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Notes on Transliteration and Abbreviations

The system of transliteration for Arabic and Persian words is in accordance with that used in the *Encyclopedia Islamica*, edited by Wilferd Madelung and Farhad Daftary, vol. 3 (2011), p. xi and available online at: http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-islamica/*-transliteration. The dates are based on the lunar (hijrī qamarī) calendar or the solar Iranian calendar (hijrī shamsī) (Sh.) alongside Gregorian solar years. English renderings of Qur’ānic verses rely on the translations of the Tanzil project, available at www.tanzil.net. Furthermore, other translations of Qur’ān at www.islamawakened.com/index.php/qur-an are considered. Qur’ānic citations appear in the following format: sūra number: āya number. For instance, āya number thirteen of sūrat al-Hujurāt, the forty-ninth chapter of the Qur’ān, appears as 49:13.
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This book endeavors to determine the characteristics of Khwāja Muḥammad Nāṣir ‘Andalīb’s (1105/1694–1172/1759) Sufism in eighteenth-century India during the gradual disintegration of the Mughal Empire. It does so in terms of the contents of Nāla-yi ‘Andalīb (composed in 1153/1741). Among the circles of Sufis in Delhi, ‘Andalīb was a mystical theoretician who propounded the Ṭarīqa-yi Khāliṣ Muḥammadiyya, or the Sincere Muḥammadan Path, as a mystical renewal of Islam. As the main repository and legacy for his reflections, Nāla-yi ‘Andalīb provides insight into the Islamic intellectual atmosphere of Delhi and demonstrates ‘Andalīb’s interaction with the varied groups and traditions active during the Mughal era, as well as their convergence and interrelation with the eighteenth-century cultural, social, and political context. This work has not yet been properly studied in academia, nor are there any published editions and translations of his works. Accordingly, the aim of this book is to compensate for such a lack of literature and independent systematic analysis of ‘Andalīb’s role and importance in shaping the religious history of the time. Consequently, the primary theoretical contribution of this book to the field of Sufi studies is to illuminate certain concepts and terms which ‘Andalīb’s Khāliṣ Muḥammadiyya employs within the framework of a return to an original, pristine Islam. It is an attempt to understand what ‘Andalīb saw as errors in the debates about the faith during his time based on his redefining what constitutes true Islam.

‘Andalīb was connected not only to the Naqshbandī Sufi order, as a descendant of its founder, Bahā’ al-Dīn Naqshband (d. 791/1391), but also to the Qādiriyya through his wife, who was a descendant of ‘Abd al-Qādir Jīlānī (d. 561/1166), from whose teachings the Qādiriyya was founded.1 As Alam states, both the Naqshbandiyya and the Qādiriyya were the most famous active Sufi orders at the time, having increased in popularity at a key period in the seventeenth century to rejuvenate Muslim spirituality.2 In India, the important role of Sufism in Islamizing its adherents and expanding Islamic culture can be discerned from its functions in the social, religious, and political scene and its aim of reviving Islam.3 Sufi masters were attentive to all facets of life, from involvement in political affairs as rulers often supported Sufis in order to legitimizing their own political power, to providing solutions for the problems
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of the common people, such as the healing of sicknesses and deliverance from famine and death. Sufi *khānaqāhs* drew disciples and devotees from the full range of classes in society, including traders, aristocrats, soldiers and the common people alike.\(^4\)

To explain Sufi traditions in Delhi during ‘Andalib’s time, the mystical worldview must be considered after the expansion of the school of Ibn al-’Arabi (d. 638/1240), who is sometimes called *al-shaykh al-akbar* (“the greatest master”). Heated debates in Sufi communities took place on his interpretations of the concepts of unity (*tawḥīd*): the “unity of being” (*wahdat al-wujūd*).\(^5\) His school was extended over time after commentaries on his works, *Futūḥāt al-makhliyya* and *Fusūṣ al-ḥikam*, were written. Some key figures in the elaboration of Ibn al-’Arabi’s thought are Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī (d. 673/1274), ’Abd al-Razzāq al-Kāshānī (d. 730/1330) and Dawūd al-Qayṣārī (d. 751/1350). Ibn al-’Arabi’s teachings applied philosophical language to strengthen the theoretical aspect of Sufism. Sufi literary tradition in all parts of the Islamic world came to be greatly under the influence of the terminology of his *wahdat al-wujūd* theology, and it was through the mystical literary works of Nūr al-Dīn ’Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī (d. 898/1492) that India became familiar with *wahdat al-wujūd*. Jāmī’s works like *Silsilat al-dhahab, Lawā’ih* and *Naqd al-nuṣūṣ fi sharh Naqṣb al-Fusūṣ* played an important role in shaping the Sufi traditions of India.\(^6\) Among the prominent representatives of Ibn al-’Arabi’s school in India are the names of two Chishti masters: ’Abd al-Quddūs Gunguhī (d. 944/1537) and Muḥīb Allāh Ilāhābādī (d. 1057/1648),\(^7\) who began the tradition of writing commentaries on Ibn al-’Arabi’s works. Shaykh ’Abd al-Karīm Lāhūrī (d. 1045/1635) commentary on the *Fusūṣ al-Ḥikam* can be mentioned among this trend.\(^8\) In the Indian religious context, *wahdat al-wujūd* provides an opportunity for interactions to take place between Muslim ascetics and Sufis with Hindu sages and Yogis who all looked for similarities between Sufi teachings and Vedantic wisdom.\(^9\)

