

АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК РОССИИ  
РУССКОЕ ГЕОГРАФИЧЕСКОЕ ОБЩЕСТВО  
ВОСТОЧНАЯ КОМИССИЯ

# СТРАНЫ И НАРОДЫ ВОСТОКА

Под общей редакцией  
академика Российской Академии наук  
М. Н. БОГОЛЮБОВА

Вып. XXX  
**ЦЕНТРАЛЬНАЯ АЗИЯ. ВОСТОЧНЫЙ ГИНДУКУШ**



«ПЕТЕРБУРГСКОЕ ВОСТОКОВЕДЕНИЕ»  
1998

---

---

*Sergei Andreyev*

## UWAYSĪ ASPECTS IN THE DOCTRINE OF THE RAWĀNĪ MOVEMENT

For centuries the concept of metaphysical initiation to esoteric knowledge without any participation of a living spiritual guide was a characteristic undercurrent in Sufism. This tendency is known as the Uwaysī tradition called so after Uways al-Qaranī, a legendary contemporary of the prophet Muḥammad who is reputed to have communicated with him telepathically as stated by Ibn Saʿd of Basra (circa 168 A.H./784 A.D.-230 A.H./845 A.D.), the well-known compiler of the biographies of the companions of the prophet and early *ḥadīṡ* scholars (Ibn Saʿd, 1904-40, vol.VI, pp. 111-14)<sup>1</sup>. In this respect the Pashtuns' homeland was not an exception. The traces of Uwaysī tradition are visible in the doctrine of the Rawḫānī movement, a powerful 16th-17th century religio-political movement which dominated intellectual and political life of the Pashtun tribesmen for almost seven decades.

It seems necessary to discuss briefly the Rawḫānī view of a spiritual guide (*pīr/shaykh*) before moving to the analysis of possible Uwaysī connections in the Rawḫānī doctrine.

The concept of a perfect spiritual guide (*pīr-i-kāmil*)<sup>2</sup> is central in the Rawḫānī *weltanschauung* which stresses that man can reach spiritual enlightenment only through such a guide. Although none of the known Rawḫānī sources devotes a special chapter or section to this subject, it is dealt with extensively throughout the works of the founder of the movement Bāyazīd Anṣārī (932 A.H./1525 A.D.-980 A.H./1572 A.D.). While Khayr al-Bayān, the main Pashto source on the Rawḫānī creed, focuses on the status of Bāyazīd Anṣārī himself and the qualities bestowed upon him by God, the Persian treatise dealing primarily with activities of Bāyazīd Anṣārī and his successors, i.e. Ḥāl-nāmah-i-Bāyazīd Rawḫān, pays more attention to Bāyazīd Anṣārī's personal opinion on the general qualities of the true and false *pīr*. Apart from that the difference between information on this subject provided by the two major Rawḫānī sources is merely formal. Ākhūnd Darwīzah (939 A.H./1533 A.D.-1048

A.H./1638-39 A.D.), a bitter opponent of the Rawḫānī doctrine who left a hostile account of the movement, reports that Bāyazīd Anṣārī wrote a number of treatises on the position and authority of the spiritual guide. According to Darwīzah's allegations, the founder of the Rawḫānī movement in these works distorted the words of the Koran and quoted fabricated *ḥadīṣ* (Darwīzah, 1969, p. 122). No such source is known to be extant.

Like in Sufism in general the Rawḫānī concept of *pīr* is based on a well-known *ḥadīṣ* "Those who have no guide have no religion"<sup>3</sup> which is quoted repeatedly throughout the Ḥāl-nāmāh (Mukhliṣ, 1986, pp. 33, 134, etc). Bāyazīd Anṣārī held strong views on this point; when first seeking his spiritual perfection he even considered himself as "without religion" since he did not have a guide to instruct him, although previously he had not doubted his piety since his religious education was complete and he was living according to the *sharī'at* (Mukhliṣ, 1986, p. 33). Later on, he often emphasised that without a *pīr-i-kāmil* one cannot cognize God<sup>4</sup>, thus explaining why people who do not have a guide are without religion.

Bāyazīd Anṣārī sharply distinguished between true and false guides. The true *pīr*, he stated, teaches "four kinds of knowledge (*chahār 'ilm*), four stations (*maqām*), four secrets and the knowledge of monotheism/unity (*tawḥīd*)<sup>5</sup> to a disciple who is chosen for him by God (Mukhliṣ, 1986, pp. 33, 143). Teaching is an obligation for the *pīr*; according to the Ḥāl-nāmāh, God ordered Bāyazīd Anṣārī to teach the knowledge of *tawḥīd* to those who seek it "in order to lighten many lanterns from just one and [thus] increase the light" (Mukhliṣ, 1986, p. 95). On this basis the founder of the Rawḫānī movement criticised a pious and knowledgeable, but silent dervish whom he met during his business-trip to Kandahar by comparing him to a fruitless tree (Mukhliṣ, 1986, p. 91).

