

**.. Ottomans-Safavids-Mughals:Shared knowledge and connective  
Systems**

Francis Robinson

The boundaries of modern nation-states and the blinkered view of area studies scholarship have tended to obscure both important areas of shared experience and significant systems of connection between the Middle East and South Asia. If this is true of the structural characteristics of the Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal empires, of the ways in which their local, regional and imperial systems were articulated, and if this is also true of their commercial organisation and techniques of trade, this is no less true of the content of their systems of formal learning, of the nature of their major sources of esoteric understanding, and of the ways in which they were linked by the connective systems of learned and holy men.

By comparing the curriculums taught in the madrasas of the three empires up to the end of the seventeenth century we will aim to reveal the differing balances maintained between the transmitted subjects (`ulum-i naqliyya/manqulat) and the rational subjects (`ulum-i `aqliyya/ma`qulat). We will also examine the extent to which madrasas adopted the same texts, and even used the same commentaries and annotations. That there were shared texts and commentaries was a consequence of the travels of scholars throughout the region. Often they journeyed in search of knowledge, but they did so too in search of both patrons to sustain their work and safety from oppression. The paths they

followed were the channels along which ideas came to be shared; the centres at which they congregated were the places from which ideas were broadcast.

A second concern will be to explore the extent to which spiritual ideas were widely shared. A study of the influence of Ibn `Arabi over the sufis of the three empires illustrates the existence of a shared world of spiritual understanding. In the same way so does the spread from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries of opposition to Ibn `Arabi's transcendalist approach. The channels along which these ideas spread were in large part, of course, those of the connections of the great supra-regional sufi orders, for instance, the Khalwatiyya in the eastern Mediterranean lands, but most important of all, of course, the Naqshbandiyya which in the third and fourth phases of its development spread not just from India into the Ottoman empire but throughout the whole of the Asian world.

Finally, over the period from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries, we will compare developments in formal learning and in spiritual knowledge in the regions of the three empires. In each region there was an attempt to assert the transmitted over the rational subjects in the madrasa curriculum, and in two regions there was a reorientation of sufism towards socio-moral reconstruction. There were, however, notable differences in the timing of these developments from region to region and in the outcome of attempts to assert the supremacy of the transmitted subjects. We will try to see what connections can be made between these developments and the wider social and political context.

### The Madrasa Curriculums

The purpose of madrasa scholarship was to transmit the central messages of Islamic society and the skills which made them socially useful. These messages and skills were, by and large, contained in great books most of which had been written by the end of the eighth century of the Islamic era. Scholars of the Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal period rarely encountered these great books as simple texts. Instead they approached them through a battery of commentaries, super-commentaries and notes; from time to time a commentary would acquire greater importance than the original text itself.

The great books of the madrasa curriculum were listed under different subject headings, and these subject headings were in turn divided into categories. Various principles were used for categorisation. One which was followed in all three empires divided the subjects of the curriculum into rational subjects (`ulum-i `aqliyya/ma`qulat) and transmitted subjects (`ulum-i naqliyya/manqulat). The former contained logic, philosophy, the various branches of mathematics, medicine, and the latter Quranic exegesis, Traditions, Arabic grammar and syntax, law and jurisprudence. Theology could be placed in either category depending on the amount of philosophical influence there was in the pursuit of the discipline.<sup>(1)</sup> Again differences in the political and social climate could lead to different weights being given to subjects and to the branches themselves in the curriculum.

Appendices I to III set out versions of the madrasa curriculums of the Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal empires. No date

is given for the Ottoman curriculum (Appendix I) but the fact that the curriculum gives reasonable emphasis to the rational sciences, which were suppressed from the seventeenth century onwards, and that the most recent Ottoman scholars mentioned as commentators are Kemalpashazade (d.1533) and Tashkopruzade (d.1560) suggests that reasonably we can see this as the curriculum in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Again, no precise date can be offered for the Safavid curriculum (Appendix II). What is set down is a list of books made in the 1930s by Mirza Tahir Tunikabuni, who wished to record the major treatises traditionally used in the madrasas of Iran. We have left out of this list works composed after 1700, so the books listed may be seen as the probable content of the Safavid curriculum in the seventeenth century. This said, the idea of curriculum should be used with care, for what is set out is a list of major books rather than a carefully constructed pattern of learning.

In the case of the Mughal curriculum, however, we can give a fairly precise date. The Dars-i Nizamiyya (Appendix III), as it was known, was put together by Mulla Nizam al-Din of Firangi Mahal (d.1748) in the early eighteenth century. In doing so he was formalising the practice of his father, Mulla Qutb al-Din Sihalwi (d.1691), who had been concerned to incorporate in the curriculum the big advances made in the rational subjects in India during the seventeenth century alongside the established transmitted subjects. We opt for Mulla Nizam al-Din's course, rather than that which Shah Wali Allah (d.1762) noted was taught around the same time in his father's Madrasa Rahimiyya in Delhi,

because it was to spread throughout India in the eighteenth century and to be the basic curriculum for most madrasas down to the twentieth century. (2) Part of the reason for the popularity of the course stemmed from its emphasis on the rational sciences.

For the Dars-i Nizamiyya was as much a style of teaching as a curriculum. It laid emphasis on comprehension as much as rote learning and good students were able to complete their course more quickly than heretofore. Again, too much emphasis should not be given to the actual number of books in each subject, for instance, the twelve in grammar and syntax, the eleven in logic or the three in philosophy. Nothing was laid down that all should be taught, teachers introducing extra books according to the ability of the student. Indeed, Mulla Nizam al-Din's method was to teach the two most difficult books in each subject on the grounds that, once they had been mastered, the rest would present few problems. (3)

One point which emerges clearly from a comparison of the three curriculums is the extent to which they all draw on the scholarship of Iran and Central Asia and particularly that of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, which was probably the scholarship Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413) had in mind when he versified about the religious learning which had arisen in Arabia finding its maturity and stability in Iran. (4) Of the main texts written in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries very few did not come from this region, the most prominent exceptions being those of Ibn Hajib (d.1248) of Cairo, those of Siraj al-Din al-Urmawi (d.1283) of Konya and those of Ibn Hisham (d.1361) of Cairo. Very few new texts emerge in the years from 1400 to 1700,

a text on Arabic grammar by the Ottoman scholar Mulla Fanari (d.1430), the theological masterpiece of the Safavid scholar Mulla Sadra (d.1641) al-Asfar al-Arba`ah, and, several new texts on grammar and syntax apart, three major texts in the Dars-i Nizamiyya.(5) In all regions during the years 1400-1700 there was a vigorous industry of commentary and in no area was this more vigorous under the Ottomans and Safavids than in law and jurisprudence.

Most striking, however, is the extraordinary impress on the curriculum of those two great rivals at the court of Timur Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389) and Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413). Between them they commentated on most of major works in the madrasa curriculum. Ultimately their influence was more enduring in the Sunni Ottoman and Mughal empires than in the Shia Safavid empire. Nevertheless, that their influence did reach down the centuries can be seen in the editions of their works published towards the end of the nineteenth century in Cairo, Istanbul, Tehran, Delhi, Lucknow and Calcutta.(6)

A second and connected point which emergers from a comparison of the curriculums is the extent to which there is a substantial number of texts used in all three, or at least in two of them. All three, for instance, used the Shafiyya and Kafiyya of Ibn Hajib in grammar and syntax, the Miftah al-`ulum of al-Sakkaki in rhetoric and the Shamsiyya of al-Qazwini in logic. Texts were shared between at least two of the curriculums in all subject areas except Traditions, although we should note that Mishkat al-Masabih, which was used in the Dars-i Nizamiyya, drew exclusively on the six canonical collections used in the Ottoman

madrasas. The only points at which there was any sharp distinction was, as is to be expected, between the Shia curriculum of the Safavids and the Sunni curriculums of the Ottomans and Mughals in the fields of law, jurisprudence and Traditions.

While demonstrating how far the three empires shared a common inheritance of knowledge and its packaging we should also note that by our cut-off dates of 1600 for the Ottoman empire and 1700 in the case of the Safavid and Mughal empires different emphases were being made in the application of the curriculums. The Ottomans, for instance, were laying more and more emphasis on the transmitted subjects. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries Ottoman madrasas had kept a good balance between the rational and the transmitted sciences, chalking up distinguished achievements in mathematics, astronomy and scholastic theology. But by the end of the sixteenth century this balance had been upset and the rational sciences were severely threatened. There were signs of trouble in the first half of the century when Tashkopruzade lamented the declining popularity of mathematics and scholastic theology, and hence a general decline in scholarly standards.<sup>(7)</sup> While the destruction in 1580 of the new and state-of-the-art observatory of the Sultan's chief astronomer has come to symbolise for Ottoman historians the victory of the transmitted subjects over the rational subjects and a greater openness of mind. The results of this victory were clear by the mid-seventeenth century when Katib Chelebi wailed:

But many unintelligent people remained as inert as rocks, frozen in blind imitation of the ancients. Without deliberation, they rejected and repudiated the new sciences. They passed for learned men, while all the time they were ignoramuses, fond of

disparaging what they called 'the philosophical sciences', and knowing nothing of earth or sky. The admonition 'Have they not contemplated the Kingdom of Heaven and Earth?' made no impression on them; they thought 'contemplating the world and the firmament' meant staring at them like a cow.(8)

The Safavid and Mughal curriculums, however, gave considerable emphasis to the rational sciences. The Safavid curriculum, for instance, offered medicine and mysticism, which do not figure in the other curriculums.(9) The most notable Safavid emphasis, however, was in logic and scholastic theology; we think of the achievements of the school of Isfahan in the works of Baha al-din `Amili, of Mir Baqr Damad and most of all of Mulla Sadra. This emphasis and their achievement was carried by Safavid scholars into Mughal India culminating in the formation of the Dars-i Nizamiyya and a further consolidation of the rational sciences.