Through the lenses of Ibn al-’Arabi’s worldview, the figure of the Prophet Muhammad was spiritually and historically revised. The spiritual aspect of his character was discussed in Sufi circles under the topics of the Reality of Muhammad (*al-Ḥaqīqat al-Muḥammadiyya*), and the Light of Muhammad (*al-Nūr al-Muḥammadī*).\(^10\) Considering that the Prophet Muhammad in mystical cosmology and prophetology has borne the idea of the perfect man (*al-insān al-kāmil*), who is introduced as an all-comprehensive engendered being (*kawn jāmī*). The perfect man is the locus (*mażhar*) of the comprehensive manifestation (*tajallī*) “from the Divine names to the immutable entities” in comparison with all creatures that benefited from the Being in different degrees.\(^11\) Moreover, discussions about the status of the friend of God (*wāli*) and the role of the seal of the friends of God (*khātam al-awliyā*) were also topics in Sufi circles. *Awliyā* convey the Prophet’s spirituality and they were perceived as mediators between the divine world and the corporeal world.

The Naqshbandiyya were important in India for their attempts to preserve Islam against syncretism and the acceptance of Hindu ideas and practices
by adherents to the notion of \textit{wahdat al-wujūd}. It was under the influence of Ahmad al-Farūqī al-Sirhindī (d. 1034/1624) that Aurangzeb (r. 1068/1658–1118/1707), the sixth emperor of the Mughal Empire, ordered Muḥibb Allāh Ilahābādī’s commentaries on Ibn al-ʿArabī’s work burned. Sirhindī was a disciple of Khwāja Bāqī Bī Ilāh (d. 1012/1604), who is known for having firmly established the Naqshbandiyya in India. He is famous as an eminent critic of Ibn al-ʿArabī’s ideas and for representing the notion of the “unity of vision” (\textit{wahdat al-shuhūd}). Living over 1,000 years after the rise of Islam, Sirhindī was viewed as the reviver of the second Islamic millennium (\textit{mujaddid-i alf-i thānī}), who sought to push the Muslim community toward a renewal of Islam. He was famed as a great \textit{sharī’a}-minded master, advocated Sunni orthodoxy and decried what he viewed as distortions of Islam, including faithlessness, the innovations of the Shi’as, the pantheist views of Hindus and the humiliation of Muslims. For Sirhindī, Sufism is the inseparable inner aspect of religiosity, but it must be strictly compatible with \textit{sharī’a}. In his point of view, \textit{sharī’a} is the outward aspect of religiosity.

Sirhindī was inspired by the critical attitudes concerning the concept of \textit{wahdat al-wujūd} in the teachings of ʿAlā al-Dawla Simnānī (d.736/1336), a well-known Kubrawī master. He advanced the concept of \textit{wahdat al-shuhūd}, which pertains to the matter of ontological \textit{tawḥīd} and emphasized transcendence (\textit{tanzih}) over similarity (\textit{tashbīh}) in the understanding of \textit{tawḥīd}. This \textit{tanzih} point of view underscored a distinction between the Creator and creatures, since he believed that duality is necessary for a proper understanding of \textit{tawḥīd}. Considering three degrees of knowledge or certitude (\textit{yaqīn}); that is the knowledge of certainty (\textit{ilm al-yaqīn}), the vision of certainty (\textit{ayn al-yaqīn}) and the truth of certainty (\textit{ḥaqq al-yaqīn}); Sirhindī uses the allegory of the sun and stars and explains that

the \textit{wujūd} would deny the existence of the stars while looking at the sun, because he is overwhelmed by the spectacle and cannot see anything except the sun itself. His view is patently wrong. The \textit{shuhūd}, on the other hand, knows that the stars do exist, though he also sees only the sun. His consciousness is in the stage of \textit{ayn al-yaqīn}, while that of the \textit{wujūd} remains at the lower stage of \textit{ilm al-yaqīn}. The highest stage of conscious, that of \textit{ḥaqq al-yaqīn}, can be reached when the sight of the onlooker is sharpened to such an extent that can see the stars and the sun simultaneously.

\textit{Ḥaqq al-yaqīn} is attainable at the end of the path, and this is achieved through perceiving the unity of God. As far as \textit{tanzih} and \textit{tashbīh} standpoints are concerned, highlighting the \textit{tashbīh} aspect of Ibn al-ʿArabī’s teaching ignores all aspects of his worldview. From a theosophical perspective, Chittick argues that Ibn al-ʿArabī’s \textit{wahdat al-wujūd} considers God as the Necessary Being (\textit{Wājib al-Wujūd}), the absolute possessor of being and “everything other than God” (\textit{mā siwā Allāh}) receives its being from God. Attributing being only
to God affirms monotheism and a *tanzīḥī* perspective. However, the *tashbīḥī* side of his worldview is to consider that the act of being can be attributed to things or entities (*aʿyān*) as unveiling and self-disclosure (*taḥāllī*) and the self-manifestation (*zuhūr*) of being. In this way, Ibn al-ʿArabī’s notion can be cited: “He/not He” (*howa lā howa*), which is to say that they are both God and other than God, both *wojūd* and other than *wojūd*.”

