

THE BOOK OF ERRORS: A CRITICAL EDITION AND STUDY OF

KITĀB AL-AGHĀLIṬ BY ABŪ ‘ABD AL-RAḤMĀN AL-SULAMĪ (D. 412/1021)

by

JAWAD ANWAR QURESHI

(under the direction of Dr. Kenneth Honerkamp)

ABSTRACT

The *Kitāb al-aghālīṭ* (The Book of Errors) by Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī (d. 412/1021) elucidates a number of errors in both thought and practice that a traveler of the Sufi path might fall into. This study presents a critical edition of the Arabic text of *Kitāb al-Aghālīṭ* produced from four manuscripts (three of which were previously uncatalogued), a detailed synopsis of the book, and addresses questions of authorship and the relationship between *Kitāb al-aghālīṭ* and the *Kitāb al-luma’* of Abū’l Naṣr al-Sarrāj (d. 378/988). The main manuscript used in forming the critical edition treats the *Kitāb al-aghālīṭ* as a section of another Sulamī work previously thought lost – *Miḥan mashāyikh al-ṣūfiyah* (The Trials of the Sufi Masters) – a critical edition of which is included as an appendix.

INDEX WORDS: Islam, Sufism, Malāmatīya, Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī, Abū’l Naṣr al-Sarrāj, *Kitāb al-aghālīṭ*, *Miḥan mashāyikh al-ṣūfiyah*, *Kitāb al-luma’*, *Ghalatāt al-ṣūfiya*.

THE BOOK OF ERRORS: A CRITICAL EDITION AND STUDY OF
KITĀB AL-AGHĀLIT BY ABŪ 'ABD AL-RAHMĀN AL-SULAMĪ (D. 412/1021)

by

Jawad Anwar Qureshi

A.B. University of Missouri-Columbia, 1999

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2002

© 2002

Jawad A. Qureshi

All Rights Reserved

THE BOOK OF ERRORS: A CRITICAL EDITION AND STUDY OF
KITĀB AL-AGHĀLIT BY ABŪ 'ABD AL-RAHMĀN AL-SULAMĪ (D. 412/1021)

by

Jawad Anwar Qureshi

Approved:

Major Professor: Kenneth Honerkamp

Committee: Kenneth Honerkamp
Alan Godlas
Sandy Martin

Electronic Version Approved:
Gordhan L. Patel
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2002

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
الحمد لله والصلاة والسلام على سيّدنا محمد

DEDICATION

I dedicate this work to my father, who attended the University of Georgia forty years ago, after having just arrived from Pakistan. Dad, I hope that this will show you that all of your efforts to provide a better life for your family have been realized. I also dedicate this work to those whose paths I hope to follow: my teachers and *shuyukh*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

لَا يَشْكُرُ اللَّهَ مَنْ لَمْ يَشْكُرِ النَّاسَ

حديث نبوي

Whoever does not thank people, has not thanked God.

(Prophetic tradition)

I thank Shaykh Nuh Keller for granting his permission to carry out this study.

I must acknowledge Dr. Kenneth Honerkamp's influence on this work: he suggested that I work on Sulamī's text, graciously handed me the manuscripts that he had gathered from Morocco and Egypt, procured a copy of the Riyadh manuscript, and then guided me through every step of the research – reading and editing the manuscripts, forming the synopsis, as well as reading unpublished works of Sulamī with me. It would not be an exaggeration to say that if there is any value in this work it is due to his influence and that if there are any shortcomings then they are from me. Also, I thank Dr. Alan Godlas who, along with Dr. Honerkamp, provided perhaps the most unique and inspiring educational experience during my studies at UGA. To both Dr. Honerkamp and Dr. Godlas I bear a debt of gratitude and will forever be thankful.

I also thank my friend Sidi Mokrane Guezzou of Amman, Jordan for his comments on the manuscript of the *Miḥan* and for attempting to track down the reference to the *Kitab al-Aghālīṭ* in Ibn 'Arabī's writings. Similarly I thank my good friend and classmate Ms. Alison Bramblett for her help with the German and participating in "the greater jihad" with me at Peabody Hall.

Also, I thank my family for their support and encouragement during my studies, in particular my brother Mr. Omar Qureshi and my sister Ms. Aisha Qureshi. Besides their unflinching moral support and encouragement, both provided much needed financial assistance without the least bit of hesitation.

Also, I thank my former boss at the UGA Graduate School, David Knox, for his patience and assistance in getting this thesis ready for submission. Finally, I thank the faculty, staff, and my colleagues at the UGA department of Religion for providing a challenging and warm environment to grow in.

To all of the above and to those that I might have forgotten to mention: thank you.

والحمد لله

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
A NOTE ON DATES, QUR'ĀNIC REFERENCES, AND FOREIGN WORDS	ix
PREFACE	1
CHAPTER	
1 Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī and the <i>Kitāb al-aghālīṭ</i>	3
Sulamī: Scholar and Sufi Shaykh	3
Title of the <i>Aghālīṭ</i> and its Relationship to Other Sulamī Texts.....	11
Authorship and a Comparison with Sarrāj's <i>Kitāb al-luma'</i>	13
Conclusion	17
2 Synopsis of <i>Kitāb al-aghālīṭ</i>	18
Introduction	18
Errors that occur in terms of doctrine.....	21
Errors that occur in terms of social transactions and Sufi practices	26
Errors that occur in terms of spiritual states	30
3 The Arabic text of <i>Kitāb al-aghālīṭ</i>	37
The Manuscripts	37
Method of the critical edition	39
Images of the manuscripts.....	41
<i>Kitāb al-aghālīṭ</i> - Critical Edition	49
CONCLUDING REMARKS	69
APPENDIX – <i>Miḥan mashayikh al-ṣūfiya</i>	71

Concerning the text.....	71
Images of the manuscripts.....	72
<i>Miḥan mashāyikh al-ṣūfiya</i> – Critical Edition.....	74
REFERENCES.....	79

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.

PREFACE

The text that is the focus of this study, the *Kitāb al-aghālīṭ* (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 *Aghālīṭ* 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-aghālīṭ* 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-ṣūfiya*). 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 *Aghālīṭ*. 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 *Aghālīṭ* as a section of another Sulamī work, the *Miḥān mashāyikh al-ṣūfiya* (The

¹ See Arberry’s “Did Sulamī Plagiarize Sarrāj?” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1937): 461-465.

Trials of the Sufi Shaykhs). From the content of the two works, it is clear that they are separate books and the *Miḥan* 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.² 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.

² See Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī, *Usūl al-malāmatīya wa ghalaṭāt al-ṣūfiya*, ed. 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Ahmed al-Fāwī Maḥmūd (Cairo: al-Irshād, 1985).

Chapter 1

Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī and the *Kitāb al-aghālīṭ*

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 Khālīd ibn Sālim ibn Zāwiyya ibn Sa'īd ibn Qabīṣa ibn Sarrāq al-Azdī al-Sulamī. Sulamī's student and scribe Abū Sa'īd 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 Ismā'īl 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-Baghādādī's entry on Sulamī in the former's *Tārīkh Baghdad* (Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, 1965), 2: 248-249, biographical dictionaries have drawn heavily on Khashshāb's work and is quoted by Shams ad-Dīn Muḥammad al-Dhahabī in his *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'* (Beirut: Mu'assasat al-Risālah), 17: 247-255 (hereafter referred to as Dhahabī). Tāj al-Dīn al-Sūbkī builds on Dhahabī's information on Sulamī and includes some of his own comments in his *Ṭabaqāt al-shāfi'iyah al-kubra* (Cairo: 'Isa al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī), 4:143-147 (hereafter referred to as Subkī). The *Risala* of Abū'l 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-sufiyyah* (Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Nafīs, 1986). This list of writings and biographical material was updated and incorporated into Suleyman Atesh's introduction to his *Tis'at kutub fi uṣūl al-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-Sulamī," 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 Sūfī 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.² Though Nishāpūr had virtually every school of Islamic thought in her midst, the main combatants were the Shāfi'ī 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.³ 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.⁴ 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 Malāmatiya (the People of Blame). Besides the Karrāmites and the Malāmatīs, Nishāpūr also had teachers of Iraqi Sufism. Virtually all the Sufis of Khurasān came from the Shāfi'ī-Ash'arī faction,⁵ of which Sulamī was a leading figure – all of his teachers were Shāfi'ite and it is said that he met the great Ash'arite scholar Abū Bakr al-Bāqillanī (d. 403/1013) when the latter visited Shiraz. Though Sulamī was a high standing member of the Shāfi'ite-Ash'arite tradition, his main scholarly interests were not jurisprudence or theology but Sufism and

² For a detailed socio-political study of Nishāpūr, see Richard Bulliet *The Patricians of Nishapur*. For the relationship between the 'ulemā' and the ruling class, see Bulliet "The Politico-Religious History of Nishapur in the Eleventh Century." In *Islamic Civilisation 950-1150*. ed. D. S. Richards, 71-91. Oxford, 1973.

³ For more on the Shāfi'ī and Ḥanafī disputes, see Bulliet *The Patricians of Nishapur*, 28-46.

⁴ On the Karrāmites and their place in Khurasān, see C. E. Bosworth, "The Rise of the Karrāmiya in Khurasān," *Muslim World* (1960) 6-14.

⁵ On the relationship between the Sufis and the Shāfi'ī madhhab in Nishāpūr, see Margaret Malamud's "Sufi Organizations and structures of authority in medieval Nishapur," *IJMES* 26 (1994), 427-442.

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 Sufis.”⁶

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.⁷ He was accused of being untrustworthy in transmitting ḥadīth (*ghayr thiqa*) by a jealous opponent of the Nishāpūr’s Ḥanafī-Mu’tazilite faction, Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Qaṭṭān. However, Subkī repudiates this charge and state that he was indeed trustworthy.⁸ Furthermore, Sulamī composed a number of questions to the ḥadīth master Abū’l Ḥasan al-Daraqūṭnī (d. 385/995) concerning the soundness of ḥadīth narrators (*jarḥ wa ta’dīl*) about which Dhahabī says, “They are questions of one who knows [this field] (*su’āl ‘ārif*).”⁹ He also compiled a collection of forty ḥadīth which the later Shafī’ī jurisprudent and ḥadīth master Sharaf al-Dīn an-Nawawī (d. 676/1277) mentions in the introduction to his own popular collection.¹⁰

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 Malāmatīya and had accompanied Abū ‘Uthmān al-Ḥīrī (d. 298/910). Sulamī received *khirqah* (robe of investiture) and permission to initiate novices from the Shāfi’ī shaykh Abū Sahl al-Su’lūkī (d. 369/980).¹¹ He also also received the *khirqah* from Abū’l Qāsim al-Naṣrābādhi (d. 367/977-8) and accompanied him on the Hajj. Naṣrābādhi’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 Abi ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī lil-Daraqutni fi jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl*, ed. Sulayman Atesh (Riyadh: Dar al-‘Ulūm li’l-Tibā’ah wa’l-Nashr, 1988).

¹⁰ For Sulamī’s forty ḥadīth, see Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sakhāwī’s checking in the latter’s *Takhrīj al-arba’in al-Sulamīya fi’l ṭaṣawwūf*, Ed. ‘Alī Ḥasan ‘Alī ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1986).

¹¹ Böwering incorrectly states that al-Su’lūkī was a Ḥanafī. Subkī (3:137) gives his full name as Ḥanafī 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-Saqāfī (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 Malāmatīya and Iraqī 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-ṣūfiyyah* (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-ṣūfiyyah* (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).

¹² See Mohammad Ebn-e Monavvar, *The Secrets of God's Mystical Oneness* [Asrār al-Towḥid], trans. John O'Kane (New York: Mazda Publisher, 1992), 100.

¹³ For this classification of Sulamī's writings, see Böwering, "Qur'an Commentary of al-Sulamī," 45.

¹⁴ See Rkia Cornell's *Early Sufi Women* (Louisville: Fonsvitae, 2000) for a critical edition and translation of this book. For an earlier Arabic edition that is not quite up to par, see Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Tanāhi's edition (Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanji, 1993).

¹⁵ There are two good scholarly editions of the *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyyah* by Nur al-Din Shurayba (Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Nafīs, 1986) and Ed. J. Pederson (Leiden: Brill, 1960). For a study of the *Ṭabaqāt*, see Jawid Mojaddedi's *The Biographical Tradition In Ṣufism*, (Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press, 2001), 9-40.

¹⁶ For a critical edition of the latter, see Gerhard Böwering's *The Minor Qur'ān Commentary of Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān 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-naḥs* (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-malāmatīya* (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.

¹⁷ *Jawamī' ādāb al-ṣūfiyya and 'Uyūb al-naḥs wa-mudawātuhā*. Ed. Etan Kohlberg (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1976); also Atesh 183-290. For the *Kitāb al-Futuwwah*, see *The Book of Sufi Chivalry*. Trans. Tosun Bayrak (New York: Inner Traditions International, 1983). *Risālat al-malāmatīya*. 'Affī's *al-Malāmatīyah wa'l-ṣūfiyah wa ahl al-futūwah* (Cairo: Dār Iḥyā Kutub al-'Arabīyah, 1945).

¹⁸ Böwering, 55.

¹⁹ Böwering, 50.

²⁰ Julian Baldick, *Mystical Islam* (New York: University of New York Press, 1989), 85.

²¹ For this particular development in Sulamī studies, see Kenneth Honerkamp's "The Principles of the *Malāmatīya*: Study, Critical Edition, and Translation of Two Texts by Abu 'Abd al-Rahman al-Sulami (d. 412/1021)," (master's thesis, University of Georgia-Athens, 1997).

As for Sulamī's credentials as a Sufi shaykh, we have already mentioned that he was raised under the watchful eye of his Malāmatī 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 than 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 ḥadīths. These texts are

²² See Ebn-e Monavvar, *The Secrets of God's Mystical Oneness* [Asrār al-Towḥīd], trans. John O'Kane (New York: Mazda Publisher, 1992), 100.

²³ In his introduction to the *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣufiyah* (p. 46), Shurayba quotes this saying from Sibṭ ibn al-Jawzī, *Mir'āt 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 *Manāhij al-ʿārifīn* (The Paths of the Gnostics).²⁶ In the *Manāhij*, 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 than ten sayings of past shaykhs and relies extensively on the Qurʾān 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’ (*maʿrifa*), 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-fuqarāʾ* (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 *fuqarāʾ* (poor) as a source of arrogance. He goes to great lengths in discussing mistaken notions of spiritual impoverishment (*faqr*) 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-mashayikh* (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

²⁶ See Etan Kohlberg’s *Manāhij al-ʿĀrifīn: A Treatise on Ṣūfism by Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī* (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam, 1979); also Atesh, 141-164.

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 tarbiyah*).³¹ 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 taṣawwūf* (Introduction to Sufism)³² 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 tasawwūf* (Passages Concerning Sufism),³³ which contain fifty-one of his discourses (*mudhākaraṭ*) 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 Malāmātī tradition. Part of the Malāmātī way is to constantly blame one’s self and not to draw the attention of others in fear of

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 “Khurasān and the End of Classical Sufism.” In *Essays in Islamic Mysticism and Piety*. Ed. and trans. by Berndt Radke and R.S. O’Fahey (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 189-219.

³² Op. Cit. ed. Yusuf Zaydan, Cairo, 1978.

³³ Manuscript in possession of Dr. Ken Honerkamp of the University of Georgia-Athens.

ostentation. For the general audience, Sulamī thus emphasized the Malāmatī 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 Malāmatī, that Sulamī penned the *Aghālīṭ*.