#### The International World of Scholarship

This world of shared knowledge was underpinned, and at times further developed, by the travels of scholars throughout the region. They journeyed in search of knowledge or to perform the Hajj, but they did so as well to win patronage or to escape oppression. Before the emergence of the Safavid empire there was considerable interaction between the great centres of learning in Iran, Khorasan, Transoxiana and India to the east, and Egypt, the Fertile Crescent and Anatolia to the west. After the emergence of the Safavid empire this wide world of interacting scholarship seems to have contracted. But, if contacts between scholars in the Ottoman and Safavid empires quickly declined, we should note that those between scholars of the Safavid empire and

India became more frequent and intense. This said, we should not regard the Safavid empire as some great bulwark separating scholars in the Mughal and Ottoman dominions because, as we shall show below, there were most important connections, sustained to a large extent by sea, between the scholars of India and those of the Arab lands, at least, under Ottoman control.

If the Safavid state was an obstacle across the paths of international scholarship, it was also a stimulus to it. The Safavids by bringing Shia scholars together as never before - Arabs from Syria, the Lebanon and Bahrain as well as Persians from Iran and Khorasan - and by providing patronage stimulated a revival of learning across the broad field of scholarship from the Traditions and jurisprudence to logic and mathematics. This was the moment, according to Syed Hosein Nasr, when 'a synthesis is created which reflects a millenium of Islamic intellectual life'.(10) The most notable aspect of this synthesis was the flowering of the School of Isfahan in scholastic theology. Mulla Sadra, the greatest figure in this flowering, is credited with reviving the rational sciences:

by coordinating philosophy as inherited from the Greeks and interpreted by the Peripatetics and Illuminationists before him with the teachings of Islam in its exoteric and esoteric aspects he succeeded in putting the gnostic doctrines of Ibn `Arabi in logical dress. He made purification of the soul a necessary basis and complement of the study of Hikmat, thereby bestowing on philosophy the practice of ritual and spiritual virtues which it had lost in the period of decadence of classical civilization. Finally, he succeeded in correlating the wisdom of the ancient Greek and Muslim sages and philosophers as interpreted esoterically with the inner meaning of the Qur'an.(11)

Mulla Sadra is the pole, so we are told, around which much of Iranian intellectual life has revolved since.(12)

Many Iranians travelled to India in the sixteenth and

seventeenth centuries; for Iranian soldiers and poets, painters and architects, no less than Iranian scholars, the courts of northern and central India were like the treasure galleons of the Spanish Main for contemporary English seadogs. Many travelled to the courts of the Deccan, contributing in the case of Bijapur and Golconda to their growing Shia quality.(13) Among notable visitors to the former was Mir Fazl Allah Shirazi, the polymath, and to the latter, Ibn-i Khakun, who was the nephew of Baha al-Din `Amili, and Mir Muhammad Mu`min Astarabadi, who achieved the rare feat of returning to Iran a rich man.(14) In his list of scholars, whom he actually knew in person, that very sardonic commentator on Akbar's reign, al-Badauni, lists a good number from Iran.(15) Moving forward into the seventeenth century the stream of scholars does not seem to slacken. The stream embraces men from the unfortunate Nazr Allah Shustari, who wrote so poignantly of the horrors of being stuck in India to his friend Baha al-Din `Amili and was eventually flogged to death in 1610(16), to more successful scholar-adventurers such as Mir Findiriski of Isfahan, who travelled widely in India, investigated Hinduism and succeeded in dying in his bed in Isfahan in 1640. It also includes Danishmand Khan of Yazd, whose interests stretched not just to Hinduism but also to contemporary western philosophy, and who died covered with honours as governor of Shahjahanabad in 1670.(17)

The most striking impact of this stream of Safavid scholars lay in the impressive development of the rational sciences they stimulated in India. Before their arrival the status of the rational sciences was low. Traditionally the transmitted

subjects dominated the curriculum and only relatively recently at the beginning of the sixteenth century had the rational subjects begun to receive attention. This situation was transformed by the arrival of Fazl Allah Shirazi at Akbar's court in May 1583 after the death of Sultan Adil Khan released him from Bijapur. This remarkable man, according to Badauni, was:

the most learned man of the learned men of his time. He was for a long time the spiritual guide of the rulers and nobles of Fars. He was thoroughly versed in all those sciences which demand the exercise of the reasoning faculty, such as philosophy, astronomy, geometry, astrology, geomancy, arithmetic, the preparation of talismans, incantations... He was equally learned in Arabic, traditions, interpretation of the Quran and rhetoric... (18)

We should also note that he was something of a Leonardo da Vinci when it came to mechanical inventions. Ironically, moreover, for someone who was to have such a profound impact on the content of the Indian madrasa curriculum he was, if the malicious Badauni is to be believed, a rotten teacher: he `seemed to be unable, as soon as he began to teach, to address his pupils otherwise than with abuse, insinuation, and sarcasm (God save us from the like!)'. (19)

Fazl Allah Shirazi, according to the eighteenth century historian Ghulam `Ali Azad Bilgrami, inspired interest in the works of the great Iranian scholars of the rational subjects, Jalal al-Din Dawwani, Ghiyas al-Din Mansur Shirazi and Mirza Jan Shirazi, which led to the subsequent study of the contemporary scholars, Mir Baqr Damad and his brilliant pupil and son-in-law Mulla Sadra. Through his own teaching, rotten though it may have been, Fazl Allah Shirazi encouraged the widespread study of the rational subjects and their incorporation into the curriculum. (20) As the seventeenth century progressed, his work

was sustained and developed. Among those involved were: Mulla Mahmud Jawnpuri (d.1652), who was the foremost philosopher of Shah Jahan's time, a debater of issues in Shiraz with Mir Baqr Damad himself, and the author of a much valued commentary, Shams al-Bazigha; `Abd al-Hakim Sialkoti (d.1656), who wrote notable commentaries on Jurjani, Taftazani and Dawwani; Mirza Muhammad Harawi (d.1699-1700), who compiled three of the most highly regarded commentaries on logic and scholastic theology, and the brilliant Danishmand Khan. Particularly important, however, was the transmission of the actual traditions of rationalist scholarship. Here the key seventeenth-century connections stem from Fazl Allah Shirazi's pupil, Mulla `Abd al-Salam Lahori (d.1627-28). From him a direct line of transmission runs through `Abd al-Salam of Dewa (d.1629-30), chief mufti of the Mughal army, and then through Shaikh Daniyal of Chaurasa to Mulla Qutb al-Din of Sihali whose son, Mulla Nizam al-Din of Firangi Mahal, was to formalise the position of the rational subjects in his Dars-i Nizamiyya. Thus, seeds sown by travelling scholars in the fertile soil of India had in not much more than a century led to the development of a madrasa curriculum which achieved a new balance of transmitted and intellectual subjects and had much in common with that taught in Safavid Iran.

The travels of scholars between Iran and India and the support they gave to this shared world of scholarship in the rational subjects did not come to an end with the break up of the Safavid and Mughal empires in the eighteenth century. In fact the collapse of the Safavid empire in the 1720s, with the accompanying sack of Isfahan and the dispersal of scholars to the

qasbahs of Iran and the shrine cities of Iraq brought new numbers seeking their fortune in India. Equally, the break-up of the primarily Sunni edifice of the Mughal empire created the circumstances in which Shia successor states could emerge, and the spreading of Shia traditions and ceremonies could take place widely throughout India. In consequence the flow of Iranian, and now Iraqi, scholars to the subcontinent no longer fed a broad synthesis of Mughal scholarship but worked increasingly to strengthen a specifically Shia strand. A Shia network of scholarly and often familial connections spread from Karbala and al-Najaf through the qasbas of Iran to the new courts of Murshidabad, Azimabad and Lucknow. Juan Cole has shown how the tentacles of the great Majlisi family of Isfahan reached through much of the region.(21) But in the same way we could talk of the travels and the impact of Shaikh `Ali `Hazin' of Isfahan who died in Banaras (c.1766), or those of Sayyid Muhammad of Yazd who died in Murshidabad (c.1781), or those of Ahmad al-Bihbahani of Kirmanshah who died at Azimabad (1819).(22)

The travelling along these networks was not just of Iranians and Iraqis to India and back. In the late-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries there was an increasing flow, in particular of Shia scholars from Awadh, to the shrine cities of Iraq. Most notable of these was Sayyid Dildar `Ali Nasirabadi (1753-1820), the leading Shia scholar of Lucknow.(23) These academic connections between India and Iraq, moreover, proved highly lucrative for the scholars of the shrine cities who from the late 1780s received large sums from the rulers of Awadh. As the mujtahids of Iraq and their acolytes bathed in the wealth of

India, so the scholars of India reflected the movements both of mind and of spirit in the Shia heartland, for instance, the victory of Usulism over the Akhbaris and the beliefs of the Shaikhis. They reflected too, moreover, the authority of the mujtahids of the shrine cities; this was always acknowledged by the mujtahids of Lucknow. (24)

We have emphasised how from the early eighteenth century Shia scholarship in India came increasingly to be for Shia consumption alone. Nevertheless, as we shall demonstrate below, the achievements of the Safavid scholars of the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries continued to be cherished and developed by sunnis in the eighteenth century, most notably by the scholars of Firangi Mahal and Khairabad. Such was the eminence of the Firangi Mahalis in the rational subjects that scholars of Lucknow's leading Shia families studied under them down to the twentieth century. Indeed, in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries Lucknow was a major intellectual centre training scholars who took pleasure in engaging with European science such as the polymath Tafazzul Husain, who translated Newton's Principia into Arabic, and the mathematician and astronomer Khwaja Farid al-Din. Furthermore, just as the Shia scholars created networks of family and scholarship, which stretched from northern India into Iraq, so the Firangi Mahalis created networks which stretched throughout northern India and reached far south to the states of Hyderabad and Arcot. Thus they helped to spread their Dars-i Nizamiyya and the especial attention to the rational subjects which it gave. (25)

Turning to consider the international community of Sunni

scholarship we see a similar world of centres of learning, of travelling scholars and of the exchange of scholarly influences within the region from India, through Southern Arabia and the Hijaz to Cairo, Damascus and to a lesser extent, or so it would seem, Istanbul.

