognized Sufi not only in his own time but in the later tradition as well. It has also established the correct title of the book in question. Lastly, it has dealt with the charge of plagiarism laid against Sulamī by Arberry and has shown that Sulamī was not plagiarizing Sarrāj, but was abridging his work.
Chapter 2

Synopsis of Kitāb al-aghāliṭ

Introduction

Kitāb al-aghāliṭ lists roughly forty errors that are made on the Sufi path from the perspective of belief, practice, as well as spiritual realizations. The text itself consists of a listing of the mistakes followed by three short sections dealing with types of knowledge, ecstatic utterances (shaṭḥiyāṭ), and a reply to statements concerning divine-indwelling (ḥulūl). The mistakes are not given in any particular order, nor are they explained in detail. Rather, the point of this book is to give a concise listing of key mistakes that a traveler of the Sufi path might make, the source of the mistake, and the correct position on the particular issue addressed.

Before listing the particular errors, it is important to note Sulamī’s classification of knowledge and who he sees as having a legitimate position to censor a Sufi when the latter errs. Sulamī states that knowledge of shari’ah is divided into four types: knowledge of transmission such as ḥadīth (riwāya) and history (āthār), knowledge of rulings (aḥkām), knowledge of analogy (qiyās) and proofs (ḥiṣb), and lastly knowledge of spiritual realities (ḥaqā’iq) and spiritual stations (munāzilāt). These types of knowledge are ranked in the order given with the highest form of knowledge being of the ḥaqā’iq and the foundational knowledge being that which is transmitted from the previous generations going back to the time of the Prophet. Given this hierarchy of knowledge, the scholar in a lower tier of knowledge can not censor someone that errs in a tier above them – thus, the scholar of ḥadīth can not censor the scholar of jurisprudence, and the
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1 Bold numbers appearing in brackets throughout this chapter refer to paragraph numbers of the Arabic, in the next chapter. Quotes in this chapter that are not referenced refer to the Arabic text of the paragraphs of the Aghāliṭ.
jurisprudent can not censor the scholar of proofs, and likewise a scholar of the three sciences just mentioned can not censor the scholar of the ḥaqā’iq, because it is the highest form of shari’ah knowledge. The only one that can justifiably take to task one that errs in the science of the ḥaqā’iq is a scholar who is realized in the ḥaqā’iq. One can not be a scholar of the ḥaqā’iq except after having mastered the three foundational sciences that he mentioned. If all four of these sciences are gathered together in one person, he is “the imām kāmil (the perfected leader), the proof, and he is the pole (quṭb).” Sulamī then suggests that such a master exists in all ages and mentions the saying of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, “The earth will not be devoid of one that is established to God as a proof so that His signs (ayāḥ) are not invalidated or His proofs disproved. Such are few in number but great in estimation with God.”

That Sufism – the science of the ḥaqā’iq – is based on the previous three sciences is established by Sulamī in many of his other texts. His definition of a Sufi is summarized in the following passage from the Manāḥij al-‘ārifīn:

One is not a Sufi who is ignorant of the rulings of God the exalted, and the rulings of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace). Whoever does not consolidate the outward rulings (aḥkām al-ẓāhir) is not suited for refining the inner rulings (aḥkām al-bāṭin). God the Exalted said: As for those that struggle in Us, We will guide them to Our path. [29: 69] How can one who gives little consideration to the outward rulings of proper habits be trusted with the ḥaqā’iq and spiritual secrets (asrāḥ)? Rather, none is realized [in the ḥaqā’iq] but a spiritual wayfarer (sālik). As for one that lacks wayfaring (sulūk) and struggling (ijtīḥād), how will he be realized and in what? Therefore, one that is ignorant of the outward rulings of God the Exalted is not a Sufi. [Similarly,] one whose state differs from [shari’ah] knowledge is not a Sufi. Al-Junayd (the mercy of God be upon him) said to ibn ‘Alwān: “Knowledge should be your companion and the spiritual-states will enter into you, for God the Exalted said: Those that are firmly guided in knowledge say, ‘We believe in it.’” [3:7] As for one whose spiritual states differs from sunnah, he is not a Sufi. It is narrated that the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace) said: “The one who holds firm to my sunnah during the corruption of my people is like one holding onto
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burning coal.” As for one whose character and comportment is not upon what the Book
and the sunnah oblige, he is not a Sufi.

It is also worth noting that Sulamī did not consider the various other forms of Islamic piety and
mysticism that were current in his time as different systems of mysticism. Rather, he considered
them stages of the Sufi path. His book Darajāt al-ṣādiqīn (The Degrees of the Righteous) is a
response to a question on the difference between Sufism, the way of blame (malāma), and the
way of the people of love (sabīl ahl al-mahabba). He responds to this question by saying: “Know
well... that these three names refer to outward characteristics of differing spiritual stations and
varied ‘points of view,’ when in fact the way of blame and the way of love are each a spiritual
station and innate characteristic experienced in Sufism.”3 Lastly, from the Aghāliṭ, [2] Sulamī
states that Sufism is based on three things: distancing oneself from that which is forbidden,
fulfilling one’s religious obligations, and leaving the base aspects of the world (dunya) to its folk.
For Sulamī Sufism is the field of Islamic learning that represents the experiential aspect of the
shari’ah and is the realization of a direct knowledge of God. Furthermore, it is the proper name
for that particular knowledge encompassing all of the sound forms of Islamic piety. By sound, it is
clear from the Darajāt that Sulamī has in mind traditions such as the Malāmatiyyah and not a
movement like the Karrāmites who were never accepted by the Sufis because their unorthodox
beliefs.

The text of the Aghāliṭ begins with an explanation of why mistakes occur [1]. Errors occur
with the Sufis because they have reached a state of knowledge and spiritual degree where one
mistake therein would lower them from their spiritual rank. Abū ‘Alī al-Rūdhbārī indicates the
precariousness of such a state: “We have reached a place in this matter like the edge of a sword;
if we said something like this, then we are in the Fire!” Sulamī notes that this is so because of the
fineness of their spiritual station and the fineness of their spiritual state.

3 Honerkamp, 107.
He then gives three types of people that had made mistakes. [3] Those that make mistakes because they lack the foundations (ušūl) of the shari'ah, concerning whom al-Junayd said, “They are prevented from attainment (wuṣūl) because of their lacking the foundations (ušūl).” [4] Those that make mistakes in the branches (furū’), which Sulamī defines as propriety, good character, and the spiritual stations (maqāmāt). This type of occurs because of a lack of knowledge of the foundations of shari’ah, following the pleasures of the lower-self (nafs), and from not learning propriety from a shaykh. The shaykh would prevent them from following their lower-self by lowering for them its pleasures, showing them its blameworthy aspects, and through guiding them to the right path. [5] Lastly, there are those whose mistakes are mere lapses. If their mistake is made clear to them, “they return to the path of guidance, noble character, and lofty spiritual states. Their lapse does not cause them to be lowered in rank, nor does it darken their spiritual lights.”

This classification can be organized as follows: mistakes made in doctrine (ušūl al-shar’), mistakes made in general societal interactions (what Sulamī calls comportment and character) and Sufi practices (furū’), and lastly mistakes made with regards to spiritual states (aḥwāl and maqāmāt). This categorization will present some problems because the nature of Sufism is that beliefs, practices, and spiritual stations are all interlinked. Because of this, an error that comes about because of a deviant belief can appear in a Sufi’s practices, or a mistaken action will have as its foundation in a mistaken understanding of a spiritual state, and so on. Be that as it may, the categorization of the errors into beliefs, social interactions, and spiritual-states remains a useful way of outlining Sulamī’s text.

_Errors that occur in terms of doctrine_

The first doctrinal error of the Sufis that Sulamī addresses occurred with those that believed that sainthood (wilāya) is higher and more complete then prophethood [28]. The source
for this rests in their mistaken reading of the Qur’ānic narrative of the prophet Moses and the saintly figure Khidr [18:65-82]. They understood from this narrative that Khidr’s state is higher than Moses’ because of the latter’s recourse to him. The mistake occurs because “they do not realize that God favors whom He wishes with what He wishes.” Sulamī then gives the following examples of God’s distinguishing some people over others at certain times: prophets were favored by being given miracles whereas the rest of creation was not in the Qur’ān; Mary was given the miracle of food being provided for [19:24-26] yet no prophets are known to have received this miracle; Āṣif ibn Barhiyya brought the throne of Bilqis the queen of Sheba before Solomon, yet Āṣif was not a prophet nor does this prove that he was somehow better than Solomon. The last example he gives is from the Prophet where certain companions are favored over others. The Prophet said that the Companion Zayd was the most knowledgeable in terms of inheritance laws, Mu‘ādh ibn Jabal the most knowledgeable in terms of lawful and prohibited, and that none was more truthful than Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī. To this, Sulamī says: “We should not doubt, nor should the doubter doubt, that Abū Bakr was more truthful than Abū Dharr and superior to him, and that ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib were more knowledgeable than Mu‘ādh (God be pleased with them all). These are favors and do not prove superiority.”

Another mistake occurred on this issue of prophethood and sainthood the source of which was the claim that prophets received revelation from God through an intermediary whereas for the saint there is no intermediary. Sulamī corrects this error by stating that prophets received revelation from God in both ways – mediated and non-mediated. Furthermore, the spiritual openings that a saint receives have an element of uncertainty or possibility of deception in them whereas prophecy is absolute certainty. The qualitative difference between the knowledge of the saint and the knowledge of the prophet is because sainthood in general and in its highest form (siddiqīyah) is derived “from the lights of prophethood and from the blessing of following the prophetic way.” Bringing this discussion on sainthood and prophethood to a close, he returns to
the narrative of Moses and Khiḍr and says: “If Khiḍr met with an atom’s weight of what Moses saw, he would perish such that nothing of him would remain.”

The next doctrinal mistake that he addresses is the issue of divine-indwelling (ḥulūl) [31]. Sulamī defines ḥulūl as “God choosing a body and dwelling within it, meaning divine lordship, and that its state of being a human has ceased. Anyone that says this,” he continues, “or is realized in this state, or supposes that divine unity (tawḥīd) has opened up to someone (based on the indications of their sayings) is a disbeliever.” The source of this error rests in not differentiating between the power that is an attribute of the Powerful and the signs of God that point to the power of the Powerful. Believing or assenting to the idea of ḥulūl in any fashion is “misguidance, disbelief.”

Sulamī deals with ḥulūl further in a separate section (faṣl) dedicated to this issue [42]. He begins by saying, “None of the leaders of the Sufis, their shaykhs, nor those they rely upon for their religion have spoken about ḥulūl. However, a group from amongst the people of Syria has uttered these words but they have neither rank in Sufism nor any mention with the shaykhs.” He then proves this point by mentioning the sayings of previous Sufi masters regarding ḥulūl, al-Junayd, Dhu'l Nūn al-Miṣrī (d.245/859), Ibn ‘Aṭā’ (d.309/922), and Abū ‘Amru'l Dimashqī. Perhaps most important quote for Sulamī’s purpose comes from Ḥusayn ibn Manṣūr al-Hallāj (d.309/922), who said, “God the exalted created these forms (hayākil) on the pattern of defect, essentially as being contingently existent. As for the spirits that reside in these forms [they exist] for a decreed amount of time and overtaken by death. Even in the spirits’ state of perfection it is deficient. The attributes of God are transcendent beyond these attributes in all manner. How is it possible that God manifest in what He brought into creation with these deficiencies and imperfections?”

Sulamī then uses two verses from the Qur’ān to show that the essential nature of creation is as slaves to God: *I did not create man and jinn save to worship Me,*[5:56] and *Indeed everything that is in the heavens and the earth will come to the Merciful as a slave.* [19:94] He then asks, “How
is it possible that God dwell within what He has necessitated as having the deficient attribute – ie slavery – such that [if He did dwell in it] He becomes the worshipper and the worshipped?"

Another group of Sufis made the mistake of claiming that they could see God in this world by their hearts in the same way that He will be seen in the Hereafter [33]. Two groups had made this claim, one from Syria that Abū Saīd al-Kharrāz (d.283/896) mentions in an unnamed book, and the other were from Baṣrāh of the companions of al-Ṣubayḥī. Though this is a theological mistake, it comes about because of a mistake made in their practices – namely, their lacking a shaykh. This mistake came about when their “spiritual struggles, wakefulness, hunger, isolation, seclusion, and contemplation became great,” at which point complacency set in and Satan made attractive to them states that they had not attained and lead them to make claims about states that they did not possess. If they had a shaykh “who could point out their mistakes to them and guide them to the right path” this would now have occurred. The importance of a shaykh in preventing such mistakes is made clear in a story concerning Sahl ibn `Abdullah al-Tustařī (d.283/896). One of his students told him that he sees God every night with his own two eyes. Sahl responded by telling his student to spit upon what he sees the next night. When the second night came, the student did as Sahl had commanded and from the third night onward he did not see anything. He thus “returned to his path and left his delusion.” The correct position regarding seeing God in this world is that it is essentially having a state of absolute certainty in Him.

