



## KARĀMA

---

**KARĀMA** “(saintly) marvel, wonder, or miracle” in Arabic (pl. *karāmāt*). As a technical term in the Muslim religious sciences both its etymology and usage fall close to the Greek *charisma(ta)* in the sense of denoting the miraculous, wondrous, or preternatural feats which God freely grants certain elect individuals the capacity to perform through the munificent generosity (*karāma*) of his divine favor. It should be noted, however, that although both have typically been understood to involve oftentimes quite extraordinary ‘breakings of the natural order of things’ (*ḵawāreq al-‘ādāt*), classical theologians were quick to draw a sharp distinction between the notion of *karāma* and that of *moʿjeza*, or the ‘evidentiary miracle’ of a prophet. Typically, taking into account their respective Arabic roots, by *moʿjeza* was meant a miraculous deed, act, or sign intended to evince the veracity of a prophet’s mission by publicly demonstrating the error of his opponents through exposing their ‘impotence’ (*‘ajz*) to effect or produce the same, an occurrence always preceded by a ‘proclamation’ (*daʿwā*), and a ‘challenge’ (*taḥaddī*) (Ebn Ḳaldun, I, pp. 188-91). By *karāma*, on the other hand, was meant simply any number of personal charismata that are neither indicative of prophetic appointment nor, although not always, intended for public view, as distinct from the effects of magic or from seemingly miraculous occurrences which actually result from the ‘divine ruse’ (*makr, estedrāj*) (Ebn Ḳaldun, III, pp. 167-8; Jorjāni, 192; Tahānawī, I, pp. 149-50, II, p. 1360).

As evinced by a wide divergence of opinion regarding the nature and significance of saintly and prophetic miracles in the classical Sunni theological



literature (overviews in Gardet, “Karāma,” and, Wensinck, “Mu’djiza”), there was indeed early interest in the topic, and Sufism was no exception (overview in Gramlich, pp. 19-58). Almost all the Sufi systematizers and apologists of the 10th-11th centuries treat the subject to some degree, situated within the wider context of what had already become, by the second half of the 9th century, a vigorous debate over the respective status of the Friend of God (*wali*) and his *welāya*, and that of the prophet (*nabi*) and his *nobuwwa*. That issue was treated first by Abu Sa’id Karrāz (d. 899) in his *Kašf al-bayān* and, in much greater detail, in the writings of Ḥakim Termeḍi (d. ca. 907-912), who also argued against denials of *karāma* (Radtke, pp. 290-99). The Sufis unanimously affirm the reality of saintly marvels, while at the same time being careful to preserve the distinction between the *karāmāt* of the *awliā’* and the *mo’jezāt* of the prophets. They add that *karāmāt* displayed by an individual whose adherence to the divine law is questionable are to be considered mere trickery, and that saintly charismata, contra Ḥallāj’s error in ‘publicizing saintly marvels’ (*efšā’-e karāmāt*, on which see Massignon, I, pp. 291-95; and as a literary topos, Hafez, no. 15, p. 51; tr., p. 98), are always best kept secret (Sarrāj, pp. 273-79; Kalābāḍi, pp. 71-79; Hojviri, pp. 276-82; Qoṣayri, II, pp. 660-64). At the same time, these authors make clear that the *wali* should not only feel all the more humbled and contemptuous of himself by being afforded such a grace, but that such divine favors should also be treated with great circumscription, because they also represent potential snares on the mystical path. An otherwise well-intentioned seeker might become, as Najm-al-Din Rāzi Dāya (d. 1256) later pointedly remarked, “irremediably drunk in the tavern of the spirit with the goblet of wondrous deeds. . . making those wondrous deeds their idol of the moment” (*Merṣād*, tr. Algar, p. 229).