From at least the sixteenth century the Arabian peninsula, because of its position in the Indian Ocean trade and its role as the centre of pilgrimage, was a focus of growing importance for Islamic scholarship. Outsiders, amongst them Indians, came to endow madrasas in both Mecca and Medina. Increasingly men visited the Hijaz not just for the purposes of fulfilling their duties as Muslims but for scholarly reasons as well. Badauni tells us of several scholars of his acquaintance who fall into this category, although for some, it should be admitted, political prudence was also a factor in their travels. Among such men was Shaikh `Abd al-Haqq of Delhi (1551-1642), who studied Hadiths for some years in Mecca under another Indian, Shaikh `Abd al-Wahhab.(26) Thanks to the pioneering work of John Voll we have become more and more aware of the great school of Hadiths scholarship which came to be established in Madina in the seventeenth century. Among the leading teachers in this school were: Ibrahim al-Kurani, his son, Muhammad Tahir al-Kurani, and Muhammad Hayat from Sind. A study of Muhammad Hayat's pupils reveals a spread of origin from Anatolia through the Fertile Crescent and the Hijaz to India.(27) Between them, moreover, al-Kurani and Muhammad Hayat taught many of the leading figures in the eighteenth-century process of revival and reform, for instance, Muhammad ibn `Abd al-Wahhab, `Abd al-Rauf al-Sinkili, Shah Wali Allah and Mustafa al-

Bakri. (28)

The interconnectedness and cosmopolitan nature of the Sunni world of the eighteenth century is further demonstrated by the role of scholarly families and the travels of individuals. Consider the Aydarus family, which had expanded from Southern Arabia in the sixteenth century to the point when in the eighteenth century there were important branches throughout the Indian Ocean region from the islands of Southeast Asia through India to East Africa. Members of the family moved from family outpost to family outpost in search of knowledge and employment. Thus `Abd al-Rahman ibn al-Aydarus (1723-1773) was born in Southern Arabia, studied and travelled in India for ten years, studied further in Mecca, Madina and the eastern Mediterranean lands, and finally settled in Egypt. (29) Consider, too, the Mizjaji family of Zabid in the Yemen. By the eighteenth century members of this learned and holy family had acquired formidable reputations as teachers of Hadiths and had contacts as teachers or students with many leading scholars of the time. Among their more famous pupils was the great itinerant scholar of the eighteenth century, Muhammad Murtaza al-Zabid (d.1791). Murtaza al-Zabid was an Indian, who began his career studying Hadiths in Delhi under Shah Wali Allah, continued it with further study in the Yemen under two members of the Mizjaji family, and ended it as the best-known scholar of late-eighteenth century Cairo and the man responsible, according to Peter Gran, for the development of a scientific outlook in the thought of those leading scholars of early-nineteenth century Egypt, Hasan al-Attaqr and Rifa al-Tahtawi. His arrival in Cairo in 1754 is portrayed by al-Jabarti

as one of the great moments in the intellectual life of the eighteenth century.(30)

Ideas flowed along the connections of teachers and pupils, of families and their branches, from the Arab lands of the Ottoman empire into India. `Abd al-Haqq of Delhi, after his return in 1591, revived the study of Hadiths in India making it both popular and rigorous and developing new methods of transmission. Shah Wali Allah (1702-1762) sustained this tradition in India and on his return from the Hijaz in 1732 began his work of reconciling the different schools of Sunni law and subordinating their study to the discipline of hadith studies. Indeed, it was the especial achievement of Shah Wali Allah and his family to sustain the study of hadiths in India, and the transmitted subjects more generally, at a time when the rational subjects caused most excitement and won most support. Nor was it just new preferences in scholarship which travelled along these connections. It is possible to link all the three great reform movements of early-nineteenth century India, to some degree at least, to influences from Arabia. Central to the Moplah outbreaks in nineteenth-century Malabar, for instance, were the scholars Sayyid Alawi from Southern Arabia, and his son, Sayyid Fazl; the latter finished, after a notable career in Malabar, the Hijaz and Oman, with an Ottoman stipend and many decorations.(31) Hajji Shari`at Allah (1781-1840), the leader of the Fara`izis in Bengal, began his movement after spending the greater part of his time in Mecca between 1799 and 1821. Recent research, moreover, has revealed the extent of the debt owed by Sayyid Ahmad Barelwi (1786-1831), the founder of the Mujahidin movement in northern

India, to the writings of Muhammad ibn `Abd al-Wahhab.(32)

If the main scholarly influences which came from the Arab lands of the Ottoman empire were primarily in the transmitted subjects, combined later with an impulse to revival and reform, those which flowed in the other direction were derived mainly from Indian achievements in the rational subjects, which were in large part those of Awadhi scholarship (see below). It is instructive to dip into the career of Shaikh Hasan al-Attar (c.1766-1835), who was a pupil of the Indian Muhadiths, Murtaza al-Zabidi, and Shaikh al-Azhar for the last four years of his life. In 1802 he left Egypt for Turkey and Syria with the specific aim of studying the rational sciences. He found that the majority of post-classical commentators were Indian and praised their work in comparison with that done at al-Azhar.(33) He himself wrote a commentary on Muhib Allah Bihari's (d.1707) major work on logic, Sullam al-`Ulum, and a gloss on `Abd al-Hakim Sialkoti's commentary on Qutb al-Din Razi. He referred in addition to the work of Mir Zahid Harawi and Mawlana `Abd al-`Ali Bahr al-`Ulum of Firangi Mahal.(34) After his return to Egypt in 1815 he played a major role in giving new emphasis to the study of the rational sciences. More generally it seems that both scholars in Turkey in support of the Tanzimat and those in Egypt in support of Muhammad `Ali drew on the rationalist scholarship of India when they needed to use scholastic theology as a vehicle of defence against an orthodoxy rooted in the transmitted subjects.(35)

There is one area which has not seemed to be closely linked into the international community of scholars and that is the

Ottoman heartland of Istanbul and western Anatolia. Leading Ottoman scholars do not seem to have travelled in Arab lands or further afield in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Equally Arab, Indian and other scholars (those from the Balkans excepted) do not seem particularly to have felt the need to visit the Ottoman heartland for the purpose of learning. Ottoman scholars, who up to the sixteenth century might have travelled to Egypt, Iran and Central Asia for study, now became increasingly inward-looking. Men progressed through the learned hierarchy less because of the quality of their scholarship than because of their birth and their mastery of the bureaucratic arts. They became so complacent that they became unaware of the decline in standards which had taken place. (36) From this condition there would appear to have been some recovery in the late-eighteenth century as Ottoman scholars began to rediscover the rational sciences through their encounter with the scholarship of India. Such, at any rate, is the picture given us by the secondary literature. It is not clear, however, whether this is a proper reflection of the condition and practice of scholars from the Ottoman heartland or merely a reflection of the current state of scholarship in the field.

### Mystical Knowledge

Mystical knowledge represents a second great area of shared experience between the regions of the three empires. It is treated separately from formal or madrasa knowledge, even though by the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries it is not necessarily realistic to do so. For one thing most learned men by this time

were also sufis. For another mysticism had come to penetrate the madrasa curriculum being taught, for instance, as a subject in itself, as it was in the Madrasa Rahimiyya of Shah Wali Allah's father, or being closely involved with the subject of philosophy (and theology) as it was in the Iranian traditions and in those of the Dars-i Nizamiyya. Indeed, so far were the connections of mystic and scholar intertwined that it can be difficult, as in the case of the pupil-teacher connections of scholars of Hadiths and the piri-muridi relations of the Naqshbandiyya in eighteenth-century West Asia, to disentangle the one from the other. Nevertheless, there is expository value in treating mystical knowledge separately, and so we do.

The extent to which a shared world of mystical knowledge existed between the Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal worlds is most readily appreciated in the influence, direct or mediated through other thinkers, of the Spanish sufi Ibn `Arabi (d.1240). Ibn `Arabi, known as al-shaikh al-akbar, or 'the greatest master' was the outstanding systematiser of medieval mystical thought. In his two major works, al-Futuhāt al-Makkiyya (The Meccan Revelations) and al-Fusus al-Hikam (The Bezels of Divine Wisdom), he drew major strands in the mystic thought of his time - the idea that God is the sole reality of everything and that this reality can only be truly perceived intuitively - together with strands of philosophical mysticism derived from the influence of Ibn Sina to create a theosophical system which was to spread through the Islamic world. It was, moreover, to be particularly influential in the Persian-, Turkish- and later Urdu-speaking parts of it and to be the benchmark against which all other sufi

ideas might be set, indeed, ultimately the benchmark against which Islamic orthodoxy itself might be judged.

Ibn `Arabi's philosophy of the `unity of being', as wahdat al-wujud is often translated, rested on the idea that God was the only reality and that the created world is a projection of his Divine Mind into material existence, in fact, His attributes of perfection, the perfect names, are the stuff of which the world is made. For the past seven centuries Muslims have differed over the extent to which Ibn `Arabi compromised the unity of God and taught a form of Islamic pantheism. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that many scholars felt that his ontological monism was by its very nature a threat to the shari`a; if `All is He', how was the believer to distinguish between one manifestation of God's grace and another, between an Islamic manifestation and one which was profoundly Hindu. There is no doubt, too, that ontological monism created for Islam a very capacious net into which, as it expanded rapidly throughout the world from the thirteenth century, it could scoop a myriad indigenous religious traditions.