This insistence on the need for a guide must be compared with the Uwaysī tradition to which Bāyazīd Anṣārī claimed to belong. As Julian Baldick defines it, "the word 'Uwaysī' designates a Muslim mystic who looks for instruction from the spirit of a dead or physically absent person" (Baldick, 1993, p. 1) and as Annemarie Schimmel adds "... outside the regular mystical path and without the mediation and guidance of a living sheikh" (Schimmel, 1975, pp. 28-29). Farīd al-Dīn 'Attār, who himself claimed to be initiated by the spirit of al-Ḥallāj, seems to be the first author to introduce the term "Uwaysī Sufis"<sup>6</sup> described these mystics in the following way: "There is a group of people called Uwaysī, who do not need a *pīr*. Since they are looked after in the blossom of the prophethood (*nubuwwat*) they obtain spiritual knowledge directly from the prophet, without any mediator, like Uways had done. Although he never saw the master of the prophets, he was taught by him. The prophet(hood) looked after him and was his companion. This is the highest status man can hope to acquire" ('Attār, 1905, vol.I, p. 24). Sometimes not only the prophet

Muḥammad but Koranic prophets and especially Khizr<sup>7</sup>, dead teachers of the past or even God himself acted as this visionary instructor. Usually there are only isolated references to Uwaysī in Islamic literature, except for "The History of the Uwaysīs"<sup>8</sup> which is a compendium of the biographies of Uwaysī Sufis many of whom never existed. However, *nā-pīrī* Sufis, i.e. mystics who had no earthly mentor, and in some cases were educated by physically absent teachers, can be traced throughout Islamic history<sup>9</sup>. It appears that some details of Bāyazīd Anṣārī's life resemble the Uwaysī tradition in Islam.

Reception of instructions directly from God which is described in the Rawḫānī sources is characteristic of Sufism in general. The peculiarity of the Uwaysī tradition is that God very often was the only source of knowledge for the Sufi with no teacher or mediator present. Kharaqānī (an Iranian Sufi, died 425 A.H./1033 A.D.) whom Julian Baldick describes as a follower of this tradition (Baldick, 1993, p. 21) claimed, according to his spiritual biography, that he had no master to teach him except God (Mīnuwī, 1975, pp. 75,82). At the same time he laid claim to a direct succession to the spiritual essence of Bāyazīd Bisṭāmī (died 261 A.H./875 A.D.)<sup>10</sup>, who initiated him in a dream, in spite of the great interval between their lives (de Bruijn, 1978, p. 1057). O.F. Akimushkin disagrees with Baldick's description of Kharaqānī as an Uwaysī which, he thinks, is based on an uncritical treatment of "The History of the Uwaysīs" account. He writes that the tendency to consider all early "founding fathers" of pre-organised Sufism as independent individual Uwaysīs was developed only in the 15th-18th centuries literary Sufi tradition. And Kharaqānī, as well as other mystics of his time, headed their own mystical schools which involved guide-disciple relationship. However, they did not belong to organised and institutionalized brotherhoods which came to existence only later (Akimushkin, 1994, p. 670). Whatever the historical reality may be, at the time of Bāyazīd Anṣārī mystics like Kharaqānī were perceived as Uwaysī. This perception influenced the intellectual environment of the 16th century.

The Indian Sufi Aḥmad Sirhindī (971 A.H./1564 A.D.- 1033 A.H./1624 A.D.) in an important letter to his disciple expressed his claim to spiritual eminence by saying: "The chain of my discipleship is connected with God without any meditation. My hand is a substitute for the hand of God." At the same time he admitted: "I am a disciple of Muḥammad connected with him through many intermediaries: in the Naqshbandī order there are twenty-one intermediaries in between: in the Qādirī, twenty-five; and in the Chishtī, twenty-seven". After this statement he, however, emphasized: "... but my relationship with God as a disciple is not subject to any mediation, as has already been related. Hence I am both the disciple of Muḥammad the Messenger of God and his co-disciple (*ham-pīrah*, that is, we are both disciples of the same master: God)". Later Aḥmad Sirhindī clarified the matter: "Though I am an Uwaysī, I

have an Omnipresent and All-Seeing Instructor (*murabbī-yi-ḥāzīr wa nāzīr*). Though in the Naqshbandī order my instructor is 'Abd al-Bāqī, yet the One who has undertaken my instruction is the Everlasting One (*al-bāqī*)<sup>11</sup> (Sirhindī, 1912, vol. III, p. 149; Eng. tr. Friedmann, 1971, pp. 27-28). Thus the Indian Sufi implied that God was the only source of his knowledge and his true teacher, while his earthly mentors were important only in regard to his formal affiliation to Sufi brotherhoods.

