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There is a certain tendency among the scholars of Shi‘ī Islam to synthesize Shi‘īsm and Sufism within the Islamic context. Chief among these scholars is Bahā‘ al-Dīn Ḥaydar b. ‘Ali b. Ḥaydar al-‘Ubaydī Āmulī (1319 or 1320 – after 1385) known as Ḥaydar-i Āmulī whose Jāmi‘ al-Asrār wa Manba‘ al-Anwār is one of his essential works in which the interrelation between Shi‘īsm and Sufism developed. This paper tries to look closely at the Jāmi‘ al-Asrār to depict the ways and approach in which Āmulī necessitates the identicality of the Shi‘ī-Sufi approach. In the same framework, his relation to Ibn Arabi is examined. Āmulī’s approach is called a marginalized one by some in the Shi‘ī seminary. This paper, on the other hand, indicates that Āmulī’s approach is more a continues and existing movement rather than a marginalized historical approach.
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1. Introduction

For many Western scholars of Islamic studies, mysticism has always been an intriguing subject to ponder upon. Western scholarship has devoted a large number of inquiries, translations, and debates regarding the history, development, and analysis of Islamic mysticism through different approaches and methodologies. The translation and examination of many mystical and educational works of outstanding Sufi figures and discussing the profound and simultaneously paradoxical notions in the history of Islamic Sufism is an example of this interest.
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Contrary to this interest, a canonical focus of western scholarship to a particular period or school of thought within the history of Islamic Sufism has resulted in inattentiveness to some other areas and prominent figures. Among those, one could allude to Bahā’ al-Dīn Ḥaydar b.’Alī b. Ḥaydar al-ʿUbaydi (1319 or 1320 – after 1385) known as Ḥaydar-i Āmulī 1 a profound figure of Shia mystical theology who has produced numerous works in the field of theoretical Sufism and Quranic interpretation concerning his Shiʿī affiliations. He was a disciple of Fakhr al-Muḥaqiqīn (1283–1369), the son of Allama al-Hillī’s 2 (1250–1325); and the most important representative of the Shiʿī School to synthesize Shiʿīsm with Sufism. The significance of Āmulī’s works lies in his tendency toward reconciliation and identification of the principles of Sufism and Shiʿīsm. He certainly was familiar with the works of Ibn ʿArabī (1165–1240), and thereupon in some of his writings, Āmulī tries to respond to Ibn ʿArabī’s ideas based on his Shiʿī principles. It is within this scope that Robert Wisnovksy tries to call it “the Akbarian Turn in Shiʿī Theology” (Wisnovsky 2007). However, the Akbarian school of thought has taught and commentated within the Shia-mystic scholars. Still, it is not so easy to call it an Akbarian turn in Shia theology.

We may refer to the fact that Shia scholars such as Āmulī have found Akbarian terminology and his way of conceptualizing the notions such as perfect man as a very close notion to their understanding of the concept of Prophet or Imam. Thus, they tried to identify some of Ibn Arabī’s mystical or theological ideas with the prophetic hadiths or Shia Imam’s narrations. Therefore, we can better call it a “Shiʿī Response to Ibn Arabī”. Ibn Miʾmar 3 the author of Al-Kashkūl Fī Mā Jarā ’Alā Āli Rasūl (The Beggar’s Bowl in Ex-

1 For a comprehensive account of Āmulī’s life and works in additional to Henry Corbin see: “Haydar-i Amuli” in: Encyclopaedia of Islam (2012–2021) & Kohlberg 1996.

2 al-Hillī was a contemporary to Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 1328), who wrote his Minhāj Al-Sunnah Al-Nabawiyyah Fī Naqḍ Kalām Al-Shīʿah Al-Qadarīyah in refutation of al-Hillī’s defense of Shiʿī doctrine in his Minhāj al-karāmah fi maʿrifat al-imāmah. He lived during the rulership of the Mongol Uljāyītu (r. 1304–16) in Iran, during which Uljāyītu converted to Shiʿīsm. Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Hilli, al-Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf (1250–1325), his son Fakhr al-Muḥaqiqīn and Sayyid Ḥaydar Āmulī lived in that era. For the development of the Shiʿī thought during Uljāyītu’s time see: Schmidtke 1991. Also, on Mongol rule in Iran see: Kolbas 2006. For more on the development of the Shiʿī and Sufi thought in this period see the forthcoming: Ansari & Asghari 2021.