Although certainly less prevalent than in Sufi hagiography of later periods, references to the *karāmāt al-awliā’* are readily found in early Arabic hagiographical compendia, such as Solami’s (d. 1021) *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣuḥufiyya*, and in parts of Abu No’aym al-Eṣfahāni’s (d. 1038) *Ḥelyat al-awliā’*. Such narratives also make an appearance in early Persian Sufi hagiology, mentioned, albeit sporadically, in the individual biographies of Sufi paragons comprising ‘Abd-Allāh Anṣārī’s (d. 1089) own *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣuḥufiyya* as well as, much more fully, in posthumously compiled hagiographies of near-contemporaries such as Abu Eṣhāq Kāzaruni (d. 1033) in the *Ferdaws al-moršediyya*, Abu Sa’id b. Abi’l-Ḳayr (d. 1049; q.v.) in the 12th-century *Ḥālāt o soḵanān-e šayḵ Abu Sa’id* and *Asrār al-tawḥid*, or Aḥmad-e Jām (d. 1141) in the *Maqāmāt-e ‘anda-pil* compiled by his disciple Moḥammad Ġaznawi. Each of these also contains formal



discussions of the notion of *karāma* itself (e.g., ‘Otmān, pp. 75, 336; Munawwar, pp. 61-62; Ġaznawī, pp. 9-11). Motivated by a drive to establish and legitimize the sanctity of their subjects, in both thematic and rhetorical terms such works came to set the tone for accounts of the *karāmāt* of the *awliā’* in almost all later works of Persian Sufi hagiography, with the possible exception of Farid-al-Din ‘Aṭṭār’s (d. ca. 1220; q.v.) *Taḍkerat al-awliā’*, which is somewhat unique owing to the particular literary idiosyncrasies of its author (Paul, p. 536).

Sufis of the post-classical period normally upheld the authenticity and significance of saintly marvels as freely given signs of divine favor visited upon those who possess the honest capacity to receive them. But the attitudes towards the role, significance, and desirability of these differed widely. Whereas ‘Ayn-al-Qożāt Hamadāni (d. 1131) audaciously claimed he possessed the ability to revivify the dead (*Tamhidāt*, pp. 250-52), a great spiritual figure like Ruzbehān Baqli (d. 1209) explicitly denied that he performed *karāmāt* at all (*Kaṣf al-asrār*, pp. 87-88); perhaps he was echoing the assertion of ‘Omar Sohrawardi (d. 1234)—later repeated by ‘Ezz-al-Din Kāšāni (d. 1334) (*Meṣbāḥ al-hedāya*, p. 26)—that being favored with saintly marvels is actually a sign of spiritual immaturity (*Ketāb a’lām al-hodā*, p. 278). For Ebn al-‘Arabi (d. 1240), who challenges the very notion of there being a ‘natural order of things’ for miracles to break in the first place (*Fotuḥāt* II, p. 372), genuine saintly marvels are divided into two types: a lesser, sensible (*ḥessiya*) miracle whose primary function is to attract the generality to God, and a greater, ‘subtle’ (*ma’nawīya*) miracle which is reserved solely for the elite (*ibid.*, pp. 369-74).

Although attempts at enumerating and classifying the *karāmāt al-awliā’* are occasionally found (e.g., Yāfe’i, *Naṣr al-maḥāsen*, pp. 17-36; Sobki, *Ṭabaqāt* II, pp. 338-44; Jāmi, *Nafaḥāt*, 22; lists in Gramlich, pp. 145-46), historically there has been little agreement regarding the exact range and scope of saintly marvels among those who have discussed the subject. Generally, however, there are certain *karāmāt* that recur with some regularity in the hagiographic literature. First, there are *karāmāt* with explicit social intent, such as miraculously effecting conversion to Islam or the materialization of food, water, and other necessities of life in times of need; safeguarding scrupulous adherence to the divine law through extraordinary awareness of the illicitness of apparently licit objects or situations; miraculously reprimanding reprobates and punishing detractors; healing the sick and raising the dead; and assisting wronged person or voyagers in peril. Second, there are *karāmāt* which display extraordinary mastery over the natural world, such as taming and/or



conversing with wild beasts or controlling the elements. Third, there are those *karāmāt* which evince the ability to transcend the limits of normal human capacity, such as being able to instantaneously traverse great distances, engage in bilocation, fly, levitate, walk on water, or be immune to fire and poison. Finally, there are those *karāmāt* connected with powers of extrasensory perception, such as mind reading and telepathy, clairvoyance and precognition, clairaudience, and spiritual discernment or ‘cardiognosia’ (*ferāsa*). An exhaustive inventory can be found in Gramlich (pp. 148-244 ff.).

