



## JĀMI II. AND SUFISM

---

### JĀMI

#### ii. AND SUFISM

Among the several facets of Jāmi's persona and career—Sufi, scholar, poet, associate of rulers—it may be permissible to award primacy to the first mentioned. This would certainly correspond to Jāmi's own view and to that of one of his closest disciples, 'Abd-al-Ġafur Lāri: both the practice of scholarship and the composition of poetry served for Jāmi, Lāri reports, as veils for his inward state, as guarantors for the concealment of spiritual absorption that is mandated by the Naqšbandiya (Lāri, p. 3, 9; Bā-ḵarzi, p. 125). As for Jāmi's dealings with rulers in Herat and elsewhere, they generally consisted of interventions on behalf of petitioners seeking the redress of grievances or the remission of taxes (Urunbayev and Epifanova, pp. 156-59), consonant with the practice of his friend and fellow Naqšbandi, Ḳvāja 'Obayd-Allāh Aḥrār (d. 1490; see further below). It must also be said, however, that Jāmi was by no means averse to receiving of costly gifts from the powerful.

Jāmi's affiliation to the Naqšbandiya, an order swiftly rising to prominence at the time in both Transoxiana and Khorasan, was central to his understanding and practice of Sufism. His association with the order began when he was still a child: when Ḳvāja Moḥammad Pārsā (d. 1419), one of the principal associates of its eponym, Ḳvāja Moḥammad Bahā'-al-Din Naqšband (q.v.; d. 1389), was passing through Herat in 1419 en route to the Hajj; Jāmi's father had hoisted him onto his shoulders to receive Pārsā's blessing. Recalling the event in later



years, Jāmi affirmed that this encounter had already linked him indissolubly to the Naqšbandiya (Kāšefi, I, p. 242; Jāmi, *Nafaḥāt*, pp. 397-98). The linkage became manifest when Jāmi joined the following of Sa'd-al-Din Kāšgari (d. 1456), who was joined to Bahā'-al-Din Naqšband by two generations in the initiatic chain. Jāmi had with difficulty extricated himself from an amorous attachment in Herat in order to follow a course of study in Samarqand, and one night, when tormented by the pangs of separation, he dreamt of Kāšgari who instructed him to take God as his beloved and as the one indispensable (*nāgozir*) companion. Hastening back to Herat, he submitted himself to Kāšgari with immediate and permanent transformative effect. This was an outcome Kāšgari himself had long desired. It was his wont to hold forth in the Masjed-e Jāme' of Herat before and after each of the five daily prayers, and whenever Jāmi passed by, before his departure for Samarqand, he would remark to his followers: "This is a young man of remarkable talent; I am enchanted by him, and know not how to ensnare him." After Jāmi's return, he proclaimed with satisfaction: "Now a royal falcon has fallen into my trap; God has granted me a favor with the company of this young man" (Kāšefi, I, pp. 239-40). The tie thus forged between the two men was soon palpably fortified by Jāmi's marriage to a granddaughter of Kāšgari.

Jāmi initially submitted himself, however, to austerities of separation from the world so extreme that on his re-emergence he had temporarily forgotten the niceties and forms of social intercourse. This retreat was intended to serve as a purgative measure, and did not represent a permanent choice; fully in accord with the Naqšbandi principle of *kalvat dar anjoman* ("solitude within society"), Jāmi soon resumed involvement in a broad range of social, intellectual and even political activities, in Herat and beyond. Indeed, while confessing to his own predilection for solitude, he frequently expressed his disdain for those who, under the pretext of piety, sought isolation from their fellows (Bākarzi, p. 226). Neither did Jāmi's Sufi initiation bring to an end his endeavors in formal scholarship, the sphere in which he had displayed precocious brilliance in both Herat and Samarqand (nor, it seems, did it free him from the arrogance that frequently accompanies unusual scholarly attainment). This did not necessarily imply a contradiction, for as Kāšefi reports, there were many who believed that "engagement with the path of the K̄wājagān [the Naqšbandi masters and their immediate predecessors in Transoxiana] reinforces the powers of intellectual and rational perception" (Kāšefi, I, p. 237; one of his early teachers in Herat, Šahāb-al-Din Moḥammad Jājarmi, nonetheless expressed dissatisfaction with his recourse to Kāšgari; Kāšefi, I, p. 240). Also in