Title of the Aghālīṭ and its Relationship to Other Sulamī Texts

Before the present study, scholarship on the *Aghālīṭ* had access to one manuscript of the text from the Dār al-Kutub library in Cairo.³⁴ This particular manuscript comes from compilation of works on Sufism and contains a copy of the Sulamī's *Risālat al-malāmatīya*. At the end of the *Risāla*, a section appears titled *Ghalaṭāt al-ṣūfiya* (The Errors of the Sufis), and presents the text of *Kitāb al-aghālīṭ*. Two studies have been carried out on the Dār al-Kutub manuscript, one by Abu'l 'Alā' al-'Affifī, titled *al-Malāmatīya wa'l ṣūfiyah wa ahl al-futūwa*,³⁵ which presented a critical edition of Sulamī's *Risāla* but did not include the *Ghalaṭāt al-ṣūfiya* 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-malāmatīya wa ghalaṭāt al-ṣūfiya*.³⁶ 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 'Affifī'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 'Affifī

³⁴ See chapter 2 for information on all of the manuscripts mentioned in this section.

³⁵ Op. cit., Cairo: Dār Iḥyā Kutub al-'Arabīyah, 1945.

³⁶ Op. cit., Cairo: al-Irshād, 1985.

ended his.³⁷ However, Maḥmūd's position is not without foundation – the *Ghalaṭāt* starts abruptly without the *basmallah*, preamble, opening supplication, or anything of the sort, which is very uncharacteristic of Sulamī's books. Also, the *Ghalaṭāt* does start off as a *faṣl* (section) and is followed by three more, suggesting that the *Ghalaṭāt* is an addendum of sorts to the *Risāla*.

The issue of whether or not the *Ghalaṭāt* 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 *Ghalaṭāt* but gives a different title to the book – *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 *Risāla* but a previously unknown work *Miḥan mashāyikh al-ṣūfiya* (The Trials of the Sufi Shaykhs). Even though this collection treats the books as being a part of the *Miḥan*, it is clear from their content that they should not be treated as one book. The *Miḥan* lists the trials of twenty-six Sufi shaykhs and should be considered another contribution by Sulamī to hagiographical literature.³⁸ The *Aghāliṭ*, however is not hagiographical in the least bit and like a number of other Sulamī works (such as *Jawāmi' ādāb al-ṣufiyah*, *Uyūb al-naḥs*, *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 *Gharā'ib min 'ulūm al-ṣufiya*, and the Bin Yusuf manuscript gives a fuller title: *Kitāb al-aghāliṭ fihi gharā'ib min 'ulūm al-ṣufiya* (The Book of Errors, Containing Oddities from the Science of the Sufis). *Kitāb al-aghāliṭ* then is the proper title because this is the only manuscript that actually refers to it as a book. Also, *Ghalaṭāt* (which was used in the Dār al-Kutub manuscript) is an incorrect form of the plural of the Arabic

³⁷ Hartmann's edition of the *Risālah*, in *Der Islam*, (8) 157-203.

³⁸ See the appendix of this thesis for an edition of the *Miḥan*.

word *ghalaṭ*, the correct plural of which is *aghālīṭ*. 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 *Aghālīṭ al-ṣūfiya*.³⁹ Because Ibn ‘Arabī does not mention the *Miḥan* along with it, this provides further support that the *Aghālīṭ* is a separate work of Sulamī.

*Authorship and a Comparison with Sarrāj’s Kitāb al-luma*⁴⁰

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 *Aghālīṭ*, 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.”⁴¹

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

³⁹ See Osman Yahya’s edition, printed in his edition of Ḥakīm Tirmidhīs *Kitāb khatm al-Awliyā* (Beirut: al-Maṭba‘at al-Kathilūkīya, 1965), 144.

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 than is found in *Aghālīṭ*. To illustrate this point, a translation of the beginning sections of the *Luma'* and the *Aghālīṭ* 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 than 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 oneself 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 than 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 (*shatḥ*) 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 (*‘ilm*) 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’iq*), and the third, leaving the world (*dunyā*) 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 *dunyā*), 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 *Aghālī* is its conciseness and focus: Sulamī leaves out all of the glosses and explanatory material and retains only the

⁴³ The bold numbers that appear in brackets refer to the paragraphs of the Arabic edition (see chapter 3).

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 *Aghālī* 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.⁴⁴ 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 Malāmatī 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,

⁴⁴ Op. cit., Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967, 1:673. Helmut Ritter also takes Sezgin's position; see his review of Shurayba's edition of Sulamī's *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya* in *Oriens* 7 (1954): 397-399.

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 than 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-aghālīṭ*

Introduction

Kitāb al-aghālīṭ lists roughly forty errors that are made on the Sufi path from the perspective of belief, practice, as well as spiritual realizations.¹ 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. [40] 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 (*iḥtijāj*), 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

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 *Aghālīṭ*.

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 kāmīl* (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 (*ayāt*) 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*:²

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-zāhirī*) 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 (*asrār*)? Rather, none is realized [in the *ḥaqā'iq*] but a spiritual wayfarer (*sālik*). As for one that lacks wayfaring (*sulūk*) and struggling (*ijtihād*), 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

² See Kohlberg, *Manāḥij al-‘Ārifīn: A Treatise on Ṣūfism by Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī*, (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam, 1979), 32.

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-maḥabba*). 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 *Aghālīṭ*, [2] Sulamī states that Sufism is based on three things: distancing ones self from that which is forbidden, fulfilling ones 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 Sulami has in mind traditions such as the Malāmatīyah and not a movement like the Karrāmites who were never accepted by the Sufis because their unorthodox beliefs.

The text of the *Aghālīṭ* 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 (*uṣūl*) of the shari'ah, concerning whom al-Junayd said, "They are prevented from attainment (*wuṣūl*) because of their lacking the foundations (*uṣūl*)." [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 (*uṣūl 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 than 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 Gods distinguishing some people over other 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 Barḥiya brought the throne of Bilqīs 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."

[29] 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 (*tawhīd*) 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 (*faṣḥ*) 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 slavehood – 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 Saʿīd al-Kharrāz (d.283/896) mentions in an unnamed book, and the other were from Baṣrah 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 ʿAbdullah al-Tustarī (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 Mālīk, which he does not give in full but which is in his *Arbaʿīn* as follows: ⁴

⁴ See *al-Arbaʿīn fiʾl-taṣawwūf* in Sakhāwī's *Takhrīj al-arbaʿīn al-sulamīya fiʾl-taṣawwūf* (Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1986), 64. For a commentary on this ḥadīth from a Sufi perspective see ibn ʿAṭā ʾIllah al-Iskandarī's *Laṭāʾif al-minan* (Cairo: Dār al-Maʿārif, n.d.), 140-146.

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 (*mu’minan 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,⁵ 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 (*‘arafa falzim*)!”

Another saying along the same lines as al-Ḥārithah’s is the saying of ‘Āmir ibn ‘Abd Allāh 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 (*taqlīl*) 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 (*shahwāʾ*), 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 (*ʿuzlah*), 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 (*jadh*) 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 sever 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 (*samāʿ*). [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 (*haqīqa*).”

[24] The other group felt that Sufism was nothing more than “recitation (*qawāl*) [of songs], dancing (*raqs*), audition (*samāʿa*), solo recitals (*taqsim*), poetry (*qaṣāʾid*), taking invitations, and attending gatherings.” What lead them to this position was that they saw some of the shaykhs enjoying themselves during sessions of *samāʿa*. What is hidden from them though is that every soul has something of the idleness and forgetfulness in it and that for such souls *samāʿa* is not healthy and perhaps even unlawful, the latter being more likely. Junayd said: “If you see an aspirant (*murīd*) that loves *samāʿa*, 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 *samāʿa* and defended it showing it’s Prophetic origins. Also, a few of the stories narrated in the *Risāla* of Qushayrī concerning Sulamī have to do with *samāʿa*, 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 Maʾrūf Zarīq and ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Abu ʿl-Khayr edition). Also, see the section on *Ḥifdh qulūb al-mashāyikh* (p. 334), for how Sulamī questioned that a session of Qurʾān recital under the guidance of his shaykh Abū Sahl al-Suʿlūkī was changed to session of singing.

to do so in the Qur'ān: *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 shari'ah to prevent them from taking that which is illicit; they should not earn anything that is based on figurative interpretations (*ta`wilāt*); 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 Qur'ānic 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 than 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),⁷ detailing the fine points of *faqr* and the mistaken notions that a number of Sufis had regarding it. In the *Aghāliṭ* however, he limits his discussion to the following groups: [6] one group that preferred *ghina* 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 (*'ubudiya*). [25] One group held that “the slave is not truly a slave until he is free (*hur*) 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 (*hur*), and if he becomes free then his slavehood ends. This is a major mistake.” Slavehood (*'ubudiya*) 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 *tahiyah* 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 (*ikhlas*) 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*). [35] The only people that speak about the reality of these states are the righteous-saints (*siddīq*) and the unbelievers (*zindīq*). 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 *zindīq* from engaging in sins because he attributes his ignorance and all of his vile actions to God. The *siddīq* 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.

[36] Sulamī then mentions the mistake that occurs in the station of proximity to God (*qurba*). In the *Futūḥāt al-makkīya* Sulamī is linked to ibn 'Arabī in this particular state. While in Ṭijāsā in Morocco ibn 'Arabī 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 Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī, 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 *Futūḥāt al-makkīya*, 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 *Aghālīṭ* 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 Baghdad 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 *ḥulūl* 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.

⁹ See *Kitāb khatm al-Awliyā'*. Ed. 'Uthmān Yaḥya (Beirut: al-Maṭba'at al-Kathilūkīya, 1965), 144.

“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 Sulamīyāt collection.

1. The Sulamīyāt Collection from Riyadh (MS ج)

MS ج comes from the Imam Muḥammad ibn Sa'ūd University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia; catalog (compilation ج), 455 folios, copied in the year 474/1083. The compilation is called the *Sulamīyat* and contains 26 books of Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī. 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 ، حسبي ربي وبه توفيقى* 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 الغلط الذي وقع للقوم من أين هو وما دواؤه*. The table of contents for the *Sulamīyat* gives as a full title for the section including the *Miḥan* as: *كتاب ذكر من مشايخ وذكر الاغلوطات الذي وقع للقوم*, 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 *وطبقة من...* or *وطبقة غلطوا...* 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: *غرائب 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 الاغاليط فيه غرائب*

من علوم الصوفية وما صرفوا وما غلطوا فيه منه ، مما جمعه وأثبتته الإمام أبو عبد الرحمن السلمي ثم النيسابوري رضي الله عنه وأرضاه ،
 This is the only manuscript that mentions the title
 of the book as *Kitāb al-aghālīṭ*. The copyist occasionally brings attention to new sections by
 placing three dots in a triangle at the end of a section. Also, the phrase *وطبقة غلطوا...* or *وطبقة*
اخرى... which generally starts a new section in the text is written in bolder, longer strokes to
 highlight it. Like MS م there are not any significant differences between MS ب and MS ج with
 regards to sections, though there are variants between them. As already mentioned MS م agrees
 most with MS ب.

4. The Dar al-Kutub Manuscript (MS ج)

MS ج is from the Dar al-Kutub in Cairo, Egypt. Under “*Usūl al-malāmatīya wa ghalatāt al-ṣūfīya*.”
 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-malāmatīya*, which comes before
 it in the folio and begins: *فصل في غلطات الصوفية*. MS د differs with the other three in that it includes a
 short section titled: *فصل فيه رد على قائلين بالحلل* which the others lack. Also, MS ج has the most
 variants then the other three.

Method of the critical edition

In forming the critical edition of *Kitāb al-aghālīṭ* MS ج was given priority due to its historical
 precedence, coming sixty-two years after the passing of Sulamī. The *Sulamīyāt*, from which this
 manuscript comes from, are the oldest manuscript works of Sulamī. New pages in
 MS ج are indicated in the text between square brackets.

The variants from MSS **د م** 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 (**تعالى ، عزّ وجلّ** etc), the Prophet (**صلى الله عليه وسلم** etc), or pious figures (**رضي 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 ﴿ 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.

وَصَلَّاهُ مَا ارَادَ أَنْ يَفْعَلَ وَكَتَبْنَا اثْنَيْ عَشَرَ مِثْقَالًا مِنْ ذَلِكَ طَائِفَةً
 مِنَ الْقِيَمِ فِي مِثَابِجِهِ وَفِي رَأْسِهَا طَائِفَةٌ مِنَ الْقِيَمِ
 دَخَلَتْ عَلَى ابْنِ سَيِّدِ الدُّنْيَا فِي حَضْرَةِ جَلْسَتِهِ فَلَمَّا فَرَغَ رَأَى رِجَالًا
 يَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ الْعَرِاقِيَّةُ الْجَنِيدُ وَرُومٌ وَمُتَمَوِّزٌ وَارِثٌ طَائِفَةٌ
 أَرَبَابُ النُّجُودِ وَوَجْهٌ الْبَرِّ فَاسْتَفَافَ مِنْ كَلَامِهِمْ وَفَقِيرٌ وَقَالَ لِي
 بَعْضُ مَنْ حَضَرَ مَا جَاءَ أُنَا لِكَيْ يَأْتِيَ مِنْ هَذِهِ الْمَلَكَةِ لِيَسْتَكْفِ
 تَكُونَ دَمَكَ فَاحْرَجَ مِنْهَا حُرْمَةً
فِي الْخَطِّ السَّيِّئِ وَقَعَ لِلْقَوْمِ مَا يَرَوْنَ
 وَذَلِكَ بِمَا يَلُغِيهِ إِلَى جِلْمٍ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ وَالْحَالِ أَنْ لَا تَقَانَهُ الْوَاهِدُ فِي ذَلِكَ
 نَسَقَ طَائِفَةٍ مِنْ رَجُلَيْهِمْ كَمَا وَارِثُ الْعِلْمِ الرَّوْدِيَارِ وَرَجُلٌ مِنَ الْقَوْمِ فِي هَذَا الرَّيْ
 الْيَوْمِ كَانَ مِثْلَ حَيْدِ السَّيْفِ فَإِنْ فَلَمَّا كُنِيَ فِي الْمَنَارِ وَذَلِكَ لِيَفْعَلَ الْمَقَامَ وَرَقِي
 الْحَالِ وَأَمَّا بَنِي اسْتِثْنَاءِ هَذَا الْأَمْرِ عَلَى سَلْبِهِ اسْتِثْنَاءُ
 أَوْ يَكُنْ اجْتِنَابُ الْحَاذِرِ وَاللَّامِي إِذَا الْفُلُ بَصُرَ الْبَاقِيَّةُ مِنَ الْمَنَارِ عَلَى الْمَحَالِ
 وَالْعَرِاقِ وَقَعَ مِنْ ثَلَاثِ وَصُفَى طَائِفَةٍ مِنْهُمْ عَلَى الْوَأَى الْأَصُولِ مِنْ قَوْلِهِ
 أَحْكَامُ الْأَصُولِ الْأَصُولِ الشَّيْخِ وَصُغْفَرُ صَدَقَتِهِمْ وَأَخْلَاصِهِمْ وَفَائِدَتِهِمْ
 كَمَا وَارِثُ الْحَسَنِ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ وَأَمَّا مَنْ غَوَى إِلَى الْوَصُولِ لِنُصْبِ الْأَصُولِ
وَالطَّيْفِ السَّابِقِ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ وَهِيَ
 لِأَوْدَادِ الْأَوَّلِ وَالْمَقَامَاتِ وَذَلِكَ مِنْ قَوْلِهِمْ فَنَهَى بَارِ الْأَصُولِ وَأَنْبَاءُ حَقِّهِمْ
 حَرِّطَ النَّفْسَ وَنَمَرَ