Sulamī does make the point that seeing God in this world is possible with the heart. This comes about through “a witnessing faith, the reality of unity, and pure certainty.” He proves that this occurs through absolute certainty by referring to the ḥadīth of al-Ḥārithah ibn Mālik, which he does not give in full but which is in his Arba‘īn as follows: 4

---

On the authority of al-Ḥārithah ibn Mālik (God be pleased with him) that he passed by the Messenger of God (God bless him and give him peace) and he said to him, “How did you wake up this morning, O Ḥārithah?” He said, “I awoke a believer in God in truth (muʿminan haqqan).” He said, “Watch what you say for every truth has a reality! So what is the reality of your faith?” He said, “I have shunned myself from the world, and it is as though I am looking at the people of paradise visiting one another, and it is as though I am looking at the people of the fire suffering.” He said, “O Ḥārithah, you have known, so persist with this (‘arafta falzim)!"

Another saying along the same lines as al-Ḥārithah’s is the saying of ‘Āmir ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Qays, “If the cover were lifted I would not increase in faith.” Such statements are said only in a state of realization (taḥqīq) and comes to the slave in state of overpowering, drunkenness, and enjoyment. From such visions by the heart higher degrees of certainty come to the recipient, in accordance with the statement from the Prophet, “Hearing is not like seeing.”

The last major error in matters of doctrine that Sulamī gives concerns the spirit (rūḥ) [39]. A number of groups made claims concerning the spirit: one claimed that it is the light of God’s essence and therefore uncreated; another that it was the life of His essence and also uncreated; another that the spirits are created but that the Holy Spirit (al-rūḥ al-quds) is uncreated; another that spirit of the common-folk is created and that the spirit of the elect is uncreated; and another group that claimed that the believers have three spirits, the non-believers one, and the righteous saints (siddiqīn) have five. “All of this,” says Sulamī, “is wrong and false. The sum of the issue is what God – exalted is His mention – said: They ask you concerning the spirit; say: ‘The spirit is of the affair of my Lord. [17:57] It is His affair, it is created and that between it and God there is neither derivation, nor relation.”

5 This can also be read in the passive as “My self has been shunned from the world.”
Errors that occur in terms social transactions and Sufi practices

[14] One of the most detrimental mistakes that can hinder the Sufi progress to their goal a state of idleness or losing spiritual aspiration (ḥāl al-fatrah). This lack of aspiration occurs when some of the seekers hear of the spiritual struggles of those that came before them and how God extolled their names and raised their measure amongst creation. This causes them to exert great efforts to mimic the past masters. However, when the matter becomes prolonged for them and they do not see the fruits of their efforts, they become lazy in their spiritual struggles. One can be saved from this error if they are fortunate enough that God attracts them back to Him and returns them to spiritual struggle (mujāhada). If this happens, then this break from their spiritual struggles and exercises becomes a period of relaxation that occurs from time to time to the hearts and bodies of those struggling. Otherwise, if they do not return to mujāhada, then they are deluded. Abu ‘Alī al-Rudhbārī said: “The end is like the beginning and the beginning is like the end – whoever leaves something at the end that he did in the beginning is deluded.”

[11] Of those that erred in social transactions were those that made a mistake in expanse in this world (tawassu’ fi'l dunya). Expanse and increase in the world is justified only for prophets, saints, or the siddiqīn for they can be established in worldly means justly. Their sign is that they do not find repose with what their hands possess, nor do they seek increase in it. To them, possessing a little or a lot is the same. They do not find pleasure in giving or withholding and know the correct perspectives and rights in both; they take with permission and give with permission and do not err in either.

[12] Another mistake was made by the people mortification (taqashshuf) and decrease (taqīf) who held that any form of leniency to the lower-self (nafs) would lower them from their spiritual degree. A slave should not mortify themselves or seek decrease except in the beginning of their spiritual disciplining, or through intense spiritual striving, or when impropriety manifests itself from the lower-self. However, if he then finds pleasure in creation seeing him discipline
himself, he should leave these spiritual exercises and return to normal practices with regards to eating and clothing.

[15] It was a common practice for Sufis to travel great distances to meet various shaykhs in order to learn from them. This too became a source of errors for some Sufis. The correct intention for traveling to meet the shaykhs is to learn propriety, take knowledge from them, obey their commands, and preserve their honor. The mistake that was made occurred when a group of Sufis wanted to meet the shaykhs for the sole purpose of bragging to others that they had met such-and-such who had said such-and-such, making their travels and visiting with shaykhs a source of pride, arrogance, and ostentation instead of a source of humility and knowledge. Worse still is the traveler that seeks the acceptance of the shaykh (qubūl al-shaykh) or wants the shaykh to honor him. Such a persons journey amounts to “a travel from knowledge to ignorance, and he will never benefit from [his travel] ever.”

[16] Another group made a mistake when giving in charity (infāq). They supposed that the goal was nothing more then the act of giving and being generous. This is a mistake. For the Sufis, possessions and attachment to worldly means are a veil between them and God. Thus, to lift the veil, the Sufis gave of what they possessed and “worked in cutting themselves from worldly causes (qat‘ al-asbāb) in hopes of reaching the Causer (al-musabbib).”

Three groups made mistakes in trying to free themselves from the afflictions of the lower-self. [18] One group attempted to do so by leaving food for a period of time. Their mistake is that they thought that if the lower-self were subjugated by leaving food it would be overcome and they would be protected from its incitement. However their mistake is that “the path of overcoming the lower-self and breaking it be taken from the shaykhs and teachers such that evil is not produced from the good that is desired of it [i.e. overcoming the lower self]. If evil is produced from the path of good it is impossible to correct it.” There is also a practical aspect to not leaving food for a period of time it could weaken the aspirant such as to cause a break to occur in fulfilling religious
obligations. We should remember that for Sulamī, the Sufi path is founded upon fulfilling religious obligations and thus “a deficiency that occurs in religious obligations is evil in all cases.” Sulamī provides a rule that the Sufi should adhere to with regards to eating based on the sunnah of the Prophet: “It is obligatory upon the slave that he not eat that which will encourage him to base desires (shahwāt), and he should not leave eating in accordance to what will weaken his obligations. He should use the sunnah according to what the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace) said, ‘A third for food, a third for drink, and a third for air.’”

[19] Another group tried to protect themselves from the lower-self by “isolation (‘uzlah), entering into caves, and seclusion in mountains and open deserts.” They thought that this will protect them from their desires and that God will bring them to the stations that He brought His saints to. The foundation for this practice is found in the life of the Prophet who used to seclude himself in Mount Hira for days at a time before the beginnings of revelation. Those that embark on this program without the pre-requisite states make a mistake that could cause them great harm. The Sufis that carried out the practice of isolating themselves from society did so because of attractions (jadhb) from God – He attracted them to Him and thus freed them of needing others. They were freed from the needs of creation because God had enriched them through Him.

[20] A third group tried to free themselves from physical desires by castrating themselves. The mistake here – besides being a blatant contradiction of the tenets of Islam – is that they do not realize that the source of desires is not physical organs but the heart. Even if they were to castrate themselves, they would still be afflicted as long as the desires exist in the heart. Instead of severing the genitalia they must severe these base desires from the heart.

Other mistakes occurred due to a mistaken understanding of two of the most outward signs of Sufism, wearing wool clothing and attending sessions of audition (samā‘a). [22] The first group put on wool clothing and patched frocks and then learned a few things about the science of
the Sufis and by doing this felt that they became one of them. However, “putting on airs and imitating others,” he says, “has nothing to do with spiritual reality (haqiqa).”

[24] The other group felt that Sufism was nothing more then “recitation (qawal) of songs, dancing (raqṣ), audition (samā’a), solo recitals (taqsīm), poetry (qaṣā‘id), taking invitations, and attending gatherings.” What lead them to this position was that they saw some of the shaykhs enjoying themselves during sessions of samā’a. What is hidden from them though is that every soul has something of the idleness and forgetfulness in it and that for such souls samā’a is not healthy and perhaps even unlawful, the latter being more likely. Junayd said: “If you see an aspirant (murīd) that loves samā’a, then know that something of idleness remains in his soul.” In deeming that for some people audition is impermissible Sulamī’s position suggest that that he was against the practice. This is far from the case and it should be pointed out that Sulamī has written on samā’a and defended it showing it’s Prophetic origins. Also, a few of the stories narrated in the Risālah of Qushayrī concerning Sulamī have to do with samā’a, and one in particular of how Sulamī was censored by other Sufis and scholars for frequenting such gatherings.6

One of the central ideas of Sufism where both thought and practice are intricately linked is in the state of relying upon God (tawakkul) and two groups made mistakes here. [13] The first committed an error with regards to earning an income (kasb). A group of Sufis earned their income and censored those that did not, and another group that did not earn an income censored those that did. Both of these are mistakes because the state of earning an income is a dispensation from the sunnah. Tawakkul (which Sulamī defines as “trusting that God will deliver on what He has promised) on the other hand is obligatory upon all believers who are commanded

6 For this story in particular see Risālah Qushayrīyah under the section of Firāsa (236-237 of the Ma’rūf Zarīq and ‘Alī ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd Abu ‘l-Khayr edition). Also, see the section on Ḥifdh qulūb al-mashāyikh (p. 334), for how Sulamī questioned that a session of Qur’ān recital under the guidance of his shaykh Abū Sahl al-Su‘lūkī was changed to session of singing.
to do so in the Qurʾān: *And trust in God if you are believers.* [5:5] Sulamī recognizes that there are those that can not live up to this obligation and must take the dispensation of earning an income. For those people, the following conditions are given to protect them from the faults inherent in earning: they should not rely upon their income; their work should does not keep them from fulfilling religious obligations in their appointed times; they should learn enough knowledge of the shariʿah to prevent them from taking that which is illicit; they should not earn anything that is based on figurative interpretations (*taʿwilāt*); and they should give to their brothers that are unable to earn and support them.

[21] The second mistake that occurred regarding the state of *tawakkul* happened with those that wandered aimlessly in the valleys and mountains without food, water, or provisions for the path. They supposed that through this they would reach the station of the truthful-saints (*siddiq*) concerning the reality of *tawakkul*. The mistake occurs because those saints that did this were people that were immersed in spiritual exercises and were well-established in their spiritual states – they were not bothered by lacking material goods, nor were they bothered by loneliness. This occurs when opposite states, such as poverty and self-sufficiency, honor and debasement, and so on, are one to the Sufi. “Whoever embarks on this plan of action without these beginnings and exercises,” he says, “makes a mistake and ruins his moment (*waqt*) and state.”

Errors that occur in terms of spiritual states

A number of mistakes were made with respect to the states of spiritual poverty (*faqr*) and self-sufficiency (*ghina*). Their foundation is in the Qurʾānic verse: *O mankind! You are the poor in your relation to God and God is the Rich, the Owner of Praise!* [35:15] This verse emphasizes the absolute impoverishment of all that is other then God (which is how Sufis define the world) to Him and the absolute independence of God from any other. Sulamī wrote an entire text, *Zalal al-
fuqarā’ (The Mistakes of the Sufis), detailing the fine points of faqr and the mistaken notions that a number of Sufis had regarding it. In the Aghālīṭ however, he limits his discussion to the following groups: [6] one group that preferred ghīna over faqr, their argument being that they are not enriched through worldly means but are enriched through God instead of being in need of Him. [7] One faction made the mistake of assuming that the Sufis were enriched by the base aspects of the dunya and not God. This lead them to narrate false narrations justifying their position. However, this is far from the intended meaning of the Sufis when they gave preference to ghinā over faqr.

[8] Another group spoke about impoverishment to God (iftiqār ila Allah) and its reality and claimed that it meant owning few things, being in desperate need, and having patience during times of affliction. A faction of those that claim to be Sufis claimed that the faqir that is in need and that lacks patience and contentment has neither merit nor reward in his poverty. They are mistaken because “the faqir that is patient and content has a degree over the faqir that is destitute and in need, and the faqir that is destitute and in need has a rank above the affluent one whose affluence is based on the dunya.”