full conformity with Naqšbandi precepts was Jāmi's disdain for miraculous visions and feats (*karāmāt*); the only such feat worth aspiring to was, he said, to experience a state of intense awareness of God (*jadba*) in the company of one blessed by Him (Kāšefi, I, p. 240). In one respect, however, Jāmi seems to have dissented from Naqšbandi norms, for he did not advocate exclusive recourse to the silent *dekr* that had been normative for the order ever since the time of its eponym. He even discerned in vocal *dekr* qualities lacking in its silent counterpart, embracing as it does in cyclical fashion the faculties of the imagination (*motakayyela*), speech, hearing, and then again the imagination; and he rejected suspicions that its practice partook of hypocrisy (Kāšefi, I, p. 266). Another sign of individual preference at variance with Naqšbandi norms was his occasional indulgence in *samā'*, ecstatic circular motion to the accompaniment of music and song, in particular when stimulated by the composition of his romantic maṭnawī, *Yusof o Zoleykā* (Lāri, p. 7).

Equally important for Jāmi's practice of Sufism, especially after the death of Kāšgari in 1456, were his links with the already mentioned Naqšbandi shaykh, K̄vāja 'Obayd-Allāh Aḥrār, resident in Samarqand, where he wielded considerable influence in the affairs of the Timurid dynasty. Aḥrār was Jāmi's senior by some twelve years, but the two men appear to have regarded each other as equals, judging by the compliments exchanged between them. Jāmi praised Aḥrār for his skill in the fluent exposition of Naqšbandi principles, dedicated to him one of his didactic maṭnawīs, the *Toḥfat al-aḥrār*, and lauded him when he died. For his part, Aḥrār would encourage aspirants on the Sufi path to study with Jāmi (Kāšefi, I, p. 251). They first met in 1460 when Aḥrār came to Herat in order to appeal to Sultan Abu Sa'id for the abolition of a tax, the *tamgā*, not authorized by the *šari'a* (Bākarzi, p. 116). More significant and prolonged interaction took place some five years later in Samarqand, Jāmi having gone there expressly to visit Aḥrār. They spent whole days together for close to six months, engaged in learned and uplifting discourse. Two years later, they met again in Marv, where Aḥrār had been invited by Sultan Abu Sa'id; and Aḥrār suggested that Jāmi should join him there (Bākarzi, pp. 142-43). Their fourth encounter took place in 1479. Aḥrār was once again absent from Samarqand, busy with mediating between the warring sons of Abu Sa'id, but ultimately the two men met in Šāš (Tashkent) and were able to commune anew without significant disruption. Much of their time was spent in meaningful and mutual silence, but it was on this occasion that Aḥrār was able to help Jāmi understand certain problematic passages in Ebn al-'Arabī's *Fotuḥāt* (Kāšefi, I, pp. 249-50). Jāmi and Aḥrār also corresponded with each



other, some of their letters being little more than concise and formulaic expressions of esteem but others recommending their bearers for some form of assistance (Jāmi, *Pis'ma-avtografy*, letters 121, 197, 208, 263, 267, 279; Gross and Urunbaev, p. 131, 168-69, 335, 345; Kā-šefi, I, pp. 248-49). Jāmi also paid public tribute to Aḥrār with the encomia he included in the prefatory matter of several of his maṭnawis (*Yusof o Zoleykā*, in *Haft owrang (awrang)*, pp. 588-89; *Leyli o Majnun*, in *Haft owrang*, pp. 753-55; and *Ḳerad-nāma-ye Eskandari*, in *Haft owrang*, pp. 918-19).