قَفْ تَشْتَظِرُ الْقَوَاتِ فَتُجِزُّهُ الْخَلْقَ قَسْمًا لَطِيفًا بِالشَّيْطَانِ
 بِالْقَوَائِمِ مِنْ جَارِي طَرَفٍ قَبِيلِ الْغَزَلِ رَدِمِ الْمَسْلُوحِ
 وَأَمَّا سَمِيحٌ لَكِنَّهُ مَا جَرَّوْهُ فِيهِ السُّبُوقُ الَّذِي يَخْلُفُكُمْ وَالشَّمْعُ
 لَفْظُهُ مَا فَوْقَهُ مِنَ الْحِكْمِ لَا يَخْلُفُكُمْ اسْتِوَارُ الْوَاحِدِ إِذَا قَوِيَ وَجَدْتُمْ
 فَتَعَبُّوْهُ أَعْدَادُكُمْ بَعْدَ بَارِهِ لِيَسْتَعْرِفَ سَامِعِيهِ مُنْفَكِّعٌ عَلَيْهِ وَمَقْتُولٌ بِهَا لَكِ
 وَمَوْزِيهِ وَسَالِمٌ مِنْهُ فَاجِي وَتَقَالِ شَمْعُ طَمَحِ الْمَاءِ الْبَهْرُ إِذَا ضَاقَ النَّهْرُ عَنِ الْمَاءِ
 فَيُقْبِضُ مِنْ جَارِيَتَيْهِ كَرَكَةِ الْبَرْدِ الْوَاحِدِ إِذَا قَوِيَ وَجَدْتُمْ وَلَمْ يَطُوقِ
 حَجَرٌ مَا يَرُدُّ عَلَيْهِ عَلَى قَلْبِهِ مِنَ الْبَرِّ طَوْنُ أَنْوَاعِ الْحَقَائِقِ شَيْطَانٌ دَلَّكَ عَلَى لَبْسَانِهِ
 فَيَقْتَرِحُ بَعْدَ بَارِهِ مَشْغَلُهُ عَلَى الْفَهْمِ الْمَعْلَى فَيَقُومُ أَرْبَابُهَا قَسَمِي
 ذَلِكَ عَلَى الْأَصْطِلَاحِ مُشْطَلِحًا وَالْمَسَالِمِ لَمْ يَرَوْهُمْ مَوْلَاهُمْ وَمَقَاصِدُهُمْ
 وَمَعَادِرُهُمْ وَمَوَارِدُهُمْ تَزَكُّ الْمُنْكَارِ عَلَيْهِمْ وَيَكُلُّ أَمْرُهُمْ إِلَى اللَّهِ تَقَالِي وَرَجْعُ
 مَا لَعَلَّ عَلَى نَفْسِهِ فَإِنَّهُ اسْلَمَ لَهُ وَاحْتَشَرَتْ بَابُ الرِّغَابِ وَالْفَتْوَى وَالْحَرْبِ
 وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ
 لَحْزَةً حَسْبِي رُوحُهُ تَوَقَّعِي
 مَسْأَلَةُ عِبَادِ النَّفْسِ عِنْدَ رُبِّهِ

تَسْمِيَةُ الْمَلِكِ الْأَمِيرِ الْأَمِيرِ

الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ وَالْعُلَمَاءُ
 وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ الَّذِي عَرَفَ الْأَصْفَوْتَهُ بِعَيْنِهِ وَالْقَسَمِ وَالْقَسَمِ وَالْقَسَمِ وَالْقَسَمِ وَالْقَسَمِ
 وَجَعَلَهُمْ أَهْلَ الْبَقَاءِ وَالْإِنْتِبَاهِ لِمَوَارِدِ الْأَعْوَالِ عَلَيْهِمْ وَوَقَّعَهُمْ لِمَوَارِدِ
 عَيْنِيهَا وَمَكَلَّمَ مِنْ شَرِّهَا دَارُؤِيهِ مَخْفُوفٍ عَلَى أَهْلِ الْإِنْتِبَاهِ فَسُجِّلَ

[illegible]

تعالى لا يطوع عليه محذره فكيف الثاني قال محمد القزويني ان هذه الحكاية
 التي في الوحي المحمدي لم يقدّر ادواته قد صاح وقال لو كان في هذه الثورات
 بني كان منهم وقد ثبت في الاصول التي يتقدم ذكرها من منثور الكلايين
 كلام شيخهم واعتهم وظاهر احوالهم بانسال الله تعالى ان لا يجوز
 بركانه وفي ذلك ما يستدل به دفعه الله تعالى لغوهم على ما وردت
 من احوالهم وعباداتهم ونحو ترغيب الى الله عز وجل ان يوفقنا لمرضاته
 ويعيننا على مصالح الدنيا والاخرة بمفضله ورحمته في غلطات
 الصوفية رضي الله عنهم قال الملوك ابو عبد الله بن ابي رضى الله عنه
 في الخراسانيين لانهم يتكلمون عن احوالهم وعن العقائد واهل العراق
 يصفون احوال غيرهم وليسوا واصفا بيا لظ والغلط الذي وقع للغير
 وذلك ليلوهم الى حيل من الله في الحال ودرجة سقطوا عنها بالتفاته
 كما قال ابو علي الرودي رضى الله عنه بلغت في هذا الامر الى مكان مثل حد
 السيف فاءن قلنا كذا في النار وذلك لدرجة المعاصم ودرجة الحال واما
 بني هذه الامور اسس على ثلاثة اشياء اولها اجتناب المحارم والثاني
 اداء الفرائض والثالث ترك الدنيا لاهلها والغلط وقع في
 ثلاثة اوجه طبقة غلطت في الاصول لقلّة احكامهم احوال الشريعة ومنع
 منهم واخلاصهم كما قال الجنيد رضى الله عنه انما منعوا من الاصول
 لتفسيح الاصول وطبقة غلطت في الفروع من الادب والاحكام
 والمقامات وذلك لقلّة معرفتهم بالاصول واتباعهم خطوط النقي
 والدين ولم يتادبوا بمن يروضهم ويحرمهم المراتب وندبهم على المنابع
 وبعثهم النقي وعيوبها فتسقط عنهم خطوطها فتبطل هو لا مثل من
 يدخل بيضا حليما بغير سراج يريد ان يطلب فيه شيئا فثابتا يجدها
 يطلب ويقتد في تلك الطلبة اكثر مما يتبع وطبقة غلطت في رلة
 او هفوة فاذا تبين لهم ذلك عاودوا الى سبيل الرشاد ومكارم الاخلاق
 وسما الى احوال وقبلوا التضرع وتركوا العناد وادعوا الحق فلا ينجون

بنك

انعام الجيد بن محمد اعلموا رحمكم الله ان الحق سبحانه وتعالى لا يوصف
 بالحوادث في الوجود ولا يثبت بجوار الزمان كالحق تعالى ولا شيء
 موجود ولا شخص معبود فكيف يحسن بحالده كان في الزمان عنها غني وكيف
 يتقبل بانتقال العناجل وتقلي ان يوصف بشيء من هذه العليل وقال
 دا النون المصري الخلول لا يليق انه المعبود المحنزه والهيكل المبتدعة
 وليق يحسن الحق مكان ارضية او ان ولا مكان ولا اوان ولا زمان
 جل وتعالى عن ذلك وقال ابن عطاء بسطيل ذلك الاستحالة لانه يستحيل
 ان يشا كل القديم المحدث او يساويه او يقرن به لان الخلول لا يكون
 المدين المستحال وقال ابو عبد الله المشيقي كيف يجوز ان يحل الحق
 في شخص هو انما ملانها للنفس وكان عنه مستغنيا وهو القاهر
 بعبادته الباني بصغائه عن صفات خلقه كان ولا مكان ولا زمان
 وهو الان كما كان وقال الحق بن علي مشهور الخلاج الحق تعالى اوجد هذين
 الهيكل علي رسم العليل منوطه بالافات فاني في الحقيقة وانما الارواح
 فيها الى اجل معدودة فتصيرها بالوقت وديطها في وقت انماها بالعين وصغائه
 تعالى بانيه عن هذه الاوصاف من كل الوهوه فكيف يجوز ان يظهر الحق فيها
 اوجده بهذا النفس والعلية كلا وحاشا وثبت ان الحق سبحانه وتعالى
 الزم كانه وصف اليهودية بالخلق اجمع فقال وما خلقت الجن والانس الا
 ليعبدون وقال ان كل من في السموات والارض الا آت الرحمن عبدا فكيف
 يجوز ان يحل فيها الرمة وصف النفس وهو اليهودية فيكون مستعبدا
 معبودا تجزئت تملطات الصوفية والحمد لله من شئ اليهودية وصلى الله على
 سيدنا محمد واله وصحبه وسلم تسليما لغير ارجا ايدا الى يوم الدين وحسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل
 عم



First page of the Bin Yusuf Manuscript

[٨٢ب]

في الغلط الذي وقع للقوم من أين هو وما دواؤه^١

- ١ [قال^٢: الشطح للخرسانيين^٣ لأنهم يتكلمون عن أحوالهم وعن الحقائق ،
والعراقيون^٤ يصفون أحوال غيرهم وليس الواصف^٥ بشطاح^٦ ، فالغلط الذي وقع للقوم^٧
وذلك من بلوغهم إلى محل من العلم والحال إن الالتفاتة الواحدة في ذلك تسقطهم عن
درجتهم^٨ كما قال أبو علي الروذباري رحمه الله : قد بلغنا في هذا الأمر إلى مكان مثل حدّ
السيف ، فإن قلنا كذا ففي النار . وذلك لدقة المقام ودقة الحال .
٢ وإنما بني أساس هذا الأمر^٩ على ثلاثة أشياء : أولها اجتناب المحارم ، والثاني أداء
الفرائض ، والثالث ترك الدنيا على أهلها .
٣ والغلط وقع في ثلاثة وجوه^{١٠} : طبقة منهم غلطوا^{١١} في الأصول من قلة إحكامهم
أصول الشرع ، وضعف صدقهم^{١٢} وإخلاصهم ، وقلة معرفتهم ، كما قال الجنيد رحمته الله : وإنما
مُنِعُوا في الوصول لتضييع الأصول .

^١ م : + بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم ، صلى الله على سيدنا محمد وعلى آله وصحبه وسلم ، غرائب من علوم الصوفية ، لأبي عبد الرحمن السلميّ رحمه الله ؛ د : فصل في غلطات الصوفية رضي الله عنهم ؛ ب : بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم وصلى الله على سيدنا محمد وعلى آله وصحبه ، كتاب الاغاليط فيه غرائب من علوم الصوفية وما صرفوا وما غلطوا فيه منه ، مما جمعه وأثبته الإمام أبو عبد الرحمن ثم النيسابوري رضي الله عنه وارضاه ، رواية أبي القاسم عبد الكريم ابن هوازن القرشي قدس الله روحه .

^٢ د : + المؤلف ؛ ب : + الإمام أبو عبد الرحمن السلميّ رضي الله عنه .

^٣ [للخرسانيين] م : من الفاظ الخرسانيين .

^٤ د : وأهل العراق .

^٥ م : الوصف .

^٦ د : بشطاح .

^٧ ما بين المعقوفين ناقص في ر ، الزيادة من م د ب .

^٨ [وذلك من بلوغهم تسقطهم عن درجتهم] م : لبلوغهم إلى محل من العلم والحال ودرجة سقطوا عنها بالفتاة ؛ د : وذلك من بلوغهم إلى محل من العلم والحال ودرجة سقطوا عنها بالفتاة واحدة ؛ ب : في ذلك لبلوغهم من العلم والحال إلى محل ودرجة سقطوا عنها بالفتاة واحدة .

^٩ [بني أساس هذا الأمر] م د ب : بني هذا الأمر وأسس

^{١٠} د ب : أوجه

^{١١} [طبقة منهم غلطوا] م : طبقة غلطوا ؛ د : طبقة منهم غلطت ،

^{١٢} د : فهمهم

٤ والطبقة الثانية غلطوا^١ في الفروع وهي^٢ الآدب والأخلاق والمقامات ، وذلك من قلة معرفتهم بالأصول ، واتباعهم حظوظ النفس^٣ ، ولم [٨٣] يتأدّبوا بمن يروضهم ويسقط عنهم حظوظ النفس^٤ ، ويجرعهم المرات ، ويدلّهم على المناهج ، ويعرّفهم عيوبها^٥ . فمثلهم كمثل من يدخل بيتاً مظلماً بلا سراج ثم يريد أن يطلب فيها شيئاً ، فما يُفسد أكثر مما يُصلح ، فمتى يجد مقصوده ولا يجد ما يطلب^٦ .

٥ والطبقة الثالثة كان^٧ غلطهم زلة أو هفوة ، فإذا تبين لهم ذلك عادوا إلى سبيل الرشd ومكارم الأخلاق ومعالي الأحوال ، وقبلوا النصح وتركوا العناد وأذعنوا للحق ، فلا تنقص تلك الهفوة من مراتبهم شيئاً ، ولم يظلم عليهم أنوارهم ولم يمتزج صفوهم بالكدورة^٨ .

٦ ومنهم من غلط^٩ في ألفاظ الفقر والغناء ، فطبقة من المترسمين التصوف^{١٠} شرفوا^{١١} الغناء على الفقر ، وأشار بهم في ذلك^{١٢} أن الغناء بالله أجل من الافتقار إلى الله ، لا الغناء بأعراض الدنيا .

٧ وتوهمت طائفة أخرى أنهم^{١٣} إنما فضّلوا الاستغناء بهذه الأعراض الدنيّة من الدنيا^{١٤} ، فجعلوا لها تأويلات [و]روّوا فيه روايات واحتجوا فيه^{١٥} ، وهو بعيد من مراد القوم .

^١ [والطبقة الثانية غلطوا] م ب : وطبقة ثانية غلطوا ؛ د : وطبقة غلطت

^٢ [وهي] م د ب : من

^٣ د : + والدنيا

^٤ [ولم يتأدّبوا ... حظوظ النفس] ساقط في م ؛ [يسقط عنهم حظوظ النفس] ساقط في د

^٥ [ويعرّفهم عيوبها] د : ويعرّفهم النفس و عيوبها فسقط عنهم حظوظها

^٦ [فما يفسد ... ما يصلح] د : فمتى يجد ما يطلب ويفسد في تلك الظلمة أكثر مما يصلح ؛ [فمتى يجد مقصوده ولا يجد ما يطلب] م : متى يطلب ما يجد

^٧ [والطبقة الثالثة كان] م ب : وطبقة ثالثة ؛ د : وطبقة

^٨ [ولم يظلم ... بالكدورة] ساقط في م د ب

^٩ [ومنهم من غلط] م د : وطبقة غلطت

^{١٠} [فطبقة من المترسمين] م : فطبقة من أهل ؛ د : فقوم ؛ ب : فطبقة من

^{١١} م د ب : فضّلوا

^{١٢} [وأشار بهم في ذلك أنهم] م د ب : وإنما أشاروا بذلك أن هؤلاء

^{١٣} [و]توهمت طائفة أخرى] د : وطائفة أخرى توهمت

^{١٤} [لمن الدنيا] ساقط في م د

^{١٥} د : في ذلك تحجيجات

٨ وطبقة^٢ تكلمت في الافتقار إلى الله وحقيقته ، فتوهمت بعضهم أنهم^٣ إنما يفضلون قلة الشيء وشدة الحاجة والصبر على الضرر^٤ . وتوهمت طائفة أخرى من أهل الدعاوى أن الفقير المحتاج الذي يعدم الصبر والرضى لا فضيلة له ولا ثواب له على فقره ، وغلطوا لأن^٥ للفقير^٦ الصابر الراضي درجة على الفقير المضطر المحتاج^٧ ، وللفقير المضطر المحتاج المعدم للرضا والصبر^٨ درجة على الغني الذي يكون غناه بالدنيا^٩ . [٨٣ب]

٩ وزعمت طائفة منهم^٩ أن الفقر والغنى حالان لا يجب للعبد أن يسكن معهما^{١٠} ، بل يعبرهما ولا يسكن^{١١} معهما ولا تقف عندهما^{١٢} ، وهذا عند الحقائق والنهايات^{١٣} فتوهم قوم منهم أن هذه^{١٤} مساوات بين الفقر والغناء وما هذا كذلك^{١٥} ، لكن المتحقق^{١٦} في الأحوال يستوي^{١٧} عنده الأضداد في حاله وليس^{١٨} بمستويتين في أصولهما ، بل حاله يجعلهما عنده شيئاً واحداً^{١٩} .