Ibn `Arabi's ideas were disseminated by sufi masters in the guidance they gave their followers in their malfuzat, in their maktubat, and in the other forms of witness to their ways of knowing God. They were disseminated, too, by the great achievements of the gnostic philosophers, in particular those of the School of Isfahan, which found such a prominent place in the Safavid madrasa curriculum and in the Dars-i Nizamiyya. But the most potent source of dissemination was poetry, both in the court languages of the region, Persian and later Turkish and Urdu, and in the regional languages, for instance, Sindhi, Punjabi and

Bengali. Many of the great poets of the region transmitted Ibn `Arabi's vision, for instance, Fakhr al-Din Iraqi (d.1289) and Mulla Jami (d.1492), but so too did `popular poets', for instance, those tied to the Bektashi sufi order. In a society in which the art of beautiful words was amongst the most highly prized poetry was always going to be a remarkably effective medium, and not least for its development of images of earthly love to illustrate the spiritual passion of the seeker after God.

Parasexual imagery broadcast Ibn `Arabi's good news about man's relationship to God just as today it might broadcast the good news about man's relationship to the material world.

In the Ottoman empire, and especially in Anatolia, the influence of Ibn `Arabi was great and matched only by that of Jalal al-din Rumi. Early in the thirteenth century Ibn `Arabi had been invited to Konya by the Seljuk Sultan, Kay Kaus, and there his devoted disciple, Sadr al-Din (d.1273), played a major part in establishing his ideas as a substantial influence in Turkish thought. Although there was always opposition from some scholars, Ibn `Arabi was an important influence on the main body of scholars from Mulla Mehmed Fanari, the founder of the Ottoman madrasa tradition, through the Shaikh al-Islam, Kemalpashazade (d.1498), who issued a fatwa approving all his works, to translators of his work into Turkish and commentators on it such as Bali of Sofia (d.1533) and `Abd Allah of Bosnia (d.1660).(37)

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries he remained influential - in the early-nineteenth century, for instance, Hasan al-Attar, the rector of Al-Azhar to be, travelled to Damascus to study Ibn Arabi under Shaikh `Umar al-Yafi (38) -

although he was beginning to become the target of reformers. In the twentieth century we are told his ideas were still widespread in Anatolia. Sayyid Nursi, the sufi reformer who was opposed to Ibn al-`Arabi's vision, still wrote in his idiom and the majority of the questions put to him by his disciples in the Isparta-Afyon region between 1925 and 1950 involved problems relating to wahdat al-wujud. (39)

In the Safavid empire the influence of Ibn `Arabi was also present. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries his ideas had spread rapidly through Iran as a result of the writings of his pupil Sadr al-Din of Konya. Henceforward his impress lay strongly on nearly all aspects of the region's sufism, being found as much in the teachings of the great mystical orders such as the Nurbakshiyya and the Ni`matallahiyya, as it was in the mystical poetry of Fakhr al-Din Iraqi or Mulla Jami, who also wrote influential commentaries and treatises on the shaikh's work.

If the consolidation of the Shia Safavid empire led eventually to the suppression of sufism, as it came to be seen as a potential threat to royal authority and as scholars came to object to its popularisation, it did not lead to the suppression of Ibn `Arabi's ideas. Indeed, these came increasingly to be bound up in the development of that distinctive Iranian theosophical tradition, born of the interaction of philosophy, theology and mysticism, which through the efforts of the School of Isfahan came to be embedded in the Safavid madrasa course. Its legacy was maintained by the transmitters of the theosophical tradition, such as Mulla Muhsin Kashani (d.1680-81), Mirza Muhammad Sadiq Ardistani (d.1721-22) and his pupil Mirza Muhammad

Taqi Almasi, and then came to be revived in the nineteenth century by Mulla `Ali Nuri and his leading student, Mulla Hadi Sabzivari. More specific studies of Ibn `Arabi were not neglected either, leading scholars being Qazi Sa`id Qumi (d.1691) 'the Ibn `Arabi of Shiism' and Mir Sayyid Hasan Taliqani of Isfahan. (40)

The impact of Ibn `Arabi was probably greater in the Mughal empire than in its Safavid neighbour. By the late-fifteenth century Ibn `Arabi's ideas had become influential everywhere in the subcontinent and the first of what were to be myriads of books on the Fusus had been written. (41) As in the case of Iran, the poetry of Iraqi and Jami was particularly influential in spreading his influence. But so too, even though many sufis were concerned to make a sharp distinction between Islam and Hinduism, were the possibilities that wahdat al-wujud offered for enriching contact between Muslim and Hindu mystical traditions. These were possibilities which were vigorously explored by sufis at the local level. (42) They were also explored at the imperial level as Akbar and Dara Shikoh experimented with religious ideas which appeared to build bridges between Islam and indigenous religious beliefs. The latter, under the influence in part at least of Shah Muhib Allah Allahabadi (1587-1648) whose writings won him the sobriquet the 'Ibn `Arabi of India', felt the 'unity of Being' to be all-pervasive and so transformed the Bismillah thus: 'In the name of Him who has no name, Who lifts His head at every name you call...' (43) He translated fifty Hindu Upanishads into Persian and searched for a common denominator between Islam and Hinduism. One senses that a real religious distaste, as well as

raison d`etat, led his victorious younger brother, Awrangzeb, to have him executed in 1659.

The influence of Ibn `Arabi did not wane with Dara Shikoh's bloody end. Arguably his sufi vision remained the main underpinning of popular sufism down to the twentieth century, although admittedly from the early-nineteenth century it did come under increasingly heavy fire from movements of revival and reform. As for the sufism of the elite, there was support amongst some for wahdat al-wujud throughout the eighteenth century, but not amongst all. Nevertheless, the leading representatives of the major scholarly traditions of the era, Shah Wali Allah of Delhi and Mawlana `Abd al-`Ali Bahr al-`Ulum of Firangi Mahal (d.1810) were both followers of the Shaikh. And, if the former's support was qualified, the latter put his complete trust in the Fusus and the Futuh, writing his masterwork, an interpretation of Rumi's Mathnawi, in the light of their vision. Nineteenth-century reformism and the adoption of western secular thought greatly reduced the influence of Ibn `Arabi amongst the intelligentsia. However, he remained a major inspiration to two leading sufis of the first half of the twentieth century, `Abd al-Bari of Firangi Mahal (d.1926) and Ashraf `Ali of Thana Bhawan (d.1943).

The reaction against Ibn `Arabi's theory of the `Unity of Being' was almost as pervasive, almost as much an illustration of the sharing of knowledge and of understanding amongst the peoples of the three empires, as the spread of the ideas of the great master in the first place. There had always been a current of opposition to Ibn `Arabi, in particular amongst students of

Hadiths and followers of the Hanbali scholar Ahmad ibn Taimiyya.

From the seventeenth century, however, this opposition began to acquire greater significance as its primarily religious basis came to have resonances with aspects of political policy and social structure. As scholars sought to reconstruct Islam and Islamic society in the face of the loss of political power, or in the face of compromises with non-Islamic belief and practice, they began to re-interpret Ibn `Arabi's ideas in a less extreme fashion, indeed, some began to reject him altogether. Thus, the Naqshbandi sufi, Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi (d.1624), reacted with alarm at the religious compromises the Mughals were prepared to make with their Indian environment. Against Ibn Arabi's `Unity of Being' he posed a `Unity of Witness' (wahdat al-shuhud). The mystic who experienced the `Unity of Being', he argued, was undergoing a purely subjective state. Objective understanding revealed not that `All is He' but that `All is from Him'. Reality was not to be found wholly in God but also in His world. The sufi, therefore, had to take action in this world in order to bring it into harmony with the Divine order, and God had sent his guidance for this task through the Prophet Muhammad.

The major manifestation of this new spirit, and its symbol for much of the rest of mankind, Islamic and non-Islamic alike, was the Wahhabi movement of mid-eighteenth century Arabia. In India the germ of activism was kept alive by Naqshbandi sufis such as Shah Wali Allah (d.1762), Mirza Jan-i Janan (d.1781) and Khwaja Mir Dard (d.1785). In Shia Iran it was manifest in the upperhand which the Akhbari school of scholars, who held that the Quran and the Traditions from the Prophet and the Imams were

sufficient guidance for the community, had for much of the eighteenth century over the Usulis who fostered the study of theosophy and intellectual traditions derived in part from Ibn `Arabi. In northern Iraq in the late-eighteenth century this activism is found in the leadership of the Naqshbandi sufi, Mawlana Khalid Baghdadi, whose influence was felt later in eastern Turkey, the Caucasus and Central Asia. By the nineteenth century a reform movement in which, the Arabian Wahhabis apart, attitudes to Ibn `Arabi were often seen as the measure of support for an Islamic sufism or not was widespread throughout the region from Anatolia to Bengal. Indeed, it had spread to much of the Islamic world beyond.

#### The International World of Mysticism

Just as the connections of pupil and teacher were the ties which linked together the intentional community of scholars, so those of disciple and master, and of all disciples and masters to the shrines of the saints of their orders, in particular to the founding saints of their orders, were the links which held together the world of the mystics. Along these links new ideas travelled, new orientations came to be established. Some sufi orders offered links purely at a regional level, for instance the Bektashiyya and the Mawlawiyya of the Ottoman empire, the former, according to Evliya Chelebi in the mid-seventeenth century had 700 hospices and much popular support from eastern Anatolia through to the Balkans, while the latter had fourteen large hospices in the big cities and seventy-six in the towns, all of which were controlled from the central hospice in the shrine

complex of the founder Jalal al-Din Rumi in Konya.(44) In India the Chishtis, both in the Nizami and Sabiri branches, were the equivalent order. We do not, unfortunately, have contemporary estimates of the numbers of their shrines and hospices. Nevertheless, they were spread throughout the subcontinent and, of course, the annual celebrations of the `Urs of a saint at any shrine celebrated the linkages of his order through time and space. In Iran after the suppression of the sufi orders, arguably mystical links, outside the focus on the Imams themselves, became those of teacher and pupil in the schools of theosophy. In the late eighteenth century, however, the orders revived, the Ni`matallahiyya, for instance, returning under the leadership of `Ali Raza, having been kept alive in the Indian Deccan.