Jāmi expounded the fundamental principles of the Naqšbandiya in a brief treatise entitled *Sar-rešta-ye tariq-e Ḳwājagān* ("The Quintessence of the Path of the Masters"). He sets forth as the goal of their path "permanent presence with God" (*davām-e ḥożur ma'a'l-Ḥaqq*); once such presence has become fully assimilated, the result is witnessing (*mošāheda*), i.e., a witnessing of the divine manifestation in all things. The paths to this goal are threefold: ceaseless and silent *dekr*, accomplished in such fashion that one seated next to the person engaged in it would be unaware of his state; *tawajjoh*, interpreted in this context to mean orientation to the heart as the locus of a divine presence resulting from *dekr*; and *rā-beṭa*, a constant state of inward attachment to the spiritual guide. The attribution to Jāmi of another, somewhat longer treatise on the Naqšbandiya (*Resāla-ye Naqšbandiya*, ms. Esad Ef. 3702 [Süleymaniye]), is uncertain, for no mention of it occurs in lists of his writings drawn up by contemporaries, and it seems to rest on little more than the citation of a line of his verse at the very end of the work. Jāmi gathered some of the sayings of Ḳvāja Moḥammad Pārsā and supplemented them with commentary in a brief treatise, *Soḳanān-e Ḳvāja Pārsā*, and he also prepared a précis of the main source for the life of Bahā'-al-Din Naqšband, the *Anis al-ṭālebin wa 'oddat al-sālekin* of Ṣalāḥ-al-Din b. Mobārak Boḳāri; what appears to be an autograph copy of his version is to be found in the Khudabakhsh Library in Patna (Moḥammad Dāker Ḥosayn, introduction, Jāmi, *Ḳolāṣa-ye Anis al-ṭālebin*, p. xiii). Finally, the title of Jāmi's longest maṭnawī, *Selselat al-dòahab* ("The Golden Chain") may be an allusion to a secondary line of Naqšbandi initiatic descent so designated, that consisting of the first eight Imams of the Prophet's Household. This diffuse work does, in any event, sometimes address itself to matters of distinctively Naqšbandi concern, such as the true nature of the silent *dekr* (*Selselat al-dòahab* in *Haft owrang*, pp. 20-29). It also includes Kāšgari's account of how his master, Neẓām-al-Din Ḳāmuš, had swiftly freed himself from the love of a handsome young man (*Selselat al-dòahab* in *Haft owrang*, pp. 164-66). More informative, however, than all the foregoing for



Jāmi's understanding and personal practice of the Naqšbandi path are the dicta and anecdotes recorded by his biographers, especially 'Abd-al-Ġafur Lāri in his *Takmela*.

Although authorized by Kāšġari to inculcate the distinctive *dekr* of the Naqšbandis in aspirants to the path and fulfill all the other tasks of formal spiritual guidance, Jāmi was notoriously averse to the tasks of preceptorship. After the death of Kāšġari, he customarily assigned those who sought training in the path to Moḥammad Ruji, another of his *kalifas*, and similarly referred Ṣon'-Allāh Kuzakonāni, who customarily led the prayer at the mosque where his circle would gather, to still another successor, 'Alā'-al-Din Maktabdār (Algar, 2003, p. 13, 24-25). News of this reached Aḥrār in Samarqand, and he accordingly asked Faḡr-al-Din Kāšefi, newly arrived from Herat, whether it was true that Jāmi did not accept *morids*, by contrast with Ruji. Kāšefi responded that this was the case, whereupon, with a mixture of regret and approval, Aḥrār cited this dictum of 'Abd-al-Ķāleq Ġojdovāni, an initiatic ancestor of the Naqšbandiya: *dar-e šayḡi-rā beband, dar-e yāri begošāy/ dar-e kalvat-rā beband, dar-e šoḡbat-rā gošāy* ("close the door of shaiikhhood, open the door of friendship/ close the door of retreat, open the door of companionship"; Kāšefi, I, pp. 251-52). Nonetheless, again according to Faḡr-al-Din Kāšefi, "if a sincere person should suddenly appear, he [i.e., Jāmi] would secretly enlighten him about this path," a case in point being his own father, Ḥosayn Wā'eḡ Kāšefi. The elder Kāšefi had come to Herat in the hope of joining the following of Kāšġari, but the shaiikh had expired not long before his arrival. He therefore beseeched Jāmi to accept him as his disciple. Jāmi demurred, but "by way of allusion pointed him to a certain spiritual practice" (*šogli*; Kāšefi, I, pp. 253-54); the wording seems to convey a high degree of reluctance. Perhaps anxious to enhance his spiritual legacy, Jāmi changed course toward the end of his life and began to look actively for authentic seekers (*arbāb-e ṭalab*), but he was disappointed, for, he said, "seekers are many, but what they seek is only the gratification of their own souls" (Kāšefi, I, p. 252).