١٠ وطبقة^{١٩} توهمت أن المراد من الفقر العدم وقلة الشيء والفقر فقط ، واشتغلت^{٢٠} بذلك ولم يطلبوا حقائق الفقر ، وخفى عليهم أن رؤية الفقر في الفقر حجاب الفقير عن

^١ د : وهذا

^٢ م ب : + أخرى

^٣ [أنهم] ساقط في م

^٤ ب : الرضى

^٥ د : في ذلك ولم يعلم أن

^٦ ب : + المحتاج

^٧ [للفقير الصابر] المضطر المحتاج ساقط في م ؛ [المحتاج] ساقط في ب

^٨ [للرضا والصبر] د : الصبر والرضى

^٩ [منهم] ساقط في م د ب

^{١٠} د : إليهما

^{١١} [لا يسكن] ساقط في ب

^{١٢} م د : معهما

^{١٣} [وهذا عند الحقائق والنهايات] د : وهذا لا يكون إلا عند أهل الحقائق

^{١٤} في الأصل : هذا

^{١٥} [لوما هذا كذلك] د : وليس كذلك

^{١٦} [لكن المتحقق] د : إنما المتحقق

^{١٧} ب : تستوي

^{١٨} ب : ليستا

^{١٩} م ب : + أخرى

^{٢٠} د ب : فاشتغلتوا

حقيقة الفقر . وليس في الفقر حالة أقل من العدم وقلة الشيء ، فإن ذلك يشركه فيه المعدوم والسؤال والمكديون^١ وما هم^٢ بمحمودين^٣ ولا هم فيه رتبة^٤.

١١ وطبقة منهم غلطوا^٥ في التوسع في الدنيا وترك التوسع فيها ، ولا يصلح التوسع^٦ والتكثير^٧ منها إلا لنبي أو ولي^٨ أو صديق^٩ . ومنهم من يقوم في الأسباب^٩ بحق لا بحظ^{١٠} ، ومن يعرف^{١٠} الإذن ويكون^{١١} من أهل الإذن ينفق إذا أُذن له في الانفاق ، ويمسك إذا أُذن له في الإمساك ، ولا يعرف ذلك إلا الأنبياء وأهل الكمال^{١٢} . والنهاية من الأولياء^{١٣} . وعلامتهم أنهم لا يسكنون^{١٣} إلى ما في أيديهم ولا يطلبون الزيادة عليه ، ويكون القليل والكثير عندهم واحداً ، ولا يستلذ بالعطاء ولا بالامساك ، ويعرف وجوه الحقوق فيها^{١٤} فيضعها بأمر ويمسكها بأمر ، لا يغلط في ذي ولا في ذاك^{١٥}.

١٢ وطبقة من التقشّف والتقليل^{١٦} ظنّوا أن الرفق في النفس ، وتناول^{١٧} المباح واسترواح النفس بحال ، مما^{١٨} يسقط العبد عن درجته ، وعندهم أن كل من رقة نفسه أو رفق به فهو باطل^{١٩} ، وذلك غلط [١٨٤] منهم^{٢٠} لأن العلة في ذلك كالعلة في التوسع والترفع

^١ [المكديون] ساقط في م د

^٢ [وما هم] د ب : وليسوا

^٣ ب : + في ذلك

^٤ [ولا هم رتبة فيه] م ب : ولا رتبة لهم فيه ؛ د : ولا رتبة لهم في الفقر الحقيقي

^٥ [وطبقة منهم غلطوا] م ب : وطبقة أخرى غلطت ؛ د : وطبقة غلطت

^٦ [ولا يصلح التوسع] ساقط في م

^٧ م : التكثير

^٨ [أو ولي] ساقط في د

^٩ م : - في الأسباب

^{١٠} م د ب : عرف

^{١١} في الأصل : + له

^{١٢} [وأهل الكمال] م د : أرباب ؛ ب : أرباب النهايات

^{١٣} ب : يسكنون

^{١٤} ب : - فيها

^{١٥} [لا يغلط في ذي ولا في ذاك] ساقط في م د

^{١٦} [وطبقة من التقشّف والتقليل] م ب : وطائفة أخرى غلطوا في التقشّف والتقليل و ؛ د : وطبقة غلطوا في التقشّف والتقليل و

^{١٧} م د ب : تناول

^{١٨} م د ب : - مما

^{١٩} م د : - وعندهم أن كل من رقة نفسه أو رفق به فهو باطل

^{٢٠} م : - منهم

سواء. وليس للبعد أن يعمل^١ ذلك إلا في وقت ابتداء رياضته^٢ أو شدة مجاهدته^٣ أو عند سوء أدب يظهر من النفس ، فيؤدبها بنوع من هذه التأديبات^٤ ، ثم إذا شاهد آفاقها واستحلا ملاحظة الخلق له ترك ذلك ، وعمل في الانقلاع عنها^٥ والرجوع إلى طريق المساواة مع الخلق في المطعم والملبس من وجهه.

١٣ وطبقة^٦ من المتقربة^٧ عملوا في الكسب^٨ وأنكروا على من لم يكسب وهو ترك الكسب^٩ ، وغلطوا أيضاً^{١٠} فإن الكسب رخصة وإباحة سنة^{١١} ، فمن لم يطبق حاله ردّ إلى سنته^{١٢} والمؤمنون كلهم مأمرون بالتوكل ، قال الله تعالى ﴿وَعَلَى اللَّهِ فَتَوَكَّلُوا إِن كُنْتُمْ مُؤْمِنِينَ﴾ [المائدة: ٥] وهو^{١٣} الثقة بما وعد الله له ، فمن أسقط^{١٤} عن هذه الدرجة وردّ إلى حال السنة من الكسب ففيه شروط: أحدها أن لا يعتمد على كسبه ، ولا يشغله ذلك عن أداء الفرائض في أوقاتها ، ويتعلم^{١٥} من العلم ما لا يتناول حراماً ، ولا يأخذ من كسبه شيئاً من الرخص بالتأويلات ، ويرفق إخواناً له يعجزون^{١٦} عن الكسب ويتعهدهم^{١٧} ، إذ ذاك تزيل^{١٨} عنه عيب الكسب^{١٩}.

^١ ب : - : على

^٢ د : أو رياضته ؛ ب : رياضة

^٣ ب : مجاهدة

^٤ م د ب : - : فيؤدبها بنوع من هذه التأديبات

^٥ ب : - : عنها

^٦ م : وطائفة أخرى ؛ ب : وطبقة أخرى

^٧ د : المتقدمة

^٨ د : وأمرؤا به

^٩ م د ب : - : وهو ترك الكسب

^{١٠} د : - : أيضاً

^{١١} م د ب : لمن لم يطبق حال التوكل ، فإن التوكل حال النبي ﷺ والكسب سنته

^{١٢} د : والتوكل هو

^{١٣} د : حرج

^{١٤} م ب : وأن يتعلم ؛ د : و منها أن

^{١٥} د : وأن يعين إخوانه العاجين

^{١٦} د : + : من كسبه ؛ ب : يتفقدتهم

^{١٧} د : فيذلك يزول

^{١٨} د : فهذه بعض سرائط الكسب

١٤ طبقة^١ من المريدين غلظت^٢ في حال الفترة ، وذلك أنهم لما سمعوا مجاهدات^٣ من قبلهم من المشايخ الأكابر^٤ والسادة المتقدمين ، وما نوّه الله تعالى بذلك من اساميهم^٥ ورفع مقدرهم^٦ في خلقه ، اجتهدوا وعملوا في الاجتهاد مدّة ، فلمّا طال بهم الأمر طمعت نفوسهم بالكرامات فلم يجدوها^٧ كسلوا في مجاهدتهم فسموا ذلك^٨ الكسل فترة ، وهو كسل وخداع ، ولو جذبهم الحق إليه^٩ جذبة لما كسلوا فكانت فترتهم رجوعاً إلى المجاهدة ، فإن الفترة هو^{١٠} استرواح لقلوب المجتهدين ولأبدانهم وقتاً دون وقت ، ثم يعودون إلى حال الاجتهاد كما حكى عن الرُّوذباري رحمه الله أنه قال: النهاية كالبداية والبداية كالنهاية^{١١} ، فمن ترك من نهايته [٨٤ب] شيئاً مما كان يعمل في بدايته فهو مخدوع^{١٢}.

١٥ طبقة منهم^{١٣} غلطوا في سياحتهم وأسفارهم ، وجعلوا أسفارهم سوقاً^{١٤} لأنفسهم ، ولقيا المشايخ تكبراً على أبناء جنسهم ممن لم يسافر سفرهم ، وهذا غلط^{١٥} وما لهذا سافر القوم إنما سافروا لتُسفر^{١٦} لهم أخلاقهم^{١٧} عما لا يصلح في درجاتهم فيبدّلونها ويلقوا المشايخ^{١٨} ومن كان قصده في لقاء المشايخ أن يأخذ منهم كلامهم فيروّح به على العامة فهو متعني^{١٩} ، ومن كان قصده الافتخار بأنه رأى فلاناً وفلاناً فهو راوي على العامة^{٢٠} ، ومن كان قصده التأدّب بهم والأخذ عنهم والائتمار لأمرهم واعتقاد الحرمة لهم فأولئك هم

^١ م : + أخرى

^٢ م : غلطوا

^٣ د ب : مجاهدة

^٤ د : الأبرار

^٥ د : - وما نوّه الله تعالى بذلك من اساميهم ؛ + لما سماهم الله بذلك

^٦ د : قدرهم

^٧ د : + فلما رأوا ذلك

^٨ م : ذلك

^٩ م ب : - إليه

^{١٠} د : تكون

^{١١} العبارة في الأصل : نهاية كالبداية وبداية كالنهاية

^{١٢} م ب : أخرى ؛ ب : - منهم

^{١٣} د : - سوقاً

^{١٤} د : لتستبين

^{١٥} م : أحواضهم

^{١٦} د : + في سفره وقصده

^{١٧} م ب : - على العامة

المسافرون ، ومن طلبت منه نفسه إقبال شيخ عليه أو إكرام^١ له فإن سفره سفرة^٢ من العلم إلى الجهل ولا ينتفع به^٣ أبداً.

١٦ وطبقة^٤ غلطوا في الإنفاق وتوهموا أن المراد من الإنفاق البذل والخلق والسخاء ، وليس مراد القوم ذلك ولكنهم رأوا أن التعلق بالأسباب قطع^٥ عن المسبب ، فعملوا في قطع الأسباب عن انفسهم رجاء الوصول إلى المسبب^٥.

١٧ وطبقة^٦ غلطوا في المباحات ، ولم يتكلفوا المراعاة الأوقات وقالوا: ليس لنا معلوم ، أيش ما وجدنا آكلنا وذلك وقتنا . وذلك غلط لأن الوقت إذا فات لا يُدرك ، وليس الوقت أن يكون معموراً بالارفاق^٧ ، إنما الوقت ما يكون معموراً بالذكر والإخلاص والرضى . وعمارة الوقت بالارفاق^٨ من نزعات الشيطان ، وعمارته بالذكر من موارد الحق .

١٨ وطبقة^٩ غلطوا في ترك الطعام والعزلة ، وتوهموا أن النفس إذا كسرت بترك الطعام انكسرت وذلت للحق ويؤمن شرهاً ، وذلك غلط . وإنما يجب أن يؤخذ طريق تذليل النفس وكسرها من المشايخ والأستاذين حتى لا يتولد^{١٠} مما يريد من الخير شراً ، فإن الشر إذا تولد من طريق الخير لا يمكن تداركه . والانسان إذا ترك الطعام أياماً [١٨٥] أداه ذلك إلى خلل يقع في الفرائض ، ونقص يقع في فريضة شر^{١١} من تمادى النفس في كل وقت . والعبد يجب^{١٢} أن لا يأكل من الطعام ما يقويه على^{١٣} الشهوات ، ولا يتركه بقدر ما يضعف عن

^١ م : إكرامه

^٢ د : كسفر

^٣ د : بذلك

^٤ م : + أخرى

^٥ د : - [فعملوا في قطع الأسباب عن انفسهم رجاء الوصول إلى المسبب]

^٦ م ب : + أخرى

^٧ د : + التي هي النفس

^٨ د : + وما لا تهوى الأنفس

^٩ م ب : + أخرى

^{١٠} د : يكون على صاحبها

^{١١} د ب : اضر على المرید

^{١٢} [والعبد يجب] د : ويجب على العبد

^{١٣} د : + طلب

الفرائض ، ويستعمل السّنة على ما قال النبي ﷺ : **ثلث للطعام وثلث للشراب وثلث للنفس** ، والثلث الذي هو للنفس هو لأنفاس العبادة والفهم عن الله ﷻ والرجوع إليه .

١٩ وطبقة^١ غلّطت في العزلة ، وتوهمت أنّ العزلة والدخول في الكهوف والانفراد في الجبال والفلوات يؤمنهم من شرور أنفسهم ، ويوصلهم الله بالخلوة والانفراد ما وصل إليه أوليائه^٢ . وغلّطوا فيه لأن المشايخ دعاهم إلى العزلة والانفراد داعي العلم وقوّة الحال ، وذلك جذبٌ من الحق ، جذبهم إليه فأغناهم به عن كل ما سواه ، فمن لم يكن مصحوبه قوة الحال وغلبة الوارد ثم يتكلف الانفراد والعزلة فإنه يظلم نفسه ويدخل^٣ عليه بذلك ضرراً عظيماً . وأصله حال النبي ﷺ لما دنا أوان الوحي إليه ، كان يذهب إلى حراً فيخلوا فيه الأيام ذوات العدد ، وذلك من غلبة الوارد الذي^٤ دنا وقته عليه .

٢٠ وطبقة غلّطت^٥ في أنهم جبّوا^٦ أنفسهم وتوهموا^٧ أنهم يسلمون من الشهوات النفسانية بذلك ، وغلّطوا فإن الآفات تبدوا من الباطن وقطع^٨ الآلة لا يزيل ذلك ، وإنما يزيل ذلك قطع الشهوات عن القلب ثم الآلة لا تضر^٩ ، وإن قطع الآلة لا تنفع مع شهوات الباطن^{١٠} .

٢١ وطبقة غلّطوا^{١١} في أنهم هاموا على وجوههم في البوادي والبراري والمفاون والجبال^{١٢} بلا زاد ولا ماء ولا آلة للطريق ، وتوهموا أنهم يصلون بذلك إلى منازل الصادقين في حقيقة التوكل ، وغلّطوا لأن القوم الذين عملوا هذا كانت لهم بدايات ورياضات

^١ م ب : اخرى

^٢ [ويوصلهم الله ... ما وصل إليه أوليائه] م د ب : ويوصلهم الانفراد والخلوة إلى ما وصل الله الأولياء

^٣ [يتكلف الانفراد والعزلة فإنه يظلم نفسه ويدخل] م د ب : تكلف الانفراد والعزلة فإنه يظلم نفسه وأدخل

^٤ د : عليه من الوحي

^٥ [وطبقة غلّطت] م ب : وطبقة اخرى غلّطوا ؛ د : وطائفة غلّطوا

^٦ [في أنهم جبّوا] م د ب : في حبّ

^٧ ب : ظنوا

^٨ د ب : حبّ

^٩ د : مع ذلك

^{١٠} م د : - [وإن قطع الآلة لا تنفع مع شهوات الباطن]

^{١١} [وطبقة غلّطوا] م ب : وطبقة اخرى غلّطوا ، د : وطائفة غلّطوا

^{١٢} [البوادي والبراري والمفاون والجبال] م ب : البراري والبوادي والجبال ؛ د : البراري والجبال

ومجاهدات^١ [٨٥ب] ، وكانوا مستقلين بأحوالهم لم يبالوا بالقلّة ولم يستوحشوا من الوحدة ، وذلك لما استوت أحوالهم عندهم من^٢ الاضداد من الفقر والغنى والعزّ والذلّ وغير ذلك ، فمن ركب هذه الخطة من غير هذه البدايات والرياضات^٣ غلط وأفسد وقته وحاله .