As there were orders primarily confined to one region, so there were orders with a supra-regional reach. We think of the Khalwatiyya, which stretched from eastern Turkey through the Fertile Crescent to Cairo, where, through the leadership of Mustafa al-Bakri in the mid-eighteenth century, it was to play a major role in the reorientation of African sufism towards social activism. We think of the Qadiriyya, whose followers were established from eastern Turkey through Iraq to much of India, but were also to be found worldwide. But most of all we think of the Naqshbandiyya, the leaders of the new this-worldly sufism throughout Asia from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and as scholarship is coming to reveal the outstanding example of the linkages through space and time provided by islamic systems for the transmission of knowledge. (45)

The flow of new sufi ideas along the connections of the

Naqshbandiyya has been well-charted. In India the new direction in sufi understanding given to the order by Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi travelled down through his disciples, inspired great spiritual figures of the eighteenth century such as Shah Wali Allah, Mirza Jan-i Janan, Sana Allah Panipati and Khwaja Mir Dard, and in the early-nineteenth century was broadcast from the influential sufi hospice of Shah Ghulam `Ali Naqshband in Delhi - the Shah was in direct line of sufi descent from Sirhindi. (46) Over the same period Sirhindi's chain of succession and his influence was spread into West Asia. One important line was spread through Mecca, the Yemen and then to Egypt by Taj al-Din ibn Zakariyya (d.1640) and his disciples. A second even more important line was extended by Murad al-Bukhari (1640-1720), a follower of one of Sirhindi's sons, whose family became part of the elite of Damascus and was closely involved with that pivotal sufi figure, `Abd al-Ghani al-Nabalusi (1641-1731). In several articles John Voll has set out evidence for the intermingling of Naqshbandi affiliation, Hadiths scholarship and revivalism, noting, while at the same time exercising caution in drawing conclusions, the key role of such figures as Ibrahim al-Kurani, Muhammad Hayya al-Sindhi and Shah Wali Allah. (47)

The interaction between India and the Ottoman lands received a second great impulse in the early-nineteenth century. Mawlana Khalid Baghdadi (d.1826) was the source of this new drive. He was inspired during a visit he made to India in 1809 by the teaching of Shah `Abd al-Aziz of Delhi (d.1824), the son of Shah Wali Allah, and was subsequently initiated into Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi's branch of the Naqshbandiyya (the Mujaddidiyya) by Shah

Ghulam `Ali. On his return to Iraq in 1811 he initiated through his teaching the most recent phase of the Naqshbandiyya, the Khalidiyya, which is marked by aims of Islamic revitalisation, strategies of popular mobilisation and a concern to fight against Western imperialism and processes of imitative Westernisation. (48) His influence was felt from Algeria to Indonesia. It was also felt specifically and intensely in Damascus, Baghdad, Istanbul, Kurdistan and eastern Anatolia. Sherif Mardin tells us how in the mid-nineteenth century Naqshbandiyya-Khalidiyya hospices were spreading in eastern Anatolia and the other was becoming identified with the struggle of the people against the Ottoman bureaucracy. (49) This was the context in which the Turkish sufi Bediuzzaman Said Nursi (1876-1960), who was brought up in the region, came to be influenced by the example of Mawlana Khalid both in developing his form of Islamic scripturalism and in his defence of Muslims against the inroads of secularisation and westernisation. In making his case the sufi works from which he quoted most frequently were the letters of the seventeenth-century Indian, Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi. (50)

#### Concluding Remarks

A world of much shared knowledge has been revealed in the Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal empires. This shared knowledge, moreover, was constantly renewed in most, although not all, of the region by the travels of scholars and mystics and the connections of teachers and pupils, masters and disciples. It was thus, for instance, that Iranian skills in the rational sciences were carried to the fertile ground of India; it was

thus, too, that Indian achievements in the rational sciences and in mysticism were carried to West Asia.

There is evidence that at different times societies tended to emphasise different elements within this framework of shared knowledge. These emphases for the period from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries require closer inspection. In the Ottoman world, for instance, from the seventeenth century there is an emphasis on the transmitted as against the rational sciences, and from the eighteenth century a reorientation amongst some sufis towards activism. In the early nineteenth century, however, as the Ottomans and Egyptians faced the West, there was for a couple of decades at least a revival of the study of the rational sciences. In the Safavid region during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there was the rise of the Akhbaris with their emphasis on the transmitted sciences, which came side by side with the suppression of sufism and a decline in the pursuit of scholastic theology. These subjects seem only to make a serious recovery with the establishment of the Qajar state in the nineteenth century. In the Mughal region, although there was from the early seventeenth century the beginning of the reorientation of sufism, and there was also a new impulse to the study of the Traditions, the major development was in the rational sciences, in which scholars from Awadh were to be notably productive.<sup>(51)</sup> Moreover, this was scholarship of quality and influence which produced works which were both attract attention in Damascus and Cairo in the nineteenth century and to remain in the madrasa curriculum in the subcontinent into the twentieth century. In the Mughal region, as was not the case in

the Ottoman and Safavid regions, the rational sciences and the sufism of Ibn `Arabi were not seriously attacked by supporters of socio-moral reconstruction until the nineteenth century.

These summaries of the different emphases given to different aspects of knowledge in the region of the three empires at different times suggest that there may be connections to be made between these different emphases and changing political contexts.

In a wantonly schematic and broad-brush fashion we suggest that the rational sciences, along with Ibn `Arabi's other-worldly sufism, tended to flourish when Muslims were confidently in power: during the growth and consolidation of the Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal empires, during the remaking of state power under the Ottoman Tanzimat and in Muhammad Ali's Egypt, during the remaking of state power during the Qajar period in Iran, and during the further development of the Mughal system under the Mughal successor states in the eighteenth century - South Asian historians no longer suggest that the breakup of the Mughal empire necessarily meant a decline of a self-confident Mughal world. On the other hand, the transmitted sciences, along with Sirhindi's this-worldly sufism, tended to flourish when Muslims felt that Muslim state power, either because of compromises with non-Muslim forces within or because of compromises with non-Muslim forces from without, was threatened or destroyed as the upholder of Islamic society: in the Mughal empire under Akbar, for instance, in the north west of India from the mid-eighteenth century, in late-seventeenth and eighteenth century Iran, and through much of West Asia and India from the beginning of the nineteenth century.

This said, it should not be thought that such a simple correlation is proposed without substantial qualification. The decline of Ottoman interest in the rational sciences, for example, was hardly the consequence of a felt decline of Ottoman power. It was more a consequence of the decline of madrasa scholarship itself, as learning became less central to the making of a successful career, as the bureaucracy began to petrify into a highly conservative 'establishment', and as intellectual life migrated to the salons. Again it is evidence that great scholarly traditions might have a life of their own regardless of the political context. Thus, Hadiths scholarship seems to have held the upper hand in Egypt throughout the Ottoman period. In much the same way ideas might have a life of their own regardless of the political context. Thus, the ideas of Ibn Taymiyya, the shari'a-minded Hanbali scholar, continued to be studied in West Asia by a few in the centuries of Ottoman domination. Thus, too, the ideas of Sirhindi were kept alive in India and in West Asia, although it was not until two centuries after his death that circumstances became ripe for them to win widespread support.

In addition to considering the changing emphases in knowledge in their political context, it is also worth considering them in their social context. If in the seventeenth century Sirhindi's reorientation of sufism did not gain widespread support, it was because it was the scholarly concern of an elite. But, in the late-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries his reorientation of sufism and the Islamic activism which it implied, came to have social force as it coincided with the interests of major social formations in the region, many of

which suffered from the impact of the Western presence - political and economic as well as social and psychological. There were, for instance, the lower classes of the towns of eastern Anatolia who in the mid-nineteenth century found refuge in the Naqshbandiyya-Khalidiyya sufis against the closed world of Ottoman officialdom. There were also the qasba gentry of northern India, who found themselves in the nineteenth century increasingly excluded from the benefits of the commercialisation of the economy and the benefits of service under the colonial state, and sought refuge in many different trajectories of Islamic reform. There were, too, the scholarly and bazaari classes of Iran, which in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries increasingly found themselves marginalised by the influx of Western capital and by the inroads of Western culture into the state. They came eventually to embrace an Islamic activism, which had explosive power when yoked to the concerns of the newly urbanised masses from the countryside.

From the early nineteenth century the encroachment of the West - the infiltration of the state by Western knowledge, the infiltration of the economy by Western capital, the infiltration of society by Western Christians, and so on - brought about a shift in Islamic systems of knowledge which was much more substantial than the changes of emphasis they had known before. The pursuit of the rational sciences was in large part abandoned in favour of the transmitted sciences; support for other-worldly sufism was in large part abandoned in favour of a this-worldly sufism of action, indeed, increasingly support for sufism itself was being abandoned altogether. The broad-based knowledge, which

shaped Islamic attitudes in times of power, and which contained within it the seeds of religious understandings of breadth and sophistication, came steadily to be sacrificed for a more narrowly-based knowledge which would not hinder the urgent struggle for socio-moral reconstruction.

### References

1. 'Madrassa', B. Lewis et al. eds., Encyclopaedia of Islam, 2nd ed., Vol. V, Fasc. 95-96, especially pp. 1129-31.
2. The table below indicates the numbers of books in each subject taught at the Madrasa Rahimiyya and at Firangi Mahal in the early eighteenth century.