Among Sufis of later generations, such ideas about the nature, role, and significance of saintly charismata were eagerly cultivated, increasingly amplified in the culture of both the Sufi cloister and the popular imagination through the circulation of embellished accounts of the *karāmāt al-awliā’* in hagiology as well as through popular stories connected with the ever-expanding cult of saints and practice of shrine visitation. The former include universal hagiographies, such as ‘Abd-al-Raḥmān Jāmi’s (d. 1492) *Nafaḥāt al-awns* and, with the rise of the Sufi brotherhoods, *ṭariqat*-based hagiographies, such as Aflāki’s (d. 1360) *Manāqeb al-‘ārefīn* on Rumi and his disciples or Ebn Bazzāz’s account of Shaykh Ṣafi-al-Din Ardabili (d. 1334), the *Ṣafwat al-ṣafā’* (brief synopsis in Browne, *Lit. Hist. Persia* IV, pp. 38-39). The post-Mongol period also witnessed the continued production of hagiographies of individual saints and Sufi masters, such as those compiled by descendents of Ruzbehān Baqli almost a century after his death. These, perhaps contrary to their ancestor’s aforementioned statement, are replete with accounts of *karāmāt* visited upon him over the course of his life (Šaraf-al-Din Ebrāhim, *Toḥfat ahl al-‘erfān*, and, Šams-al-Din ‘Abd-al-Laṭīf, *Ruḥ al-jenān*, in *Ruzbehān-nāma*, pp. 1-149, 152-370, passim). As for the popular stories, biographical anecdotes regarding local miracle-working *awliā’*, such as those found in the 14th-century pilgrim’s guidebook to the tombs of the saints of Shiraz by Jonayd-e Širāzi (d. after 1389), the *Šadd al-ezār*, evince the popular attraction of the idea that a saint retains the power to work miracles *post mortem* and that this can be accessed through the *baraka* associated with his earthly tomb.

Despite the impact of rationalism and reform across the modern Muslim world, such attitudes concerning the *karāmāt* of the *awliā’* have continued to persist in popular religiosity, and while scholars have traditionally dismissed such materials as pious or quaint legend, a number of recent studies dealing with the history of Sufism in pre-modern Iran and Central Asia have shown that accounts of the *karāmāt* of the *awliā’* embedded in hagiographic and other



literatures constitute quite unique and valuable sources for the writing of the social and cultural history (e.g., Aigle, 1995a; idem, 1995b; idem, 1995c; DeWeese, 2000; idem, 1999; idem, 1993; and Gross, 1999).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources. Šams-al-Din Aḥmad Aflāki, *Manāqeb al-‘ārefīn*, ed. T. Yazıcı, 2 vols., Ankara, 1976; Eng. tr. J. O’Kane as *The Feats of the Knowers of God*, Leiden, 2002.

‘Abd-Allāh Anšāri, *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣufīya*, ed. M. S. Mawlā’i, Tehran, 1983.

Moḥyi-al-Din Ebn al-‘Arabi, *al-Fotuḥāt al-makkiya*, Cairo, 1911, II, pp. 287, 369-75, 478-93; IV, p. 65.

Farid-al-Din ‘Aṭṭār, *Tadkerat al-awliā’*, ed. M. Este’lāmi, Tehran, 1967.

Bāqellāni, *Ketāb al-bayān ‘an al-farq bayn al-mo’jezāt wa’l-karāmāt*, ed. R. McCarthy, Beirut, 1958.

Ruzbehān Baqlī, *Kašf al-asrār*, tr. C. Ernst as *The Unveiling of Secrets*, Chapel Hill, 1997.

Ebn Bazzāz, *Ṣafwat al-ṣafā’*, ed. Ğ-R. Ṭabāṭabā’i Majd, Tabriz, 1994.

Najm-al-Din Rāzi Dāya, *Merṣād al-‘ebād*, ed. M. A. Riāḥi, Tehran, 1986; Eng. tr. H. Algar as *The Path of God’s Bondsmen: From Origin to Return*, Delmar, N.Y., 1982.