Despite all the foregoing, several persons are said to have been formally trained by Jāmi in the *ṭariqa*: Raḡi-al-Din 'Abd-al-Ġafur Lāri (d. 1506), renowned for a number of writings, especially the supplement (*takmela*) he wrote to Jāmi's *Nafaḡāt al-ons*, an engaging and detailed portrayal of his master as a near-perfect embodiment of the Naqšbandi ideal; Mawlānā Šahidi Qomi, who took refuge in Gujarat once the Safavids conquered Khorasan; and



Ḳwāja Żiā'-al-Din Yusof, Jāmi's third son (d. 1513) (Algar, 2003, pp. 24-25). Others include 'Alā'-al-Din Sāvaji (d. 1559); Mas'ud Širvāni (d. 1531); Ḥāfez-al-Din Bayhaqi, whose son, Moḥammad Hāšem, having received the *ṭariqa* from him, passed it on to some five other persons, at least one of whom trained another generation of disciples (Kešmi, *Nasamāt*, pp. 108-109, 110-14, 122-23). As for 'Ališir Navā'i (d. 1501), minister to Mirzā Ḥosayn Bayqarā and celebrated for his poetry in both Persian and Chaghatay Turkish, he openly proclaimed his loyalty to Jāmi in this unambiguous verse: *Nevāyi kim mürid ve bendesidir/ irâdet yoluda efkendesidir* ("Navā'i, his [i.e., Jāmi's] disciple and slave/ is prostrate before him in the path of discipleship," quoted in Lâmiî, *Nefehat Tercemesi*, p. 458).

In addition to these individuals, two relatively late sources, *al-Entebāh fi salāsel awliyā'i'llāh* by Šāh Wali-Allāh Dehlavi (d. 1762), and the *Tebyān wasā'el al-ḥaqā'eq* of Kamāl-al-Din Ḥaririzāda (d. 1882) mention the Jāmiya as a distinct branch of the Naqšbandiya, leading from 'Alā'-al-Din Maktabdār through his son, Ġiyāt-al-Din Aḥmad, to Jāmi's nephew, Mawlānā Moḥammad Amin (*al-Entebāh*, p. 32, *Tebyān*, III, f. 201b). This account presupposes that Maktabdār had an initiatic relationship with Jāmi as well as with Kāšgari, something not borne out by the sources. The Jāmiya is said to have spread to the Hejaz, becoming entwined there with other lines of Sufi transmission and therefore losing its independent significance. What is certain is that Jāmi's posthumous influence on Sufism was exerted more by the broad literary corpus he carefully and deliberately assembled than by any Naqšbandi lineage descended from him.

Jāmi joined to his Naqšbandi affiliations an enthusiastic, even combative devotion to the teachings and textual legacy of Ebn al-'Arabi. Not only had he been preceded in this devotion by other Naqšbandis, notably Moḥammad Pārsā; he also saw a clear affinity between the two foci of his loyalty: "Uttering the *dekr* softly is the method of some shaikhs, including the great master Moḥyi-al-Din Ebn al-'Arabi . . . The method of most shaikhs is uttering the *dekr* loudly, whereas the method of imagining (*taḳayyol*), i.e., the silent *dekr*, is the foundation of the path of the [Naqšbandi] masters" (Lāri, *Takmela*, p. 28). Jāmi saw in him the supreme exponent of gnostic wisdom for the Arabs, just as Jalāl-al-Din Rumi had been for the Persians; defended in public debate Ebn al-'Arabi's view that the Pharaoh had died a believer; and rejected as misconceived the criticisms made of some of his teachings by the Kobrawi, 'Alā'-al-Dawla Semnāni (d. 1336) (Bāḳarzi, pp. 90, 96, 103).