Subject	Rahimiyya	Firangi Mahal
Grammar/Syntax (Sarf/Nahw)	2	12
Rhetoric (Balaghat)	2	2
Philosophy (Hikmat)	1	3
Logic (Mantiq)	2	11
Theology (Kalam)	3	3
Jurisprudence (Fiqh)	2	2
Principles of Jurisprudence (Usul al-Fiqh)	2	3
Traditions (Hadiths)	3	1
Exegesis (Tafsir)	2	2
Astronomy & Maths (Riyaziyyat)	Several	5
Medicine (Tibb)	1	-
Mysticism (Tasawwuf)	5	1

Source: G.M.D. Sufi, Al-Minhaj; being the evolution of curriculum in the Muslim Educational institutions of India (Delhi, 1977), pp. 68-75.

3. For analyses of the Firangi Mahal method of teaching the

- Dars-i Nizami see, Mufti Muhammad Raza Ansari, Bani-i Dars-i Nizami (Lucknow, 1973), pp. 257-65 and Altaf al-Rahman Qidwa`i, Qiyam-i Nizam-i Ta`lim (Lucknow, 1924), and for a powerful critique of the Dars written for a group of Indian `ulama in the 1890s see Shah Muhammad Husain Bil Tanzim-i Nizam al-Ta`allum wal Ta`lim (Allahabad, n.d.).
4. Cornell H. Fleischer, Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: the historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600), (Princeton, 1986), p. 260.
  5. These three new texts were: the Musallam al-thubut and the Sullam al-`Ulum by Muhib Allah Bihari and the Shams al-Bazigha by Mullah Mahmud Jawnpuri.
  6. See, for instance, the editions of Sa`d al-Din Taftazani's works in H.A.R. Gibb et al. eds., Encyclopaedia of Islam, 1st ed., Vol. III, pp. 604-07.
  7. Halil Inalcik, The Ottoman Empire: the classical age 1300-1600 (New York, 1973), p. 179.
  8. Katib Chelebi, Balance of Truth, English trans. from Turkish by G.L. Lewis (London, 1957), p. 25.
  9. We should, nevertheless, note that both medicine and mysticism had a place in the Madrasa Rahimiyya curriculum and that one of the specialised institutes established by the Ottoman Sultan Sulaiman I in the mid-sixteenth century was devoted to medicine.
  10. S.H. Nasr, 'Spiritual Movements, Philosophy and Theology in the Safavid Period' in P. Jackson & L. Lockhart eds., The Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. VI (Cambridge, 1986), p. 661
  11. S.H. Nasr, 'Sadr al-Din Shirazi (Mulla Sadra)', in M. M.

- Sharif ed., A History of Muslim Philosophy, Vol. II (Wiesbaden, 1966), p. 958.
12. Ibid., p. 959.
  13. S.A.A. Rizvi, A Socio-Intellectual History of the Isna`Ashari Shi`is in India, Vol. I (Canberra, 1986), pp. 271-72, 276, 296, 300-01.
  14. Ibid., pp. 222-27, 319-26, 303-19.
  15. Al-Badaoni, Muntakhabu-t-Tawarikh, ed. and trans. by T. Wolseley Haig, Vol. III, (Delhi, 1973), pp. 109-238.
  16. Rizvi, Socio-Intellectual History, Vol. I, p. 370.
  17. Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 220-21, 224-27; S.H. Nasri, 'The School of Ispahan' in Sharif ed., Muslim Philosophy, pp. 922-26.
  18. Al-Badaoni, Muntakhabu-t-Tawarikh, Vol. III, p. 216.
  19. Idem.
  20. Rizvi, Socio-Intellectual History, Vol. II, p. 206.
  21. J.R.I. Cole, 'Imami Shi`ism from Iran to North India, 1722-1856: state, society and clerical ideology in Awadh' (Ph.D Dissertation, Un. of California, Los Angeles, 1984), pp. 90-101.
  22. Rizvi, Socio-Intellectual History, Vol II, pp. 107-28.
  23. J.R.I. Cole, Roots of North Indian Sh`ism in Iran and Iraq: religion and state in Awadh, 1722-1859 (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1988), pp. 63, 138-39, 163, 186.
  24. Ibid., pp. 213-315.
  25. Francis Robinson, 'Problems in the History of the Farangi Mahall Family of Learned and Holy Men', in N.J. Allen et al., eds., Oxford University Papers on India, Vol. I, Part 2 (Delhi, 1987), pp. 11-16.

26. Badaoni, Muntakhabu-t-Tawarikh, pp. 167-72.
27. John Voll, 'Muhammad Hayya al-Sindi and Muhammad ibn `Abd al-Wahhab: an analysis of an intellectual group in eighteenth-century Madina', Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, XXXVIII, 1, pp. 32-39.
28. Ibid., and John Voll, Islam: continuity and change in the Modern world (Boulder Col., 1982), pp. 56-59.
29. Voll, Islam, pp. 72-73.
30. John Voll, 'Linking Groups in the Networks of Eighteenth-Century Revivalist Scholars: the Mizjaji Family in Yemen', in N. Levtzion and John O. Voll eds., Eighteenth-Century Renewal and Reform in Islam (Syracuse, 1987), pp. 69-92, and Peter Gran, Islamic Roots of Capitalism: Egypt, 1760-1840 (Austin, 1979), p. 54.
31. Stephen Dale, Islamic Society on the South Asian Frontier The Mappilas of Malabar 1498-1922 (Oxford, 1980), pp. 127-67.
32. Marc Gaborieau, 'A Nineteenth-Century Indian "Wahhabi" tract against the Cult of Muslim Saints: Al-Balagh al-Mubin' in Christian W. Troll ed., Muslim Shrines in India: their character, history and significance, Delhi, 1989), pp. 198-239.
33. Gran, Islamic Roots, p. 98.
34. Ibid., pp. 148-49, 201.
35. Ibid., pp. 132-50.
36. See H.A.R. Gibb & Harold Bowen, Islamic Society and the West: a study of the impact of Western civilization on Moslem culture in the Near East, Vol 1, 2, pp, 139-64 and

- R.Repp, 'Some observations on the development of the Ottoman Learned Hierarchy' in N.R. Keddie ed., Scholars, Saints and Sufis: Muslim religious institutions since 1500, (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1972), pp. 17-32
37. Inalcik, Ottoman Empire, pp. 199-202.
38. Gran, Islamic Roots, pp. 96, 98, 108.
39. Serif Mardin, Religion and Social Change in Modern Turkey: the case of Bediuzzamn Said Nursi (Albany, 1989), pp. 16, 208.
40. S.H. Nasr in Jackson, ed., Cambridge History of Iran, Vol. VI, pp. 656-97.
41. Annemarie Schimmel, Mystical Dimensions of Islam (Chapel Hill, 1975), p. 357.
42. See Asim Roy, The Islamic Syncretistic Tradition in Bengal (Princeton, 1983), pp. 141-206.
43. Annemarie Schimmel, Islam in the Indian Subcontinent (Leiden, 1980), p. 99.
44. Inalcik, Ottoman Empire, p. 201.
45. H. Algar, 'The Naqshbandi order: a preliminary survey of its history and significance', Studia Islamica, XLIV, 1976, pp. 123-52. See, too, M. Gaborieau, A. Popovic and Thierry Zarcone, Naqshbandis: Historica Developments and Present Situation of a Muslim Mystical Order, (Istanbul, 1990).
46. For the significance of the shrine of Shah Ghulam Ali see, Warren E. Fusfeld, 'the Shaping of Sufi Leadership in Delhi: the Naqshbandiyya Mujaddidiyya, 1750-1920' (Ph.D dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1981).
47. See Voll, 'Muhammad Hayya al-Sindi', 'Linking Groups' and

Islam, supra.

48. Albert Hourani, 'Sufism and Modern Islam, Mawlana Khalid and the Naqshbandi Order', in Albert Hourani, The Emergence of the Modern Middle East (London, 1981), pp. 75-78; Mardin, Religion and Social Change, pp. 57, 59ff.
49. Mardin, Religion and Social Change, p. 59.
50. H. Algar, 'Said Nursi and Risala-i Nur: an aspect of Islam in contemporary Turkey', in Khurshid Ahmad & Zafar Ishaq Ansari, eds., Islamic Perspectives: studies in honour of Mawlana Sayyid Abul A`la Mawdudi, (Jeddah, 1980), p. 329.
51. F. Robinson, 'Scholarship and Mysticism in early Eighteenth-Century Awadh' in A.L. Dallapiccola and Stephanie Zingel-Ave Lallemand eds., Islam and Indian Regions (Franz Steiner, Stuttgart, 1993), Vol. I, pp. 377-98.

#### Appendix I: The Ottoman Curriculum

This is based on a list of books and comments in Mustafa Bilge, Ilk Osmanli Medreseleri, Instabul Universitesi Edebiyat Fakultesi Yayinlari No. 3101 (Edebiyat Fakultesi Basimevi: Istanbul, 1984), pp. 40-63. I am very grateful to Cemal Kafadar for drawing the

work to my attention and to Tayhan Atay for help with translation.

The Transmitted Sciences: `Ulum-i Naqliyya

Grammar & Syntax: Sarf wa Nahw

<u>Asas al-Tasrif</u>	Mulla Fanari (d. 1430)
<u>Shafiyya</u>	Ibn Hajib (d.1248)
<u>Tasrif-i Zanjani</u>	`Izz al-Din Zanjani (d. 1257), text known as <u>al-`Izzi</u>
<u>Maqsud</u>	Imam Abu Hanifa, gloss by Shaikh Badr al-Din (d.1240)
<u>Marah al-Arwah</u>	Ahmad ibn `Ali ibn Mas`ud.
<u>Alfiyya</u>	Ibn Malik, (d. 136-61). Many glosses.
<u>`Awamil</u>	`Abd al-Qahir Jurjani (d.1078)
<u>Kafiyya</u>	Ibn Hajib (d.1248)
<u>Shuzur al-Zahab</u>	Ibn Hisham (d.1360)
<u>Qatr al-Nada wa Bal al-Sada</u>	Ibn Hisham (d.1360)
<u>Mughni al-Labib</u>	Ibn Hisham (d.1360)
<u>al-I`rab `an Qawa`id al-I`rab</u>	Ibn Hisham (d.1360)
<u>al-Misbah</u>	Nasir ibn Matrizi (d. 1212-13)

Rhetoric: Balaghat

<u>Miftah al-`Ulum</u>	al-Sakkaki (d.1228). Comentaries by Qutb al-Din Shirazi (d.1311), Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389) and Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413).
<u>Talkhis-i Miftah</u>	Jalal al-Din Qazwini (d.1338), a summary of Al-Sakkaki. Commentaries by Akmal al-Din (d.1384), Zawzani (d.1389) Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389) - his <u>Mutawal</u> and his <u>Mukhtasar</u> .