٢٢ وطبقة غلطوا^٤ في لبس المرقعة والصوف المعمولة^٥ من غير ضرورة ، وأخذوا الركاء وتعلّموا شيئاً من إشارات القوم وعلومهم ، وظنّوا أنهم إذا فعلوا ذلك كانوا منهم ، وليس التحلي والتشبه من الحقيقة في شيء ، لأن النبي ﷺ قال : ليس الايمان بالتحلي والتمني ، وقال ﷺ : المتشبه بما لم يعط كلابس ثوبي زور .

٢٣ وطبقة أحرزوا قوتهم وجمعوها ووضعوها^٦ ثم عمدوا بعدها إلى الصلاة والصوم^٧ وقيام الليل واستعمال الورع ولبس الخشن وأكل الجشب والبكاء والتضرّع ، وظنّوا أن ذلك المقصود من الأمر وأن ليس بعده شيء ، وغلطوا فإن بداية التصوف هو الخروج من المعلومات والأكل من الغيب والأخذ منه ، ومن رجع منهم إلى سبب في بدايته فانما هو^٨ لأهله ، ومن لا يقوي قوته ممن فرض عليه تعهده .

٢٤ وطبقة توهمت^٩ أن التصوف هو القول والرقص والسماع والتقسيم^{١٠} والقصائد واتخاذ الدعوات والتكلف للاجتماعات لما رأى من بعض الصادقين انبساطاً في وقت من^{١١} الأوقات في السماع ، وغلطت في ذلك لأن^{١٢} كل قلب متلوث بشيء من الدنيا ، وكل نفس فيها شيء من البطالة والغفلة فلا يصحّ لها السماع ، بل لا يحل له ذلك^{١٣} .

^١ د : - ومجاهدات

^٢ [أحوالهم عندهم من] م ب : عندهم

^٣ د : - [وكانوا مستقلين بأحوالهم لم يبالوا بالقلّة ولم يستوحشوا من الوحدة ... فمن ركب هذه الخطة من غير هذه البدايات والرياضات]

^٤ [وطبقة غلطوا] د : وطائفة غلطوا ؛ ب : وطبقة اخرى غلطوا

^٥ [المرقعة والصوف المعمولة] م د ب : الصوف والمرقعة

^٦ م : - ووضعوها

^٧ [الصلاة والصوم] م د ب : الصوم والصلاة

^٨ د : رجوعه

^٩ [وطبقة توهمت] د : وطائفة توهمت ؛ ب : وطبقة اخرى توهمت

^{١٠} م د ب : النغم

^{١١} [وقت من] د : بعض

^{١٢} د : ولم تعلم أن

^{١٣} د : + والآخر أصبح ، قال الجنيد رحمه الله لبعض من سأله عن السماع : إذا رأيت المرید يجب السماع فاعلم أن في نفسه بقية من البطالة

٢٥ وطبقة غلطت^١ في اسم الحرية والعبودية وتوهمت أن الحرية أجل من العبودية^٢ ،
 وإنما أطلق من أطلق^٣ اسم الحرية لشيئين ، [١٨٦] أحدهما أنه قال لا يكون العبد على الحقيقة
 عبداً حتى يكون عما سوى مولاه حراً ، وهذه طريقة صحيحة^٤ ومنهم من نفى الحرية
 وهجنها وقال : إنَّ الحر إذا عمل لجزء وطلب عوض^٥ ولا تخلوا معاملة الأحرار عن
 طلب الأعواض ، والعبد ليس له طلب جزاء ولا عوض من سيده ، إنَّ أعطاه أعطاه متفضلاً
 وإن لم يعطه لا يستحق عليه شيئاً^٦ ، والحر يعمل للجزء وينتظر ما يستحق^٧ .
 ٢٦ فغلطت طبقة منهم وتوهمت^٨ أن العبد ما دام^٩ بينه وبين الله بُعداً يسمى عبداً ،
 فإذا وصل إليه صار حراً وإذا صار حراً سقط عنه العبودية ، وهذا غلط كبير لأن اسم
 العبودية أتم فإن الله تعالى سمى أوليائه عباده ، وسمى ملائكته عباده ، وسمى أنبياءه عباده ،
 وقدم النبي ﷺ العبودية على النبوة في التحيات ، فقال : أشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وأشهد أن
 محمداً عبده ورسوله . ولا مقام أبلغ من مقام النبي ﷺ ، وهو يصلي حتى تورمت قدماه ،
 فقليل له في ذلك فقال : أفلا أكون عبداً شكوراً ، فتفهم ولا تغلط^{١٠} !
 ٢٧ وطبقة غلطت^{١١} في الإخلاص وظنَّت أنها قلة المبالاة وأن يخرج العبد عن رؤية
 الخلق ولا يوافقهم في جميع ما يريد أن يعمل حقا كان ذلك أو باطلاً . وإنما وقعوا إلى هذا
 أن طائفة من مشايخ القوم سئلوا عن الإخلاص فقالوا : لا يصفوا له^{١٢} الإخلاص حتى لا يبقى

^١ [وطبقة غلطت] د : وطائفة غلطت ؛ ب : وطبقة أخرى غلطت

^٢ د : + ولم يعلموا أن اسم الحرية

^٣ [وإنما أطلق من أطلق] د : وإنما أطلقه من أطلقه

^٤ [إنَّ الحر إذا عمل لجزء وطلب عوض] م : إنَّ الحر إذا عمل لطلب جزاء وعوض ؛ د : إنَّ الحر إذا عمل لطلب به جزاء وعوضاً

^٥ م ب : إذا ؛ د : لكن إذا

^٦ د : فغلطوا في هذه القول

^٧ [والحر يعمل للجزء وينتظر ما يستحق] ساقط في م د ب

^٨ [فغلطت طبقة منهم وتوهمت] م : فغلطت طائفة منهم وتوهمت ؛ د : طائفة توهمت

^٩ د : - ما دام

^{١٠} [فتفهم ولا تغلط] ساقط في م د ب

^{١١} [وطبقة غلطت] م د : وطبقة غلطوا ؛ ب : وطبقة أخرى غلطوا

^{١٢} د : لأحد

على العبد شيء من رؤية الخلق والكون^١، فغلطت هذه الفرقة وتوهمت أن ذلك يصح بالدعاوى والتقليد، فتركوا الأدب وتجاوزوا الحدود^٢ وغلبتهم النفوس والهوى، ولم يعلموا أن العبد المطلوب بالإخلاص هو المذهب المؤدب الذي اجتنب السيئات وأقبل على الطاعات ونازل الأحوال والمقامات حتى أداه ذلك إلى صفاء^٣ الإخلاص، فأما من ضيّع البدايات كيف يصل إلى حقيقة الرعايات؟

٢٨ وطبقة غلطت في النبوة والولاية [٨٦ب] فرغمت أن الولاية أعلى وأتم، وذلك لأنهم نظروا إلى قصة موسى عليه السلام والخضر عليه السلام في قوله تعالى: ﴿فَوَجَدَا عَبْدًا مِنْ عِبَادِنَا﴾ إلى قوله ﴿إِنَّكَ لَمْ تَسْتَطِيعْ مَعِيَ صَبْرًا﴾ [الكهف ٦٥-٨٢]. توهمت هذه الطبقة أن حال الولاية أفضل من حال النبوة لرجوع موسى عليه السلام إليه، ولم يعلموا أن الله تعالى يختص من يشاء بما يشاء. خص الأنبياء بالمعجزات على دوام، ثم خص مريم رضي الله عنها بقوله: ﴿وَهَزَيْتُ إِلَيْكَ بِجِدْعِ النَّخْلَةِ﴾ [مريم ٢٥] ولم يكن هذا لأحد من الأنبياء ولم تكن هي نبية ولا هي أفضل من نبي. وآصف بن برخيا كان عنده علم من الكتاب فأتى بعرش بلقيس قبل أن يرتد إليه طرفه، ولم يكن هذا بنبي ولا يدل هذا على أنه أفضل من سليمان عليه السلام بهذا. وقال النبي ﷺ: أفرضكم زيد، وأعلمكم بالحلال والحرام معاذ، وما أظلت الخضراء ولا أقلت الغبراء ذي لهجة أصدق من أبي ذر. ثم لا نشك ولا يشك شك أن أبا بكر رضي الله عنه أصدق من أبي ذر وأفضل منه، وأن عمر بن الخطاب وعلي بن أبي طالب أعلم من معاذ بن جبل رضي الله عنهم، وهذه تخصيصات ولا تدل على الفضائل.

٢٩ وذكروا أن الأنبياء عليهم السلام يوحى إليهم بالواسطة والأولياء يتلقفون من الحق وذلك غلط، فإن الأنبياء صلوات الله عليهم لهم رسالة بواسطة والتلقف جميعا، وأعمالهم بعيدة من الاغترارات، والاغترارات وقعت في حال الأولياء لا في أحوال الأنبياء.

^١ د: ولا من الكونين

^٢ د ب: الحد

^٣ ب: - صفاء

^٤ ب: + أخرى

^٥ د: + من النبوة

^٦ د: الطائفة

والولاية والصدقية إنما تمامها وإشراقها بأنوار النبوة ومن بركات متابعة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أجمعين^١ . ولو ألقى على الخضر عليه السلام ذرة مما شاهد موسى عليه السلام^٢ لأحقق^٣ حتى لا يبقى منه شيء^٤ . وحجب علم الخضر عن موسى تهدياً وتأدياً لا تعليماً واحتياجاً.

٣٠ وطبقة غلظت في الإباحة والحظر وزعمت أن الأشياء في الأصل مباحة^٥ وإنما وقع الحظر للتعدي ، فما لم يقع تعدي فالأشياء على أصلها ، واستدل^٦ بقوله ﷻ ﴿فَأَنْبَتْنَا فِيهَا حَبًّا وَعِنَبًا وَقَضْبًا وَزَيْتُونًا وَنَخْلًا وَحَدائقَ غُلْبًا وَفَاكِهَةً وَأَبًّا مَتَاعًا لَكُمْ وَلِأَنْعَامِكُمْ﴾ [عبس ٢٧] على الجملة غير مفصل [٨٧أ] ، وطمعت نفوسهم بأن المحظور على المسلمين مباح لهم إذا لم يتعدوا في تناولها . وإنما أدهم ذلك ما سمعوا من انبساط^٧ بعض المتقدمين مع إخوانه في دخول الدار التي يسكنها^٨ والأكل فيها والأخذ من كسبه ، يريد بذلك إدخال السرور عليه في الانبساط ، وما يحكى عن بعضهم : إنا كنا لا نصحب من يقول نعلي وقميصي وثوبي ، وإنما كان ذلك منهم لثلا يروا لنفسه ملكاً يختصون به دون من يحضره من إخوانه حتى أن احتاج إليه أخوه أخذه ولبسه ولم يحتشمه^٩ . وليس من يدعي أن الأشياء على الإباحة^٩ بأولى ممن يقول أن الأشياء^{١٠} على الحظر فيمتنع من ذلك كله .

٣١ وطبقة^{١١} تكلمت بالحلول ولم يُسمع هذا إلا حكاية ، وما شاهد أحد منهم أحداً^{١٢} ، وهو انهم^{١٣} قالوا أن الله تعالى اصطفى جسماً حلَّ فيها بمعنى الربوبية فأزال عنها معاني البشرية . فمن قال به أو تحقق فيه أو ظنَّ أن التوحيد بدأ له بما أشار من هذه المقالة فهو

^١ م : - [ومن بركات متابعة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أجمعين]

^٢ م د : + من سماع اكلام ورؤية النور

^٣ ب : لا تمحوا

^٤ ب : + أخرى

^٥ [في الأصل مباحة] م : مباحة في الأصل

^٦ في الأصل : واستدلوا

^٧ د : - انبساط

^٨ ب : - التي يسكنها

^٩ [أن الأشياء على الإباحة] م ب : أصل الأشياء على مباحة

^{١٠} [يقول أن الأشياء] م : يدعي أنها على الحظر

^{١١} ب : + أخرى

^{١٢} د : متكلما بذلك وإنما هم اخترعوا ذلك من انفسهم

^{١٣} [وهو انهم] ساقط في د

كافر^١ . وإنما ضلّت الحلولية إن صحّ عندهم مقالتهم لأنهم لم يميزوا بين قدرة التي هي صفة القادر وبين الشواهد التي تدلّ^٢ على قدرة القادر وصنعة الصانع ، فتاهت عقولهم^٣ ، 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^٤ ، ومنهم من قال على الدوام^٥ ، ومنهم من قال وقتاً دون وقت ، وكل هذا ضلالة وكفر^٦ .

٣٢ وطبقة غلطت في فناء البشرية ، فتوهمت أن^٧ فناء البشرية^٨ حين تكلم القوم في الفناء والبقاء ، فوقعت لهم^٩ وساوس فتركوا الطعام والشراب وتوهموا أن البشرية هي الغالب والجلّة إذا ضعفت زالت بشريتها^{١٠} . وتوهمت هذه الطبقة أنه يجوز أن يكون العبد موصوفاً بالصفات الالهية^{١١} وأن^{١٢} الذي ذكر القوم فناء صفات البشرية وذلك أن سلطان أنوار الحق إذا بدت على البشرية [٨٧ب] أزال^{١٣} صفات رعونتها من^{١٤} رؤية الأعمال واستحسان الطاعات ، وردّه^{١٥} من الجهل إلى العلم ومن الغفلة إلى الذكر ، ومن العُجب إلى رؤية المنة ، والله الهادي^{١٦} .

٣٣ وطبقة من أهل الشام ادّعوا أنهم يرون الله ﷻ بالقلوب في دار الدنيا كما يرونه في الآخرة ، وقد ذكر هذا^{١٧} أبو سعيد الخرّاز في كتاب كتب إليهم ، وذكر في فصل منه :

^١ د : + حقاً

^٢ م د ب : دلّت

^٣ د : + واختلفوا في قولهم

^٤ [ومنهم من قال حال في المستحسنات وغير المستحسنات] ساقط في د

^٥ [ومنهم من قال حال في المستحسنات وغير المستحسنات ، ومنهم من قال على الدوام] ساقط في م ب

^٦ [ضلالة وكفر] د : كفر وافك وضلالة

^٧ د : - أن

^٨ [فتوهمت أن فناء البشرية] ساقط في ب

^٩ د : + عند ذلك

^{١٠} م د ب : إنما

^{١١} [بدت على البشرية أزال] في د ب : بدا ... أزال

^{١٢} د : مثل

^{١٣} د : الرجوع

^{١٤} [ومن العُجب إلى رؤية المنة ، والله الهادي] ساقط في م د ب

^{١٥} م : + عنهم ؛ ب : + عنه

وبلغني أنه نبغ بناحيتمكم قوم يقولون كذا وكذا ، وتوسوس^١ في هذا أيضاً جماعة من أهل البصرة^٢ من اصحاب الصبحي ، وذلك لما كثرت مجاهداتهم وسهرهم وجوعهم وانفرادهم وخلوهم وتفكرهم صاحبهم الإعجاب فاصطادهم الشيطان وزين لهم ذلك حتى ادّعوا ما ليس لهم . وذلك أنهم^٣ لم يقفوا^٤ إلى شيخ^٥ يبين لهم طريق خطائهم ويردّهم إلى الصواب كما وقع لاصحاب^٦ سهل بن عبد الله رحمه الله حين قال له بعض أصحابه^٧ : إني أرى الله ﷻ في كل ليلة^٨ بعين رأسي . فقال^٩ : إذا رأيته الليلة^{١٠} فابرق عليه ، فلما رآه في الليلة الثانية بزق عليه فلم ير بعد ذلك شيئاً ، فرجع إلى طريقه^{١١} وترك هوسه^{١٢} . ورؤية القلوب إن صح^{١٣} فبمشاهدة الإيمان وحقيقة التوحيد وصفاء اليقين كما كان لحارثة^{١٤} ، ولا يظن^{١٥} أحد من عامر بن عبد الله القيس^{١٦} حين قال : لو كشف الغطاء ما ازددت يقيناً . إن ذلك تحقيق ، بل ذلك في كل غلبة وسكر وانبساط يرد على العبد ، ولا يستوي الخبر والعيان بعد قول النبي ﷺ : ليس الخبر كالمعاينة .