Despite having received their instructions directly from the highest source, Uwaysī mystics did not dismiss earthly masters perhaps because of the popular Islamic saying "He who has no elder has Satan for his elder" (Furūzānfar, 1955, p. 30) which certainly influenced the ethos of their time<sup>12</sup>. Many of these mystics found their spiritual realisation in a compromise implying a relationship in which the follower is formally attached to a living guide and through him to a regular *silsilah*, yet his true teacher is God, the Prophet, a Koranic personage or a deceased *walī*<sup>13</sup>. The earthly guides were considered unimportant and necessary only for the initial stages of spiritual perfection<sup>14</sup>. This is a general Sufi idea, but in the Uwaysī tradition it is more explicit. Besides, for traditional practising Sufis of the later period theoretical ability to receive direct instructions from divine sources was confined only to highly advanced mystics of the past. In their everyday life these Sufis relied entirely on their elders. The Uwaysīs, on the contrary, thought that even ordinary people could begin to advance on the path of spiritual perfection without formal guidance of the elder. There is a general trend to consider any great mystic who had no apparent living master to instruct him on the advanced problems of high mysticism as an Uwaysī. For instance Ibn al-'Arabī (560 A.H./1165 A.D. – 637 A.H./1240 A.D.), the most influential theorist of Sufism, has often been seen as an Uwaysī in the general Sufi tradition<sup>15</sup> since he himself underscored the importance of benefiting from the spirits of dead mystics and his literary activity is presented as being inspired by God and Muḥammad. In line with the above-mentioned Uwaysīs' practical compromise apart from "hidden friends of God" and Khizr serving as his instructors, Ibn al-'Arabī had living guides (e.g. Abū al-'Abbās al-'Uryabī) who taught him conventional Islamic disciplines and elementary mysticism.

It appears that at least in the Naqshbandī intellectual tradition Uwaysī Sufis were considered as of the most illustrious status (ter Haar, 1992; p. 314; Hussaini, 1967, p. 112).

Not all mystics outside the usual Sufi elder-disciple relationship are "genuine" Uwaysīs, since by calling oneself an Uwaysī one can avoid the severe criticism of Sufi elders and traditional '*ulamā'*. Usually *nā-pīrī* Sufis were condemned by the Muslim establishment. Only if they acquired a large following and a respected status, or lived in seclusion and did not enter into any

controversy with the established brotherhoods were they recognized as *awliyā' Allāh* (the friends of God) and called Uwaysī (Hussaini, 1967, p. 103). However, there is no way to know who was sincere in his claim to be an Uwaysī. Since Bāyazīd Anṣārī like the two above-mentioned Sufis, Kharāqānī and Aḥmad Sirhindī, as well as many others, also falls into the category of *nā-pīrī* Sufis he can be referred to as an Uwaysī. However, he, unlike these mystics, was eagerly looking for an earthly mentor even after having received the divine revelation, but could not find him.

The Ḥāl-nāmah indicates that the founder of the Rawḫānī movement was aware of the Uwaysī tradition in Sufism. While being questioned by the Afghan '*ulamā'* he replied that his *pīr* was the prophet Muḥammad and likened himself to Uways who received the bounty of esoteric knowledge (*ni'mat-i-bāṭin*) from God with the help of the prophet Mūḥammad (Mukhlīṣ, 1986, p. 193). On another occasion, during the Kabul trial<sup>16</sup>, Bāyazīd Anṣārī told Qāzī Khān, the judge of Kabul, that he had acquired spiritual perfection through the prophet Muḥammad directly and that he was an Uwaysī. No living guide taught him the knowledge he propounded (Mukhlīṣ, 1986, p. 267). The fact that Bāyazīd Anṣārī called himself an Uwaysī only when challenged by the hostile '*ulamā'* and facing a tribunal may indicate that he used this claim as a means to repudiate charges of heresy. In his doctrinal writings Bāyazīd Anṣārī never described the prophet as his guide. He always referred exclusively to God as his direct instructor and once mentioned Khizr as the messenger who indicated his future spiritual advancement. Therefore it seems that his reference to the prophet Muḥammad served the purpose of proving that he was a good Muslim, i.e. the follower of the prophet. These defensive references to the prophet might resemble Aḥmad Sirhindī's idea that since he was a disciple of God he, therefore, he is also a disciple and co-disciple of Muḥammad. However, this important point is not discussed in Bāyazīd Anṣārī's theoretical writings. Besides, references to the Uwaysī tradition can be found only in the Ḥāl-nāmah, which deals mainly with Bāyazīd Anṣārī's life, not his teaching. The Uwaysī tradition is never mentioned in Khayr al-Bayān, the main source on the Rawḫānī doctrine.

Mention of the Uwaysī tradition can be found in different Muslim countries<sup>17</sup> but it seems that this notion was most wide-spread in Muslim India where not only individual mystics had Uwaysī-type relations with God or Muḥammad or both but entire Sufi brotherhoods (Chishtī, Qādirī,) listed Uwaysīs in their "chains" (*silsilah*) (Baldick, 1993, p. 27). Besides, the Uwaysī legacy played an important part in Naqshbandī tradition which at the time of Bāyazīd Anṣārī was influential in Pushtunistan<sup>18</sup>. Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband himself, as well as other important figures, directly or indirectly associated with the Naqshbandī tradition, experienced the Uwaysī initiation (ter Haar, 1992, pp. 312-318). Thus, theoretically, Bāyazīd Anṣārī could have some formal knowledge of the Uwaysī