He nonetheless confessed to an initial inability to grasp certain of Ebn al-‘Arabi’s writings, and it was not until he had studied the works of Ebn al-‘Arabi’s foremost pupil, Şadr-al-Din Qonavi/Qunyavi (d. 1234), that matters were clarified for him. According to Lāri, he had vowed that “if this gate be opened for me, I will expound the meanings intended by this group [the Sufis of Ebn al-‘Arabi’s school] in such a way that people will easily understand them,” and all that he wrote thereafter on that subject was in fulfillment of that vow (Lāri, p. 17). There is indeed an unmistakable pedagogical intent in much of Jāmi’s writing on Sufi matters. He wrote first a commentary on *Naqd al-noşuş fi Şarḥ naqd al-noşuş*, Ebn al-‘Arabi’s own digest of the *Foşuş al-ḥekam*, drawing on both Qonavi and other previous commentators such as Mo’ayyed-al-Din Jandi (d. 1291), Sa’d-al-Din Farġāni (q.v.; d. ca. 1299-1300), ‘Abd-al-Razzāq Kāšāni (d. 1335) and Dā’ud Qayşari (d. 1350), from whose works he includes pages of verbatim quotation. Far bulkier than the original work, the *Naqd al-noşuş* serves effectively as a general introduction to the mysticism of Ebn al-‘Arabi, with particular attention to the concept of the “Perfect Man” (*al-ensān al-kāmel*; Chittick, pp. 142-51). Later Jāmi wrote a commentary on the *Foşuş al-ḥekam* itself, a relatively modest enterprise in that he restricts himself to elucidating the immediate meaning of each sentence in the original text and shuns theoretical digressions.

The role of Jāmi in propagating the mysticism of Ebn al-‘Arabi in the Persian-speaking world was by no means limited to these two commentaries. More accessible and aesthetically attractive was his *Lawāyeḥ* (“Illuminations”), a series of thirty-six meditations of varying length on metaphysical topics such as the relation of the divine attributes to the Essence (*Lawāyeḥ*, ed. Richard, no. 15, p. 78), the plurality of the modes of the Essence and their “inclusion” within Its unity (no. 19, p. 96), and the connection between degrees of existence and degrees of knowledge (no. 33, p. 154). Here, too, he cites previous authorities, above all Qonavi, as well as Ebn al-‘Arabi himself (pp. 123, 147, 154, 163). Jāmi is moved on several occasions in this work to criticize both the Aş‘ari theologians and the philosophers (*ḥokamā*), finding their views inferior to the insights of the Sufis (*Lawāyeḥ*, ed. Richard, pp. 122-24, 152). He took up the same comparative theme, systematically and in detail but more prosaically, in *al-Dorrat al-fāķera fi taḥqiq maḍhab al-Şufiyya wa’l-Motakallemin wa’l-Ḥokamā’ al-Motaqaddemin*, a work commissioned by Sultan Mehmed Fatih but only completed after his death in 1481. Eleven principal topics are examined in turn, with the theologians represented by Şarif Jorjāni (d. 1413) and Sa’d-al-Din Taftazāni (d. 1390), the philosophers by Naşir-al-Din



Ṭusi (d. 1274), and the Sufis by Qonavi, Mollā Fanāri (d. 1431), and Dā'ud Qayṣari, as well as Ebn al-'Arabi himself. Not all the copious citations from these authorities are explicitly identified by Jāmi (Heer, Introduction to *al-Dorrat al-fākera*, pp. 6-9).

The *Lawāyeḥ* is written in a mixture of rhymed prose and verse, mostly quatrains appended to the end of each section and serving to summarize it. The relationship between poetry and prose is the exact opposite in the case of his *Šarḥ-e robā'iyāt*: here, the quatrains come first, forty-eight in number, and they are each followed by an average of one page of commentary. The quatrains express concisely some gnostic or metaphysical theme, which is then developed in greater detail in the commentary. Similarly compounded of prose and verse are two commentaries Jāmi wrote on the works of others: *Lawāme'* ("Gleams"), on the celebrated wine poem of Ebn al-Fāreż (d. 1235); and *Aše'at al-lama'āt* ("Rays from the Flashes"), on the *Lama'āt* of Faḳr-al-Din 'Erāqi (d. 1289). Both of these address themselves primarily to the theme of love (*ešq*) as articulated by Ebn al-'Arabi and his school.