The controversial topic was shaped around the relation of human beings to the creator regarding the issue of annihilation and union with God. Sirhindī’s adherents, known as Shuhūdīs, as representatives of *sharīʿa*-based Sufism, accused the followers of Ibn al-ʿArabī, known as Wujūdīs, of misunderstanding Ibn al-ʿArabī’s message. The Wujūdī standpoint thrived in the Indian religious environment, with its pantheistic beliefs and monism, which denied the separation between God and creatures. What was understood as *waḥdat al-wujūd*, according to Chittick, was the technical elaboration of Ibn al-ʿArabī’s thought based on the commentaries mainly derived from Ibn al-Fārīd’s (*Tāʾīyya* and its interpretation by Saʿīd al-Dīn al-Farqānī). In addition, in attributing *waḥdat al-wujūd* as the main characteristics of Ibn al-ʿArabī’s teachings, the role of Ibn al-Taymiyya as an opponent is significant. His criticism targets the notion of the Reality of Muhammad. Dividing Sufis into Shuhūdī and Wujūdī groups must not ignore Sirhindī’s respect for Ibn al-ʿArabī and should also take into account his attempts to deeply perceive the reality of unity. The shaping of the contradiction between *waḥdat al-wujūd* and *waḥdat al-shuhūd*, or an intoxicated Sufism against a sober Sufism or a *tanzīḥī* point of view against *tashbīḥī*, was the product of the writings of modern thinkers as well as a growing tendency to construct an Indian identity of Islam by emphasizing Sirhindī’s thought.

The variety of reactions within any given order, like the Chishtiyya, Qādiriyya and Naqshbandiya, to the strong popularity of *waḥdat al-wujūd* is considerable. For instance, while Bandī Nawāz Gīsū-Darāz (d. 825/1422), a famous Chishti shaykh, was against Ibn al-ʿArabī and rejected his way of thought and said “this Muḥyī al-Dīn” (“the reviver of religion”) who in the meaning is Mumīt al-Dīn (“the destroyer of religion”), of course, attempted to eradicate the faith.” However, Shaykh Muḥibb Allāh Ilāhābādī Chishti wrote a work entitled *al-Tawsīyya* and was an adherent of Ibn ʿArabī and an interpreter of his Sufism.

In the above-mentioned debates, it is not surprising that among the Naqshbandīs who rejected Ibn al-ʿArabī’s thought, ʿAndalīf and some of his contemporaries respected him and accepted his terms and concepts in spite of adopting Sirhindī’s critical stance at the same time. It can be argued that their familiarity with two different mystical worldviews opened the door for discussions to criticize any deviations and misunderstandings of Ibn al-ʿArabī’s teachings in the polytheistic-based context of India. Therefore, ʿAndalīf along with his son are two figures that argue against the pantheistic aspects of popular Wujūdī Sufism, which was under the influence of indigenous religious beliefs, while their works are replete with Ibn al-ʿArabīan ontology and concepts such as *al-insān al-kāmil* and *wilāyah*.
The role of ʿAndalīb’s thought must be compared to the teachings of other contemporary religious intellectuals who were also pioneers in Islamic revivalism. In doing so, ʿAndalīb’s name must be mentioned alongside the best-known Naqshbandī Mujaddīdī figures in Delhi of that time, Shāh Wali Allāh (d. 1176/1762) and Mīrzā Mazhar Jān-i Jānān (d. ca. 1195/1781). Unlike ʿAndalīb, both masters were well-known and were surrounded by many devotees. They held seminars in mosques and khānaqāhs which were filled with disciples. All three men perceived serious threats to Muslim society that threatened the purity of their faith. They were, each in their own way, motivated to strengthen the Muslim community and improve the lives of adherents by championing political, social, and ethical empowerment. Thus, they sought to strengthen beliefs by calling for a renewal of Islam, meaning a reorientation of Sufi tradition and the return to a pristine form of Islam according to the Qurʾān and the sunna.28 The regeneration of shariʿa led to the strict observance of divine laws and the imitation of Prophetic morality and values. In spite of having such common concerns and while sharing a Naqshbandī background, they each presented different approaches. It can be argued that after Sirhindī’s death, his reformist thought was spread by his followers across South Asia and beyond, making the Mujaddidiyya a highly influential branch of the Naqshbandiyya during the eighteenth century and up to the present.29 However, it might be better seen as an ensemble of spiritual traditions, as his teachings were interpreted in different ways by subsequent generations of Mujaddīdī masters. Based on their various understandings, many sub-orders have branched out from the Mujaddidiyya, such as the Khālidīyya, Sayfiyya, Tāhirīyya, Qāsimiyya, and Haqqāniyya, thus making it neither a uniform nor a centrally organized sub-order of the Naqshbandiyya.30