tradition since it is known that a book on this subject was available for the contemporary Indian Muslims: "In the Indian subcontinent, we find seventeenth-century manuscripts, now in Pakistan, of the 'Sayings (*Malfūzāt*) of Master Uways Qaranī' – an example of a particularly Muslim-Indian genre, in which the conversations of a mystic are recorded or forged. The work also contains accounts of Uways's life and miracles..." (Baldick, 1993, p. 20; Munzawi, 1984, p. 2022). Alternatively, Bāyazīd Anṣārī could obtain the information on the Uwaysī tradition by hearsay and since he had the experience of direct mystical contact with God with no mediation of a spiritual mentor he could connect himself to this tradition, either sincerely or as a means of escaping the allegations of heresy. Therefore it is unclear whether Bāyazīd Anṣārī's statements and conduct resulted from a conscious imitation of Uways or merely from the similarity of his mystical aspirations and practical defensive considerations.

Besides Bāyazīd Anṣārī's above-mentioned affirmation that he was an Uwaysī there are some other similarities between the Rawḫānī doctrine and the Uwaysī tradition. Taken separately they can resemble general Sufi notions; however, considered together in the Uwaysī context, they correspond to the system of beliefs adopted by Uwaysī mystics. These similarities are connected with the notion of Bāyazīd Anṣārī's advancement to the highest possible state (*ḥāl*) and level, that of the prophet Muḥammad (Mukhliṣ, 1986, pp. 52-53). It is tempting to compare this view with the above-mentioned statement of Aḥmad Sirhindī where he correlates himself with the prophet. Bāyazīd Anṣārī was also ordered by God to perform the prayer or worship of prophets, which is an imitation of the object of worship, instead of the prayer or worship of the ordinary believers (Mukhliṣ, 1986, pp. 69-76). Here again we come across the Uwaysī tradition. It is stated that God communicated with Kharaqānī by the revelation reserved for the prophets (*waḥy*) which is opposed to that reserved for the *awliyā'* – "saints"/friends of God (*ilhām*). This mystic was also supposed to be placed above the prophets and the "friends of God" on the Judgment Day (Mīnuwī, 1975, pp. 55-62). It is known that Ākhūnd Darwīzah accused Bāyazīd Anṣārī of claiming to receive *waḥy* (Darwīzah, 1892, p. 148). This idea of sharing the mystical achievements of the prophet Muḥammad is also typical for Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband who is reported to attain a state of "being without any attribute or characteristic feature (*bīṣifatī*)" after having concentrated on the spiritual presence of Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmizī (died circa 295 A.H./908 A.D.). This state represents the highest level of mystical experience people can attain. This level belongs pre-eminently to the prophet Muḥammad but can be shared by highly advanced *awliyā'*. Bahā' al-Dīn stated that before him Abū al-Qāsim Gurgānī (died 469-70 A.H./1076-77 A.D.) who concentrated on the spirituality of Uways al-Qaranī and used his name "Uways" as the *zīkr*

had reached the same level (ter Haar, 1992, p. 317 with reference to Muḥammad Pārsā, 1975, pp. 15,25-26).

At the first glance it seems that the fundamental *theoretical* rules of the Uwaysī school prescribed to its followers to avoid the establishment of the conventional Sufi guide-disciple relationship. And indeed, "The History of the Uwaysīs" reminds the reader a number of times that "in the Uwaysī path it is not the practice to have the elder-disciple relationship" (Baldick, 1993, p. 71) and that those who take disciples abandon the Uwaysī tradition (Baldick, 1993, p. 100), since, "to accept disciples is contrary to Uwaysī usage" although some elders could be given leave to do so (Baldick, 1993, p. 94). On the other hand, the fact that accounts of the Uwaysī elders having thousands of disciples outnumber accounts of their refusal to educate novices indicates that the Uwaysī rules concerning the acceptance of disciples were rather ambivalent. On the one hand, Uways, the founder of the tradition which bears his name, refused to accept one 'Abd Allāh as his disciple since "there is no discipleship in the Uwaysī brotherhood" and offered him companionship (*muṣāḥabat*) instead. On the other hand it is reported that Uways himself ordered one Yāsir of Istanbul<sup>19</sup> to acquire disciples and to become an elder (Baldick, 1993, pp. 60, 121, 124). In her review of Julian Baldick's book on the Uwaysī mystics (Baldick, 1993) Patricia Crone writes that in the Uwaysī environment teaching was considered virtuous provided that "one does so without the relationship of elder and disciple, the proper relations being companionship or fraternity" (Crone, 1994). And indeed, Aḥmad Ūzgānī reports that people wanting to become disciples were allowed only companionship (Baldick, 1993, p. 160) in order to receive guidance [not education] as regards the Uwaysī method (Baldick, 1993, p. 60). At the same time, apart from numerous accounts of the conventional Sufi *pīr/shaykh* – *murīd* relationship enjoyed by a significant number of the Uwaysī mystics, "The History of the Uwaysīs" reports that the Uwaysī teachers could have both disciples and companions simultaneously. These companions obviously had lower rank than the "proper" disciples<sup>20</sup>.