Abu No‘aym Eṣfahāni, *Ḥelyat al-awliā’ wa-ṭabaqāt al-aṣfīā’*, 10 vols. in 5, Beirut, 1967-68.

Sadid-al-Din Moḥammad Ğaznavi, *Maqāmāt-e žanda-pil*, ed. Ḥešmat Mo’ayyed Sanandaji, Tehran, 1961.

Hafez, *Fifty Poems of Ḥāfīz*, ed. and tr. A. J. Arberry, Cambridge, 1947.



- ‘Ayn-al-Qożāt Hamadāni, *Tamhidāt*, ed. ‘A. ‘Osayrān, Tehran, 1962.
- ‘Ali b. ‘Oṭmān Hojviri, *Kašf al-maḥjub*, ed. V. A. Zhukovsky, Leningrad, 1926; repr., Tehran, 2001, pp. 276-303.
- ‘Abd-al-Raḥmān Jāmi, *Nafaḥāt al-ons men ḥazarāt al-qods*, ed. M. ‘Ābedi, Tehran, 1991, pp. 16-23.
- ‘Ali b. Moḥammad Jorjāni, *Ketāb al-ta’rifāt*, Beirut, 1979, pp. 20, 193, 234.
- Abu Bakr Kalābādi, *Ketāb al-ta’arrof*, ed. ‘Abd-al-Ḥalim Maḥmud, Cairo, n.d., pp. 71-79 (chap. 26).
- Ebn Ḳaldun, *The Muqaddimah*, 2nd ed., tr. F. Rosenthal, Princeton, 1967, I, pp. 188-91; III, pp. 167-68.
- ‘Ezz-al-Din Kāšāni, *Meṣbāḥ al-hedāya wa’l-meftāḥ al-kefāya*, ed. J. Homā’i, Tehran, 1988, pp. 24-26.
- Abu Sa’id Ḳarrāz, *Kašf al-bayān*, in *Rasā’el al-Ḳarrāz*, ed. Q. Sāmarrā’i, Baghdad, 1967.
- Jamāl-al-Din Abu Rawḥ Loṭfallāh, *Ḥālāt o soḳanān-e šayḳ Abu Sa’id Abu’l-Ḳayr Mēhāni*, ed. I. Afšār, Tehran, 1963.
- Ma’šum-‘Ališāh, *Ṭarā’eq al-ḥaqāeq*, Tehran, 1950, I, pp. 122-36.
- Moḥammad b. al-Monawwar, *Asrār al-tawḥid fi maqāmāt al-šayḳ Abi Sa’id*, ed. D. Şafā, Tehran, 1953; Eng. tr. J. O’Kane as *The Secrets of God’s Mystical Oneness*, Costa Mesa, Calif., 1992.
- Maḥmud b. ‘Oṭmān, *Ferdaws al-moršodiya*, ed. F. Meier in *Die Vita des Scheich Abū Ishāq al-Kāzarūnī*, Leipzig, 1948.
- ‘Abd-al-Karim Qoşayri, *al-Resāla al-qoşayriya*, ed. ‘Abd-al-Ḥalim Maḥmud and M. b. al-Şarif, Cairo, 1966, II, pp. 660-713.
- Ruzbehān-nāma*, ed. M. T. Dāneşpażuh, 1969.
- Abu Naşr Sarrāj, *Ketāb al-Loma’*, ed. M. al-Hendāwi, Beirut, 2001, pp. 273-85.
- Mo’in-al-Din Abu’l-Qāsem Jonayd-e Şirāzi, *Şadd al-ezār fi ḥaṭṭ al-awzār ‘an zawwār al-mazār*, ed. M. Qazvini and ‘A. Eqbāl, Tehran, 1987; Persian version



by 'Isā b. Jonayd as *Hazār mazār*, ed. N. Weṣāl, Shiraz, 1985.

Tāj-al-Din Sobki, *Ṭabaqāt al-šāfe'iya*, ed. M. Ṭanāḥi and M. al-Ḥilw, Cairo, 1964, II, pp. 338-44.