3 His full name according to Tārīkh ‘Ulamā’ Baghdād (History of Scholars of Baghdad) is ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ismāʿīl al-Asadi al-Baghdādi Abū Muhammad al-Manʿūt bi al-Jalāl al-Kātib, al-Adīb al-filsūf al-Muʾīnī bi Ibn Miʾmar. Ibn al-Fuwāṭī in his Talkhīṣ Majmaʿ Al-ādāb Fī Muʾjam Al-Alqāb calls him “al-Shaykh, al-ʿālim al-ʿārif Taj al-Din ʿAbd Allāh ibn Ismāʿīl ibn al-Miʾmar” and adds that Ibn Miʾmar’s disciples had learned “secrets of the Sufi scholars”. His Shiʿī refutation to Ibn Taymiyyah entitled Al-Insāf Fī al-Intiṣāf Li Ahli al-Ḥaqq Min Aḥl al-Isrāf Raddun ʿAlā Minhāj al-Sunnah Li Ibn Taymiyyah al-Ḥarrānī.
planation of What Went to the Household of the Prophet) believes the well represents the Shī‘i-Sufi convergence prior to the emergence of Sayyid Ḥaydar Āmulī.

Nevertheless, within the Western scholarship, first Henry Corbin and Osman Yahya’s edition introduced Āmulī’s Jami‘ al-Asrar (the Sum of the Secrets) to the readers. Herman Landolt, Seyed Hossein Nasr, Etan Kohlberg, Van Ess, Robert Wisnovksy, Muhammad Rustom, and some others, regarding Āmulī’s life and works, have written scholarly articles or entries in encyclopedias.

2. Sayyid Ḥaydar Āmulī

Āmulī, in the introduction to his commentary on the Quran known as al-Muḥīṭ al-a’ẓam, gives us more details of life and chronology of his works. It is important to note that Āmulī belongs to the pre-Safavid (1501–1722) era of Shi‘i school of Islam. The influence of the socio-political power of Safavids made Shi‘i theology to be developed in certain fields, but a delicate observation of Āmulī’s thought will show us the foundations of the mystical theology of Shi‘i Islam prior to the Safavids era. A famous post-Safavid figure of this approach is Mulla Sadra whose commentary on Uṣūl al-Kāfī could be described as another step in developing Shi‘i mystical theology (Asghari 2017).

Āmulī, in his introduction to his commentary on Fusūs al-Hikam of Ibn Arabi, alludes to the point that God has ordered him to detach from the worldly matters and focus all of his attention to Him only. Therefore, he was “inspired” by God to find a place and stay there to be able to worship Him. He was ordered to find the most valuable and sacred place on the earth. Āmulī narrates this as follows:

Thus, after detachment from my job as minister, boss, and leaving all my wealth and parents, wife, children, and friends, I travelled toward Mecca.

In the history of Islamic thought and Sufism travelling to Mecca to seek proximity to God is quite common. Al-Zamakhshari (1074 or 1075–1143 or 1144) a famous commentator of the Quran who was called as Jār-Allāh (God’s neighbour), al-Ghazzālī and Ibn al-‘Arabī, who wrote his voluminous

---

1 For more on the theological challenges and development of the Shi‘i mystical theology see the forthcoming Ansari, H. & Asghari, S. 2021. Extremism (Ghuluww) as a Philosophical School: Studies on Shi‘i-Sufi and the Nuṣayrī’s Relationships during the 6/12-8/14th centuries.
al-Futūḥāt al-Makkīyyah in his journey and dwelling in Mecca, have had the same mentality.