Shāh Wali Allāh, who has come to be the most famous pioneer of Islamic revivalism in the eighteenth century, wanted to bridge the gap between Muslims of different groups. His aim was to examine and assess theology and Sufism according to the Qurʾān and sunna.31 He wrote Ḥujjat Allāh al-baligha32 and translated the Qurʾān from Arabic into Persian in a work entitled Fath al-raḥmān. With this significant Persian translation, he opened a new stage of ijtihād and the interpretation of Islamic law based on temporal and local circumstances.33 He called himself the “preserver of time,” qāʾīm al-zamān, and as Rizvi states, Wali Allāh believed that “the Divine grace, as well as his own intuitive knowledge and mystical clairvoyance, enabled him to perform the impossible task of smoothing over differences and harmonizing (taḥbīq) the traditional mystical and rational sciences of Islam and all the conflicting views and beliefs associated with them.”34 The center of his activity and the place where his pupils gathered was a mosque and his house, both of which were located in the heart of Shāhjahānābād near the Jāmiʿa Masjīd.35 Regarding IbnʿArabī’s teachings, Shāh Wali Allāh, in his works like Fāsysala-yi wahdat al-wujūd wa al-shuhūd, advanced synthesis of the Wujūdī and Shuhūdī approaches as two different perspectives which are essentially similar. His peaceful tendency in this regard caused Mujaddīdīs after him to become more moderate in Wujūdī/Shuhūdī polemics. However, his teachings
evoke the intellectual environment investigated in this study and its pro-
lific aspect was for the interactions of Sufis to participate in this debate. An
example of criticizing, rejecting, defending, and responding could be found in
the work of Mawlavī Ghulām Yahyā, Mazhār Jān-i Jānān’s disciple, against
Shāh Wālī Allāh’s attitude and the continuity of debates by followers of Shāh
Wālī Allāh to support his approach, such his son Shāh Rafī’ al-Dīn’s Damgh
al-bāṭil. 36

Mīrzā Mazhār Jān-i Jānān, a prominent Naqshbandī Sufi poet of Delhi,
contributed to the development and revival through his teachings. Mazhār
was concerned that Islam had been damaged by struggles between the Shi’a
and Sunni. He envisioned a remedy to purify beliefs by following the sunna.
He was known as the “Shaper of Sunnis” (Sunni tarāsh) for his insistence on
firm adherence to the sunna, and for encouraging the conversion of Shi’as to
Sunni Islam. 37 His ideas were considered as a Sunni attempt to decrease the
political power of Shi’a members of the Mughal court. 38 He was surrounded
by numerous disciples and his Naqshbandī sub-order came to be known
as the Mazhāriyya Shamsiyya. 39 The close association of his disciples with
possessors of power like Najīb al-Dawla (d. 1184/1770) and the backing of
the Rohilla Afghans was a reason that his circle of followers extended to
North India. 40 It could be argued that his acknowledgment that the Vedas are
among the divinely revealed scriptures was a part of a tendency to encourage
interfaith dialogue. 41 It links his attempt for understanding Hindu wisdom to
a tendency that began with the comparative work of Abū Rayhān al-Bīrūnī (d.
ca. 444/1052), Tahqīq mā lil-Hind, along with contributions by Dārā Shukhā
(d. 1069/1659) in translating the Upanishads. However, Jān-i Jānān’s approach
from a Sunni perspective does not agree with Hindu rituals and the religiosity
of common Hindus in spite of respecting the knowledge of Hindu elites. 42 In
literary circles, he was considered one of the “four pillars of Urdu poetry”
in Delhi and an influential figure in the emergence of Urdu as a literary lan-
guage. His thought and teachings convey his perspectives on local problems,
and in them he gives instructions for how to follow his path. These thoughts
can be accessed in his Dōwān, a collection of poetry written in both Persian
and Urdu, as well as two treatises entitled Risāla-yi sulūk-ī ṭarīqa and Risāla-
yi tanbihāt-ī khamisa, writings against certain Shi’a beliefs; and a collection of
letters entitled Kalīmāt-ī ṯayyabāt. Qadri, in Muslim-Mystic Trends in India,
believes that one feature of his works that makes them distinguishable is that
they utilized a clear and understandable vocabulary which attracted common
people rather than employing complicated and erudite words. 43

Returning to a Pristine Islam from a Mystical Perspective in the
Eighteenth Century

