

not refrain from criticizing many Sufis, praised Kharrāz in his references to him. It is very likely that Junayd sought to bring Kharrāz's Sufism together under the comprehensive and united framework of *taṣawwuf* that he wanted to establish and strengthen. Therefore, it is possible that Junayd was in need of Sufi leaders who could join him on the difficult path towards achieving that goal. Kharrāz, whose teachings on *fanā'* and practical life of hardships and rigid austerities did not exactly complement Junayd's pragmatism and ideal image of *taṣawwuf*, was in Junayd's eyes a necessary support for establishing his own agenda. Kharrāz was not satisfied with practising this type of life. He rather was a great theoretician and a man of letters. Kharrāz's case is completely different from that of Shiblī or Nūrī even though the passionate aspects of his *taṣawwuf* seem to be similar. Kharrāz was older than Junayd, and his character had nothing in common with the disordered character of Shiblī, for instance. His renunciatory mode of life was completely different from that of many other members of the *ṣūfiyya* who simply chose to maintain their engagement in social, political and economic positions of fame like Ruwaym and 'Amr al-Makki. Imagining the general scene of *taṣawwuf* during those days helps us to understand Junayd's agenda and better contemplate his distinctive approaches towards his contemporaries: the teachings and activities of Ḥallāj, Nūrī, Shiblī, Abū Ḥamza al-Baghdādī and others in one group; social-oriented Sufi personalities like Ruwaym and Makki in another and personalities that came from the Sufi circles while choosing to attack the Sufis, like Ghulām Khalīl (d. 275/888) and Ibn Yazdānyār,<sup>128</sup> in the third group. Among all these, Kharrāz stood out as the one whose character could provide Junayd's agenda with a great deal of support.

ABŪ ḤAFṢ AL-ḤADDĀD (D. C. 265/878–879)<sup>129</sup>  
OF NISHAPUR

The teachings of the early founders of the *malāmātiyya* in the eastern parts of the world of Islam show us interesting strategies of approaching

<sup>128</sup> No date of death is provided in his biography. See e.g., Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt*, 423–426; Qushayrī, *Risāla*, 30. See also the detailed reference to him in Chapter 7.

<sup>129</sup> Sulamī indicates three options for his date of death: 264 or 267 or 270. See Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt*, 105–106. For the biography of Abū Ḥafṣ, see, in addition to Sulamī's *Ṭabaqāt*: Qushayrī, *Risāla*, 18; Baghdādī, *Ta'rikh baghdād*, vol. 14, 133–136; Iṣfahānī, *Ḥilyat al-awliyā'*, vol. 10, 244–245; Anṣārī Haravī, *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya*, 38–40; Jullābī Hujwiri, *Kashf al-mahjūb*, 154–156.

new affiliates. The character of Abū Ḥafṣ al-Ḥaddād al-Naysābūrī is of great significance here. One of the earliest sources for his image and his role in guiding novices in the Sufi path is Sulamī's *Risālat al-malāmātiyya*. Throughout this short work, the founders of *malāmātiyya* and their successors are described as having guided their novices to practising a normative mode of social life and 'attending the markets' (*luṣūm al-aswāq*) as means to conceal their inner truth and to avoid people's praise.<sup>130</sup> At the very beginning of the work, Sulamī differentiates between three ranks of 'the people of religious sciences and spiritual states' (*arbāb al-'ulūm wa-l-aḥwāl*): Muslim traditionalists in the first, the 'people of divine knowledge' in the second rank and finally the group of *malāmātiyya* in the third rank. Sulamī indicates that the description of the second group is 'analogous to the state of *ṣūfiyya*' (*shabih bi-ḥāl al-ṣūfiyya*).<sup>131</sup> This, most likely, refers to the Sufis of Baghdad. Sulamī goes on to provide us with comparisons between *ṣūfiyya* and *malāmātiyya*, while praising and favouring the latter. In order to celebrate *malāmātiyya*'s preference over the other famed Baghdadi group, Sulamī quotes the following statement of Abū Ḥafṣ al-Ḥaddād, who presents an interesting comparison between the novices of *ṣūfiyya* and the novices of *malāmātiyya*:

The novices of *malāmātiyya* are unstable in the position of manhood (*mutaqallibūn fī al-rujūliyya*); their lower souls have no impact on them [...] since their outwards are unveiled while their inwards are hidden. The novices of *ṣūfiyya* bring into view the imprudence of their *karāmāt* in a way that motivates the men of truth to laugh at them due to their plentiful impure claims and the rarity of their true states.<sup>132</sup>

Abū Ḥafṣ al-Ḥaddād criticizes the *ṣūfiyya* for not warning their novices against showing off their spiritual capacities. Meanwhile, the novices of *malāmātiyya* keep wavering and do not feel that they arrive at the ultimate spiritual rank that allows them to celebrate this achievement. The word *rujūliyya* in the above quotation indicates the *malāmātiyya*'s way to obtaining inner states of closeness and purity and ignoring every external indication for them. The behaviour of the *ṣūfiyya*'s novices, on the other hand, causes contempt and sarcasm since it focuses specifically on external indications for spiritual states. *Karāmāt* are nothing but the typical example for such indications. Controversies regarding different Sufi doctrines and practices between the line of Abū Ḥafṣ and his

<sup>130</sup> See Sulamī, *Risālat al-malāmātiyya*, 91, 101.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid., 87.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid., 88–89.