[9] Another faction of them claimed that poverty and affluence are two states of the slave and that he does not have to find repose with either one of them. Rather, he should consider them, but not find repose with them nor stop at them. This is at the ends [of the path] and the realities (haqa‘iq). A group of them supposed that this is an equivocation of poverty and affluence, but this is not so. Rather, for the one realized in these states, his state makes the two opposites one to him. They are not the same in essence, but his state makes them the same.

[10] A group claimed that what is meant by faqr is lacking material things only, so they busied themselves with this and lost the reality of faqr. Sulamī emphasizes that by faqr the Sufis were not talking about possessions but an ontological state of the slave with respect to God.

---

7 See Honerkamp.
Advising those that think that faqr simply entails lacking material goods, he says, "It was hidden from them that seeing ones poverty in a state of poverty is a veil to the faqir to the realities of poverty. In faqr, there is no state lower then lacking material goods for beggars share this state as well; it is not a praised state nor do beggars have any degree (rutbah)."

A series of mistakes occurred with regards to understanding the Sufi states of freedom (hurriya) and slavehood ('ubūdiya). [25] One group held that "the slave is not truly a slave until he is free (hurr) from everything besides his Lord," which, Sulamī says is the correct position. Part of the incorrect understanding comes from those that disapproved of hurriya and censored it by saying that if the free person acts he does so seeking compensation. The slave however does not seek reward or compensation from his Master – if He gives then He gives graciously, and if He does not then the slave does not deserve anything. The root of the problem lies in the idea that somehow the Sufis status as a slave is lifted at some point, such that he is no longer a worshipper of God. [26] Sulamī says: “A group of them erred and supposed that as long as there is distance (bu‘d) between the slave and God he is called a slave. If the slave attains to knowledge of God then he is called free (hurr), and if he becomes free then his slavehood ends. This is a major mistake.” Slavehood ('ubūdiya) is more perfect and more complete then that of hurriya because:

God named his friends His slaves, and He named His angels His slaves, and His prophets His slaves. The prophet (God bless him and give him peace) chose slavehood over prophethood in the tahiyyah and said: "I bear witness that there is no god but God and I bear witness that Muhammad is His slave and messenger." There is no station higher then the station of the Prophet (God bless him and give him peace); he used to pray until his ankles swelled, he was asked about this and said: “Should I not be a slave that is thankful?” So understand and do not err!

[27] Another group made a mistake in understanding the nature of sincerity (ikhlāṣ) which caused them to break with societal norms. What lead them to this was their misunderstanding
something that the shakhs said regarding sincerity: “Sincerity is not attributed to one until nothing of the sight of people remains with the slave.” By believing that the slave becomes sincere only after he loses all concern for what others say lead them to go against societal norms, differing with them whether they right or wrong. Those that made this error were veiled from the fact that one who truly possesses sincerity is “propitious, well-mannered, distances himself from sins, turns towards acts of obedience, and who is joined with the states and stations until these lead him to the purity of sincerity.”

Another error that lead to breaking societal norms occurred in the idea of the annihilation of ones humanness (fanā’ al-basharīya) [32]. This particular error occurred when the Sufis spoke about the states of annihilation (fanā’) and subsistence (baqā’) and lead them to leave food and drink. They did this in an effort to lower their essential humanity, believing that this would lead to annihilation in God. Those who hold this viewpoint also held that it is possible for the slave to take on the attributes of God. The correct position regarding annihilation of the slave’s humanity is that the slave’s base characteristics cease and the slave moves “from a state of ignorance to knowledge, from heedlessness (ghaflah) to remembrance (dhikr), from vanity to seeing grace.”

[34] Another group made a mistake in understanding the state of purity (safa) and cleanliness (tahāra) thinking that the two can apply absolutely and perpetually to a slave. According to them, when they are cleansed of faults and blemishes they mean that the distance between them and God is overcome. However, the correct position is that the slave is never purified perpetually but rather for periods of time. Also, what the slave is cleansed of is not distance from God rather it is that the heart (qalb) is cleansed of base attributes such as malice, hatred, deceit, and so forth. The nafs however is the locus of faults and will never be emptied of them.

The mistake made in purity and cleanliness is the notion that the separation between God and the slave can be overcome. This error manifests itself in misunderstandings of two
other key Sufi terms, namely union (jam') and separation (tafriqah). The only people that speak about the reality of these states are the righteous-saints (siddiq) and the unbelievers (zindiq). Those that make mistakes in understanding union and separation do so because they lack knowledge of the foundations of this path, and therefore also lacked knowledge of its branches, both of which lead them to make gross mistakes when it comes to understanding these states. This in turn lead them to leave society, violate societal laws, and eventually Divine Laws. They attributed to the origin that which is properly attributed to the derivative, and attributed to the state of union that which is properly attributed to the state of separation and thus they did not give everything its proper place. When such is the case, nothing refrains the zindiq from engaging in sins because he attributes his ignorance and all of his vile actions to God. The siddiq on the other hand returns to God in everything after knowing what is required of him from the foundations and branches of shari'ah and does not violate any rules of propriety, giving everything it’s just due.

Sulamî then mentions the mistake that occurs in the station of proximity to God (qurba). In the Futuhat al-makkya Sulamî is linked to ibn ‘Arabi in this particular state. While in Ijisal in Morocco ibn ‘Arabi mentions that he attained a station that he did not know the name of and realized that he was alone in this station. He was complaining to a friend about his isolation when suddenly a shadow appeared to him. He gives the rest of the account as follows:8

I rose from my bed and went towards it, hoping to receive some solace from it. It embraced me and I looked at it closely and saw that it was Abû ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamî, whose spirit had assumed corporeal form for my sake. God had sent him out of compassion for me. I said unto him: “I see that you [too] are in this station!” His reply was: “It was while I was in this station that I was overtaken by death, and I will never cease to be here.” I told him of my isolation and complained about the absence of any companion. He said to me: “He who is in exile always feels alone! Now that divine

---

8 This translation is taken from Claude Addas’ Quest for the Red Sulphur (174-175). See also Futuhat al-makkya, 2:261.
providence has granted you access to this station praise God, for to how many people is this given, brother of mine? Are you satisfied with the fact that Khaḍir [sic] is your companion in this station?”… I replied: “Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, I know of no name to designate this station.” He answered: “It is called the station of Promixity (maqām al-qurba). Realise it in its fullness!”

In Ibn ‘Arabī’s Jawāb al-mustaqīm he states that he did not find this station mentioned in any other book save the Aghāliṭ by Sulamī.⁹

The error that occurs in the state of proximity to God (qurb) and delight therein is that they felt that in their closeness to God they became ashamed in His presence to continue preserving in the duties that He commanded them to maintain and thus left the proper comportment that they so eagerly looked over before, as well as the rulings and commandments of God that they previously persisted in. However they are mistaken, because comportment and the commands of God are His deposition over His slaves – whenever one is induced to increase in comportment and fulfilling His commands, or to continue in ones preservation of these acts, then these are from God and are of the essence of proximity to Him. However, when either ones comportment or preserving the commandments of God ceases and one thinks that they are in a state of proximity, this is in reality a state of distance from God.

The last two errors left both deal with the idea of the effacement of the individual as a result of the Sufis intense spiritual practices. [37] The first of these is the notion of the annihilation of ones attributes. This occurred with a group from Baghad that held that once their own individual attributes are effaced that they enter into the attributes of God. They then proceeded to speak about this state which caused them to say things that resemble hulūl and the Christian notion of incarnation. The mistake that they make is that they believe that the attributes of God are God Himself. The correct understanding of the annihilation of attributes is that the slaves is annihilated from his own personal desire entirely and entering into the desires of God.

“He has no desire along with His desire in it, so that whatever God wills, he wills it for himself.”

When the personal whims of the slave are effaced it is not God Himself the dwells in the heart of the slave, or His attributes; rather it is “His glorification (*ta’dheem*), awe (*haybah*), and unity (*tawhid*).”

[38] A group of them erred in the annihilation of attributes (*fana’ al-awsaf*), they are a group of Baghdadis. Their position is that when they are annihilated from their attributes they enter into Gods attributes, and they assign to themselves a meaning that leads them, with their ignorance, to speaking about divine-indwelling and to something similar to what the Christians say regarding the Messiah (upon whom be peace). The correct meaning of annihilation of attributes of the slave and entering into the attributes of God is that the slaves annihilation from his desire entirely, and his entering into the desires of God by it. He has no desire along with His desire in it, so that whatever God wills, he wills it for himself. This is the annihilation of his attributes and taking on the attributes of God. They erred because they mistakenly thought that the attributes of God are God Himself, and this is not so, because He does not dwell in the hearts, rather his glorification (*ta’zīm*), awe (*haybah*), and unity (*tawhīd*).
Chapter 3
The Text of Kitāb al-aghālīṭ

The Manuscripts

Photocopies of all of the manuscripts mentioned below were used and not the originals. I must acknowledge Dr. Kenneth Honerkamp’s role in graciously providing photocopies of the Moroccan, Bin Yusuf, and Dar al-Kutub manuscripts and for procuring a photocopy of the Sulamiyāt collection.

1. The Sulamiyāt Collection from Riyadh (MS ١)

MS ١ comes from the Imam Muḥammad ibn Saʿūd University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia; catalog (compilation ʿ), 455 folios, copied in the year 474/1083. The compilation is called the Sulamiyat and contains 26 books of Abū ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Sulami. The pages are 16.1 cm x 24 cm with approximately twenty lines per page and approximately fifteen words per line. Each book in the compilation begins with the phrases بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم وحسيب ربي وحسيب توقيفي followed by the title of the text. The Kitāb al-aghālīṭ does not begin as such and appears to be a section of the book before it, Dhikr miḥan mashayikh aṣ-ṣūfiya. It is set off from the rest of the Miḥan by a section heading that reads: ﴿في الغلف الذي وقع لقوم من أين هو وما دواوون﴾ The table of contents for the Sulamiyat gives as a full title for the section including the Miḥan as: ﴿كتاب ذكر من مشايخ وذكر بالأغلفوات الذي وقع لقوم﴾ suggesting that the Aghālīṭ is a part of the Miḥan. The text of the Miḥan is edited and presented as an addendum to the present study. The text is written in a loose diwānī script, and is generally quite readable. Occasionally there is an elision of letters in the text and often times the diacritical marks are left off. Corrections and miscopied portions of the text were crossed out. Missing
portions that were caught in the checking of the manuscript are indicated by a small arrow and then the missing text would sometimes be on the margin and other times above the arrow. The copyist placed circles throughout the text to mark the sections copied and later as the copy was checked from the original a dot was placed in the circle to indicate it was checked. The text is structured almost like a list with each new error that Sulamī mentions beginning with or or a similar phrase. These words were set off from the text in that they were usually written after one of the dotted circles and are written in thicker longer clearer strokes.

2. The Moroccan Manuscript (MS م)

MS م was kindly provided to Dr. Honerkamp from a private collection by the late Mustafa Nājī of Rabat, Morocco. The pages have twenty-five lines per page, approximately fourteen words per line. The title of the book is given as: غزائب من علوم الصوفية لأبي عبد الرحمن السلمي. The text is written in crude Maghribi script. At first glance it appears the most difficult to read but the copyist is consistent in his style throughout, rendering it quite readable once one has familiarized oneself with his handwriting. Overall, the text agrees with MS ر in that there are not any new sections. However, they are not in complete agreement and there are variants between the two. MS م agrees most with MS ب.

3. The Bin Yusuf Manuscript (MS ب)

MS ب is from the Bin Yusuf Library in Marrakesh, Morocco; catalog (compilation 387), 123 folios, copied ca. 936/1530. The pages are 18.5cm x 14 cm, twenty lines per page, and approximately nine words per line. The margin being badly worm eaten was reduced in the binding. The pages are thick and handmade. The text was written in black ink, in crude but readable unvocalized Maghribi script. The title of the text in MS ب is given as كتاب الإغاليط في غزائب
This is the only manuscript that mentions the title of the book as Kitāb al-aghāliṭ. The copyist occasionally brings attention to new sections by placing three dots in a triangle at the end of a section. Also, the phrase which generally starts a new section in the text is written in bolder, longer strokes to highlight it. Like MS ٤ there are not any significant differences between MS ٥ and MS ٦ with regards to sections, though there are variants between them. As already mentioned MS ٤ agrees most with MS ٥.