From a political point of view, the weakness and deterioration of the Mughal
Empire resulted in social and political upheaval during ʿAndalūb’s lifetime
that inspired him to pursue a mystical revival of Islam. The century’s chaos
and the court’s defeats caused some scholars to call it a “dark age.” According to ʿAlavī in *The Eighteenth Century in India*, advocates of this classification were mostly imperialist, nationalist historians and colonial authors such as James Mill, Jadunath Sarkar, Iswari Prased, and Tara Chand. Their opinion has been questioned by many other scholars such as John O. Voll, who criticized this labeling as being one-dimensional. Jamal Malik asserts that “the orientalist perception of a ‘dark age’ and stagnation which culminated by around 1750, aimed to emphasize the flourishing enlightenment of Europe juxtaposed against the barbarism and despotism of the Orient.” This opinion sought to legitimize the British conquest and occupation of India. In her book *The Mughal Empire and Its Decline*, Hintze offers a new perspective to the debate on the “dark age” label and instead suggests using “change” in order to describe this period of time and to try to answer the question of how “change” was perceived. In this way, Malik describes such “change” as having already been inherent in paradigms before the colonial penetration of the Orient. A group of revisionist scholars, such as K.N. Panikkar, C.A. Bayly, Muzaffar Alam, and Chetan Singh, concentrated on the progressive economic and social outcomes of reform to power structures in spite of political and agricultural declines. However, revisionists still acknowledge the weakness of eighteenth-century movements.

Hintze considered the eighteenth century in relation to the beginning of colonialism as a “temporary power-vacuum between two great empires, the Mughal empire and the British empire.” Such insights into this century divide it into two parts: pre-colonial, before the 1750s; and colonial, after the 1750s. This perspective considers the death of Aurangzeb in 1707 as a historical turning point since after that, the Mughal Empire lost its stability and power. The second important political shift was the Battle of Plassey in 1757. In this struggle, the British East India Company defeated the nawāb of Bengal. These dates are important since the structuring and flourishing of ʿAndalib’s thoughts and teachings lie between these two poles: 1707 and 1759.

A view held in the present book is the theory that decline must be restricted to the political sphere. The concurrent cultural-religious sphere was, from the perspective of intellectual history, actually thriving and prospering despite hardships in the course of daily life. This belief stands in contrast to the idea of a cultural failure that has been presented by some scholars, such as Athar Ali, who believes that the political impoverishment of the Mughal Empire was part of a widespread cultural crisis in the Islamic world. However, the understanding of the Islamic experience in the eighteenth century announced as a result of debates in the last decades on what has been called Sufi reform by some Western scholars writing about pre-modern and modern Islam, an idea that carries elements of revitalization rather than weakening.

Using the concept of “reform” frames such development as a new vigorous stage in the mystical interpretation of Islam. Like-minded proponents of this definition are Reinhard Schulze, John O. Voll, C.A. Bayly, and Jamal Malik. This idea, however, has had some critics such as Bernd Radtke who criticized...
and denied the existence of such reform and enlightenment elements. This Sufi reform led to a reorientation and transformation of Sufism that split into two realms. According to Voll, it was: “A significant evolution in Sufi theological and philosophical positions as well as a further development of the organization of the ṭarīqa and its function in society.”

The notion of Sufi reform is supported by many scholars, such as Schulze, Levtzion, Voll, Esposito, and Schimmel, who define it as an intellectual development of the Islamic world and the root of Islamic modernity. Schulze believes in an Islamic enlightenment and calls for the “historiographical emancipation of the Islamic eighteenth century as a point of original equivalency to the European age of enlightenment and revolution.” He calls attention to the need for contextual studies of eighteenth-century writings as a means to uncover the origins of renewal in Islam. Such suggested research has even been emphasized by Rudolf Peters, a critic of the idea of an Islamic enlightenment, as well as in O’Fahey and Radtke’s critical paper, “Neo-Sufism Reconsidered.”

Fazlur Rahman is the most famous scholar to apply the term neo-Sufism to reformist currents in Sufism between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as a description of a different phase of Sufism, though he considers Ibn al-Taymiyya (d. 728/1328) as the first neo-Sufī. Generally, the Sufis of the Islamic world contributed to building stable places for Islam. They aimed at finding solutions to local and internal problems. Among them we can mention the Khalwatiyya in Egypt and the Naqshbandiyya in the Mughal and Ottoman empires. In this regard, neo-Sufism extensively supported a gradual literary modification that adopted vernacular languages to spread reformist thinking by attracting the attention of the common people.

One of the most important critical studies of neo-Sufism was carried out by Radtke and O’Fahey in their article “Neo-Sufism Reconsidered.” They demonstrate substantial continuity with the medieval period in the textual production of Sufis, and contextualize the materials in pre-modern Islamic mysticism. Radtke and O’Fahey warn that the label of neo-Sufism should be used with discretion in light of Sufism’s rich history. They use neo-Sufism to refer to the specific organizations of Sufi orders only in certain areas. The label of reformist Sufi could instead be used for brotherhoods who challenged colonial powers, such as those Sufi networks that resisted Italian and French colonization in North Africa.

Regarding analysis of intellectual tendencies in the eighteenth century, Ahmad S. Dallal’s Islam without Europe is a recent study that reconsiders the contested theories of decline and stagnation. It examines the orientalist and revisionist historiographies of the eighteenth century. He considers Fazlur Rahman’s neo-Sufism to be very rationalist and to pay little extended attention to religious, cultural, and indirect social concerns. To elucidate the intellectual side, he explains: “The reform tradition of the eighteenth century questioned classical knowledge and self-consciously set out to remake it. It sought to rehabilitate its present by renegotiating its relationship with the
According to Dallal, the Sufis’ reactions to the reformists’ criticizing attitudes must not be understood merely as defensive as this ignores the productive sides.