This ambivalence of the theoretical rules and discrepancy in the views of the status of the Uwaysī followers resulted in a pragmatic accommodation which allowed to accept novices (called either companions (*muṣāḥib*) or disciples (*murīd*) according to the general Sufi tradition of discipleship. This compromise led to the establishment of the Uwaysī "chain of succession" (*silsilah*). "The History of the Uwaysīs" describes the institutionalization of the Uwaysī tradition and its routinization in the true Weberian sense<sup>21</sup>. The Uwaysī brotherhoods had eventually acquired all typical characteristics of the Sufi *ṭarīqat*. Their followers went as far as to venerate the descendants of their deceased guides<sup>22</sup> (Baldick, 1993, pp. 127-128, 176). The Uwaysī movement, however, was more loosely structured than the Naqshbandī brotherhood, its main rival in

Central Asia, which eventually supplanted the Uwaysī tradition in this area (Baldick, 1993, pp. 37-38)<sup>23</sup>.

Thus in his quest to educate people Bāyazīd Anşārī broke with a loosely defined *theoretical* Uwaysī principle not to take disciples. This did not block his agreement with the Uwaysī practice which often did not comply with the above-mentioned rule. However, his emphasis on the establishment of a rigid institutionalised relationship between spiritual guide and disciple distanced Bāyazīd Anşārī from more individualist Uwaysī *milieu* and brought him closer to conventional Sufism. Bāyazīd Anşārī's claim to be an Uwaysī does not necessarily mean that he considered the movement founded by himself as Uwaysī or based exclusively on Uwaysī principles. It closely resembles the example of Shaykh Aḥmad Sirhindī – Bāyazīd Anşārī also once declared himself an Uwaysī but maintained the conventional guide – disciple relationship with his followers. However, unlike Bāyazīd Anşārī, Aḥmad Sirhindī was formally affiliated to a number of Sufi brotherhoods.

It is unclear whether the teaching done by Bāyazīd Anşārī's deputies differed from that of their leader. According to the Ḥāl-nāmah, Muḥammad Kāmil, the first Rawḫānī *khalīfah*, was asked by the founder of the Rawḫānī movement "to give people repentance and the benefit of religion" (Mukhlis, 1986, pp. 142,143), which is too vague a description of his activities to compare with those of Bāyazīd Anşārī. It seems that the rite of shaking and pressing hands (*muşāfahahat*), symbolising acceptance of a novice and being a part of a vow of submission to the guide (*'ahd al-yad*) (Trimingham, 1971, p. 151), was practised by Muḥammad Kāmil; for he was instructed by Bāyazīd Anşārī "when you take [shake] a hand say that [your] hand is [like] the hand of Pīr-i-Dastgīr" (Mukhlis, 1986, p. 142). This practice of hand clasping as a part of formal allegiance to a guide is a clear breach of the Uwaysī custom as reported by "The History of the Uwaysīs". A prominent Uwaysī mystic Muḥammad Bāqir did not allow his followers to shake his hand and to take the *'ahd al-yad* because "this was not customary in the Uwaysī path". Instead they made a compact of fraternity (*'ahd al-ukhūwwat*) (Baldick, 1993, p. 94).

Although Bāyazīd Anşārī never mentioned that one of the *pīr*'s tasks is purifying his disciple from their sins he obviously followed this general Sufi principle since throughout the Ḥāl-nāmah he is reported as asking his followers to repent in order that they free themselves from their wrongdoings.

Another popular Sufi *ḥadīṣ* employed by Bāyazīd Anşārī to highlight his position concerning the importance of the *pīr* is "Among his people [tribe] (*qawm*) the *pīr* is like the prophet in his religious community (*umma*)" (Mukhlis, 1986, pp. 106, 123)<sup>24</sup>. He interpreted this *ḥadīṣ* literally and compared himself with the prophet Muḥammad by saying that his followers, like those of the Prophet, will reach their desired aim, i.e. the knowledge of religion

and unity with God. He states that the "perfect guide" (*pīr-i-kāmil*) himself will be numbered in "the category of prophets" (Mukhlīṣ, 1986, p. 124). This emphasis on the significance of a religious teacher in his reference group (either *qawm* or *umma*) paved the way for further departure of the Rawḫānī movement from the Uwāysī tradition. After the death of Bāyazīd Anṣārī the Rawḫānī movement began to correspond to the pattern of "maraboutic Sufism"<sup>25</sup>. In this case affiliation to the spiritual guide is based on a collective adherence of a clan or tribe to a *pīr*'s family. Meanwhile, the number of this guide's individual followers is usually very low. Nowadays, and especially in the early 1980s, one can observe the same process of changing behavioral patterns from individual following of a Sufi elder to the collective support of a guide-turned-political-leader within the so-called "parties" of Afghan *mujāhids*<sup>26</sup>.