4. The Dar al-Kutub Manuscript (MS ٦)

MS ٦ is from the Dar al-Kutub in Cairo, Egypt. Under "Usūl al-malāmatiya wa ghalaṭat al-ṣūfiya." No. 178, under the "Taṣawwūf" compilations. The pages have approximately twenty-five lines per page and approximately fourteen words per line. The script is clear and readable. The copyist treats the work as though it were a section of Sulamī’s Risālat al-malāmatiya, which comes before it in the folio and begins: . MS ٦ differs with the other three in that it includes a short section titled: which the others lack. Also, MS ٦ has the most variants then the other three.

Method of the critical edition

In forming the critical edition of Kitāb al-aghāliṭ MS ٦ was given priority due to its historical precedence, coming sixty-two years after the passing of Sulamī. The Sulamīyat, from which this manuscript comes from, are the oldest manuscript works of Sulamī. New pages in MS ٦ are indicated in the text between square brackets.
The variants from MSS دم and ب are given as footnotes in the text, in that order (based on their historical priority). Modern standard Arabic orthography was used and thus orthographical variants are not mentioned. Each of the manuscripts used different standard honorifics following the names of Allah (صلی الله عليه وسلم etc), the Prophet (تعالى، علی وسلم etc), or pious figures (رضی الله عنهم، رحمه الله etc). The honorifics of MS ر were used without mention of the variant honorifics in the other manuscripts, though when possible it was attempted to combine between them. In recording the variants, no attention was given to variant prepositions and conjunctions that are nearly synonymous (the Arabic wa and fa, for example).

Verses from the Qur’ān are written in bold, vocalized, and marked by ی and َ followed by the surah name and verse number in square brackets. Ḥadīths are also written in bold but are unvocalized. Sayings of Sufi masters appear after a colon and end with a full-stop. Additions to the text are given between square brackets. Paragraph numbers were added to facilitate reading and indicate when the author discusses a new error. Corrections made by the copyists on the manuscripts are not mentioned.
First page of Aghālīt from the Sulamiyyāt
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي في الصورة المقدمة.
Last page of the Moroccan manuscript
First page of the Dar al-Kutub manuscript
لا يمكنني قراءة النص العربي من الصورة.
Last page of the Bin Yusuf Manuscript
الغطس الذي وقع للقوم من أيّه وما دواؤه

١ قال الله تعالى: LAT لَمْ يَكُنُوا يَكُلُّونَ عَنْ أَحَوْالِهِمْ وَعَنْ هَقَائِقِهِمْ، والعراقون: يصفون أحوال غيرهم وليس الواصف بشطح، فالغطس الذي وقع للقوم] ٧: وذلك من بلغتهم إلى محل من العلم والحال إن الانفتاح الواحدة في ذلك تقطيع عن درجتهم: كما قال أبو علي الروذاري رحمه الله: قد بلغنا في هذا الأمر إلى مكان مثل حد السيف، فإن قلنا كذا ففي النار، وذلك لدقة المقام ودقة الحال.

٢ إما بيّن أساس هذا الأمر على ثلاثة أشياء: أولاً اجتناب المنحرّم، والثاني أداء الفرائض، والثالث ترك الدنيا على أهلها.

٣ والغطس وقع في ثلاثة وجهات: طبقة منهم غلطوا في الأصول من قلة إحكامهم أصول الشرع، وضعف صداقهم وإخلاصهم، وقاطة معرفتهم، كما قال الخنجر: وإذا مُنعوا في الوصول لضياع الأصول:

١: مَنّ أُسِدَ اللهُ الرحمَنَ الرحيمَ صلى الله عَلَيْه وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ دَوَلَةٌ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ.

٢: مَنّ أُسِدَ اللهُ الرحمَنَ الرحيمَ صلى الله عَلَيْه وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ.

٣: مَنّ أُسِدَ اللهُ الرحمَنَ الرحيمَ صلى الله عَلَيْه وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ.

٤: مَنّ أُسِدَ اللهُ الرحمَنَ الرحيمَ صلى الله عَلَيْه وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ.

٥: مَنّ أُسِدَ اللهُ الرحمَنَ الرحيمَ صلى الله عَلَيْه وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ.

٦: مَنّ أُسِدَ اللهُ الرحمَنَ الرحيمَ صلى الله عَلَيْه وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ.

٧: مَنّ أُسِدَ اللهُ الرحمَنَ الرحيمَ صلى الله عَلَيْه وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ.

٨: مَنّ أُسِدَ اللهُ الرحمَنَ الرحيمَ صلى الله عَلَيْه وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ.

٩: مَنّ أُسِدَ اللهُ الرحمَنَ الرحيمَ صلى الله عَلَيْه وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ.

١٠: مَنّ أُسِدَ اللهُ الرحمَنَ الرحيمَ صلى الله عَلَيْه وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ.

١١: مَنّ أُسِدَ اللهُ الرحمَنَ الرحيمَ صلى الله عَلَيْه وَسَلَّمَ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَهْدِيَ، دَوَلَتْ النَّاسِ عَلَى سَيدَنا مَحَمَّدٍ ﷺ عَلَى سَيدَنا هُوسَانٍ.
4. والطبقة الثانية غلطوا في الفروع وهي الأدب والأخلاقيات والمقامات، وذلك من قلة معرفتهم بالأصول، وإتباعهم حظوظ النفس، ولم [38] يتقدموا ببروضهم ويسرعت عنهم حظوظ النفس، ويجبرهم المرات، ويغلبهم على المناهج، ويرفعهم عيوبهم. فمثلهم كمثل من يدخل بيئته منظمة بسراج ثم يريد أن يطلب فيها شيئاً، فما يُفسد أكثر مما يُصلح، فمن يجد مقصوده ولا يجد ما يطلب.

5. والطبقة الثالثة كان غلطهم زلة أو هفوة، فإذا تبين لهم ذلك عادوا إلى سبيل الرشد ومشارك الأحوال ومعالي الأحوال، وقبلوا النصح وتركوا العنان وأذعنوا للحق، فان تنقصر تلك الهفوة من مراتبهم شيئاً، ولم يظلم عليهم أنوارهم ولم يخرج صفوفهم بالكدورة.

6. ومنهم من غلط في أفلاط الفقر والغناء، فطبقة من المترجمين التصوف، شرفوا الغناء على الفقر، وأشار لهم في ذلك 12 أن الغناء بالله أجمل من الافتقار إلى الله، لا الغناء بأعراض الدنيا.

7. وتوهت طائفة أخرى أهم 13 إما فضلوا الاستغناء بهذه الأعراض الدنيا من الدنيا، فجعلوا لها تأويلات وأرووا فيه روايات واحتجوا فيه 15، وهو بعيد من مراد الفقوم.

---

1. والطبقة الثانية غلطا م ب. وطبقة ثانية غلطا د. وطبقة غلطت.
2. أو م ب. من.
3. أو م ب. والدانية.
4. أو لم يتأثروا حطوط النفس ساقط في م. و시스템 عنهم حظوظ النفس ساقط في د.
5. أو عرفهم غيرها د. وعروفهم النفس وعروا ساقط عنهم حظوظهم.
6. كما يسبح م. يسمح م ما يطلب ويدع في تلك الطاعة أكثر مما يصلح اعتماداً يقدقوق ولا يقدقوق ما يطلب ما يقبل ما يقبل.
7. أو الطبقة الثالثة كما م. وطبقة ثالثة د. وطبقة.
8. أو يفعلون ساقط في د. وطبقة.
9. أو لم يغضب بالذكر. والدانية.
10. أو م ب. من غلط م د. وطبقة غلطت.
12. أو م ب. حصلوا.
13. أو أشارهم في ذلك أهم. ويتائر اشاروا بذلك أن هؤلاء.
14. أو توهون طائفة أخرى. وطائفة أخرى توهنت.
15. أlsi الدنيا ساقط في م. د.
8 وطريقة تكلمت في الافتقار إلى الله وحقيقته، فتوفرهم بعضهم أمه، أما يفضلون قلّة الشيء وشدّة الحاجة والصر على المفرّ. وتتوفر طائفة أخرى من أهل الدعوة أن الفقير المختار الذي يعدم الصبر والرضى لا قضية له ولا ثواب له على قفره، وعليه لأن الفقير الصابر الرضي درجة على الفقير المختار المختار، ولفقير الفقير درجة على الفقير المختار المختار، والمصر ولقح الذي يكون عنه بالدنيا.{٣٨}

9 وزوّمت طائفة منهم أن الفقير والغني حالان لا يبعدان أن يؤسّس معهما، بل يعبرهما ولا يسكن معهما ولا تتفق عدتهما، وهذا عند الحقائق والنهائيات. فتوفرهم قوم منهم أن هذه المسئوات بين الفقير والغني وما هذا كذلك، لكن المحقق في الأحوال يستوي عند الأضراد في حالة وليست بمستويين في أصولهما، بل حالة يجعلهما. {٠١}

10 وطريقة تتوفر أن المراد من الفقر العدم وقلّة الشيء والفقر فقط، وأشتغلت بذلك ولم يطلبوا حقائق الفقر، وخشى عليهم أن رؤية الفقر في الفقر حجاب الفقر عن

---

{١} huhu
{٢} م ب: ٤ أخرى
{٣} ألم: ساقط في م
{٤} ب: الفرض
{٥} د: في ذلك لم يعلم أن
{٦} ب: الفراق
{٧} الفقير الصابر... من قلّة الحاجة، ساقط في م، ألم في ب
{٨} ساقط في م
{٩} ب: الفراق
{١٠} م: ساقط
{١١} لا يسكن: ساقط في ب
{١٢} م: معهم
{١٣} وهذا عند الحقائق والنهائيات، ولهذا لا يكون إلا عند أهل الحقائق
{١٤} في الأصل هذا 
{١٥} وما هذا كذلك
{١٦} إن الحقائق 
{١٧} ب: في
{١٨} ب: الفراق
{١٩} م: أخرى
{٢٠} م: فانقلوا
حقيقة الفقر: وليس في الفقر حالة أقل من العدم ولا حالة الشيء فإنه ذلك يشترك فيه المدعوم والسؤال والمكنون وما همهم بعموم يا ولاهم في رتبة
11 وطبيعة منهم غلطوا في التوسع في الدنيا وترك التوسع فيها، ولا يصلح التوسع والتكير منها إلا النبي أو ولي أو صديق. ومنهم من يقوم في الأسباب يحق لا يحظى، ومن يعرف الإذن ويكون من أهل الإذن يتفق إذا أخذ له في الإمساك، ولا يعرف ذلك إلا الأنبياء وأهل الكمال والنهائية من الأولباء، وعلائمهم أعلم لا يسكنون إليه ما في أيديهم ولا يطلبون الزيادة عليه، ويكون القليل والكثير عندهم واحدًا، ولا يستدل بالعطاء ولا بال أمساك، يعرف وجه الحقق فيها فيضعها بأمر ومسكها بأمر، لا يغلط في ذي ولا في ذلك
12 وطبيعة من التكير والتقليل ظننا أن الرفق في النفس، وتناول المباح واستراح النفس بحال، مما يسقط العبد عن درجه، وعندهم أن كل من رفقة نفسه أو رفق به فهو باطل، وذلك غلط [84] منهم لأن ال علة في ذلك كالعلقة في التوسع والتصرف

1 المكنون: سافط في م
2 أو ومنه: د ب و ليسوا
3 ب 3 في ذلك
4 ولا رتبة فاعلا م ب ولا رتبة فاعلا في الفقر الحقيقي
5 وطبيعة منهم غلطت م ب ومنه أخرى غلطت 4 في فلقة غلبت
6 ولا يصح التوسع سافط في م
7 م: الكتاب
8 أو ولي سافط في د
9 م 3 في الأسباب
10 م ب 3 غرفة
11 في الأصل
12 أهل الكمال م د أرباب البدوات
13 ب 3 لقاء
14 ساكنون
15 في 
16 لا يغلط في ذي ولا في ذلك سافط في م
17 وطبيعة من التكير والتقليل م ب ومنه أخرى غلطوا في التكير والتقليل وم 4 وطبيعة غلطوا في التكير والتقليل وم
18 م 3 م ب 3 ما
19 م 3 وعندهم أن كل من رفقة نفسه أو رفق به فهو باطل
20 منهم
وأدب يظهر من النفس، فيؤدي بنوع من هذه التأديبات، ثم إذا شاهد أفافا واستحلا ملاحظة الحلق له ترك ذلك، وعمل في الانقلاع عنها، والرجوع إلى طريق المساواة مع الحلق في المطعوم والملبس من وجهه:

13 ، وقبله من المتبربة عملوا في الكسب، وانكروا عليه من لم يكسب وهو ترك الكسب، وغفلوا أيضاً فإن الكسب رخصة وادبحة سنة، فمن لم يطلب حاله رد إلى سنة، والمؤمنون كلهم مأمورون بالتوكل، قال الله تعالى: "وَعَلَى اللَّهِ فَتَوَكَّلْنَا إِن كُنتُم مُّؤْمِنِينَ" (الأنام: 5) وهو اللطف مما وعد الله له، فمن أسوق عن هذه الدورة ورد إلى حال سنة من الكسب فهي شروط: أحدها أن لا يعتمد على كسبه، ولا يشغله ذلك عن أداء الفرائض في أوقاتها، وتعلم من العلم ما لا يتناول حراما، ولا يأخذ من كسبه شيئاً من الرخص بالتأويلات، ويرفع إخوانا له يعوزون عن الكسب ويعدوه، إذ ذاك تزيل عنه عيب الكسب.