Accepting the fact that the topics on Sufi reform and neo-Sufism in the history of Sufism are today generally seen as being out of date, this book benefited from these older debates that provided criteria for categorizing emphasized features of Sufism in the eighteenth century. Recent scholarship uses debates concerning neo-Sufism to analyze Sufi reform in the intellectual history today, as Khaled El-Rouayheb believes in his *Islamic Intellectual History in the Seventeenth Century*. He strictly believes that a western interpretation of Islamic tradition imposed neo-Sufism by applying foreign concepts of renaissance, enlightenment, and humanism for the eighteenth-century Sufism in these debates.

Applying O’Fahey and Radtke’s summarized characteristics of eighteenth-century Sufism by way of nine categories is useful for understanding important dimensions of ‘Andalīb’s Sufism, as well as more broadly to the historical experience of Muslims during that century. These are:

a) Rejection of “popular” ecstatic Sufi practices, e.g. dancing, the “noisy” *dhikr*, saint worship and the visiting of saints’ tombs.  
b) Rejection of Ibn al-ʿArabī’s teachings, especially his doctrine of *waḥdat al-wujūd*.  
c) Rejection of the *murshid/murīd* relationship and the hierarchical mystical Way leading to *fatḥ* or “illumination”; emphasis on moral and social teachings.  
d) “Union” with the spirit of the Prophet, with a general emphasis on “The Muḥammadan Way”, Ṭarīqa Muḥammadiyya.  
e) Legitimation of the position of the order’s founder through his having received prayers, litanies and his authority generally directly from the Prophet.  
f) Creation of mass organizations hierarchically structured under the authority of the founder and his family; “Whereas earlier teachings of *tasawwuf* meant passing on a devotional tradition, in the eighteenth century in the newly-styled orders it implied initiation into a social organization”.  
g) Renewed emphasis on Hadith studies, especially, “The importance of studying the earliest possible texts of Hadith rather than the later standard collections”,  
h) Rejection of *taqlīd* and the assertion of the right to exercise *ijtihād*.  
i) The will to take political and military measures in the defence of Islam.

The term orthodoxy here is applied to show the sharp distinctions between Islamic groups. It pertains to a group which claims to practice according to *sharīʿa*, the Qur’ān and the *sunna* and casts their opponents as unlawful heretics. Labeling orthodoxy changes considerably in different times and places. It has been criticized when employed with reference to Islam, with alternatives like orthopraxy and Islamic normativity being proffered in its place, but orthodoxy is used here out of convenience and familiarity to most readers. Using the term orthodoxy in relation to Islam derives from a
Christian western perspective that refers to traditionalists, who believe in the sole authority of scriptures. In Muslim terminology, this dichotomy could be referred to the people of hadith (ahl-i hadith) against rationalists (ahl-i 'aql) according to Shahristānī, or people of transmitted reports ('ulamā' al-rusūm) against people of truth (ahl-i haqq) and the people of inward meaning (ahl-i bāṭin) against the people of outward meaning (ahl-i zāhir) in the words of Ibn 'Arabī.75

What has been called an orthodox trend in Sufism traces back to the teachings of early Islamic thinkers, such as Junayd al-Baghdādī (d. 297/910)76 and Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī (d. 504/1111),77 and it was later promoted in the interpretations of Ibn al-Taymiyya. In India, orthodox approach can be seen in the teachings of Sirhindī, ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Dihlawī and later the views of Shāh Waḥī Allāh,78 who reacted against the pantheistic creeds of the followers of wuhdat al-wujūd and many other features of popular Sufism for spreading un-Islamic and polytheistic practices like the worship and veneration of saints along with the visitation of their tombs.79 In sum, their attempt to Islamize the surrounding society with an emphasis on Islamic identity gave an exclusivist color to their attempts.80

So-called orthodox Muslims follow the Prophetic sunna as a model. A perceived pristine form of Islam in the Prophet’s time became idealized, since Islam after the conquests faced interactions with a variety of societies, regional cultures and the pre-Islamic beliefs that caused it to adopt some innovations in faith and practice. Therefore, the study of hadith literature became important as the demand for reform was increasing. Malik has noted that emulating the sunna in faith and practice was a means to guide Muslims by connecting them to prophetic authority in the earliest period of Islam.81 The reformists’ concern was to purify “‘alien” features and “superstition,” thereby its former greatness,” as Alexander Knysh pointed out.82 Reconstructing the life of the Prophet and the early community of Muslims was held as an ideal and a source to perceive the “pristine” form of Islam, before it encountered a variety of societies, regional cultures and non-Islamic beliefs. In doing so, many contemporary Sufi masters who cited false hadiths or ecstatic utterances of the great Sufis in their sermons were criticized for misleading their disciples.83 In India, the most prominent scholars in the study of hadiths were above-mentioned ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq Dehlawī, who wrote Madārij al-nubuwwa.84 Studying hadiths became important as a basis for Islamic knowledge in Shāh Waḥī Allāh’s teachings. For him, hadiths functioned as “a neutral mediator” between a variety of Islamic tendencies and was also a means for unification.85