The same topic is frequently encountered in the vast body of ghazals that make up about three quarters of Jāmi's three successive divāns, later assembled into a single whole. Many of the poems in question are suffused with homoerotic undertones that were by then conventional in Persian Sufi poetry. By way of explanation, Jāmi had recourse to the equally conventional adage that love of the metaphorical—the divine beauty as manifested in a human—serves as a bridge to love of the Real, but it seems that Jāmi tarried indefinitely on the bridge in question, for he confessed that even in old age he was appreciative of the beauty of young men (Bākarzi, p. 138). Certain of the ghazals do, however, lend themselves reasonably to allegorical explanation, given the inclusion in them of technical terms of gnosis and metaphysics such as *momken* and *wājeb* (contingent and necessary [being]) or *mabda'* and *ma'ād* (the beginning and return [of all things]) (*Divān-e Kāmel, ḡazals* 292 (392), p. 283, and 879 (979), p. 509).

Jāmi's most substantial and widely read contribution to the Sufi canon was perhaps his *Nafaḥāt al-ons men ḥaža-rāt al-qods*, a hagiographical compendium that marked the apex of this genre in Persian. Here as in several of the instances already enumerated, he built carefully and respectfully on the work of his predecessors. The foundation had been laid by 'Abd-al-Raḥmān Solami (d. 1021) with his *Ṭabaqāt al-Šufiyya* in Arabic. This book was then rendered by Kvāja 'Abd-Allāh Anṣāri (d. 1089), using the same title, into the



Persian dialect of Herat; he rearranged much of the contents and added material of his own. Jāmi recounts this history in his introduction to the *Nafaḥāt*; the language used by Anṣārī, he claimed, had become incomprehensibly archaic and liable to misinterpretation, apart from which Sufis of the four centuries that had elapsed since Anṣārī had completed his work also deserved to be memorialized. Hence the *Nafaḥāt*, a compendium based on the *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣuḥufiyya* but incorporating material from other “reputable books;” the final impetus for its composition was supposedly provided by an earnest request from Navā’i (Jāmi, *Nafaḥāt*, p. 2). Before proceeding thus to update the *Ṭabaqāt al-Ṣuḥufiyya* in terms of both content and language, Jāmi takes care to define key concepts relating to the history of Sufism: the meanings of sainthood (*walāya*) and the saint (*walī*); the difference between the Sufi (the fully accomplished wayfarer), the *motaṣawwef* (the one still striving on the path); the *malāmātī* (“the seeker of blame”); various levels of *tawḥīd*; and the charismatic feats (*karāmāt*) of the saints (Jāmi, *Nafaḥāt*, pp. 3-25).

Among the new biographies he includes are those of numerous Naqṣbandīs and their immediate ancestors, beginning with Yusof Hamadāni (d. 1140) and ending with Aḥrār, who was still alive at the time of writing; the inclusion of a living figure in a work of this type was unusual, and it may be taken as another mark of Jāmi’s esteem for Aḥrār (Jāmi, *Nafaḥāt*, pp. 380-416). He allots even more space to the other order important at the time in the eastern Persian world, the Kobrawiyya, together with its Sohrawardi antecedents (pp. 420-55). Remarkable, too, is that he includes towards the end of his work notices of eleven poets, ranging chronologically from Sanā’i (d. ca. 1131) to Hafez (Ḥāfeẓ, pp. 593-612). It is by no means certain, as Jāmi would have it, that Sanā’i was a disciple of Yusof Hamadāni, or that ‘Aṭṭār (d. 1221) followed Majd-al-Din Baḡdādi (d. 1220) (Jāmi, *Nafaḥāt*, p. 593, 596), still less that some of the poets he refers to can with confidence be identified as Sufi. Jāmi’s efforts to make a Sufi of Kāqani (d. 1199) are particularly unconvincing (Jāmi, *Nafaḥāt*, p. 605); but to his credit he confesses to uncertainty whether Hafez “ever stretched out the hand of discipleship to an elder” (Jāmi, *Nafaḥāt*, p. 612). In all, what have been termed “eight clusters” of entirely new entries can be discerned in the *Nafaḥāt* (Mojaddedi, p. 169).