## Notes

1. Hīshām al-Dustuwā'ī (died 153 A.H./770 A.D.), a Basran traditionist and biographer of the Prophet, was, according to L. Massignon, the first author who mentioned Uwāys (Massignon, 1954, p. 163). A.S. Hussaini provides a detailed account of Muslim traditions relating to Uwāys and Uwāysī Sufis (Hussaini, 1967, pp. 103-113)

2. This term may have been borrowed from the Naqshbandī *milieu* where it was used for the description of highly advanced guides with an important distinction of *pīr-i-kāmil* i.e. the guide perfect for himself and *pīr-i-mukammil* i.e. the guide perfecting other people. The disciple of Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband Ya'qūb Charkhī (died 851 A.H./1447 A.D.) described these guides who are capable of leading others to perfection as those who are both "illuminated" (*nūrānī*) and "illuminating" (*nūrbakhsh*) (ter Haar, 1992, pp. 318-319). It is tempting to relate these Naqshbandī terms, *nūrānī* and *nūrbakhsh*, to the self-appellation of the doctrine of Bāyazīd Anṣārī, i.e. *rawshānī* / *rawḫānī* (the enlighten). Of course the opposition between light (i.e. knowledge and general good) and darkness (i.e. ignorance and general evil) is common to many unrelated religious traditions. As it usually is the case with the Rawḫānī works, no source gives direct evidence to any outside influence, including the Naqshbandī one. Thus, with no source evidence for or against this assumption one is again confined to speculation based on circumstantial evidence. A good example of this circumstantial evidence are parallels between the concept of *pīr-i-kāmil* and the famous Sufi idea of *al-insān al-kāmil* (the perfect man). But this is the subject of a separate study.

3. This *hadīṣ* is a part of Muslim oral tradition. It cannot be found in the early *hadīṣ* collections or in Zhukovskii's list of traditions used by al-Hujwīrī in his *Kashf al-Mahjūb*.

4. There are numerous references to this view in both Ḥālānāmah-i-Bāyazīd Rawḫān (Mukhlīṣ, 1986) and *Ṣīrāt al-Tawḥīd* (Bāyazīd Anṣārī, 1952).

5. It is obvious that these "four kinds of knowledge, stations and secrets" correspond to the four main stages of spiritual perfection envisaged by the Rawḫānī doctrine, i.e. *sharī'at*, *ṭarīqat*, *ḥaqīqat* and *ma'rīfut*.

6. This is implied by Muḥammad Pārsā, a disciple of Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband (Muḥammad Pārsā, 1975, p. 14-15).

7. *Khīzr* is often described as investing Sufis with the *khirqah*. Thus these mystics were immediately connected with the highest source of spiritual inspiration (Schimmel, 1975, pp. 105-6).

8. The book is known under two titles: "Tazkirah-i-Uwāysiyya" and "Tazkirah-i-Satuq-Bughra-Khānī". It was written in Persian in Eastern Turkistan circa 1008 A.H./ 1600 A.D. by Aḥmad ibn Sa'd al-Dīn al-Ūzgānī, who was an Uwāysī mystic himself.

9. For more references on the Uwaysī tradition see Baldick, 1993.

10. The bulk of Kharaqānī's famous "paradoxical sayings" goes back to his "visionary guide" Bāyazīd Bisṭāmī.

11. Because Aḥmad Sirhindī had earthly teachers Alexander Knysch doubts his association with the Uwaysī tradition (Knysch, 1995, p. 105). This is difficult to accept. Sirhindī's own claim that he belongs to the Uwaysī tradition cannot be considered as exclusively metaphorical since he emphasized the absolute importance of the divine instruction as the sole source of his knowledge which is "not subject to any mediation". It seems that Sirhindī's association with various Sufi brotherhoods, which he unreservedly admitted, was parallel and subordinate to his Uwaysī type relationships with the divine instructor whom he regarded as his true teacher.

12. A.S. Hussaini suggests that this may be a forged *ḥadīṡ* (Hussaini, 1967, p. 103).

13. Aḥmad Sirhindī's claim to belong to a number of Sufi brotherhoods and yet have only one true instructor, i.e. God, is an illustrative example of this practice.

14. J.G.J. ter Haar offers an interesting explanation of the seeming contradiction between the imperative for a novice to establish and maintain strong ties with a (living) *ḡīr* and the notion of an initiation by and obedience to a deceased or metaphysical guide. He writes: "At first sight these two aspects may seem to contradict each other, but in reality they are two complementary sides of the same coin, since what matters in both cases is the spirit of the spiritual guide and this spirit is apparently not confined to his actual bodily presence" (ter Haar, 1992, p. 312). Spiritual contact with a deceased or metaphysical guide involved a certain amount of disloyalty to the actual living *ḡīr* as it is illustrated by Bahā' al-Din Naqshband's refusal to recite the vocal *ḡīkr* given by his earthly mentor Sayyid Amīr Kulāl in order to concentrate on the *ḡīkr* given to him by his deceased guide 'Abd al-Khālīq Ghujduwānī (ter Haar, 1992, p. 316).