Āmulī’s account of his life shows that at the time of detachment, he was thirty. Meanwhile, due to sickness, his travel to Mecca and Medina did not last long; he, therefore, went back to Mashhad in Iran and later moved to the holy city of Najaf in Iraq where he settled and began his ascetic discipline (Riyāḍhah), seclusion (khalwah) and spiritual journey. It is in this stage that he receives more openings and spiritual discoveries. Based on his account, meanings, knowledge, truth, and subtleties unveiled to him, and he realized that all of them are from Divine speeches (Kalimāt ul-Illah), which are countless and endless. Like Ibn Arabi in his Fusus, he states that he was inspired and ordered by God to reveal some of those words to God’s excellent servants. Thus, he begins to compile a book on the knowledge of Tawhīd (absolute unity) and its secrets in a book he entitles Jāmi’ al-Asrār wa Manba’ al-Anwār.1

Featured biographers of Shi’ā scholars posited Āmulī as a profound figure of Shi’a mystical theology. Nūr Allāh al-Shushtarī (b. 1557), in Majālis al-Mu’minīn (Shushtarī 1986), Mūhammad b. ‘Ālī al-Tabrīzī (1879–1955), in Rayḥānat al-Adab (Mudarris 1967), Khwansārī, in Rawḍāt al-Jannāt (Muhammad Bāqir ibn Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn 2003), Mā’sūm ʿĀlī Shāh, in Ṭarā’iq al-Haqā’iq and Al-Amīn, in A’yān al-Shī’a (‘Āmilī 1947) have their accounts and the entry of life and works of Āmulī. The later in his account attributes to Āmulī variety of qualities such as “man of knowledge”, “jurist”, “commentator of the Quran”, “the narrator of hadith” (Muhaddith). What makes it exciting is that Al-Amīn adds that he was among the most outstanding scholars of Imāmiyyah, and among the noblest of Shia scholars. He then adds that he was among the most outstanding scholars of Sufism and belonged to Imāmi School of Islam. These are the qualities that Āmulī expected a true Shia scholar must obtain and for which he spent his life and carrier.

Perhaps one of the most outstanding biographical notes in Āmulī’s life is how he was described in 1360 by Fakhr al-Muḥaqqiqīn son of al-Hillī (1250–1325) which is narrated by Al-Amīn in his A’yān al-Shī’a (ʿĀmilī 1947). This short note indicates that Āmulī’s received his permission of Ijtihād from Fakhr al-Muḥaqqiqīn while he described him as follows: “I have authorized our master, the noble (Sayyid), the leader and scholar, […] the most esteem of scholars, the most learned of the learned, the one who combined knowledge with action, the honour of the prophet’s household.” These attributes are an indication of the importance of Āmulī in the eyes of the greatest scholars of Shi’ī Islam.

1 Osman Yahya states that the total number of Āmulī’s works is thirty-five books and treatises.
3. Jāmiʿ al-Asrār

Jāmiʿ al-Asrār wa Manbaʿ al-Anwār is one of the most important works by Āmulī in which he sums up his mystical theology. A modern study of the book in Arabic published in Tehran in 1968. Henry Corbin (1903–1978) and Osman Yahyā edited and co-authored its introduction (Āmulī 1989). The main book includes an introduction and three chapters, each of which contains four principles (Qā'idah).

In his introduction, Āmulī explains the philosophy behind authoring the book. At first, he clarifies that it was written in response to the request of “the righteous brethren that are wayfaring in the spiritual path”. The main question of those people who seem to be his disciples in the Sufi path was according to Āmulī the greatest secrets of God, prophets and his friends (awlīyāʾ)”. He then continues to go into details of those questions by remarking that he wants to talk about the secrets of Tawhid, its kinds, consequences and demands.

Āmulī was not the first author in the history of Islam to write about the Unity of God and its demands. What makes his works outstanding is his approach to the religious literature in which the outcome is a mystical theology as if this approach is the sole and core intention of revelation and goal of religion. Every individual is invited to this way of contemplation and to actualize the inner potential Divine realities that possess. Āmulī reached all these conclusions in synthesizing Shiʿīsm with Sufism within the framework of the Shiʿī theology that, according to him, is not separable from Sufi theology.