1. ب: على
2. د: أو يرئي، ب: رياضة
3. ب: ماهية
4. د: فؤادا بنوع من هذه التأديبات
5. ب: عنها
6. د: واطاقة أخرى، ب: واطاقة أخرى
7. م: مقدمة
8. د: وأعمره به
9. م: وهو ترك الكسب
10. د: أيضاً

11. د: بين من لم يطلب حال التوكل، فإن التوكل حال النبي، والكسب سنة
12. د: والتوكل هو
13. د: جرح
14. م: أو يتعلم، ب: و منها أن
15. د: وأن بعض إخوانه الحاضرين
16. د: من كسبه، ب: يخففصم
17. د: فذلك يقول
18. د: هذه بعض سرائط الكسب
14 وطبة من المريدين غلبت في حلالترة، وذلك أغلب مما سمعنا محادثات من قبلهم من المشايخ الأكبر والاسادة المتقدمين، وما نمو الله تعالى بذلك من اسمائهم ورفع مقدارهم في حلقة، اجتدوا وعملوا في الجهاد مدةً، فلم يزال يومهم طمعت نفسها بالكرامات فلم يجدوها كسلوا في مجادلهم فسموا ذلك الكسل فترة، وهو كسل وحذاء، ولو جذبتهم الحكمة جذبة لما كسلوا فكانت فرحاً رجوعًا إلى المجاهدة، فإن الفترة هو استراح لقلوب الجهاديين وأبداعهم وتناً دون وقت، ثم يعودون إلى حال الاحترام كما حكي عن الروذابي رحمه الله أنه قال: النهاية كالبداية والبداية كالنهاية 11، فمن ترك بنهاية 88 وبشراً مما كان يعمل في بدايته فهو مخدوع.

15 طبقة منهم غلبت في سباقاتهم وأسفارهم، وجعلوا أسفارهم سوقاً لأنفسهم، ولقب المشايخ تكراراً على أبناء جنسهم من لم يسافر سفرهم، وهذا غلط. وما هذا سافر القوم إلا سافروا لتشتاق 12 لهم أخلاقيهم 15 عما لا يصلى في دراجاتهم فينقلونها ويلقون المشايخ، ومن كان قد غاهم في لقاء المشايخ أن يأخذ منهم كلهم فمروحة وبه على العامة فهو معتن 16، ومن كان قد افتخار بأنه رأى فلاناً وفلاً فهو راوي على العامة 17، ومن كان قد افتخار أنه رأى فلاناً وفلاً فهو راوي على العامة 17، ومن كان قد افتخار أنه رأى فلاناً وفلاً فهو راوي على العامة 17، ومن كان قد افتخار أنه رأى فلاناً وفلاً فهو راوي على العامة 17.
المسافرون، ومن طلبت منه نفسه إقبال شيخ عليه أو إكرام له فإنَّ سفره سفرةٌ من العلم إلى الجهل ولا ينفع به أبداً.

17 وطبقةً غلطوا في الإنفاق وتوهموا أن المراد من الإنفاق البذل والخلق والسخاء، وليس مراد القوم ذلك ولكنهم رأوا أن التعلُّق بالأسباب قطع عن المسيب، فعملوا في قطع الأسباب عن انفسهم رجاء الوصول إلى المسيب.

18 وطبقةً غلطوا في المباحات، ولم يتكلفو الفراشة الأوقات وقالوا: ليس لنا معلوم، أباَس ما وجدنا آكلنا وذلك وقتنا، وذلك غلط لأن الوقت إذا فات لا يدرك، وليس الوقت أن يكون معموراً بالرفاق، إنما الوقت ما يكون معموراً بالذكر والإخلاص والرضى، وعمارة الوقت بالرفاق من نزعات الشيطان، وعمارته بالذكر من موارد الحق.

الطعام انكسرت وذلقت للحق ويؤمن عليها، وذلك غلط، وإما يجب أن يوجد طريق تدلي النفس وكسرها من المشاهد والأستاذين حتي لا يتوّلد. مما يريد من الخبر شرًا، فإن الشر إذا تولَّد من طريق الخير لا يمكن تداركه، والنساء إذا ترك الطعام أياً أداه ذلك إلى خلل يقع في الفرائض، فنصب يقع في فريضة شر من تمادى النفس في كل وقت، والعبد يحب أن لا يأكل من الطعام ما يقوي عليه 17 الشهوات، ولا يتركه بقدر ما يضعف عن
الفرائض، ويستعمل السنا على ما قال النبي ﷺ: "ثالث للطعام وثالث للشراب وثالث للنفخ، والثالث الذي يفتقَن هو لأنفس العبادة والفقه عن الله تعالى الوجوه إليه، وتنفَّس غلت في العزلة، وتومه أن العزلة والدخول في الكهوف والانفراد في الجبال والقلوات يؤمنهم من شرور أنفسهم، ويوصلهم الله بالخلو وانفراد ما وصل إليه أولياءٌ. وغلطوا في أن المشايخ دعاهم إلى العزلة والانفراد داعي العلم وقوة الحال، وذلك جذب من الحق، جذبهم إليه فأغناهم به عن كل ما سواء، فمن لم يكن محصولاً قوة الحال وغلطوا الفرد ثم ينكلف الانفراد والعزلة فإنه يظلم نفسه ويدخل عليه بذلك ضراً عظيماً وأصلل حال النبي ﷺ لما دنا أوان الوحي إليه، كان يذهب إلى حراإ فيخلوا فيه الأيام ذات العدد، وذلك من غلبوا الفرد الذي، دنا وقته عليه.

20 وغلطوا في أنفسهم وتوهموا أنفسهم من الشهوات النفسانية بذلك، وغلطوا فإن الآفات تبدوا من الباطن وقطع الآلة لا يزيل ذلك، وإنما يزيل ذلك قطع الشهوات عن القلب ثم الآلة لا تضر، وإن قطع الآلة لا تنفع مع شهوات الباطن.

21 وغلطوا في أنفسهم وتوهموا أنفسهم على جوهوهم في البوادي والباري والمفاون والجبال بلا زاد ولا ماء ولا آلة للطريق، وتوهموا أنفسهم ينكلف بهم ذلك إلى منازل الصادقين في حقيقة الثوكل، وغلطوا لأن القوم الذين عملوا هذا كانت لهم بدات ورياضات.
وجمادات فئة [158ب]، وكانوا مستقلين بأحواضهم لم يبالوا بالقلة ولم يستوحشومن الوحدة، وذلك لما استوت أحوالهم عندهم من الاضداد من الفقر والغنى والعزة والذلة وغير ذلك، فمن ركب هذه الحلكة من غير هذه البدايات والرياضيات غلطة وأفسد وقت وحالة.

22 وطبقه غلطوا في ليس المرقع والصوف العمولية من غير ضرورة، وأخذوا الركاء وتعلموا شيئاً من إشارات القوم وعلمهم، وظنوا أنهم إذا فعلوا ذلك كانوا منهم، وليس التحليلي والتشبيه من الحقيقة في شيء، لأن النبي قال ليس الإمام بالتحلي والتمي، وقال: المشبه بما لم يعط كلامبا نوفي زور.

23 وطبقه أحرزوا قوهم وجمعوها ووضعوها، ثم عمدو بعدها إلى الصلاة والصوم وقيام الليل واستعمال الورع وليس الخشن وأكل الجبنة والبيكاء، والتضرع، وظنوا أن ذلك المقصود من الأمر وأن ليس بعده شيء، وغلطوا فإن بداية التصوف هو الخروج من المعلومات والأكاذ من الغيب والأخذ منه، ومن رجع منهم إلى سبب في بداية فاعلا هو لأهلهم، ومن لا يقوى قطوه من فرض عليه تعهد.

24 وطبقه توجهان أن التصوف هو القول والرقص والسماع والتقيس، والقصائد، واتخاذ الدعوات والتكلفة للاجتماعات لما رأى من بعض الصادقين اناساطاً في وقت من الأوقات في السماع، وغلط في ذلك لأن كل قلب مثوث بشيء من الدنيا، وكل نفس فيها شيء من البطالة والغلة فلا يصح لها السماع، بل لا يجل له ذلك.

---
1. د - وجماعات
2. أحوالهم عندهم من أم ب - عندهم
3. د - أو كانوا مستقلين بأحوالهم لم يبالوا بالقلة ولم يستوحشومن الوحدة... من ركب هذه الحلكة من غير هذه البدايات والرياضيات
4. وطبقه غلطوا أ - واطلاق غلطوا ب - واطلاق أخرى غلطوا
5. أمرقع والصوف العمولية أ - الصوف والمرقع
6. م - ووضعها
7. أصلما والصوم ب - الصوم والصلاة
8. رجوع
9. وطبقه توجهان أ - واطلاقا توجهت ب - واطلاق أخرى توجهت
10. م - وانمة
11. من - من B - بعض
12. د - لم يتمكن أن
13. د - والآخر أصح، قال الجلبي
14. بعض من ساءه عن السماع - إذا رأيت المراد يحب السماع فأعلم أن في نفسه بقية من البطالة.
25 وطبقت غلطت في اسم الحرية والعبودية وتوعمت أن الحرية أجل من العبودية،
وإلا أطلق من أطلق اسم الحرية لشيءٍ في الفصل [68] أ، أخذنا أنه قال لا يكون العباد على الحقيقة
عبداً حتى يكون عما سوى مولاه حرًا، وهذه طريقة صحيحة، ومنهم من نفى الحرية
وهاجها وقال، إن الأحر إذا عمل عمل جزاء وطلب عوض، لا تخلو معاملة الأحرار عن
طلب الأعوام، والعبد ليس له طلب جزاء ولا عوض من سبيده، إن أعطاه أطهار متفضلاً
وإن لم يعطه لا يستحق عليه شيئاً، والحر يعمل للجزاء ويتظر ما يستحق.
26 فغلطت طبقة منهم وتوعمت أن العباد ما دام بنى وبين الله بعدد يسمى عبداً،
فإذا وصل إليه صار حرًا وإذا صار حرًا سقط عنه العبودية، وهذا غلط كبير إن اسم
العبودية ألم فإن الله تعالى سمي أولياءه عباده، وسمي ملائكته عباده، وسمي أنبايبه عباده
وقدم النبي ﷺ العبودية على البشر في التحيات، فقال: أشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وأشهد أن
محمد ﷺ عبده ورسوله ولا مقام أبلغ من مقام النبي ﷺ، وهو يصلي حتى تورّمت قدمه،
فقبل له في ذلك فقال: أفلا أكون عبدًا شكورًا، فتفهم ولا تغطت!!
27 وطبقت غلطت في الإخلاص وظنت أن حفلة المبالات وأن يخرج العبد عن رؤية
الخلق ولا يوافقهم في جميع ما يريد أن يعمله حقًا كان ذلك أو باطلًا، وإذا وقعوا إلى هذا
أن طائفة من مشايخ القوم سألوا عن الإخلاص فقالوا: لا يصفوا له الإخلاص حتى لا يبقى