15. The author of "The History of the Uwaysīs" considered Ibn al-'Arabī's The Meccan Illuminations (al-Futūḥāt al-Makkīyya) as one of the sources of his own work. Baldick notes that the arrangement of chapters in pairs and correspondences between different sub-series in Uzganī's treatise resembles the structure of The Meccan Illuminations (Baldick, 1993, p. 55, 49). It is interesting that Aḥmad Uzganī mentioned this book alongside the well-known collection of Sufi biographies by Jāmī, "The Breaths of Familiarity" (Nafḥāt al-uns). Unlike Jāmī's work Ibn al-'Arabī's treatise is on Sufi theory and practice, and does not focus on the lives of Muslim mystics, except in so far as it provides an autobiographical account of Ibn al-'Arabī's own experience. However, Ibn al-'Arabī's life-story was not included into "The History of the Uwaysīs".

16. According to the suggestion of the chief of the Khalīl tribe Malik Ḥabīb Bakhīl and by the order of the governor of Peshawar Jānīsh Khān Bāyazīd Anṣārī was summoned to the court of the ruler of Kabul Mīrzā Muḥammad Ḥakīm where he was tried for heresy. He declined the charge and after a long dispute proved his "orthodoxy". Therefore he, for much displeasure of the traditionalist establishment, was released from custody and resumed his activities in the tribal area (for the account of the Kabul trial see: Mukhliṡ, 1986, pp. 263-267; Darwīzah, 1892, p. 153).

17. In Turkey (Gibb, 1904, pp. 217-218) and in Iran (Vambery, 1868, pp. 2-3).

18. The archenemy of the Rawḫānī movement Ākhūnd Darwīzah belonged to this brotherhood.

19. Since Uways was said to be a contemporary of the prophet Muḥammad it is an obvious anachronism that he ordered someone "of Istanbul".

20. It is unclear whether these Uwaysī "companions" resembled traditional Sufi "associates" who were organisationally attached to the brotherhoods but never reached higher stations (*maqām*) and remained "laymen" with regard to their lifestyle.

21. Cf. the arguments presented in Max Weber's article "The Routinization of Charisma" concerning the necessity for the social relationships of a charismatic uninstitutionalized nature to become "either traditionalized or rationalised, or a combination of both" in order not to remain a purely transitory phenomenon, but on the contrary, to take on the character of a permanent relationship forming a stable community of disciples or a band of followers" (Weber, 1968 pp. 54-60).

22. The account of the decision of a community of Uwaysīs to accept one 'Abd al-Wahhāb, the son of their dead guide, as their late elder's deputy highlights the Uwaysī frustration about the conflict between their theoretical rules and practice. The reader is informed that the young and ignorant heir was taught by his father's disciples. This is in line with general Sufī tradition; for instance, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī was also instructed by his father's disciples and later effectively succeeded him. The same happened to 'Abd al-Wahhāb and in the course of time he was able to take the responsibilities of the head of the community. But he did not start teaching until Khīzr declared that he had given half of his own rank (*martabah*) to 'Abd al-Wahhāb (Baldick, 1993, p. 128). Thus, eventually the story begins to correspond to the Uwaysī principles and the head of the community becomes a true Uwaysī instructed by a visionary guide.

23. O.F. Akimushkin denies any institutionalization of the Uwaysī tradition. He argues that individual Uwaysī mystics always acted outside any organisational framework. He equates the Uwaysī Sufis with *majzūb* mystics – individuals drawn in spiritual search to the degree of insanity (*dīwānagī*) because they did not have an instructor to guide them (Akimushkin, 1994, p. 670). However, the essence of the Uwaysī tradition is not the absence of the *shaykh/pīr* but the exclusive influence of [the spirit of] a visionary instructor.

24. al-Hujwīrī used this *ḥadīṡ* in the same context (al-Hujwīrī, 1926, p. 62; Eng tr. Nicholson, 1911, p. 55).

25. This term was first applied to the Afghan context by Olivier Roy (Roy, 1985, pp. 56-58).

26. In this respect it is noteworthy that Pashtun religious leaders, either '*ulamā*' or Sufi *pīrs*, are not an integral part of the segmentary tribal structures based on kinship. They enjoy the status of alien "guests of honour" living in a tribal environment. Therefore, they often act as inter-tribal mediators. Before they were included in the state structures as a result of a partial modernisation of Afghanistan and Pakistan in the 20th century they often tried to challenge tribal authority and create independent political bodies of their own supporters. In Pashto this process is called *gund-bāzī*. It means "party building"; and in this respect the self-appellation of the *mujāhids*' organisations "*ḥizb/ahzāb*" (party) can be a good example of a "Freudian slip".

It seems that the Rawḫāni movement with its leader Bāyazīd Anṣārī who tried to divert the Pashtuns from their tribal life and create a new political and religious entity of the followers of the new creed is the first *recorded* example of the *gund-bāzī*-type of the Pashtun unification.