Although the Prophet was considered the exemplar par excellence, he also became more accessible and earthly. Reaching union with his spirit became another characteristic of Sufism. Malik states that “some reformist movements even humanized the Prophet while others stuck to his inviolability, all adhering to some aims: mobilising against unjust rulers, offering alternative remedies in the line with prophetic ethics.”86 From Radtke and O’Fahey’s
perspective, the belief in uniting with the spirit of the Prophet meant that imitating the Prophet was a means to achieve this, but it was not a substitute for union with God.\textsuperscript{87} Emphasis on such propheto-centrism among several Sufi paths across the Muslim world during that period led them to use the name “Muḥammadan Path,” or Ṭarīqa-yi Muḥammadiyya.

In the eyes of the reformists, the blind imitation of earlier Muslims, or taqlīd, was rejected. Taqlīd was seen as restricting a believer’s understanding by relying on old and out-dated interpretations, while ijtihād entailed a constantly shifting process of interpreting holy texts which takes context and particularities of time and place into account. In other words, the aim of ijtihād was to recover the spirit of the Prophetic age. As Malik states, ijtihād demonstrated a tendency toward distinction from the age of the Prophet. It sought to bring about a political and social ideal, making this into a reality through personal effort.\textsuperscript{88}

Activist engagement in social affairs is one characteristic in the above-mentioned list that increased the influence of Sufis on society and helped them in trying to build an ideal community.\textsuperscript{89} Voll uses the idea of “socio-moral reconstructionism,” or a quest for a fundamental transformation to counteract the socio-moral decline, as distinguishing the eighteenth century and the reversal of more traditional Islamic beliefs.\textsuperscript{90} O’Fahey and Radtke call this reform “an outward-looking reformist orientation.”\textsuperscript{91} Citing Buehler, Werbner asserts that neo-Sufism did away with intoxication and promoting the passing through stages on the path, returning to the world and living apparently like “any ordinary pious person” so as to “become extraordinarily ordinary.”\textsuperscript{92} Neo-Sufism venerated the Prophet’s socio-political life and sought to emulate it, thus opposing earlier quietism within Sufism.\textsuperscript{93}

Furthermore, among the Muslim scholars of Delhi, the issue of the role of the Prophet’s companions and the definition of orthodox Islam raised the question again about the Prophet’s succession. Strong sectarian hostilities that had surfaced necessitated reconciliation in the community regarding religious authority and the ways to attain the Prophetic knowledge. Again, the debate was under the influence of Ibn al-Taymiyya. Sufi masters of Delhi had different approaches in dealing with sectarianism, many with the same goal of identifying Islam with Sunnism. Some of them like ʿAndalīb had more mystical attitudes, and some like Shāh Wālī Allāh mixed a political manner of thought with a mystical perspective.\textsuperscript{94} Shāh Wālī Allāh’s works Izālat al-khāfā ʿan khilāfat al-khulāfā and Qurrat al-ʿayn fī tafāl al-shaykhaīn impressed the Sufi circles by rejecting Shiʿism and the status of the four caliphs became a topic of debate again.\textsuperscript{95} Qasim Zaman discusses how Shāh Wālī Allāh was concerned about “how the prophetical mission of Muhammad was completed not by the time of his death but rather at the hands of his successors. The prophet-like qualities the Rashidun had possessed had allowed them to give form and substance to the religion. They were able as well to understand what God wanted them to do on their own rather than on anyone’s instruction (az sirr-i tahqiq na az sirr-i taqlid).”\textsuperscript{96} Shāh Wālī Allāh paid attention to the
anti-Shīʿa attitudes of Sirhindī and translated his *Radd al-ravāфиз* before 1731 into Arabic, with addition of some comments and discussions. After him, the Shīʿa/Sunni polemics were continually discussed by his successors and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz wrote *Tuḥfa-yi ithnāʿ ashariyya* in 1789–90.

The last point to cover, after having considered ʿAndalīb and his Naqshbandī contemporaries in the Islamic movements of the eighteenth century, is their activities and thoughts vis-à-vis other active (non-Naqshbandī) Sufi orders of Delhi. One recent study is Moin Ahmad Nizami’s *Reform and Renewal in South Asian Islam,* which studies reform and the Chishti Ṣābriyya. This work demonstrates the interactions among Sufi orders during the gradual deterioration of the Mughal Empire. To understand Sufi networks in pre-colonial India, during colonialism and afterwards, the influence of Mujaddidi revivalist masters—in his words “Walullāhī scholars”—must be considered along with the activities of the Chishtiyya in Awadh, who were known for coexistence and peaceful attitudes. Similarly, the critical view of the Chishtiyya leads to a severe criticism of Hindu Bhakti influences on Indian Sufism. Their emphasis on *shariʿa* constructed a basis for the fundamentalist Deobandī School in the nineteenth century that highlighted the role of the ʿālim-Sufi. With such a background, they used khānaqāh and madrasa institutions and merged *ḥadīth* and *fiqh* into their mystical views.