1. وطبقت غلطت في وثاب طائفة غلطت في ب: وطبقت أخرى غلطت
2. ولم نعلم أن اسم الحرية
3. وإنما أطلق من أطلق ﷺ، وإنما أطلقه من أطلقه
4. إن الأحر إذا عمل عمل جزاء وطلب عوضاً: إن الأحر إذا عمل عملًا فطلب حزاء ووعوضاً: إن الأحر إذا
عمل عملًا طلب به حزاء ووعوضاً
5. إن الأحر إذا عمل عمل جزاء وطلب عوض: إن الأحر إذا عمل عملًا فطلب حزاء ووعوضاً
6. فطلبوا في هذه الفصول
7. إن الأحر يعمل للجزاء ويتظر ما يستحق: ساقط في ب
8. طائفة طائفة منهم وتوعمت: طائفة غلبت طائفة منهم وتوعمت: طائفة توعمت
9. فلم يتم: ما دام
10. طائفة ولا تغطت: ساقط في ب
11. طائفة غلبت: وطبقت أخرى غلبت
12. لحدث
في العدء شيء من رؤية الخلق والكون. فغلطت هذه الفرقة وتوههم أن ذلك يصح بالدعوى والتقليد، فتركوا الأدب وتجاوزوا الحدود وغاصتهم النفس والهواء، ولم يعلموا أن العبد المطلوب بالإخلاص هو المهدب المؤدب الذي ابتعد السيات وأقبل على الطاعات ونازل الأحوال والمقامات حتى أتى ذلك إلى صفاء الإخلاص، فأما من ضيّع البدايات كيف يصل إلى حقيقة الرعايات؟

وًطّبقة ُغلطت في النبوة والولاية {٨٨}، فزعمت أن الولاية أعلى وأتم، وذلك لأهم نظرفا إلى قصة موسى {٤} والخضر {١} في قوله تعالى: {فَوَجَدُوا عباضاً من عبادنا} {الكهف: ٥٢ - ٥٣}. تهمّت هذه الطبقة أن حلال الولاية أفضل من حال النبوة لرجع موسى {٤} إليه، ولم يعلموا أن الله {٤} يختص من يشاء بما يشاء، حسن الأنبياء بالمعجزات على دواوين، ثم حسن مريم رضي الله عنها بقوله: {وَزَيَّرَ إِلَيْكَ بِجَدْعَ النَّخْلَةِ} {أبي م: ٤} ولم يكن هذا لأحد من الأنبياء ولم تكن هي نبيه ولا هي أفضل من النبي، وأصف بن يرحا كان عنه علم من الكتاب فأتى بعرض بلقيس قبل أن يرد إليه طرفه، ولم يكن هذا النبي ولا يدل هذا على أنه أفضل من سليمان {٤} لهذا وقال النبي: {أفضلكم زيد، وأعلمكم بالخلال والحرام معاذ، واما أظلم الخضاراء ولا أفلت الغراء ذي هجة أصدق من أبي ذر}، ثم لا شك ولا يشكي شاك أن ابا بكر أصدق من ابن ذر وأفضل منه، وأن عمر بن الخطاب وعلي بن أبي طالب أعلم من معاذ بن جبل رضي الله عنهم، هذه تخصيصات ولا تدل على الفائض.

وذكرنا أن الأنبياء عليهم السلام بوحي إليهم بالواسطة والأولية يلتقبون من الحق وذلك غلط، فإن الأنبياء صلوات الله عليهم لهم رسالة بواسطة والنقّ جميعا، وأعمالهم بعيدة من الاغترارات، والاغترارات وقعت في حال الأولية لا في أحوال الأنبياء.
والولاية والصدقية إذا تمامها وإشرافها بأنوار النبوة ومن بركات متابعة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم. وأجمع فـ: ولو ألقى على الحضور ذرة مما شاهد موسى [73] لأحقًّا. حتى لا يبقى منه شيء. وحبع علم الحضور عن موسى نذيراً وتأديباً لتعليمًا واحتياجاً.

30. وطبقة: غلبت في الإباحة والحظر وزعمت أن الأشياء في الأصل مباحة. وإذا وقع الحظر للتعدي، فما لم يقع تعدي فالأشياء على أصلها، واستدلت بقوله [74] فانتبى فيها حب وнутьاً ورضيًّا ورهانًا وحدائق علماً وفواً وракهة وآبة متناعًا لآدم وآلهما، [75] على الجملة غير مفصل [76]، وطمعت نفسهم بأن الحصور على المسلمين مباح لهم إذا لم يتعدوا في تناولها، وإذا أداهم ذلك ما سمعوا من انبساط بعض المتقدمين مع إخوانه في دخول الدار التي يسكنها. والكل فيها والأخ من كسبه، يريد بذلك إدخال السرور عليه في الانبساط، وما يمكن عن بعضهم: إننا كنّا لا نصحب من يقول نعلي وقميصي وثوبٍ، وإنما كان ذلك منهم لولا روا لفسد ملكٍ يختصون به دون من يحضره من إخوانه حتى أن احتاج إليه أخوه أخوه وليسه ولم ينشئمه، وليس من يدعى أن الأشياء على الإباحة. بأول من يقول أن الأشياء على الحظر فيمنتع من ذلك كله.

31. وطبقة: تكلمت بالحلول ولم يسمع هذا إلا حكايته، وما شاهد أحد منهم أحداً، وهو أفهم قالوا أن الله تعالى اصطفى جسمًا حلي فيها، معنى الروبية فازال عنها معايي البشرية. فمن قال به أو تحقق فيه أو ظن أن التوحيد بدأ له بما أشار من هذه المقالة فهو
كافرٌ. وإنما ضلّت الخولية وإن صحّ عندهم مقالتهم لأقوم لم يميزوا بين قدرة النبي هي صفة القادر وبين الشواهد التي تدل على قدرة القادر وصنعة الصانع، فناءت عقولهم، فمنهم من يقول بالانوار، ومنهم من قال بالنظر إلى الشواهد المستحسنات بجهل، ومنهم من قال حال في المستحسنات فقط، ومنهم من قال حال في المستحسنات وغير المستحسنات، ومنهم من قال على الدوام، ومنهم من قال وقتًا دون وقت، وكل هذا ضلالية وكرر.

32 وطبيعة غلطت في فناء البشرية، فتوهست أن فناء البشرية حين تكلم القوم في الفناء والبقاء، فوقعتمهم وساو فتركموا الطعام والشراب وتوهموا أن البشرية هي الغالب والجثة إذا ضعفت زالت بشريتها، وتوهمت هذه الطبيعة أنه يجوز أن يكون العبد موصوفًا بالصفات الإلهية، وأن الذي ذكر القوم فناء صفات البشرية وذلك أن سلطان أنوار الحق إذا بدأ على البشرية 1178 بأخذت صفات رعونتها من رؤية الأعمال واستحسان الطاعات، وردّ 13 من الجهل إلى العلم ومن الغفلة إلى الذكر، ومن العجب إلى رؤية المهنة.

والله الهادي.

33 وطبيعة من أهل الشام ادعوا أنهم يرون الله بالقلب في دار الدنيا كما يرون في الآخرة، وقد ذكر هذا 15 أن سعيد الخرّاز في كتاب كتب إليهم، وذكر في فصل منه:

---

1 قائلًا
2 دع: دُعْتُ
3 فاقفوا في قولهم
4 من فناء الدول
5 هي الاستحقاق في
6 صفاً
7 فناء البشرية
8 و라면 ذلك
9 الب: إذا
10 أرادت على البشرية آزالت في الب: بدأ... آزال
11 الب: مثل
12 الب: الرجوع
13 الب: مضمون إلى رؤية المهنة، والله الهادي سافر في الب
14 بينهم: بينهم
15 الب: دع"
وبلغني أن نيب بناحيكم قوم يقولون كذا وكذا، وتوسوس في هذا أيضاً جماعة من أهل البصرة من أصحاب الصحبي، وذلك لما كثرت مخاهاهم وسهراهم وزج العوادهم، وخلوهم، وتركهم صحبهم، الإعجاب فاصطدامهم الشيطان زينه لهم ذلك حتى أدعوا ما ليس لهم، وذلك أنهم لم يقفوا إلى شيخ تبيين لهم طريق حطائهم وبردهم إلى الصواب كما وقع لأصحاب سهل بن عبد الله رضي الله عنهم قال له بعض أصحابه: إن أرى الله فقلت في كل ليلة: بيني رأسي. فقال: إذا رأيته الليلة فأحرق عليه، فلما رأه في الليلة الثانية برق عليه، فقلت: بعد ذلك شيئاً، فرجع إلى طريقه وتركه هو. ورؤية القلوب إن صح في مشاهدة الإيمان وحقيقة التوحد وصفة اليقين، كما كان لحارة، ولا يظنون أحد من عامر بن عبد الله القيس، حين قال: لو كشف الغطاء ما أزددت يقيناً، إن ذلك تحقيق، بل ذلك في كل غلبة وسكون وانبساط يرد على العبد، ولا ينتهي الخير والعيان بعد قول النبي ﷺ: ليس الخير كالمعاينة.

34 ومنهم من خلف في حال الصفاء والطهارة فزعمت لأنفسهم الصفاء والطهارة على الكمال وإن ذلك لا يزول عنهم. وزعموا بأن العبد يصفوا من جميع

ب: وهم

مساء لهم. فاقت في م

دع: وإذا أصحاب اليس إلك لقان: يقفوا

د: دع الله معرفة بكراب الشيطان

ب: يطلب أصحاب

ط: يطمأن أصحاب سهل قال له بعض أصحابه: كنا سهل بن عبد الله رضي الله عنهم، وافق له ذلك يقال لسهم

أ: كنا في كل ليلة، فاقت في م

ب: له: هو

ب: في: الليلة

ج: يرجع إلى طريقه، فاقت في م

ب: تلك الوسوم

ب: م: مصحح


ب: تبين

ب: في: القيس

ب: ومنهم من خلفاً: وطيفة أخرى غلطت.
الكدورات والعمل بمعنى البينونة منها والعبد لا يصفوا على الدوام وربما يصفوا له وقت دون وقت: والطهارة إذا كانت فقلب العبد من الغل و الحقد والغش وغير ذلك، فأما النفس فإنها محل العمل ولا يخلو محل العمل من العلّة. كيف وقد قال النبي ﷺ أنه ليغان على قلبي فاستغفر الله في اليوم سبعين مرة، ويقول ﷺ: إنا أستغفر للأسن، ويقول ﷺ: إذا أنا يشر ملككم. [88]

35 وطبقية غلبوا في الجمع والتفرقة، فلم يضيفوا إلى الخلق ما يضاف لله إليهم، ولم يصفوا أنفسهم بالحركة، وظروا أن ذلك منهم احترام حتى لا يكون مع الله تعالى سوى الله، فأداه ذلك إلى الخروج عن الملة وترك الحدود وخرق الشريعة، وأسقطوا اللائمة عن أنفسهم عند مجازاة الحدود، وهذا لقلة معرفتهم بالأصول والفروع ولم يفرقوا بين الأصول والفرع وبين الجمع والتفرقة، فأضافوا إلى الأصل ما هو مضاف إلى الفرع وأضافوا إلى الجمع ما هو مضاد إلى التفرقة، ولم يحسنوا وضع الأشياء موضعها، ولا يتكلف في حقيقة الجمع والتفرقة إلا صديق أو زنديق. فأما الصديق فقد جر إلى الله تعالى في كل شيء بعد معرفة ما يحتاج إليه من الأصول والفروع والحقوق وميزة الفرق بين الحق والباطل ويتبع الأمر والنهي، ويقوم بشروط الآداب على حدود الاستقامة، والزنديق لا ينجز شيء من ركوب المعاصي لأنه آداه جهله وخسارته إلى إصابة أفعاله كلها بالله حتى أزال برعمه عنه اللائمة في ركوب المآم بالتأويل الباطل، نعود بالله من ذلك.
37 وطقبة غلطت في القرب والانبساط، فتوهموا أن بينهم وبين الله تعالى حالة من القرب والانزواء، فاحتموا ذلك التوهيم بالرجوع إلى الآداب التي كانوا يراعوها والحدود التي كانوا يحافظون عليها، فبسطوا إلى ما كانوا عنه محتشمين، وتوهوا أن ذلك من قريهم ودعبوا، وطلعوا فإن الآداب والأحكام خلع من الله تعالى على عباده، فمنى ما زاده عليه حرضاً وها حفظاً فهو من الله في عين الرعاية والقرب، ومنى أزال عنه شيء من ذلك مما يظننه قريباً إلى الحق بعد منه، وبالله العباد من ذلك.