## Bibliography

- AKIMUSHKIN, 1994 – O.F. AKIMUSHKIN, Review of Julian Baldick, *Imaginary Muslims: The Uwaysi Sufis of Central Asia*, in *Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie*, vypusk 6, 1994.
- 'AJṬĀR, 1905 – Farid al-Dīn 'AJṬĀR NISHĀBŪRĪ, *Tazkirah al-Awliya'*, ed. by R.A. Nicholson, 2 vols, London-Leiden, 1905.
- BALDICK, 1993 – Julian BALDICK, *Imaginary Muslims: The Uwaysi Sufis of Central Asia*, London – New York, I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd, 1993.
- DE BRUIJN, 1978 – J.T.P. DE BRUIJN, Kharakānī, in "*Encyclopaedia of Islam*", New ed., vol. IV, Leiden, 1978.
- CRONE, 1994 – Patricia CRONE, The dead prophets' society, in "*The Times Literary Supplement*", January, 21, 1994.
- DARWĪZAH, 1969 – Ākhūnd DARWĪZAH, *Makhzan al-Islām*, Peshawar, 1969.
- DARWĪZAH, 1892 – Ākhūnd DARWĪZAH, *Tazkirah al-Abrār wa'l-Ashrār*, Delhi, 1892.
- FRIEDMANN, 1971 – Yohanan FRIEDMANN, *Shaykh Ahmad Sirhindī: An Outline of His Thought and a Study of His Image in the Eyes of Posterity*, Montreal and London, 1971.
- FURŪZĀNFAR, 1955 – Badī' al-Zamān Furūzānfār, *Aḥādīs-i-maṣnawī*, Teheran, Chāpkhānah-i-Dānishgāh, 1334 A.H./1955 A.D.
- GIBB, 1904 – E.J.W. GIBB, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol.III, Luzac, London, 1904.
- TER HAAR, 1992 – Johan G.J. TER HAAR, The Importance of the Spiritual Guide in the Naqshbandi Order, in *The Legacy of Mediæval Persian Sufism*, ed. by Leonard Lewisohn, Khaniqahi

- Nimatullahi Publications, London-New York, 1992.
- AL-HUJWIRI, 1926 – Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Uṣmān ibn-Abī ‘Alī al-Jullābī al-Hujwīrī al-Ghaznawī, *Kitāb-i-Kaṣḥf al-Maḥjūb*, ed. by V.A. Zhukovskii, Leningrad, 1926.
- HUSSAINI, 1967 – A.S. HUSSAINI, Uways al-Qaranī and the Uwaysī Ṣūfis, in *The Muslim World*, vol. LVII, 1967.
- IBN SA‘D, 1904-40 – Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad Ibn Sa‘d Ibn Manī’ al-Baṣrī, *Kitāb al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kabīr*, vols. I-IX, ed. by E. Sachau and others, Leiden, 1904-40.
- KNYSH, 1995 – Alexander Knysh, Review of Julian Baldick. Imaginary Muslims: The Uwaysī Sufis of Central Asia, in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Third Series, vol. 5, part 1, 1995.
- MASSIGNON, 1954 – L. MASSIGNON, Essai sur les origines du Lexique Technique de la Mystique Musulmane, in *Études Musulmanes*, vol.2, Paris, 1954.
- MINUWI, 1975 – *Aḥwāl wa aqwāl-i-Shaykh Abū al-Ḥasan Kharaqānī* ed. by M. Mīnuwī, Teheran, 1354 A.H./1975 A.D.
- MUḤAMMAD PĀRSĀ, 1975 – MUḤAMMAD PĀRSĀ, *Qudsiyyah: kalimāt-i-Bahā’ al-Din Naqshband*, ed. by A. Ṭāhirī ‘Irāqī, Teheran, 1975.
- MUKHLIṢ, 1986 – ‘Alī Muḥammad MUKHLIṢ, *Ḥālnāmah-i-Bāyazīd Rawṣān*, Kabul, 1986.
- MUNZAWI, 1984 – A. MUNZAWI, *A Comprehensive Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts in Pakistan*, vol. III, Iran-Pakistan Institute of Persian Studies, Islamabad, 1984.
- NICHOLSON, 1911 – Reynold A. NICHOLSON, *The Kaṣḥf al-Maḥjūb, The Oldest Persian Treatise on Ṣūfism* by ‘Alī b. ‘Uṯmān al-Jullābī al-Hujwīrī, translated from the text of the Lahore edition, compared with mss. in the India Office and British Museum, Leiden-London, 1911.
- ROY, 1985 – Olivier ROY, *L’Afghanistan: Islam et modernité politique*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris, 1985.
- SCHIMMEL, 1975, Annemarie SCHIMMEL, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, Chapel Hill, 1975.
- SIRHINDĪ, 1912 – Shaykh Aḥmad SIRHINDĪ, *Maktūbat-i-Imām-i-Rabbānī*, Delhi, 1290 A.H./1912 A.D.
- TRIMINGHAM, 1971 – J. Spencer TRIMINGHAM, *The Sufi Orders in Islam*, Oxford, 1971.
- VAMBERY, 1868 – A. VAMBERY, *Sketches of Central Asia*, Wm. H. Allen, London, 1868.
- WEBER, 1968 – Max WEBER, *On Charisma and Institution Building*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 1968.