٣٤ ومنهم من غلط^{١٧} في حال^{١٨} الصفاء والطهارة فزعمت^{١٩} لأنفسهم الصفاء والطهارة على الكمال وإن ذلك لا يزول عنهم . وزعموا أن العبد يصفوا من جميع

^١ ب : ووهم

^٢ [من أهل البصرة] ساقط في م د

^٣ د : + وإنما أصابهم إبليس بذلك لأنهم

^٤ ب : يقفوا

^٥ د : + ذي علم ومعرفة بمكايد الشيطان

^٦ م ب : لبعض اصحاب

^٧ [كما وقع لاصحاب سهل ... قال له بعض أصحابه] د : كما كان سهل بن عبد الله رحمه الله لبعض اصحابه لما وقع له ذلك يقال لسهل

^٨ [في كل ليلة] ساقط في م

^٩ د : + له سهل ؛ ب : له

^{١٠} ب : - الليلة

^{١١} [فرجع إلى طريقه] ساقط في م

^{١٢} د : تلك الوسوسة

^{١٣} م د : صحت

^{١٤} ذكر السلمي هذا الحديث في الأربعين له كما يلي : عن الحارثة بن مالك رضي الله عنه أنه مرّ برسول الله ﷺ فقال له : كيف أصبحت يا حارثة ؟ فقال : أصبحت مؤمناً حقاً ، فقال : أنظر ما تقول ، إن لكل حق حقيقة ، فما حقيقة أيمانك ؟ قال : عزفت نفسي من الدنيا ، وكأني أنظر إلى أهل الجنة يتزاوون ، وكأني أنظر إلى أهل النار يتضاعون ، فقال : يا حارثة ! عرفت فالزم ! فقالوا ثلاثاً .

^{١٥} د : يتيقن

^{١٦} ب : - القيس

^{١٧} [ومنهم من غلط] ب : وطبقة اخرى غلطت

الكدورات والعلل بمعنى البينونة منها والعبد لا يصفوا على الدوام وربما يصفوا له وقت دون وقت . والطهارة إذا كانت فلقلب العبد من الغلّ والحقد والغشّ وغير ذلك ، فأما النفس فإنها محل العلل ولا يخلوا محل العلل من العلة . كيف وقد قال النبي ﷺ أنه ليغان على قلبي فاستغفر الله في اليوم سبعين مرة ، ويقول ﷺ : إنما أسهو لأسن ، ويقول : إنما أنا بشر مثلكم . [١٨٨]

٣٥ وطبقة غلطوا^٣ في الجمع والتفرقة ، فلم يضيفوا إلى الخلق ما أضاف الله إليهم ، ولم يصفوا أنفسهم بالحركة^٤ ، وظنوا أن ذلك منهم احتراز حتى لا يكون مع الله تعالى^٥ سوى الله ، فأدّاهم ذلك إلى الخروج عن الملة وترك الحدود وخرق الشريعة ، وأسقطوا اللائمة عن أنفسهم عند مجاوزة الحدود . وهذا لقلّة معرفتهم بالأصول والفروع ولم يفرقوا بين الأصل والفرع وبين الجمع والتفرقة^٦ ، فأضافوا إلى الأصل ما هو مضاف^٧ إلى الفرع وأضافوا إلى الجمع ما هو مضاف إلى التفرقة ، ولم يحسنوا وضع الأشياء مواضعها . ولا يتكلم في حقيقة الجمع والتفرقة إلا صديق أو زنديق . فأما الصديق فيرجع إلى الله تعالى في كل شيء بعد معرفة ما يحتاج إليه من الأصول والفروع والحقوق ويميزه^٨ الفرق بين الحق والباطل ويتبع^٩ الأمر والنهي ، ويقوم بشروط الآداب على حدود الاستقامة . والزنديق لا يترجر شيء من ركوب المعاصي لأنه أدّاه جهله وخسارته^{١٠} إلى إصافة أفعاله كلها بالله حتى أزال بزعمه عنه اللائمة في ركوب المآثم بالتأويل الباطل ، نعوذ بالله من ذلك^{١١} .

^١ [حال] ساقط في الأصل

^٢ م د ب : فزعموا

^٣ [وطبقة غلطوا] د : وطبقة غلطت ؛ وطبقة أخرى غلطت

^٤ د : + والسكون

^٥ م د : + شيء

^٦ [بين الأصل والفرع وبين الجمع والفرق] د : بينهما [بين الأصل والفرع] ساقط في م ب

^٧ ب : يضاف

^٨ م : يميز له ؛ د ب : منزلة

^٩ ب : في جميع

^{١٠} [لأنه أدّاه جهله وخسارته] د : لأن جهله وخسارته أدّاه

^{١١} م ب : الخزلان

٣٦ وطبقة غلطت في القرب والانبساط ، فتوهموا أن بينهم وبين الله تعالى حالة من القرب والدنو ، فاحتشمهم ذلك التوهم بالرجوع إلى الآداب التي كانوا يراعونها والحدود التي كانوا يحافظون^١ عليها ، فانبسطوا إلى ما كانوا عنه محتشمين ، وتوهموا أن ذلك من قربهم ودنوهم ، وغلطوا فان الآداب والأحكام^٢ خلع من الله تعالى على عباده ، فمتى ما زاده عليه حرصا ولها حفظاً فهو من الله سبحانه وتعالى في عين الرعاية والقرب ، ومتى أزال عنه شيء من ذلك مما يظنه قرباً إلى الحق بُعد منه ، وبالله العياذ من ذلك .

٣٧ وطبقة غلطت في فناء الأوصاف [٨٨ب] وهم جماعة من البغداديين ، عندهم أنهم عند فنائهم من أوصافهم دخلوا في أوصاف الحق ، وأضافوا انفسهم إلى معنى يؤدّيهم بجهلهم إلى القول بالحلول وإلى شبيه من مقالة النصارى في المسيح عليه السلام . والمعنى الصحيح في فناء أوصاف العبد والدخول في أوصاف الحق فناؤه من مراداته أجمع ودخوله في مراد الحق به ، فلا يكون له مراد مع مراده فيه ، فما أراد الله به أراده لنفسه ، فهو فناء أوصافه واتصافه بأوصاف الحق . وغلطوا في أنهم ظنّوا أن أوصاف الحق هو الحق ، وليس كذلك لأنه تعالى وتقدس لا يحلّ في القلوب ولكن يحلّ فيها توحيده وتعظيمه وهيبته .

٣٨ وطبقة غلطت في فقد الحسوس^٣ ، فزعمت أنها تفقد الاحساس عند المواجهيد والأذكار القوية ويخرجون^٤ عن أوصاف المحسوس ، وهذا قول طائفة من العراقيين وهو خطأ لأنه بالحس^٥ يعرف فقد الحس ، والحس صفة البشرية ، وقد يغلب عليه باد من الواردات التي ترد^٦ على الأسرار بقهر سلطانها ، فتغيبه عن حسّه لحظة كالشمس تطلع على الكواكب فتطمس نورها ولا يزيل عن أماكنها ، كذلك الحس لا يزول ولكن يقهره غلبة سلطان الوارد عليه ، وإنما يغيب الانسان عن حسّه بحسّة عند المواجهيد الحادة .

^١ ب : - يحافظون

^٢ [الأحكام] ساقط في الأصل

^٣ د : الأحساس ، ب : المحسوس

^٤ د : يجمعون

^٥ [وهذا قول طائفة من العراقيين وهو خطأ لأنه بالحس] ساقط في د

^٦ م : تغلب

٣٩ وطبقة غلطت في الأرواح ، فقالوا قوم^١ الروح نور من انوار^٢ الله تعالى وتوهموا أنه نور ذاته ، فزعموا أنه غير روح مخلوق^٣ . وقوم قالوا حياة من حياة الله فزعموا أنه من حياة ذاته ، وقالوا أنه غير^٤ مخلوق^٣ . وقوم قالوا الأرواح مخلوقة وروح القدس غير مخلوق ، وقوم قالوا أرواح العامة مخلوق وأرواح الخواص غير مخلوقة ، وقوم قالوا للمؤمنين ثلاثة أرواح وللکافر روح واحد وللصادقين خمسة أرواح^٥ . وهذا كله خطأ وباطل ، وصوابه ما قال الله تعالى ذكره : ﴿ وَيَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الرُّوحِ قُلِ الرُّوحُ مِنْ أَمْرِ رَبِّي ﴾ [الإسراء ٥٧] . انما امره^٤ وهي مخلوقة ليس بينها وبين الله نسب ولا سبب^٥ إلا لطافة^٦ خلقتة ، وتخصيص^٧ ذوات الحيوان به^٨ .

^١ م د : - قوم

^٢ د : - انوار

^٣ غير روح مخلوق : وقوم قالوا حياة من حياة الله فزعموا أنه من حياة ذاته ، وقالوا أنه غير^٣ ساقط في د

^٤ د : - انما امره

^٥ لا نسبة ولا سبب^٥ م : لا سبب ولا نسب

^٦ م ب : + أنه حصها بلطائفه

^٧ م : وخص لها

^٨ [لطافة خلقتة ، وتخصيص^٨ ذوات الحيوان به] د : أنه حصها بلطائفه .

فصل

٤٠ علم^١ الشريعة^٢ على أربعة أقسام ، الأول منها علم الرواية والآثار ، والثاني علم الدراية والأحكام ، والثالث علم القياس والإحتجاج^٣ ، والرابع علم الحقائق والمنازلات^٤ . فمن غلط في علم الرواية لم يسأل أحداً من أهل الدراية ، ومن غلط في علم الدراية لم يسأل أحداً من أهل الرواية^٥ ، ومن غلط في علم القياس لم يسأل أحداً منهما^٦ . 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^٧ . وإذا اجتمعت هذه الأحكام الأربعة في أحد^٨ فهو الإمام الكامل والحجة وهو القطب ، كما قال علي بن ابي طالب عليه السلام لكميل بن زياد: لا تخلوا الأرض من قائم لله بحجة كيلا تبطل آياته وتدحض حجته ، أولئك الأقلون عدداً الأعظمون عند الله قدراً^٩ .

فصل^٨

٤١ وأما الشطح فإنه عبارة مستغربة في وصف واحد ينبعث ببعض فضيلة^٩ ، والشطح في لغة العرب هو الحركة ، يقال شَطَحَ يَشْطَحُ إذا تحرك ، ويقال للبيت^{١٠} الذي يجوزون^{١١} فيه الدقيق شَطَّاح^{١٢} . قال الشاعر [١٨٩]:

^١ ب : اعلم أن

^٢ د : + ينقسم

^٣ م د ب : الإجماع

^٤ د : الإستبصار

^٥ [ومن غلط في علم الدراية لم يسأل أحداً من أهل الرواية] ساقط في م

^٦ د : أحداً من العلمين المذكورين

^٧ [الأحكام الأربعة في أحد] م د : الأقسام الأربعة في شخص

^٨ د : + في الشطح

^٩ [وأما الشطح ... ببعض فضيلة] د : وهو عبارة عن وصف ما يبدو في القلب من الأنوار والفضائل

^{١٠} ب : - للبيت

^{١١} م د : تحرك

^{١٢} ب : مشطاح

قف بشط الفرات مشرعة الخيل قبيل الطريق بالمشطاح
 بالطواجين من مجازى الطريق قرين الغزلان دم الملاح^١

وإنما سمي ذلك لكثرة ما تحركون فيه الدقيق الذي ينخلونه ، فالشطح لفظة مأخوذة من الحركة لأنها حركة أسرار الواصلين إذا قوى وجدهم ، فعبروا عن ذلك بعبارة يستغرب سامعيه^٢ فمنكر عليه ومفتون به هالك ، ومؤمن به وسالم منه ناجي ، ويقال شطح الماء في النهر إذا اضاق النهر عن الماء فيفيض^٣ من حافتيه ، كذلك المريد الواحد إذا قوى وجدده ولم يطق حمل ما يرد عليه وعلى قلبه من سطوة^٤ أنوار الحقائق ، شطح ذلك على لسانه فيبرزهم بعبارة مستغربة مشككة على الفهوم إلا^٥ على فهم أربابها ، فسمي ذلك على الاصطلاح شطحاً. والأسلم لمن لم يعرف مراميهم ومقاصدهم ومصادرههم ومواردهم ترك الإنكار عليهم ، ويكل أمورهم إلى الله ﷻ ويرجع بالغلط على نفسه فانه أسلم له وأحسن في باب الرعاية والفتوة والحرمة^٦.

فصل فيه الرد على القائلين بالحلل^٧

قال صاحب الكتاب: ما قال بالحلل أحداً من أئمة القوم ومشايخهم ومن يرجع منهم إلى دين ، وإنما أطلق هذا القول قوم من أهل الشام ، وليس لهم في التصوف قدم ولا لهم مع مشايخهم ذكر. قال سيّد القوم أبو القاسم الجنيد بن محمد: اعلّموا رحمكم الله أن الحق ﷻ

^١ البيت ساقط في م د ب

^٢ افعلوا عن ذلك بعبارة يستغرب سامعيه [م د ب: فيعبرون يستغربها السامع

^٣ [إذا اضاق النهر عن الماء فيفيض] في د ب: على الماء فيفيض

^٤ د - سطوة

^٥ د: إلى اهله به لا

^٦ م: وبالله التوفيق والعون ، ولا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله العلي العظيم ، والصلاة والتسليم على سيدنا محمد نبيه الكريم ، وعلى آله وسلم وشرف وكرم ؛ د: وبالله التوفيق ؛ د: وبالله التوفيق ؛ ب: وبالله التوفيق والعون ، ولا حول ولا قوة إلا بالله العلي العظيم ، والصلاة والتسليم على سيدنا محمد نبيه الكريم وعلى آله وسلم تسليماً وشرف وكرم ، انتهت الأغاليط والحمد لله على كل حال وصلى الله على سيدنا ونبينا ومولانا محمد النبي الأمي ، وعلى آله ومحبيه وأهله وأزواجه وعشيرته وشرف وكرم ، واغفر اللهم لنا ولوالدينا وجميع أمة محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم كثيراً إلى يوم الدين ، آمين . على يد المذنب العبيد الذليل الحقير الفقير إلى الله الغني عنمن سواه ، ذلك أبو القاسم بن علي بن علي الصبيحي ثم النجادي ، أصلح الله حاله بمنه وكرمه ، رحم الله الكاتب والكاسب والقاري والمستمع ومن دعا لهم بالمغفرة والرحمة ، سألتك بالله يا ناهي هذا الكتاب ألا تدعوا لنا وتصفح عنا فيما بقي ، واخر دعانا الحمد لله رب العالمين ومالك هذا الكتاب سبيل الزعيم ولئن شاء الله بقدره:

^٧ هذه الفصل الأخيرة زيادة في د فقط وغير موجود في الأصل أو د ب

لا يوصف بالحلل في الأمكنة ، ولا ينعت بمرور الأزمنة ، كان الحق تعالى ولا شيء موجود ولا شخص معبود ، فكيف يصير بحالة كان في الأزل عنها غنيا ، وكيف ينتقل بانتقال الفناء؟ جل وتعالى أن يوصف بشيء من هذه العلل !

وقال ذوالنون المصري : الحلل لا يلحق الأغيار المخترعة والهياكل المبتدعة ، وكيف يحوى الحق مكان أو يضمه أوان؟ ولا مكان ولا أوان ولا زمان جل وتعالى عن ذلك .
وقال بن عطاء : تبطل ذلك الاستحالة لأنه يستحيل أن يشاكل القديم المحدث أو يساويه أو يقترب به ، لأن الحلل لا يكون إلا بين الأشكال .

وقال أبو عمرو الدمشقي : كيف يجوز أن يحل الحق في شخص هو أنشاه ملازما للنقص ، وكان عنه مستغنياً وهو القاهر بجباريته البائن بصفاته عن صفات خليقته ، كان ولا مكان ولا زمان ، وهو الآن كما كان .