38 وطقبة غلطت في فناء الأوصاف [88] وهم جماعة من البغداديين، عندهم أهم عند فنانهم من أوصافهم دخلوا في أوصاف الحق، وأضافوا أنفسهم إلى معيين يؤذينهم بجاهلهم إلى القول بالحلول وإلى شبيه من مقالة النصارى في المسيح. والمعنى الصحيح في فناء أوصاف العبد والدخول في أوصاف الحق فناه من مراداته أجمع ودخوله في مراد الحق به فلا يكون له مراد مع مراده فيه، فما أراد الله به أراده لنفسه، فهو فناء أوصافه واتصاله بأوصاف الحق. وطلعوا في أهم ظنوا أن أوصاف الحق هو الحق، وليس كذلك لأنه تعالى ونقدس لا يحل في القلوب ولكن يجل فيها توحيده ومعظمه وهيئته.

39 وطقبة غلطت في فقد الحسوس، فزعمت أنها تفقد الإحساس عند المواجيد والذكاء القوي ويخرجون عن أوصاف الحسوس، وهذا قول طائفة من العراقيين وهو خطأ لأنه بالحس يعرف فقد الحس، والحس صفة البشرية وقد يغلب عليه باد من الوجدات التي ترد على الأسرار بقهر سلطانها، فتعنيه عن حسه لحظة كالشمس نطق على الكواكب فستفصى نورها ولا يزيل عن أماكنها، كذلك الحس لا يزول ولكن يظهره غلبة سلطان الورد عليه، وإذا غيِّب الإنسان عن حسنه بحسه عند المواجيد الحادة.
39 وطائفة غلطت في الأرواح، فقالوا قوم الرُوح نور من نور الله تعالى وتوهموا أنه نور ذاته، فرغموا أنه غير روح مخلوق، وقوم قالوا حياة من حياة الله فرغموا أنه من حياة ذاته، وقالوا إنه غير مخلوق. وقوم قالوا الأرواح مخلوقة وروح القدس مخلوق، وقوم قالوا أرواح العامة مخلوقة وأرواح الخواص غير مخلوقة، وقوم قالوا للمؤمنين ثلاثة أرواح ولكافر روح واحد والصادقين خمسة أرواح، و هذا كله خطأ وباطل، وصوابه ما قال الله تعالى ذكره: {وَيُسَأَّلُونَكَ عِنَّمَا أُرِيَ الْإِسْرَائِيْلِيُّونَُّ} [الإسراء: 75]، انها امره، وهي مخلوقة ليس بينها وبين الله نسب ولا سبب إلا لطاعة في خلقها وخصوص ذوات الحيوان به.8
فصل

0: علم الشريعة 2 على أربعة أقسام، الأول منها علم الرواية والآثار، والثاني علم الدراية والأحكام، والثالث علم القياس والاحتجاج، والرابع علم الحقائق والمنازل.

1: فمن غلط في علم الرواية لم يسأل أحداً من أهل الدراية، ومن غلط في علم الدراية لم يسأل أحداً منهم ما. كذلك من غلط في علوم الحقائق لا يسأل عن غلطه إلا عالماً منهم كاملاً في معناه يجوز أن يكون حجة، ولا يكون عالماً بالحقائق إلا بعد أن يحكم الأصول من هذه العلوم التي تقدم ذكرنا لها. وإذا اجتمعت هذه الأحكام الأربعة في أحد، فهو الإمام الكامل والحقيقة وهو القطب، كما قال علي بن أبي طالب

2: لكيمل بن زياد: لا تخلى الأرض من قائم الله بحجة كيلا تبطل آياته وتتحسس حجته، أولئك الأققون عدداً الأعظمون عند الله قدراً.

فصل

4: وأنا الشطح فإنه عبارة مستغربة في وصف واحد يبعث بعض فضيلة، والشطح في لغة العرب هو الحركة، يقال شطح يشطح إذا تحرك، يقال للبيت الذي يجوزون فيه الدقيق شطاح. قال الشاعر [89أ]:

ب: ﴿اعلم أن﴾

ب: ﴿بتفسر﴾

ب: ﴿ب الإجماع﴾

ب: ﴿ب الاستنكار﴾

ب: ﴿وم من غلط في علم الدراية لم يسأل أحداً من أهل الرواية﴾

ب: ﴿أحدها من العلمن المذكورين﴾

ب: ﴿ألاحكام الأربعة في أحد﴾

ب: ﴿بالأقسام الأربعة في شخص﴾

ب: ﴿في الشطح﴾

ب: ﴿ألا لما الخطط: بعض فضيلة﴾

ب: ﴿هو عبارة عن وصف ما يبدو في الفقه من الأحوال والفضائل﴾

ب: ﴿للبيت﴾

ب: ﴿تحرك﴾

ب: ﴿الشطاح﴾
فصل في الرد على القائلين بالخلول

قال صاحب الكتاب: ما قال بالخلول أحدً من أئمة القوم ومشايخهم ومن يرجع منهم إلى دين، وإنما أطلق هذا القول قوم من أهل الشام، وليس لهم في التصفوف قدم ولا لهم من مشايخهم ذكر. قال سيدي القوم أبو القاسم الجنيد بن محمد: أعلموا رحمتم الله أن الحق.

1 البيت سابق في م د ب
2 أجمعوا عن ذلك بعبارة يستغرب سامع
3 إذا أعطاه النهر عن الماء فيض
4 د: - سطوة
5 د: إلى أهله يوافق
6 م: ويدعون قول الكوفة: ولا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله العلي العظيم، والإثبات والنفي في سبديه محمد نبي الكريم، وعلى الله وسلم وشرف وكرم وله.
7 القرآن: د: ويدعون قول الكوفة: بأيام الكوفة ويدعون قول الكوفة: ولا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله العلي العظيم، والإثبات والنفي في سبديه محمد نبي الكريم، وعلى الله و سبحانه وكرم، فأعلى الله الظلمة ومهمل أن نبيه صلى الله عليه وسلم كرماً إلى يوم الدين، أмин.
8 على سبيل العيد العيد الفاتر إلى الله.
9 عمه سواء، ذلك أبو القاسم بن علي بن علي الكسائي الباجي، صلى الله عليه وسلم وكرمه، حكم الله الكاتب والكابض والقاضي والمستعين ومن هذا لم يبلغه والرجل، قائلًا بله يا ناهي هذا الكتاب إلا ندعنا لنا ونصضحنا فيما بقي، وآخر ذكره الحمد لله رب العالمين ومالك هذا الكتاب سبيل الرحم وملك لنا شاء الله بقدره.

هذه الفصل الأخيرة زادة في د فقط وغير موجود في الأصل أو د ب
لا يوصف بالحول في الأمكانة، ولا ينعت بمرور الأزمنة، كان الحق تعالى ولا شيء موجود ولا شخص معبد، كيف يصير بحالة كان في الأول عنها غنياً، كيف ينتقل بانتقال الفنان؟

جل تعالى أن يوصف بشيء من هذه العلل!

وقال ذوالينون المصري: الحلول لا يلحق الأغيار المخزرة والهياكل المبتدعة، كيف يجوز الحق مكان أو يضمه أوان؟ ولا مكان ولا أوان ولا زمان جل و تعالى عن ذلك.

وقال بن عطاء: تبطل ذلك الاستحالة لأنه يستحيل أن يشاكل القدم المحدث أو يساويه أو يقترب به، لأن الحلول لا يكون إلا بين الأشكال.

وقال أبو عمر الدمشقي: كيف يجوز أن يحل الحق في شخص هو أنشأ ملازم للنقص، وكان عنه مستغناً وهو القاهر بживائبه البائس بصفاته عن صفات خليقته، كان ولا مكان ولا زمان، وهو الآن كما كان.

وقال الحسين بن منصور الخالج: الحق تعالى أوجد هذه المياكل على رسم العلل، متوطأ بالأنفاس فانية في الحقيقة، وإنما الأرواح فيها إلى أجل محدود وقهراً بالموت، وربطوها في وقت اقامتها بالحجر، وصفاته تعالى بائنة عن هذه الأوصاف من كل الوجه.

فكيف يجوز أن يظهر الحق فيما أوجدته هذا النقص والعلة؟، كلا وحاشا.


والحمد لله رب العالمين
وصلى الله على رسول محمد وآله الطاهرين
 وسلم تسليماً
CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study has sought to show Sulamī as a Sufi shaykh in his own right by presenting a text that he produced in this capacity. This book and other such teaching texts bring to light an aspect of Sulamī that has not been considered in the past, that of a Sufi shaykh of teaching and instruction (shaykh al-ta’līm wa tarbiya). The Kitāb al-aghāliṭ is concise summary of Sarrāj’s section in the Luma’ concerning the errors of the Sufis, and provides us with an example of Sulamī’s Malāmaṭī tendency of speaking through the person he is transmitting from.

Future studies that this text might lead to would involve looking at other teaching texts of Sulamī. The Sulamīyāt collection from which the main manuscript used in the critical edition of the Aghāliṭ contains twenty-six books of Sulamī, not all of which have been edited before. This collection presents a great find for studies on this key time period for the development of Sufism.

Another question that is raised from this study that requires further pursuit would be how this text was used by critics of Sufism who stood outside of the tradition. A cursory reading of the Aghāliṭ and Abu’l Faraj ibn al-Jawzī’s (d.597/1200) Talbīs Iblīs (The Devils Deception) – one of the earliest and most influential books used by critics of Sufism – shows that both authors list many of the same errors. Before going any further though, it would be important to see the intended use of ibn al-Jawzī’s book. It has been characterized as an all out attack against Sufism, but in reality the book deals with how Satan can delude and deceive people in all aspects of Islamic normative life – from reciters of the Qur’an, to ḥadīth narrators, including Sufis. Furthermore, whether or not ibn al-Jawzī was an opponent of Sufism needs to be addressed as well. It should not be forgotten that ibn al-Jawzī wrote a significant summary of one of the greatest works of Sufism, Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazzalī’s (d. 505/1111) Iḥyā’ ‘ulūm al-dīn. Is ibn al-Jawzī perhaps writing not as a
critic of Sufism, but rather as a proponent of a particular type of Sufism – a more Ḥanbalite oriented Sufism in the tradition of Abdullah Anṣārī of Herat (d.481/1089) and later that of Ḥanbalite Qādir al-Jīlānī (d.561/1166)? This question would require a study of Islamic piety within the Ḥanbalite tradition and the place of Sufism therein.

The Aghāliṭ shows Sulamī as a Sufī shaykh, but also shows his Malāmaṭī teaching as well. As a list of mistakes made on the Sufi path, it had to have been written by one who has completed the path and was thus in a position to point out these errors. Its brief and concise nature suggests that it was used by Sulamī as a teaching text, emphasizing Sulamī’s role as a shaykh of teaching and instruction. In concluding this study, the words of Aḥmed al-Zarrūq (d. 899/1493) – the North African scholar of, ḥadīth, Malikī law, and shaykh of the Shādhilī order – from his Qawā'id al-taṣawwuf (The Principles of Sufism) accurately sum up much of what has been discussed.1

There are many pretenders on this path because of its strangeness, and there is a lack of understanding because of its subtleties. There is a great deal of rejection of its followers because of its purity. People giving advice have cautioned against pursuing the path due to the numerous errors therein. Religious leaders compiled works to refute its followers because of what heretics have done to it and because of erroneous things attributed to people on the path. Even ibn ‘Arabi al-Ḥātimī (may God have mercy on him!) said, “Beware of this path, for most of those who deviate from it are of it. It is but a path of doom and a path of this world. He who actualized his knowledge, action, and spiritual state will gain the glory of eternity. He who abandons realization in the Path will be doomed and will come to an end.” We ask God for well-being through His grace and generosity!

---

APPENDIX

Miḥan mashāyikh al-ṣūfiyyah

Concerning the text

The Miḥan mashāyikh al-ṣūfiyyah comes from the Sulamīyāt (79A to 81B) that was described earlier.\(^1\) The text itself is a short addition to Sulamī’s hagiographical works and lists twenty-three Sufi shaykhs and the trials that they faced. Nūr al-Dīn Shurayba notes that Dhahabī quotes from it twice in his Siyar a’lām al-nubalā’ in the entries for Dhū’l Nūn al-Miṣrī and Abu ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ibn al-Faḍl al-Balkhī.\(^2\) Dhahabī also quotes from Sulamī in his entry for al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidhī but does not mention what book he is using. The quote though parallels what is found in the Miḥan and is presumably from there. Besides these references to the work from Dhahabī, there is no other scholarly mention of the book, particularly in the manuscript catalogs that we have at our disposal. The Sulamīyāt copy is thus a unique manuscript for the Miḥan.

---

\(^1\) See chapter three.