It is important to note that, although the nature of Islamic reform was not restricted in Sufism, as Dallal states, Sufi affinities are key factors to separate the intellectuals of the time from each other. These are in addition to their regional concerns that differentiate but also align reformists of India to others like those in North Africa. Thus, the reformist teachings of ʿAndalīb and those of his Indian contemporaries are somehow different from the reformist attitudes of al-Tijānī (d. 1230/1815), al-Shawkanī (d. 1250/1834), Ibn al-Idrīs (d. 1253/1837), al-Sānūsī (d. 1276/1859) and in other parts of the Islamic world. What united them all are that they are critics and union seekers while the Waḥḥābīs, who were the prevailing non-Sufi figures at that time, were intolerant and had minimal social and political concerns.

**Nāla-yi ʿAndalīb, Publication and Manuscripts**

The current book is based on the available lithographed form of *Nāla-yi ʿAndalīb* that exists in two volumes, 912 and 908 folios, 23 lines per folio and in black ink. It has velvet binding with golden margins and a golden medallion on both sides of the cover. There are no illuminated folios except for the first two. Inside is a brief prologue written by Shams (d. unk.), who worked in the Shāhjahānī printing-house, and there is a signature and two undated seals that belong to the last owners. The text is decorated with a headpiece (*sar lawḥ*) painted in black which is followed by the *bismi’llāh.* Each folio is filled by text and they have uniformed pagination and borders drawn around the text. Marginal notes and explanations to facilitate a correct reading are found inscribed frequently throughout the text. The sections of poetry are
separated from the prose and they are framed by borders. The headings above the poems include poetic forms such as rubāʿī, or only the title of a given naẓm (“poem”), bayt (“verse”) or miṣrāʾ (“line of a verse”). The most identifiable characteristic of this version is its impressive calligraphy and nastaʿlīq script.

After a colophon, providing information about the place of publishing, is an eloquent epilogue on the last five folios which was written by Madrāṣī. The epilogue gives the date of completion of the lithographed form as 1310/1893, at the honor of Nawwāb Shāh Jahān Begum (d. 1318/1901). Shāh Jahān Begum, in addition to being a mystic as well as an advocate and patron of poets and authors, was one of four female Muslim rulers of Bhopal. She had invested heavily in publishing copies of the Qurʾān and other books on ḥadīth, lexicons, natural sciences and so forth. She ordered the publication of Nāla-yi ʿAndalīb under the supervision of Ḥāfiz Karāmat Allāh (d. unk.), who was the head of the Shāhjahānī printing house. The publication of this voluminous work seems to have taken two years to complete, given that the prologue sets the date of publication as 1308/1890 while the epilogue states 1310/1892. Based on the number of manuscripts which are available even up to today, the Maṭbaʿa-yi Shāhjahānī was an important production center which produced lithographed forms of manuscripts. The reliability of the lithographed text could be challenged since ʿAndalīb died in 1172/1759 and his original manuscript was destroyed in 1273/1857, thus the lithographed form was produced about 139 years after ʿAndalīb’s death and 157 years after the original composition of Nāla-yi ʿAndalīb. Although the present volume does not deal with the edition of the work, it discloses its contents and translates some parts thereof.

One of the surviving manuscripts of Nāla-yi ʿAndalīb (no. 966/61, 967/62) is available in the ʿAbd al-Salām collection at the Library of Mawlānā Āzād at Aligarh Muslim University. This manuscript consists of two volumes of 495 and 463 folios, written in Indian nastaʿlīq script in black and red ink with 25 lines per folio. Man sukh rāmrū, whose name is mentioned in the colophon, as the copyist, perhaps more precisely the scribe, sometimes ignored the order of pages and wrote the text obliquely. The text begins with a table of contents in 13 folios. The margins were used to correct mistakes and provide further explanation. At the end of each page, catchwords are noted. The quality and condition of the manuscript also presents some challenges, as it is incomplete and many folios have been damaged by water, humidity, and insects.

There are three manuscripts, each consisting of two volumes, in the Khuda Bakhsh Oriental Public Library of Patna. The first manuscript (no. HL 3721 and no. HL 3721A) has 377 and 371 folios of paper measuring 30 x 19 cm with 27 lines per folio and was written in Indian nastaʿlīq script. The folios are partly or entirely dismembered and abraded, but the surviving folios have been restored and rebound together. Volume one begins from the middle of list of contents. The last folios of volume two have been damaged and the date of the manuscript cannot be estimated due to the absence of the colophon.
Figure 0.1 The first folio of the lithographed form of *Nāla-yi ʿAndalīb*, Bhopal: Maṭbaʿa-yi Shāhjahānī, 1308/1890–1310/1892, by kind permission of the National Library and Archives of Iran.