Jurisprudence: Fiqh

<u>Hidaya</u>	Burhan al-Din Marghinani (d. 1196) Glosses by many Ottoman scholars.
<u>Wiqaya</u>	Taj al-Shari`a Mahmud. Glosses by many Ottoman scholars.
<u>Mukhtasar al-Ouduri</u>	Ahmad ibn Muhammad Quduri of Baghdad (d.1036-37). Glosses by many Ottoman scholars.
<u>Fara`iz al-Sajavand</u>	Siraj al-Din Muhammad Sajavand. Commentaries by the pupils of Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389) and many Ottoman scholars.

Principles of Jurisprudence: Usul al-Fiqh

<u>Talwih</u>	Gloss by Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389) on the <u>Tankih</u> by `Ubaid Allah ibn Mas`ud (d.1346-47). Notes by Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani
---------------	---

(d.1413).  
Manar al-Anwar `Abd Allah Nasafi (d.1310).  
 Commentaries by Ottoman scholars.  
Mughni Jalal al-Din `Umar Habbazi (d.1272).  
 Many glosses by Ottoman scholars.  
Muntahar al-Sul Ibn Hahjib (d.1248). Commentaries by  
 Nasir al-Din Baizawi (d.1280), Qutb  
 al-Din Shirazi (d.1310), Azud al-Din  
 Iji (d.1355) and Mir Sayyid Sharif  
 Jurjani (d.1413).

#### Traditions: Hadiths

The six basic collections:

Bukhari  
Muslim  
Tirmizi  
Ibn Maja  
Abu Dawood  
Kabir

Madarik al-Anwar Imam Saghani (d.1252). Anthology of  
 2246 traditions.  
Masabih al-Sunna Mulla Husain al-Baghawi (d.1122).  
 Anthology of 4719 traditions.

#### Exegesis: Tafsir

Kashshaf Mulla Zamakshari (d.1143).  
 Commentary by Mir Sayyid Sharif  
 Jurjani (d.1413). Glosses by many  
 Ottoman scholars.  
Tafsir Anwar al-Tanzil Baizawi (d. 1480-81).

NB Bilge's list also includes three titles on Dogmatics: Aqaid.  
 They are by al-Iji (d.1355) with the main commentary by Mir  
 Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413), al-Nasafi (d.1142) with many  
 comentaries including one by Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389), and  
 one by Mulla Ahmad al-Hanafi with many commentaries including one  
 by Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413).

#### The Rational Sciences: `Ulum-i `Aqliyya

##### Logic: Mantiq

Isaghoji Adaptation of Isagoge Porphyry (234-  
 305) by Nasir al-Din al-Abhari  
 (d.1264). Many commentaries.  
Shamsiyya Najm al-Din `Umar ibn `Ali Qazwini  
 (d.1293). Commentaries by Qutb al-  
 Din Muhammad Tahtawi (d.1364) and  
 Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389).  
 Notes by Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani  
 (d.1413). Many Ottoman commentaries  
 in the fifteenth century.

- al-Ghurra fi`l Mantiq Sharif Nur al-Din Muhammad (d.1434) the son of Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413).
- Sharh-i Matali al-Anwar Siraj al-Din Urmawi (d.283). Commentary by Qutb al-Din Razi (d.1364). That by Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (1413) widely used in Ottoman madrasas.
- Philosophy and Theology: Hikmat wa Kalam
- Tajrid Nasir al-Din Tusi (d.1274). Most important commmentary the Tasdid al Qawa`id of Shams al-Din Isfahani (d.1348) along with that of Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413).
- Tawali al-Anwar `Abd Allah ibn `Umar Baizawi (d.1286). Most important commentary by Shams al-Din Mahmud Isfahani (d.1345). Gloss Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413).
- Sharh-i Mawaqif The gloss by Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413) on Azud al-Din al-Iji's (d.1355) Mawaqif. Many Ottoman scholars wrote glosses, Mulla Fanari's (d.1430) being the most popular.

NB There are no headings for mathematics, sufism or medicine.

#### Appendix II: The Safavid Curriculum

This is based on a list of books taught in the madrasas made by Mirza Tahir Tunikabuni in the 1930s. It was first published by I. Afshar in Farhange-e Iranzamin, Vol. 2), 1353/1975, pp. 39-82. Subsequently it has formed the basis of S.H. Nasr's `The

Traditional texts Used in the Persian Madrasahs' in S.H. Nasr, Traditional Islam in the Modern World (London, 1987), pp. 165-82.

Works in Tunikabuni's list which were written after 1700 have been excluded.

The Transmitted Sciences: `Ulum-i Naqliyya

Grammar & Syntax: Sarf wa Nahw

<u>Sarf-i Mir</u>	Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413)
<u>Tasrif-i Zanjani</u>	`Izz al-Din Zangani, Cd.1257), commentary of Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389) used.
<u>Shafiyya</u>	Ibn Hajib (d.1248)
<u>Marah al-Arwah</u>	Ahmad ibn `Ali in Mas`ud
<u>`Awamil</u>	`Abd al-Qahir Jurjani, (d.1078)
<u>`Awamil</u>	Mulla Muhsin Muhammad ibn Tahir Qazwini (C17).
<u>Samadiyya</u>	Baha al-Din `Amili (d.1621)
<u>Unmudhaj</u>	Jar Allah Abul Qasim al-Zamakshari (d.1142)
<u>Kafiyya</u>	Ibn Hajib (d.1248), commentary of Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413) used.
<u>Alfiyya</u>	Ibn Malik (d.1360-61), commentary of Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti (d.1505) used.
<u>Mughni al-Labib</u>	Ibn Hisham (d.1360).

Rhetoric: Balaqhat

<u>Talkhis-i Miftah</u>	Jalal al-Din Qazwini's C14 summary of the <u>Miftah al`Ulum</u> of Al-Sakkaki (d.1228). This is usually studied with the commentaries of Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389) <u>Mutawwal</u> and <u>Mukhtasar</u> .
-------------------------	---

Jurisprudence: Fiqh

<u>Kitab al-Kafi</u>	Muhammad ibn al-Kulaini, C10. Studied with commentaries by Mir Baqr Damad (d.1631), Mulla Sadra (d.1641), Rafi al-Din Tabataba`i C17 and Muhammad Baqr Majlisi (d.1699)
<u>Man la Yahduruhul-Faqih</u>	Ibn Babuhyah (d.991). Commentaries by Muhammad Taqi Majlisi (d.1659).
<u>Tahzib</u>	Muhammad al-Tusi (d.1067)
<u>Istibsar</u>	Muhammad al-Tusi (d.1067)
<u>Nihayah</u>	Muhammad al-Tusi (d.1067)
<u>Mabsut</u>	Muhammad al-Tusi (d.1067)
<u>Wasa`il al-Shi`ah ila ahkah al-shari`a</u>	Shaikh Hurr-i `Amili, C17.
<u>Kitab al-Wafi</u>	Mulla Muhsin Kashani (d. 1680/81)
<u>Bihar al-Anwar</u>	Muhammad Baqr Majlisi (d.1699)
<u>Shara`i al-Islam</u>	Muhaqqiq-i Hilli (d. 1277)
<u>Masalik al-Afham ila Fahm Shar`i al-Islam</u>	Shahid-i Thani,

	(d.1558)
<u>Madarik al-Ahkam</u>	Shams al-Din Muhammad `Amili, C16.
<u>Irshad al-Azhan fi Ahkam al-Iman</u>	Allama al-Hilli (d.1325)
<u>Qawa'id al-Ahkam</u>	Several well-known commentaries. Muhaqqiq-i Hilli (d.1277). Many well-known commentaries.
<u>Lum'a-i Dimashqiyya</u>	Shahid Awwal (d.1384). Commentary by Shahid-i Thani (d. 1558)

#### Principles of Jurisprudence: Usul al-Fiqh

<u>Zari`a</u>	Sayyid Murtaza, C11.
<u>`Iddat al-Usul</u>	Muhammad al-Tusi (d.1067)
<u>Minhaj al-Wusul ila `Ilm al-Usul</u>	Muhaqqiq-i Hilli (d.1277)
<u>Mabadi al-Wusul ila `Ilm al-Usul</u>	Allama al-Hilli (d.1325)
<u>Tahzib al-Usul</u>	Allama al-Hilli (d.1325)
<u>Ma`alim al-Din</u>	Shahid-i Thani (d.1558)
<u>Zubdat al-Usul</u>	Baha al-Din `Amili (d.1621)
<u>Kitab al-Wafiyya</u>	Mulla `Abd Allah Khurasani, C17.