\(^2\) See p. 41 of Shuraybah’s edition of Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyyah. For Dhahabi’s quote of the Miḥan see vol. 11, p. 543 of Siyar a’lām al-nubalā’ for his quote on Dhu’l Nūn al-Miṣrī, and vol. 14, p. 254 for his quote on Muḥammad ibn Faḍl al-Balkhī.
First page of Miḥan mashayikh al-ṣūfiyah from the Sulamīyāt
Last page of Miḥan mashayikh al-ṣufiyah from the Sulamīyāt showing the beginning of the Kitāb al-aghāliṭ
بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
حسيب ربي وله توفيق
ذكر من مشايخ الصوفية


2 وكان سلمون احب حسن الوجه حسن الكلام في الخبّة وعذوبة المنطق. وان مرأه مالت إليه، فلما علم سلمون بذلك طردها عن نفسه فجاءها إلى الجنيد فقالت: ما تقول في رجل طريقاً إلى الله تعالى فذهب الله وبني الرجل؟ فعلم الجنيد ما قالت فقال: حسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل! ف subplot هذه المرأة نفسها بالتهييج على سلمون فأتى عليها ذلك، فذهبت إلى غلام الخليل لما علمت من إنكاره عليهم، فقالت له: آن قوماه هو الصوفية فلان وفلان. وذكرهم في سلمون - يجمعون معه كل ليلة على الخرام. فرحش غلام الخليل عليهم العوام.

في الأصل: ذو النون


في الأصل: ذكرهم.

4 ذكرهم.
وعسى يهم إلى السلطان حتى أمر بضرب إعناقهم حتى كشف الله عنهم ذلك، منهم من غاب ومنهم من توارى حتى خلصهم الله تعالى من ذلك.

3 وأبي سعيد الخراز رحمه الله، أنكر عليه جماعة من العلماء ونسبوه إلى الكفر بأنفاظ وجدوه في كتبه، منها ما هو في كتاب السر، فلو قلت له من أين ولى إلى أين لم يكن له جواب غير الله، مع أنفاظ آخر له.

4 وعمرو بن عثمان الفهري، كان عندما جزء فيه [28] علم النفس، كتب في

يد بعض تلاميذه فأخذ الكتاب وهرب، فقال: سوف يقطع يده ورجله، وقيل أنه كان الحسين منصور الحلاج، فنَفَّض به ذلك.

5 وسهل بن عبد الله التستري، مع معرفته وعلمه وشدة احتجازه، قال في بعض كلامه أن الثواب فرصة على العباد في كل نفس، وكان في ناحيه رجل ثم ينسب إلى العبادة فهَيْجَ عليه العامة نفسه إلى القبائح وكفره حتى خرج منها إلى البصرة ومات بها.

6 وأبو عبد الله الحسين بن عبد الله بن بكر الصديقي، تكلم في الأسما والصفات والحوالف، فكفره أبو عبد الله الردندي وهيج عليه العامة، وقال له سهل بن عبد الله: لن فتحنا للناس حرب الحلاج فلن يصرروا علينا، فلما كَلِمْتِهم أنت بما لا يعرفون أنك ما أناك وخرج من البصرة ومات بالمدينة مدينة السواد ومن قبره، ولم يخرج الصديقي من سرب داره ثلاثين سنة يجهد ويتعد، فلما تكلم في المعارف أدهش الناس.

7 وأبو العباس بن عاطف رحمه الله، مع فهمه وعلمه وجلانه وحسن ألفاظه، وقع له ما وقع بسبب الحلاج، فدعاه حامد بن العباس فتوجه هو وخافه في الكلام، فقال له ابن عاطف أرفع يا رجل! فأمر حتى فلَّ أسانه فكان في ذلك نفسه.

8 والجندل كم مرة شهدوا عليه بالكفر حتى اختفى مراراً وعسر باللغة مراراً؟

9 وما هذا كله بأعجاب من خير عامر بن عبد القهش حين رفع إلى عثمان بن عفان أنه قال أنه خير من إبراهيم وأنه يرحم ما أحلف الله، فكتب إلى معوية بن أبي سفيان وأشخصه معوية إلى عثمان على قبته، فلما سأل عن حاله وعرف محله ومكانه من الذهب.
والعبادة أكرمه وردت إلى موضعه، وكذلك من بعده كانوا مقصودين بالأذى والمخل، كما روي عن النبي ﷺ أنه قال: [198] أشد الناس بلال الأنبياء ثم الأمثل فالأمثل يبتلي على قدر دينه.

10 وأما أبو يزيد البسطامي، فإنه لما رجع من سفره إلى بسطام وتكلم بما تكلم به من علوم لا عهد لهم به، وتكلم في أحوال الأنبياء وأحوال الأولياء، أنقر ذلك الحسين بن عيسى البسطامي إمام ناحيته والمقصود في علم الظاهر، أمر أن يخرج أبا يزيد من بسطام فأخرج منها ولم يعد إليه إلا بعد موت حسين بن عيسى البسطامي، ثم بعد ذلك ألقى الناس وعظموه وعظموا شأنه، وإلي الآن يتركون بزيارة قبره ومسجده.

11 وأما أبو عبد الرحمن محمد بن الفضل البلخي رحمه الله، وكان إمام بلخ وكان يذهب مذهب أصحاب الحديث فعاداه أهل بلخ بسبب المذهب وقالوا: لا نحب أن تسكن بلدتنا، أخرج منها! فقال: لا أخرج منها إلا أن تعلقو في عنقي حبلاً وتأخذوا بي من إحدى أطراف البلد وتجروا في السوق وتقولون: هذا مبتدع نريد أن يخرجه من بلدتنا! ففعلوا به ذلك وجرّو إلى حياجن ثم خلو بسيله، فانتفت إليهم وقال لهم: نزع الله من قلوبكم معرفته وحيته! فقيل أنه لم يخرج بعد دعاته عليهم من بلخ صوفي من أهلها بعد أن كان بيئ التصوف والزهد، ومن كان بها من صوفي فإنه غريب انتقل إليهم أو ولد غريب.

وخرج محمد الفضل إلى مفرقة وانخذوه فيها بينهم شبه نبي إلى أن مات بما.

12 وأما محمد بن علي الترمذي رحمه الله، فإنه لما صنف كتاب علل الشريعة والكتاب حكم الولاية أنكرنا عليه بسبب الكتابين، وقالوا فضل الأولياء على الأنبياء وغلطوا في ذلك، وأخرجوا من ترجمة فجاء إلى بلخ وأقام بما آياماً إلى أن رجع إليهم.

قد ذكر النهدي هذه العبارة في الكتاب سيو آثار البلاء من حكم الصوفية للسلطاني كما ذكره للسني في [عند الصوفية]، لما تكلم محمد بن الفضل بلقي في فهم القرآن وأحوال الأنبياء، أنكر عليه فقه بلغة، وقالوا: لا مبتدع، وقامت انتقادات مذهب أهل الحديث، فقال: لا أخرج حتى تفرغوا، وتكلموا في الأواسق، فقالوا: نزع الله من قلوبكم معرفته وحيته، لفظ: لم يخرج منها صوفي من أهلها، فانصرفوا، فاغلبوا في إكرامه، وقيل: إنه عظى يوماً، فمات في المسجد أربعة أيام، أما أنظر في شهر أعلام البلاء تحقيق شيخ دهش الأرباط ج 4 ص 254.
13 وأما أبو يعقوب يوسف بن الحسين الرازي، فإنَّ زهادَ أهل الري والمنقرية منهم
[80] ما زالوا ينكرُون عليه وينكلمون فيه ويرمونه بالعظام مع قلة مبالاهم كم لتمام علمه
واستقامة أحواله إلى أن توفي.
14 وأما أبو الحسن البوشنجي، فإنَّه لقي من أهل بلده ما لقي، أخرجوه منها إلى
أن جاء إلى نيسابور واستوطنها ومات بها.
15 وأما أبو عثمان الغزبري مع تمام حالة وكثرَة مjahاداته ورياضاته، خُرَّ حُرَّ عليه
العلوية بمكة، فصَبَر على رأسه ومنكبه وأطيف له على جمل في أسواق مكة حين أوججه
ذلك إلى مفارقة الحرم ودخول بغداد، وأقام بما سنة فلم يطلب ما قلبه وخرج إلى نيسابور
فأمَّام ما سنتين ومات بما رحمه الله.
16 وأما أبو بكر الشبلي رحمه الله مع تمام علمه وكثرَة مjahاداته ورياضاته وحِدة
حائِل وفضاحة لسانه، شُهد عليه غير مرة بالكفر حتى من أراد موعنه وخلاصته منهم شُهد
عليه بالجنون حتى حُبس في مارستان حتى قال فيه بعض مشايخ بغداد من الكبار وهو أبو
الحسين الخوارزمي رحمه الله: إن لم يكن الله جهنم فإنه يخلق جهنم بسبب الشبلي وإن لم
يدخِّل الجنة الشبلي ولا أرى حري من يدخلها.
17 وأما أبو القاسم النصارابادي فلقي من أهل بلدته من علمائها ومشايخ التصوف
ما لا خفا به أبداً، كانوا ينكرُون عليه أحوالهカラمه وبسطه للسمع وقعوده في هذا العلم
إلى أن خرج إلى الحرم ومات بما.
18 وأما أبو الحسن السجزي الكبير صاحب أبي حفص، فإنَّ أبا عثمان الฏيري
هجره وأمر أصحابه أن يهجره، فقال إنَّ أبا عثمان حسده وقيل إنه أغار على ما كان يتكلم
به من الكلمات العالمة، وحكي عن أبي حفص أنه قال لأصحابه: أن أخذة منكم ينبوطة في
الكلام حتى يهجر [81]، ويمنع صحبة العوام ويخص بصحة الخواص، فقيل أنه كان أبو
عبد الله السجزي.
19 وأما أبو الحسن الحصري رحمه الله، فإنّه شهد عليه بالكثير وحكى عنه ألقاً 
كتب في درج وحُمل إلى أبي الحسن من معروف قاضي الفضيحة، فاستحضره القاضي في ذلك
ومنع من العقود في الجامع، ومما زال ابن شعرون يتكلم فيه إلى أن مات.

20 وأما أبو القاسم بن جميل فكان يتكلم فيه بكل عظمة مع قلّة مبانيه بذلك، 
ولعمري لقد كان يفصل أقوالاً ويرتكت أموراً مع الكلام فيه والإنكار عليه إلى أن؟!؟ بآخره
بيرة صحبه الفقراء وعشرهم إلى أحسن طريقة وأقرها، ومات على ذلك.

21 وأما أبو بكر الطليسي مع فضل عهده ولهذه واستقامة طريقةه، تكلم في الأمر
بالمعروف والنوني عن المنكر في أمر هؤلاء المغاربة، فأخذ وحمل إلى مصر، فلم يرجع عن
 قوله فسلخ وهو حي، قبل أنه كان يسلخ منكوشاً وهو يقرأ القرآن فكاد أن يفتتنه به الناس،
رفع ذلك إلى صاحب مصر فقال: اقتلوه ثم استحوذ.

22 وأما الحسين بن منصور الحلاج، فمع اختلاف الناس فيه وتباين أقوال المشايخ،
فإن كان من القوم فلقي ما لقي مما لا يخفي، وإن لم يكن من القوم فلا كلام في حديثه.

23 وأما أبو بكر بن زبدان فإنه كان يسافر الكثير وي薰د مشايخ الصوفية ويعرفون 
له محله وكان على ذلك سينين، فلما رجع إلى بلده استحلا السياسة ورغب في صرف وجهة
العامة إليه أحد بدأ على هؤلاء وتبسههم إلى الزندقة والكفرب، كله هذا ميلاً إلى الدنيا وطلباً
للعرّ حتي بلغني أنه وقف يوما على الشبلي فقال له: يا أبا بكر قد قصدت من بعيد، أريد أن
أستلك عن مسالة: فقال الشبلي: لو كان بيننا [81ب] وصلة ما أردت أن تبعني ولكنا اثنين 
غيرين ضدّين، وذلك لما بلغه من الوقعة في مشايخه.

24 وقال أبو بكر الطليسي الفارسي: دخلت على ابن زبدان فحضرت محله،
فلما فرغ رآي وقال لي: ما تقول في هؤلاء العراقيين الجنيد وروم وسمعون وابن عطاء؟
قلت: أرباب التوحيد ووجه الدين، فاغتنام من كلامي وتعتير وقال لي بعض من حضر: يا 
رجل أنا لك ناصل، إن أقمت في هذه البلدة ل-admin. فأتت تكون في دمك خارج منها.
فخرجت.