وقال الحسين بن منصور الحلاج : الحق تعالى أوجد هذه الهياكل على رسم العلل ، منوطة بالآفات فانية في الحقيقة ، وإنما الأرواح فيها إلى أحل معدود وقهرها بالموت ، وربطوها في وقت اتمامها بالعجز ، وصفاته تعالى بائمة عن هذه الأوصاف من كل الوجوه ، فكيف يجوز أن يظهر الحق فيما أوجده بهذا النقص والعلة ، كلا وحاشا .

وثبت أن الحق ﷻ ألزم في كتابه وصف العبودية للخلق أجمع ، فقال : ﴿ وَمَا خَلَقْتُ الْجِنَّ وَالْإِنْسَ إِلَّا لِيَعْبُدُونِ ﴾ [الذاريات ٥٦] . وقال : ﴿ إِنَّ كُلَّ مَنْ فِي السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ إِلَّا آتِ الرَّحْمَنِ عَبْدًا ﴾ [مريم ٩٤] . فكيف يجوز أن يحل فيما ألزمه وصف النقص وهو العبودية فيكون مستعبداً معبوداً .

والحمد لله رب العالمين

وصلّى 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'lim wa tarbiya*). The *Kitāb al-aghālīṭ* 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 Malāmatī 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 *Aghālīṭ* 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 *Aghālīṭ* 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'ān, 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 Ḥamid al-Ghazzālī's (d. 505/1111) *Ihyā' '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 ‘Abd al-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 Malāmatī 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 ‘Arabī al-Ḥātīmī (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!

¹ Zaineb S. Istrabadi “The Principles of Sufism (Qawā’id al-Taṣawwuf): An Annotated Translation with Introduction.” PhD Dissertation. University of Indiana-Bloomington, 1986. p. 203.

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 Dhahabī's quote of the *Miḥan* see vol. 11, p. 543 of *Siyar a'lām al-nubalā'* for his quote on Dhū'l Nūn al-Miṣrī, and vol. 14, p. 254 for his quote on Muḥammad ibn Faḍl al-Balkhī.

شمسكم الله الرحمن الرحيم
 حسبي وربي محمد بن عبد الله
 ١٣
 ذال نور المحرم سنة ١٢٠٠ هـ
 المشهور وأعيد السلطان بالقمر فدعاه وشالته عن أمه
 فكل من يري به باعده فوره عن رافقه ما في
 ذال نور في الزورق وإذا نور في أخيه جماعة فعله أن هو لا يجوز إلى السلطان
 لم يشهدوا عليه بالقدر فقال اللهم إن كانوا كاذبين فغفر لهم وإن قلب الزورق فعليه
 علم أحسب أن هو لا يجوز قد فسقوا في هذا القصر فما بال الملاح فقال لم يحل القضاة
 ثم قال إذا وقف في الزورق في الفقه من يري أنه في الزورق في خير له من أن يفسد به
 شيخه وأورق في الزورق في الفقه من يري أنه في الزورق في خير له من أن يفسد به
 بعد هذا وكان ممنون المحمد حسن الوهم حسر الكليم في الحجة معذور المطلق
 وإن أمراء ما لبت إليه فلما علم ممنون بذلك ظنوها عن نفسه فحالت إلى الخبيد
 فحالت ما تقول في حركه كان طرفة الولد العالي فذهب الله ونظر الرجل فعلم الخبيد
 ما قالت فقال حسنت الله وهو التوكل فعرضت هذه المرأة نفسها بالنور
 على ممنون فادى عليها ذلك فذهبت إلى غلام الحليل ما علمت من انكارة غلامه
 فقال له إن في أموال الصومعة ولاز ولاز وزكهم فيه ممنون محمد بن محمد
 ليلته على الجاهل جرت على الحليل عليه الصلوات وتبعيهم إلى السلطان حتى أمرهم بذلك
 ليضربوا عنقهم حتى كشف الله عنهم ذلك منهم من غاب ومنهم من نوار حتى خلاصهم
 وأنهم حسر الحراز رحمه الله إنك عليه جماعة العلماء ونسبوه إلى الفقر
 بالفاط وحده في كتبه منها ما هو في كتاب السيرة فأوفيت له مزارع والراي
 لم يترك له جواب عن الله مع الفاط أخر له في عمره من كان عنده جرسه

وَصَلَّى مَا ارْتَدَّ عَنْ شَيْءٍ وَلَكِنَّهُ تَقْبَلُ عَلَيْهِمْ صَدَقَاتِهِمْ وَذَلِكَ طَائِفَةٌ
 مِنَ الْقَوْمِ فِي شَرِّ مَا بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ وَرَأَى بَيْنَهُمَا طَائِفَةً مِمَّنْ
 دَخَلُوا عَلَى النَّبِيِّ فَنَزَّلَ عَلَيْهِمْ مَجْزِيَهُمْ فَذَلِكَ مِمَّا رَفَعُوا
 قُلُوبَهُمْ هُوَ الْعِرَاقِيُّنَ الْجَنَّةِ وَرُومٌ وَمَكُونُ وَارِثًا فَطَلَبْتُ
 أَرْبَابَ النَّجْدِ وَوَعْدَهُ الْبَرِّ فَاغْتَاظَ مِنْ كَلَامِي وَتَقَبَّرَ وَقَالَ لِي
 بَعْضُ مَنْ جِئْتُ بِهِ مَا جِئْتُ لَكَ بِشَيْءٍ أَنْ أَقْبَلَ فِي هَذِهِ الْمَلِكَةِ لَيْسَتْكَ فَانْت
 تَكُونُ دَمَكَ فَاحْرَجَ مِنْهَا حَرْجَةً
في الخط الثاني وقع للفقير ما هو ما رواه
 وَذَلِكَ صِدْقُهُمْ إِلَى جَمَلٍ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ وَالْحَالِ أَنْ لَا تَقْنَعَهُ الْوَحِيدُ وَذَلِكَ
 نَسَقُ طَائِفَةٍ مِنْ رَجُلَيْهِمْ كَمَا وَارِثُهُمْ عَلَى الرَّوْثِ وَارِثُهُمْ فَذَلِكَ طَائِفَةٌ مِنْ هَذِهِ الْأُمُورِ
 الَّتِي كَانَ مِنْهَا حَقُّ السَّيْفِ فَإِنْ فَلَمَّا كُنِيَ فِي الْمَنَارِ وَذَلِكَ لَيْفَةُ الْفَقْرِ وَرَبِّهِ
 الْحَالِ وَأَمَّا بَنِي إِسْمَاعِيلَ هَذَا الْأَمْرُ عَلَى سُلْبِهِ اسْتَبْشَرَ
 أَوْ بِنَا أَجْنَابَ الْحَاكِمِ وَلِلْمَانِي إِذَا الْفَرْصَةُ وَالْمَانِي تَرَى الْمَدِينَةَ عَلَى الْمَلِكِ
 وَالْعَلَّامِ وَقَعَ مِنْ ثَلَاثِ حُجُوجٍ طَائِفَةٌ مِنْهُمْ عَلَى الْوَلِيِّ الْأَصُولِ مِنْ قَوْلِهِ
 إِنْ كَانُوا الْأَصُولُ الْأَصُولُ الشَّيْءُ وَصَغُوفُ صَدَقَتِهِمْ وَأَخْلَاصِهِمْ فَامْرُؤُهُمْ
 كَمَا وَارِثُهُمْ عَلَى سُلْبِهِ وَأَمَّا مَنْ عَوَا إِلَى الْوَصُولِ لِنَصْبِهِ الْأَصُولِ
والطاهر الدَّائِبَةُ عَلَى الْوَلِيِّ الْأَصُولِ وَهِيَ
 لِأَدَاةٍ وَالْأَصُولُ وَالْمَقَامَاتِ وَذَلِكَ مِنْ قَوْلِهِمْ بَارِئُ الْأَصُولِ وَأَنْبَاءُ عَمَلِهِمْ
 حِرْطُ النَّفْسِ وَكُلُّ

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم
حسي ربي وبه توفيقني
ذكر من مشايخ الصوفية

١ ذو النون^١ المصري رحمة الله عليه ، شُهدوا عند السلطان عليه بالكفر فدعاه
وسأله عن أمره فتكلم بين يديه باعتقاده فردّه عزيزاً مكرماً. قال بن الفرخي: كنتُ مع ذي
النون^٢ في الزورق وإذا بزورق آخر فيه جماعة ، فقال له: إن هؤلاء يميضون إلى السلطان
يشهدوا عليك بالكفر. فقال: اللهم إن كانوا كاذبين فغرقهم. فانقلب الزورق ، فقلتُ:
أحسب أن هؤلاء القوم قد فسقوا في هذا القصد ، فما بال الملاح؟ فقال: لم حمل الفساق؟
ثم قال: إذا أوقف هؤلاء في القيامة بين يدي الله عزّ وجلّ غرقى خير لهم من أن يقفوا بين يديه
شهداء زور. قال: ثم انتفض انتفاضاً وقال: وعزّ بك لا ادعوا على خلقك بعد هذا!^٣

٢ وكان سمّون المحب حُسن الوجه حُسن الكلام في المحبة وعذوبة المنطق. وأن امرأة
مالت إليه ، فلمّا علم سمّون بذلك طردها عن نفسه فجاءت إلى الجنيد فقالت: ما تقول في
رجل طريقاً إلى الله تعالى فذهب الله وبقي الرجل؟ فعلم الجنيد ما قالت فقال: حسبنا الله
ونعم الوكيل! فعرضت هذه المرأة نفسها بالتزويج على سمّون فأتى عليها ذلك ، فذهبت إلى
غلام الخليل لما علمت من إنكاره عليهم ، فقالت له: أن قوماً هو الصوفية فلان وفلان -
وذكرهم^٤ فيه سمّون - يجمعون معي كل ليلة على الحرام. فحرّش غلام الخليل عليهم العوام

^١ في الأصل: ذا النون

^٢ في الأصل: ذا النون

^٣ قد ذكر الذهبي هذه العبارة في الكتاب سير أعلام النبلاء من من الصوفية للسلمي كما يلي: قال السلمي في ((من الصوفية)): «ذو النون المصري أول من تكلم ببلدته في ترتيب الأحوال ، ومقامات الأولياء ، فأنكر عليه عبد الله بن عبد الحكم ، وهجره علماء مصر . وشاع أنه أحدث علماً لم يتكلم فيه السلف ، وهجروه حتى رموه بالزندقة. فقال أخوه: أنهم يقولون إنك زنديق. فقال: وما لي سوى الإطراق والصمت حيلة ، ووضعني كفي تحت خدي وتذكاري. قال: وقال محمد بن الفرخي: كنتُ مع ذي النون في زورق ، فمرّ بنا زورق آخر ، فقيل لذي النون: إن هؤلاء يميضون إلى السلطان ، يشهدون عليك بالكفر. فقال: اللهم إن كانوا كاذبين ، فغرقهم ، فانقلب الزورق ، وغرقوا. فقلت له: فما بال الملاح؟ قال: لم حملهم وهو يعلم قصدهم؟ ولأن يقفوا بين يدي الله غرقى خير لهم من أن يقفوا شهداء زور. ثم انتفض وتغير ، وقال: وعزّ بك لا أدعوا على أحد بعدها. اهـ أنظر في سير أعلام النبلاء بتحقيق شيخ شعيب الأرنؤوط ج ١١ ص ٥٤٣.

^٤ في الأصل: ذكرهم

وسعى بهم إلى السلطان حتى أمر بضرب إعناقهم حتى كشف الله عنهم ذلك ، منهم من غاب ومنهم من توارى حتى خلصهم الله تعالى من ذلك .

٣ وأبي سعيد الخزاز رحمه الله ، أنكر عليه جماعة من العلماء ونسبوه إلى الكفر بألفاظ وجدوده في كتبه ، منها ما هو في كتاب السرّ ، فلو قلتَ له من أين وإلى أين لم يكن له جواب غير الله ، مع ألفاظ آخر له .

٤ وعمرو بن عثمان [المكي] ، كان عنده جزء فيه [٧٩ب] علوم الخاص ، فوقع في يد بعض تلاميذه فأخذ الكتاب وهرب ، فقال : سوف يُقطع يده ورجلاه . وقيل أنه كان الحسين منصور الحلاج ، ففعل به ذلك .

٥ وسهل بن عبد الله التستري ، مع معرفته وعلمه وشدة اجتهاده ، قال في بعض كلامه أن التوبة فريضة على العبد في كل نفس ، وكان في ناحيته رجل ممن ينسب إلى العبادة فهيج عليه العامة فنسبه إلى القبائح وكفره حتى خرج منها إلى البصرة ومات بها .

٦ وأبو عبد الله الحسين بن عبد الله بن بكر الصبيحي ، تكلم في الأسماء والصفات والحروف ، فكفره أبو عبد الله الرندي وهيج عليه العامة ، وقال له سهل بن عبد الله : نحن فتحنا للناس جراب الحلثيت فلم يصبروا علينا ، فلما كلمتهم أنت بما لا يعرفون أذاك ما أذاك . وخرج من البصرة ومات بالمدينة مدينة السوس وبها قبره ، ولم يخرج الصبيحي من سرب داره ثلاثين سنة يجتهد ويتعبد ، فلما تكلم في المعارف أدهش الناس .

٧ وأبو العباس بن عطاء رحمه الله ، مع فهمه وعلمه وجلالته وحسن ألفاظه ، وقع له ما وقع بسبب الحلاج ، فدعاه حامد بن العباس فزجره وخفاه في الكلام ، فقال له ابن عطاء : أرفق يا رجل ! فأمر حتى فك أسنانه فكان في ذلك نفسه .

٨ والجنيد كم مرة شهدوا عليه بالكفر حتى اختفى مراراً وتستر بالفقه مراراً ؟

٩ وما هذا كله بأعجب من خير عامر بن عبد القيس حين رفع إلى عثمان بن عفان

أنه قال أنه خير من إبراهيم وأنه يحرم ما أحلّ الله ، فكتب إلى معاوية بن أبي سفيان وأشخصه معاوية إلى عثمان على قتب ، فلما سأل عن حاله وعرف محله ومكانه من الزهد

والعبادة أكرمه وردّه إلى موضعه . وكذلك من بعده كانوا مقصودين بالأذى والحن ، كما رُوي عن النبي ﷺ أنه قال : [١٨٠] أشدُّ الناسِ بلا الأنبياءِ ثم الأمثل فالأمثل يُتلي على قدر دينه .

١٠ 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 ، أنكر ذلك الحسين بن عيسى البسطامي إمام ناحيته والمقصود في علم الظاهر ، أمر أن يخرج أبا يزيد من بسطام فأخرج منها ولم يعد إليه إلاّ بعد موت حسين بن عيسى البسطامي ، ثم بعد ذلك ألفه الناس وعظموه وعظموا شأنه ، وإلى الآن يتبركون بزيارة قبره ومسجده .

١١ 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 إلاّ أن تعلقوا في عنقي حبالاً وتأخذوا بي من إحدى أطراف البلد وتجروني في السوق وتقولون : هذا مبتدع نريد أن يخرج من بلدتنا . ففعلوا به ذلك وجروا إلى حياجن ثم خلوا سبيله ، فالتفت إليهم وقال لهم : نزع الله من قلوبكم معرفته ومحبه ! فقليل أنه لم يخرج بعد دعائه عليهم من بلخ صوفي من أهلها بعد أن كان بيت التصوف والزهد ، ومن كان بها من صوفي فإنه غريب انتقل إليهم أو وُلد غريب . وخرج محمد الفضل إلى سمرقند واتخذوه فيها بينهم شبه نبي إلى أن مات بها .^١

١٢ وأما محمد بن علي الترمذي رحمه الله ، فإنه لما صَنَّف كتاب علل الشريعة وكتاب ختم الولاية أنكروا عليه بسبب الكتابين ، وقالوا فضّل الأولياء على الأنبياء وغلطوا في ذلك ، وأخرجوه من ترمذ فجاء إلى بلخ وأقام بها أياماً إلى أن رجع إليهم .