#### Traditions

<u>Risalat al-Bidaya fi `Ilm -al-Diraya</u>	Shahid-Thani (d.1558).
<u>Wajiza</u>	Baha al-Din `Amili (d.1621)
<u>Rawashih al-Samwiyya</u>	Mir Baqr Damad (1631)
<u>Nuzhat al-Nazar</u>	Shihab al-Din al-Asqalani (d.1449)
<u>Alfiyya</u>	Jalal al-Din al-Syuti (d.1505)

#### Exegesis: Tafsir

<u>Tafsir</u>	`Ali ibn Ibrahim Qummi, C10.
<u>Majma` al-Bayan</u>	Abu `Ali Fazl ibn Hasan Tabarsi, C12.
<u>Rawh al-Jinan wa Ruh al-Janan</u>	Abu`l-Futuh Razi, C12.
<u>Tafsir-i Safi</u>	Mulla Muhsin Kashani (d.1680-81)
<u>Tafsir</u>	Muhammad al-Tabari (d.923)
<u>Tafsir al-Kabir</u>	Fakhr al-Din Razi (d.1209)
<u>Kashshaf</u>	Jar Allah al-Zamakshari (d.1142)
<u>Tafsir Anwar al-Tanzil wa Asrar al-Ta`wil</u>	Baizawi (d.1480-81)
<u>Kanz al`Irfan</u>	Miqdad ibn `Abd Allah Hilli (d.1423)

#### The Rational Sciences: `Ulum-i `Aqliyya

##### Logic: Mantiq

<u>Risala-i Kubra</u>	Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413)
<u>Sharh-iTahzib</u>	Mulla `Abd Allah Qazdi's (d.1606) commentary on Taftazani's (1389)
	<u>Tahzib al-Mantiq</u>
<u>Shahr-i Shamsiyya</u>	Najm al-Din Qazwini, C13. Commentary by Qutb al-Din Razi (d.1364-65).
<u>Sharh-i Matali al-Anwar</u>	Siraj al-Din Urmawi (d.1283),

- commentary by Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413).  
Sharh-i Isharat Ibn Sina (d.1037). Commentaries by Fakhr al-Din Razi (d.1209), Nasir al-Din Tusi (d.1274), Qutb al-Din Razi (d.1364-65).
- Tajrid Nasir al-Din Tusi (d.1274).  
 Commentary by Allama al-Hilli (d.1325)
- Hikmat al-Ishraq Shihab al-Din al Suhrawardi (d.1191).  
 Commentaries by Qut al-Din Shirazi (d.1311) and Mulla Sadra (d.1641).
- Shifa Ibn Sina (d.1037). Commentary by Mulla Sadra (d.1641).
- Philosophy and Theology: Hikmat wa Kalam
- Shahr-i Hidayat Asir al-Din al-Abhari (d.1264). Read with the commentaries of Mulla Husain Yazdi and Mulla Sadra (d.1641).
- Tajrid Nasir al-Din Tusi (d.1274). Read with commentaries of Allama al-Hilli (d.1325), the Tasdid al-Qawa'id of Shams al-Din Isfahani C14 with commentaries by Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413), and `Ala al-Din Qushji, (d.1470), and Shawariq al-Ilham of `Abd al-Razzaq Lahiji, C17
- Sharh-i Isharat Ibn Sina (d.1037). Commentaries by Fakhr al-Din Razi (d.1209), Nasir al-Din Tusi (d.1274) and Qutb al-Din Razi (d.1364-65).
- Hikmat al-Ishraq Shihab al-Din Suhrawardi (d.1191).  
 Commentaries by Qutb al-Din Shirazi (d.1311) and Mulla Sadra (d.1641).
- Asfar al-Arba`a Mulla Sadra (d.1641).
- Mathematics: Riyaziyyat
- Tahrir Uqlidis Nasir al-Din Tusi (d.1274). Main commentary Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413).
- Khulasat al-Hisan Baha al-Din `Amili (d.1621)  
Risala-i Qushji `Ala al-din Qushji, (1470)  
Sharh-i Mulakhkhas Mahmud Chaghmini (d.1221). Commentary by Musa ibn Mahmud and notes by `Abd al-`Ali Birjandi and Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413).
- Tazkira Nasr al-Din Tusi (d.1274). Commentary by `Abd al-`Ali Birjandi.
- Almagest Ptolemy (fl.AD 127-45). New text by Nasir al-Din Tusi (d.1274) with commentaries Nizam al-Din Naishapuri and `Abd al-`Ali Birjandi.

NB Tunikabuni's list also includes three titles under the heading Sufism: Tasawwuf. All involve the study of Ibn `Arabi and include the Fusus with many commentaries. Four titles are mentioned under the heading of Medicine: Tibb. Two involve the work of Ibn Sina, including his magnum opus, the Qanun; there is also the Fusul of Hippocrates.

#### Appendix III: The Dars-i Nizamiyya in the early C18

This is based on G.M.D. Sufi, Al-Minhaj: being the evolution of curriculum in the Muslim education Institutions of India (Delhi, 1977), pp. 73-75. Extra information on books in the course has

been derived from Lawlana `Abd al-Bari's discussion of them in Altaf al-Rahman Qidwa`i, Qiyam-i Nizam-i Ta`lim (Lucknow, 1924), and extensive discussions during 1980 with Mufti Raza Ansari of Firangi Mahal.

### The Transmitted Sciences: `Ulum-i Naqliyya

#### Grammar & Syntax: Sarf wa Nahw

<u>Mizan</u>	Muhammad ibn Mustafa (d. 1505-06)
<u>Munsha`ib</u>	
<u>Sarf Mir</u>	Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413)
<u>Punj Gunj</u>	Mahmud Kashmiri
<u>Zubdah</u>	Zahid ibn Mahmud ibn Mas`ud Alwi
<u>Fusul-i Akbari</u>	`Ali Akbar Allahabadi
<u>Shafiyya</u>	Ibn Hajib (d.1248)
<u>Nahw Mir</u>	Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413)
<u>Sharh-i Mi`at `Amil</u>	Husain ibn Tawqani (d. 1520)
<u>Hidayat al-Nahw</u>	
<u>Kafiyya</u>	Ibn Hajib (d.1248)
<u>Sharh Jami</u>	Commentary on <u>Kafiyya</u> by Mulla Jami of Herat (d. 1492).

#### Rhetoric: Balaghat

<u>Mukhtasar</u>	Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389)
<u>Mutawwal</u>	Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389)

#### Jurisprudence; Fiqh

<u>Hidaya</u>	Burhan al-Din Marghinani (d.1196)
<u>Shahr-i Wigaya</u>	Commentary by Ubaid Allah ibn Mas`ud (d.1346-47) on <u>Wigaya</u> by his grandfather Taj al-Shari`a Mahmud.

#### Principles of Jurisprudence

<u>Nur al-Anwar</u>	Commentary by Mulla Jiwan of Amethi (d.1718) on `Abd Allah Nasafi's (d.1310) <u>Kitab al-Manar</u> .
<u>Tawzih Talwih</u>	Commentary by Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389) on Ubaid Allah ibn Mas`ud's (d.1346-47) <u>Tawzih</u> .
<u>Musallum al-Thubut</u>	Muhib Allah Bihari (d.1707-08)

#### Traditions: Hadiths

<u>Mishkat al-Masabih</u>	Shah Wali al-Din Abu `Abd Allah al-Khatib, C14.
---------------------------	---

#### Exegesis: Tafsir

<u>Jalalain</u>	A commentary in two parts: one by Jalal al-Din al-Suyuti (d.1505).
<u>Tafsir Anwar al-Tanzil</u>	Baizawi (d.1480-81).

The Rational Sciences: `Ulum-i `Aqliyya

Logic: Mantiq

Sharh-i Shamsiyya

Najm al-Din `Umar ibn `Ali al-Qazwini al-Katibi (d.1099), studied with the help of commentaries by Qutb al-Din Razi (d. 1364-65) and Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389)

Sullam al-`Ulum  
Risala Mir Zahid

Muhib Allah Bihari (d. 1707-08) Gloss by Mir Muhammad Zahid al-Harawi (d.1699-1700) on Qutb al-Din Mahmud ibn Muhammad's (d.1364) commentary on Katibi's Shamsiyya

Mullal Jalal

Mir Muhammad Zahid al-Harawi's (d.1699-1700) gloss on Jalal al-Din Dawwani's commentary on Sa`d al-Din Taftazani's Tahzib al-Mantiq.

Sughra  
Kubra  
Isaghoji

Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413) Mir Sayyid Sharif Jurjani (d.1413) Adaptation of Isagoge by Porphyry (234-205) by Asir al-Din al-Abhari (d.1264)

Tahzib  
Sharh-i Tahzib

Sa`d al-Din Taftazani (d.1389) Najm al-Din `Abd Allah Qazdi's (d.1606) commentary on Tahzib Qutb al-Din Razi (d.1364-65).

Qutbi  
Mir Qutbi

Philosophy and Theology: Hikmat wa Kalam

Sharh-i Hidayat al-Hikmah

Commentary of Mulla Husain ibn Mu`in al-Din on Maibuzi which was a commentary on Asir al-Din al-Abhari's (d.1264) Sharh-i Hidaya

Shams al-Bazigha  
Sadra

Mulla Mahmud Jawnpuri (d.1652) Commentary of Mulla Sadra (d.1641) on the Kitab al-Hidaya by Asir al-Din al-Abhari (d.1264)

Sharh-i Mawaqif

Mir Muhammad Zahid al-Harawi's (d.1699-1700) commentary on Azud al-Din al-Iji's (d.1355) Mawaqif

Mir Zahid

Mir Muhammad Zahid al-Harawi's (d.1699-1700) commentary on Azud al-Din's Mawaqif

Mathematics: Riyaziyyat

Tahrir Uglidis  
Khulasat al-Hisab  
Tashrih al-Aflak  
Risala-i Qushji

Nasir al-Din Tusi (d.1274)  
Baha al-Din `Amili (d.1621)  
Baha al-Din `Amili (d.1621)  
`Ala al-Din Qushji (d.1470)

Sharh-i Chaghmini

Husain Khwarazmi's Persian translation of the Sharh-i Mulakhkhas of Mahmud Chaghmini (d.1221).

NB No works on Sufism or Medicine are at this stage recorded in the Dars-i Nizamiyya, although they were to be included later.

Francis Robinson