Copious mention in the *Nafaḥāt* of one’s near ancestors was evidently a matter of prestige for some of Jāmi’s contemporaries in Herat, for they complained to him that he had not written enough concerning them. He was, however,



deliberate in his exclusions as well as inclusions, and he claimed to rely only on the most trustworthy authorities. He was particularly adamant in excluding from the *Nafaḥāt* Moḥammad Nurbakš (d. 1464), eponym of the Nurbakšiya, an offshoot of the Kobrawiyya, and a claimant to Mahdihood, despite the appeal of the son, Qāsem Nurbakš, that he make mention of him; were he to do so, Jāmi responded, Qāsem would find the result highly displeasing (*Maqāmāt*, pp. 195-96). The absence from the *Nafaḥāt* of Šāh Ne‘mat-Allāh Wali (d. 1431), an undeniably eminent figure, cannot be ascribed to any doctrinal deviance comparable to that of Moḥammad Nurbakš, for he was indubitably a Sunni. The fact that Ne‘mat-Allāh’s descendants had moved in the direction of Shi‘ism must, however, have sufficed for Jāmi—bitterly hostile to all manifestations of that creed—to expunge him from the roster of the Sufis. A similar explanation might be advanced for the omission of Šafi-al-Din Ardabili (d. 1334), were it not that his immediate successor, Šadr-al-Din (d. 1393), is respectfully mentioned in the context of Jāmi’s notice of Qāsem-e Tabrizi (d. 1433), better known as Qāsem al-Anwār (Jāmi, *Nafaḥāt*, p. 590).

Some three years after the death of Jāmi, ‘Alīšir Navā’i translated the *Nafaḥāt* into Chaghatay Turkish as *Nesāyimü’l-Mahabbe min Šemāyimi’l-Fütüvve* (ed. Kemal Eraslan). On the one hand, he abbreviated some of the entries found in the original, and on the other, he expanded it by including material on Jāmi himself as well as his companions, some Indian Sufis, and, most importantly, numerous Turkic shaykhs of Central Asia. In 1520, Lāmiī Çelebi completed a translation of the *Nafaḥāt* into Ottoman Turkish. His version was originally entitled *Futūhu’l-Mücahidîn li Tervîhi Kulûbi’l-Müşâhidîn* because its completion happily coincided with the Ottoman conquest of Belgrade but it became popularly known simply as *Nefehat Tercemesi* (first printed Istanbul, 1872); and includes entries on early Ottoman Sufis, including those who brought the Naqšbandiyya to Anatolia and Istanbul. A still unpublished Arabic translation of the *Nafaḥāt* was made by Tāj-al-Din Zakariā ‘Oṭmāni (d. 1592), an Indian Naqšbandi shaikh resident in Mecca.

In sum, whether by design or not, with his affiliations and enthusiasms, his original works and his commentaries, Jāmi represented a summation of the learned and spiritual traditions of the Persian-speaking world, especially Khorasan, on the eve of the transformations wrought by the Safavid conquest.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works by Jāmi. *Aṣḥat al-lama'āt*, in *Ganjina-ye 'erfān*, ed. Ḥamid Rabbāni, Tehran, 1974.

*Divān-e kāmel*, ed. Hāšem Rażi, Tehran, 1962.

*al-Dorrat al-fākera fi taḥqiq maḏhab al-Şufiyya wa'l-Motakallemīn wa'l-Ḥokamā' al-Motaqaddemīn*, ed. Nicholas Heer, Tehran, 1979.

*Haft Owrang*, ed. Modarres Gilāni, Tehran, 1984.

*Kolāşa-ye Anis a-ṭālebin*, ed. Moḥammad Dāker Ḥosayn, Patna, 1996.

*Lawāme'*, in *Majmu'a-ye Monlā Jāmi*, Istanbul, 1309 A.H.; repr. in *Seh resāla dar taşawwof* with introduction by Iraj Afşār, Tehran, 1981, pp. 104-89.

*Nafaḥāt al-ons*, ed. Maḥmud 'Ābedi, Tehran, 1991.

*Lawāyeḥ*, in *Majmu'a-ye Monlā Jāmi*, Istanbul, 1309 A.H.; repr. in *Seh resāla dar taşawwof* with introduction by Iraj Afşār, Tehran, 1981, pp. 3-103; ed. and tr. Yann Richard as *Les Jaillissements de Lumière*, Paris, 1982; ed. Moḥammad Ḥosayn Tasbiḥi, Tehran, n.d. *Naqd al-noşuş fi Şarḥ Naqş al-foşuş*, ed. William C. Chittick, Tehran, 1977.