^١ قد ذكر الذهبي هذه العبارة في الكتاب سير أعلام النبلاء من محن الصوفية للسلمي كما يلي : قال السلمي في ((محن الصوفية)) : لما تكلم محمد بن الفضل ببلخ في فهم القرآن وأحوال الأئمة ، أنكر عليه فقهاء بلخ ، وقالوا : مبتدع . وإنما ذاك بسبب اعتقاده مذهب أهل الحديث ، فقال : لا أخرج حتى تخرجوني ، وتطوفوا بي في الأسواق . ففعلوا به ذلك ، فقال : نزع الله من قلوبكم محبته ومعرفته . فقليل : لم يخرج منها صوفي من أهلها . فأتى سمرقند ، فبالغوا في إكرامه ، وقيل : إنه وعظ يوماً ، فمات في المجلس أربعة أنفس . اهـ أنظر في سير أعلام النبلاء بتحقيق شيخ شعيب الأرناؤوط ج ١٤ ص ٢٥٤ .

١٣ وأما أبو يعقوب يوسف بن الحسين الرازي ، فإنَّ زهَّاد أهل الري والمتقربة منهم [٨٠ب] ما زالوا ينكرون عليه ويتكلمون فيه ويرمونهم بالعظائم مع قلة مبالاقتهم بهم لتمام علمه واستقامة أحواله إلى أن توفي .

١٤ وأما أبو الحسين البوشنجي ، فإنه لقي من أهل بلدته ما لقي ، أخرجوه منها إلى أن جاء إلى نيسابور واستوطنها ومات بها .

١٥ وأما أبو عثمان المغربي مع تمام حاله وكثرة مجاهداته ورياضاته ، حُرِّش عليه العلوية بمكة ، فضرِبَ على رأسه ومنكبيه وأُطِيفَ به على جمل في أسواق مكة حتى أحوجه ذلك إلى مفارقة الحرم ودخول بغداد ، وأقام بها سنة فلم يطب بها قلبه وخرج إلى نيسابور فأقام بها سنتين ومات بها رحمه الله .

١٦ وأما أبو بكر الشبلي رحمه الله مع تمام علمه وكثرة مجاهداته ورياضاته وحده حاله وفصاحة لسانه ، شُهِد عليه غير مرة بالكفر حتى من أراد معونته وخلاصته منهم شُهِد عليه بالجنون حتى حُبِسَ في مارستان حتى قال فيه بعض مشايخ بغداد من الكبار وهو أبو الحسن الخوارزمي رحمه الله: إن لم يكن لله جهنم فإنه يخلق جهنم بسبب الشبلي وإن لم يدخل الجنة الشبلي ولا أرى حري من يدخلها .

١٧ وأما أبو القاسم النصرابادي فلقي من أهل بلدته من علمائها ومشايخ التصوف ما لا خفا به أبداً ، كانوا ينكرون عليه أحواله وكلامه وبسطه للسمع وقعوده في هذا العلم إلى أن خرج إلى الحرم ومات بها .

١٨ وأما أبو الحسن السجزي الكبير صاحب أبي حفص ، فإنَّ أبا عثمان الحيري هجره وأمر أصحابه أن يهجره ، فقليل إنَّ أبا عثمان حسده وقيل إنه أغار على ما كان يتكلم به من الكلمات العالية ، وحُكي عن أبي حفص أنه قال لأصحابه: أنَّ أحداً منكم ينبسط في الكلام حتى يُهجر [٨١أ] ويُمنع صحبة العوام ويُخص بصحبة الخواص ، فقليل أنه كان أبو عبد الله السجزي .

- ١٩ وأما أبو الحسن الحصري رحمه الله ، فإنه شُهد عليه بالكفر وحكى عنه ألفاظ كتب في درج وحُمل إلى أبي الحسن من معروف قاضي القضاة ، فاستحضره القاضي في ذلك ومنع من القعود في الجامع ، وما زال ابن شعون يتكلم فيه إلى أن مات .
- ٢٠ وأما أبو القاسم بن جميل فكان يتكلم فيه بكل عظمة مع قلة مبالاته بذلك ، ولعمري لقد كان يفصل أقوالاً ويرتكب أموراً مع الكلام فيه والإنكار عليه إلى أن ؟؟ بآخره ببركة صحبه الفقراء وعشرتهم إلى أحسن طريقة وأقربها ، ومات على ذلك .
- ٢١ وأما أبو بكر النابلسي مع فضله وعلمه وزهده واستقامة طريقته ، تكلم في الأمر بالمعروف والنهي عن المنكر في أمر هؤلاء المغاربة ، فأخذ وحُمل إلى مصر ، فلم يرجع عن قوله فسُلخ وهو حيّ ، قيل أنه كان يسُلخ منكوشاً وهو يقرأ القرآن فكاد أن يفتتن به الناس ، فرفع ذلك إلى صاحب مصر فقال: اقتلوه ثم اسلخواه .
- ٢٢ وأما الحسين بن منصور الحلاج ، فمع اختلاف الناس فيه وتباين أقوال المشايخ ، فإن كان من القوم فلقي ما لقي مما لا يخفى ، وإن لم يكن من القوم فلا كلام في حديثه .
- ٢٣ وأما أبو بكر بن يزدينار فإنه كان يسافر الكثير ويخدم مشايخ الصوفية ويعرفون له محله وكان على ذلك سنين ، فلما رجع إلى بلده استحلا الرئاسة ورغب في صرف وجوه العامة إليه أخذ يدق على هؤلاء وينسبهم إلى الزندقة والكفر ، كل هذا ميلاً إلى الدنيا وطلباً للعز حتى بلغني أنه وقف يوماً على الشبلي فقال له: يا أبا بكر قد قصدتك من بعيد ، أريد أن أسئلك عن مسألة . فقال الشبلي: لو كان بيننا [٨١ب] وصلة ما أردت أن تتبعني ولكننا اثنين غيرين ضدّين . وذلك لما بلغه من الوقعة في مشايخه .
- ٢٤ وقال أبو بكر الطمستاني الفارسي: دخلتُ على ابن يزدينار فحضرتُ مجلسه ، فلما فرغ رأيي وقال لي: ما تقول في هؤلاء العراقيين الجنيد ورويم وسمنون وابن عطاء؟ فقلتُ: أرباب التوحيد ووجوه الدين . فاغتاظ من كلامي وتغيّر وقال لي بعض من حضر: يا رجل أنا لك ناصح ، إن أقمت في هذه البلدة ليلتك فأنت تكون في دمك فاخرج منها . فخرجتُ .

REFERENCES

Addas, Claude. *The Quest for the Red Sulphur: the life of Ibn 'Arabī*. Trans. Peter Kingsley. Cambridge: Islamic Texts Society, 1993.

Affīfī, Abu'l 'Alā'. *Al-Malāmatīyah wa'l ṣūfīyah wa ahl al-futūwah*. Cairo: Dār Iḥyā Kutub al-'Arabīyah, 1945.

Alikberov, A. K. "Genre *Ṭabaḳāt* in early Ṣūfī tradition." *Actas XVI Congresso UEA* (1995): 23-30.

Arberry, A. J. "Did Sulamī Plagiarize Sarrāj?" *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1937): 461-465.

Baghdādī, Abū Bakr Ahmed ibn 'Alī al-Khaṭīb al-. *Tārīkh Baghdad: aw madinat al-salām*. 16 vols. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyah, 1965.

Baldick, Julian. *Mystical Islam: An Introduction to Sufism*. New York: University of New York Press, 1989.

Bosworth, C. E. "The Rise of the Karāmiya in Khurasān," *Muslim World* 50 (1960): 5-14.

Böwering, Gerhard. "The Qur'an Commentary of al-Sulamī." In *Essays Presented to Charles J. Adams*, ed. Wael Hallaq and Donald P. Little, 41-56. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991.

Bulliet, Richard W. *The Patricians of Nishapur: A Study in Medieval Islamic Social History*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.

_____. "The Politico-Religious History of Nishapur in the Eleventh Century." In *Islamic Civilisation 950-1150*. ed. D. S. Richards. 71-91. Oxford, 1973.

Dhahabī, Shams ad-Dīn Muḥammad adh-. *Siyar A'lām an-Nubalā'*. 23 vols. Ed. Shu'ayb al-Arna'ūṭ, et. al. Beirut: Mu'assassat al-Risālah, 1992.

Ebn-e Monavvar, Moḥammad. *The Secrets of God's Mystical Oneness* [Asrār al-Towḥid]. Trans. John O'Kane. New York: Mazda Publisher, 1992.

Honerkamp, Kenneth Lee. "The Principles of the *Malāmatīya*: Study, Critical Edition, and Translation of Two Texts by Abu 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī (d. 412/1021)." Masters thesis, University of Georgia-Athens, 1997.

Ibn 'Aṭā Illah al-Iskandarī. *Laṭā'if al-minan*. Ed. 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Maḥmūd. Cairo: Dār al-Ma'ārif, n.d.

Istrabadi, Zaineb S. "The Principles of Sufism (Qawā'id al-Taṣawwuf): An Annotated Translation with Introduction." PhD Dissertation. University of Indiana-Bloomington, 1986.

Malamud, Margaret. "Sufi Organizations and Structures of Authority in Medieval Nishapur." *IJMES* 26 (1994): 427-442.

Martin, David L. "An Account of Ruwaym b. Ahmad formal-Sulamī's *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣufiyyah* (The Generations of the Sufis)." *Al-'Arabiyyah* 16 (1983): 27-55.

_____. "An Account of Sumnūn b. Hamza from al-Sulamī's *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣufiyyah* (The Generations of the Sufis)." *Al-'Arabiyyah* 17 (1984): 25-46.

Meier, Fritz. "Khurasān and the End of Classical Sufism." In *Essays in Islamic Mysticism and Piety*. Ed. and trans. by Berndt Radke and R.S. O'Fahey. 189-219. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Melchert, Christopher. "The Transition from Asceticism to Mysticism at the Middle of the Ninth Century C.E." *Studia Islamica* 83 (1996): 51-70.

Mojaddedi, Jawid A. *The Biographical Tradition in Sufism: The ṭabaqāt genre from al-Sulamī to Jāmī*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press, 2001.

Qushayri, Abu'l Qāsim 'Abd al-Karīm ibn Hawazin al-. *Ar-Risala al-qushayriyya fi 'Ilm at-taṣawwuf*. Ed. Ma'rūf Zarīq and 'Alī 'Abd al-Ḥamīd Abu 'l-Khayr. Beirut: Dar al-Khayr, 1995.

_____. *Principles of Sufism by al-Qushayrī*. Trans. B.R. Von Schlegell. Berkeley: Mizan Press, 1990.

Ritter, Helmut. Review of *Tabaqāt aṣ-ṣufiyya* by Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī ed. Nur al-Dīn Shurayba. *Oriens* 7 (1954): 397-399.

Sakhāwī, Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad. *Takhrīj al-arba'īn al-sulamīya fi'l-taṣawwūf*. Ed. 'Alī Ḥasan 'Alī 'Abd al-Ḥamīd. Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1986.

Sarrāj, Abu 'l-Naṣr al-. *Kitāb al-luma' fi 'l-taṣawwuf*. Ed. Reynold A. Nicholson. London: Luzac and Company Ltd, 1963.

Schimmel, Annemarie. *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1975.

Sezgin, Fuat. *Geschichte Des Arabischen Schrifttums*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.

Subkī, Tāj al-Dīn al-. *Tabaqāt al-shāfi'iyat al-kubra*. 10 vols. Ed. 'Abd al-Fattah Mahmud al-Hulw and Mahmūd Muhammad al-Ṭanahī. Cairo: 'Isa al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī: 1964-1976.

Sulamī, Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-. *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣufiyya*. Ed. Nūr al-Dīn Shurayba. Cairo: Dār al-Kitāb al-Nafīs, 1986.

_____. *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣufiyya*. Ed. J. Pederson. Leiden: Brill, 1960.

_____. *Kitāb adab aṣ-ṣuhba*. Ed. M. J. Kister. Jerusalem: Israel Oriental Society, 1954.

_____. *Jawamī' ādāb al-ṣūfiyya and 'uyūb al-nafs wa-mudawatuhā*. Ed. Etan Kohlberg. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1976.

_____. *Manāhij al-Ārifin: A Treatise on Ṣūfism by Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī*. Ed. Etan Kohlberg. Jerusalem: Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam, 1979.

_____. *The Book of Sufi Chivalry*. Trans. Tosun Bayrak. New York: Inner Traditions International, 1983.

_____. *Usūl al-malāmātīya wa ghalaṭāt al-ṣūfiyya*. Ed. 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Ahmed al-Fāwī Maḥmūd. Cairo: al-Irshād, 1985.

_____. *Al-Arbaʿīn fiʾl taṣawwūf*. In: *Takhrīj al-arbaʿīn al-sulamīya fiʾl taṣawwūf*, by al-Sakhawī. Ed. ʿAlī Ḥasan ʿAlī ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd. Beirut: al-Maktab al-Islāmī, 1986.

_____. *Risālat al-nalāmatīya*. In: *Al-Malāmatīyah waʾl ṣūfiyah wa ahl al-futūwah*. Ed. Abuʾl ʿAlāʾ al-ʿAffīfī. Cairo: Dār Iḥyā Kutub al-ʿArabīyah, 1945.

_____. *Suʾālāt Abi ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī lil-Daraqutni fi jarḥ wa al-taʿdīl*. Ed. Sulayman Atish. Riyadh: Dar al-ʿUlūm liʾl-Tibāʾah waʾl-Nashr, 1988.

_____. *Tisʿat kutub fi uṣūl al-taṣawwūf waʾl zuhd li Abi ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī*. Ed. Suleyman Ibrahim Atish. Riyadh: al-Nāshir, 1993. (Nine books of Sulamī: *Manāhij al-ʿārifīn*, *Darajāt al-ṣādiqīn*, *Jawāmiʿ ʿādāb al-ṣūfiyah*, *al-Muqaddimah fiʾl taṣawwūf*, *Bayān āḥwāl al-ṣūfiyah*, *Masʿalat darajāt al-ṣādiqīn*, *Sulūk al-ʿārifīn*, *Nasīm al-arwāḥ*, and *Bayān zalal al-fuqarāʾ*)

_____. *Dhikr al-niswah al-mutaʿabbidāt al-ṣūfiyyāt*. Ed. Maḥmūd Muḥammad al-Tanāhi. Cairo: Maktabat al-Khanji, 1993.

_____. *The Minor Qurʾān Commentary of Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān as-Sulamī (d. 412/1021)*. Ed. Gerhard Böwering. Beirut: Dar el-Machreq Sarl Editeurs, 1995.

_____. *ʿUyūb an-Nafs wa adawīyatuhā*. Ed. Muḥammad Amīn ʿAbd al-Ḥādī al-Fārūqī. Damascus: Dar Fajr al-ʿUrūba, 1997.

_____. *Early Sufi Women (Dhikr an-niswā al-mutaʿabbidāt aṣ-ṣūfiyyāt)*. Ed. and Trans. Rkia E. Cornell. Louisville: Fonsvita, 1999.

Sviri, Sarah. "Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the *Malamatī* Movement in Early Sufism," in *The Heritage of Sufism*, vol. 1: Classical Persian Sufism from its origins to Rumi (700-1300). Ed. Leonard Lewisohn, 583-613. Oxford: Oneworld Press, 2000.

Tirmidhī, Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Ḥakīm al-. *Kitāb khatm al-awliyāʾ*. Ed. Osman Yaḥya. Beirut: al-Maṭbaʿat al-Kathilūkiya, 1965. (Includes the following books: Ḥakīm Tirmidhī's *Badduw shaʾn al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidhī*; Ibn ʿArabī's *al-Jawāb al-mustaḥqīm ʿamma saʾla ʿanhu al-Tirmidhī al-Ḥakīm*; Ibn ʿArabī's *Sharḥ al-masāʾil al-rūḥāniya fi kitāb Khatm al-awliyāʾ*).