Abu Ḥafṣ 'Omar Sohravardi, *Ketāb a'lām al-hodā wa-'aqīdat arbāb al-toqā*, ed. P. I.-A. Khalifé, in *al-Machriq* 58/3, 1964, pp. 277-78.

Abu 'Abd-al-Raḥmān Solami, *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣuḥufiyya*, ed. M. 'Āṭā, Beirut, 1998.

Moḥammad A'lā Tahānawī, *Mawsu'at kaššāf eṣṭelāḥāt al-fonun wa'l-'olum*, ed. R. al-'Ajam et al., Beirut, 1996, s.v. *estedrāj, karāma*. 'Abd-Allāh b. As'ad Yāfe'i, *Našr al-maḥāsen al-ḡāliyya*, ed. K. 'I. Maṣṣūr, Beirut, 2000, pp. 11-49.

Secondary sources. D. Aigle, "Charismes et rôle social des saints dans l'hagiographie persane médiévale (Xe-XVe siècles)," *BEO* 47, 1995a, pp. 15-36.

Idem, "Sainteté et miracles en islam médiéval. L'exemple de deux saints fondateurs iraniens," in *Miracles, prodiges et merveilles au Moyen âge*, Paris, 1995b, pp. 47-73.

Idem, "Un fondateur d'ordre en milieu rural. Le Cheikh Abū Ishāq de Kāzarūn," in idem, ed., *Saints Orientaux*, Paris, 1995c, pp. 181-209.

Idem, ed., *Miracle et Karāma. Hagiographies médiévales comparées*, Turnhout, 2000.

R. al-'Ajam, *Mawsu'at moṣṭalaḥāt al-taṣawwof al-eslāmi*, Beirut, 1999, pp. 779-88.

Ḥ. Anvari, *Farhang-e bozorg-e soḡan*, Tehran, 2002, s.v. *karāmāt* et seq. Deḥḳodā, *Loḡat-nāma*, s.v. *karāmāt* et seq. D. DeWeese, "An 'Uvaysī' Sufi in Timurid Mawarannahr: Notes on Hagiography and the Taxonomy of Sanctity in the Religious History of Central Asia," *Papers on Inner Asia* 22, Bloomington, 1993.

Idem, "Dog Saints and Dog Shrines in Kubravī Tradition: Notes on a Hagiographical Motif from Khwārazm," in D. Aigle, ed., *Miracle et karāma*, Turnhout, Belgium, 2000, pp. 459-97.

Idem, "Sayyid 'Alī Hamadānī and Kubrawī Hagiographical Traditions," in L. Lewisohn, ed., *The Heritage of Sufism*, Oxford, 1999, II, pp. 121-58.



- L. Gardet, “Karāma,” *EI*<sup>2</sup> IV, pp. 615-16.
- D. Gril, “Le miracle en islam, critère de la sainteté?” in D. Aigle, ed., *Saints Orientaux*, Paris, 1995, pp. 69-81.
- R. Gramlich, *Die Wunder der Freunde Gottes: Theologien und Erscheinungsformen des islamischen Heiligenwunders*, Weisbaden, 1987.
- J. Gross, “Authority and Miraculous Behavior: Reflections on *Karāmāt* Stories of Khwāja ‘Ubaydullāh Ahrār,” in L. Lewisohn, ed., *The Heritage of Sufism*, Oxford, 1999, II, pp. 159-71.
- H. J. Kissling, “Die Wunder der Derwische,” *ZDMG* 107, 1957, pp. 348-61.
- L. Massignon, *Passion*, tr. H. Mason, Princeton, I, pp. 291-95.
- Jürgen Paul, “Hagiographic Literature,” in *EIr* XI/5, 2002, p. 536.
- B. Radtke, “al-Hakīm al-Tirmidhī on Miracles,” in D. Aigle, ed., *Miracle et karāma*, Turnhout, Belgium, 2000, pp. 297-99.
- A. Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, Chapel Hill, 1975, pp. 205-13.
- S. Uludağ, “Kerâmet,” and Y. Ş. Yavuz, “(Kerâmet) – Kelâm,” in *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi* XXV, pp. 265-70.
- A. J. Wensinck, “Mu’djiza,” in *EI*<sup>2</sup> VII, p. 295.