*Pis'ma-avtografy Abdarrakhmana Dzhami iz "Al'boma Navoi,"* ed. A. Urunbaev, Tashkent, 1982 (Persian text in facsimile and Russian translation). *Resāla-ye Naqşbandiyya*, ms. Esad Ef. (Süleymaniye), 372.

*Sar-rešta-ye Tariq-e K̄vā-jagān*, ed. 'Abd-al-Ḥayy Ḥabibi, Kabul, 1965.

*Şarḥ-e Robā'iyāt*, ed. Māyel Heravi, Kabul, n.d.; ibid, in *Majmu'a-ye Monlā Jāmi*, Istanbul, 1309 A.H.; repr. in *Seh resāla dar taşawwof* with introduction by Iraj Afşār, Tehran, 1981, pp. 42-103.

*Soḳanān-e K̄vāja Pārsā*, in "Quelques Traités Naqshbandis," ed. Marijan Molé, *FIZ* 6 1958, pp. 294-303. *Tafsir Surat al-Fāteḥa*, ed. Sajjad Rizvi, forthcoming.

Other sources. Susan Āl-e Rasul, *'Erfān-e Jāmi dar majmu'a-ye āṭāraş*, Tehran,



2006.

Hamid Algar, "Reflections of Ibn 'Arabi in Early Naqshbandi Tradition," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society* 10, 1991, pp. 45-66.

Idem, "Naqshbandis and Safavids: A Contribution to the Religious History of Iran and Her Neighbors," in Michel Mazzaoui, ed., *Safavid Iran and Her Neighbors*, Salt Lake City, 2003, pp. 28-31.

'Abd-al-Wāse' Neẓāmi Bāḳarzi, *Maqāmāt-e Jāmi*, ed. Najib Māyel Heravi, Tehran, 1992.

Ye. E. Bertel's, *Navoi i Džami*, Moscow, 1965.

William C. Chittick, "The Perfect Man as the Prototype of the Self in the Sufism of Jāmī," *Studia Islamica* 49, 1979, pp. 135-57.

Šāh Wali-Allāh Dehlawi, *al-Entebāh fi salāsel awliyā'illāh*, Lyallpur, n.d. Jo-Ann Gross and Asom Urunbaev, eds., *The Letters of Khwāja 'Ubayd Allāh Aḥrār and his Associates*, Leiden, 2002.

Kamāl-al-Din Ḥaririzāda, *Tebyān wasā'el al-ḥaqā'eq*, ms. Ibrahim Efendi (Süleymaniye) 432.

Najib Māyel Heravi, *Jāmi*, Tehran, 1998.

Faḳr-al-Din Wā'eẓ Kāšefi, *Rašāḥat-e 'ayn al-ḥayāt*, ed. 'Ali-Ašḡar Mo'iniān, Tehran, 1978, 2 vols., I, pp. 235-86.

Moḥammad Hāšem Kešmi, "*Nasamāt al-qods men ḥadā'eq al-ons*," ed. Monir-e Jahān Malek, Ph.D. diss., University of Tehran, 1996.

Lāmiū Çelebi, *Nefehat Tercemesi*, Istanbul, 1872.

'Abd-al-Ġafur Lāri, *Takmela-ye Ḥavāši-ye Nafaḥāt al-ons*, ed. Bašir Heravi, Kabul, 1964.

Esmā'il Moballeḡ, *Jāmi va Ebn 'Arabi*, Kabul, 1964.

Jawid Mojaddedi, *The Biographical Tradition in Sufism: the Ṭabaqāt Genre from al-Sulami to Jāmi*, Richmond, U.K., 2001, pp. 151-76.

'Ališir Navā'i, *Ḳamsat al-motaḥayyerin*, ms. Institut Vostokovedeniya po imeni



Biruni Tashkent, 2242.

Moḥammad b. Ḥosayn Qazvini, *Selsela-nāma-ye K̄vājagān*, ms. Bibliothèque Nationale, supplément persan, 1418.

Necdet Tosun, *Bahâeddîn Nakşbend: Hayatı, Görüşleri, Tarikatı*, Istanbul, 2002, pp. 135-45.

A. Urunbayev and L. Epifanova, "The Letters of Abdarraḥman Jami as a Source of the Characteristics of the Poet's Personality," *Yádnáme-ye Jan Rypka*, Prague and the Hague, 1967, pp. 155-59.