Thereof he states that the book is written in a way that all of its subjects are based on principles of the people who confessed to the unity of God (Muwahhid) and saints in whom the truth has become actualized (Muhāqqiq). We know that the word Muhāqqiq has a certain meaning in the Islamic intellectual tradition. As William Chittick puts Taḥqīq derives from the same root as ḥaqq, which means truth, reality, appropriateness, rightness, responsibility, and duty. He as well defines Muḥāqqiq as someone who knows without the intermediary of transmission and acts appropriately. He fulfils his responsibility toward God, creation, and society on the basis of a verified and realized knowledge, not on the basis of imitating the opinions and activities of others (Chittick 2007).

Āmulī, in his introduction, tells us that by the word Muḥāqqiq he refers to real Sufis, but he reminds us that the notion about which he writes at the same time all of it is in acceptance with the Twelver Imāmī Shiʿī school (Āmulī 1969b). He then claims that he brings all these together in a way that it removes all disagreements among them and there would not be a need for another book (ibid.).
As introduction presents, the first chapter of Jāmi‘ al-Asrār wa Manba‘ al-Anwār discusses the problem of Tawhīd, its divisions, and its four principles: the virtue, definition, divisions, and the nature of Tawhīd.

In the second chapter, though, Āmulī gathers a good number of Quranic verses, prophetic hadiths, and narrations from Imams, saints, and Sufis on the notion of Tawhīd. He then briefly commends those citations.

The third chapter is devoted to the consequences of the secrets of Divine religions. Āmulī defines four principles for this part to explore those secrets as follows:

1. The explanation of al-Sharī‘a, al-Tariqa (the path) and al-Haqīqa (Truth);
2. An explanation of the secrets of prophecy (nubuwwah, risalah) and sainthood (wilāya);
3. Exploring the revelation, inspiration, and mystical intimations;
4. Clarifying the meanings and consequences of Islām, Imān (faith), and Certitude (Iqān).

Jāmi‘ al-Asrār includes exploration of a number of Āmulī’s mystical ideas. Chief among them is his famous theory of mutual relationship and in-depth unity of Shī‘ism and Sufism initially represented in this work.

Āmulī’s project, in fact, is looking to redefine Shi‘ism based on what he defines as its original spiritual meaning. He opposes reducing Shi‘ism into a mere hadith and juridical school. In his introduction to Jāmi‘ al-Asrār, while exploring the situation his time, Āmulī asserts that there has been an ongoing conflict and disagreement among Sufis and Shi‘ites. He surprisingly mentions that among the different schools of Islam, none of them rejects Sufis as Shi‘a does (ibid.). He tells us that the opposition movement as well goes in the same direction: no one rejects Shi‘a as Sufis do. Positioning himself as a connector of this two, Āmulī points out to his core beliefs and attitudes that the origin, offspring and references of both Shi‘īsm and Sufism are the same (ibid.). The similarity, according to Āmulī lies in the fact that he references of all of the sects of Shi‘a, especially the Imāmiyyah branch, is none except the commander of the faithful Ali and his children and children of his children. And the source and offspring of all of them and references for their knowledge and principles is the God almighty. The real Sufis share the same reality (see: Āmulī 1969a; Āmulī 1989).

Āmulī then turns to the Sufi clock (Khirqah) and knowledge and claims to have taken it from Ali and his children through Kumayl bin Ziyad al-Nakha’i who was Ali’s distinguished companion or through Hasan al-Basrī or Imam Ja’far ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq (Āmulī 1969b).
Āmulī tries to tell the reader that writing on Shi‘īsm and Sufism needs authenticity in both, a quality that he possesses. He indicates that the reason why those brethren asked him to author such a book was his comprehensiveness of both Sufism and Shi‘īsm. He asserts to this point as follows:

Know that from the earliest vigour of my youth, namely from my childhood to the age of thirty or thereabouts, I was engaged in studying the religion of my own forefathers, the ma‘sumin – the infallible ones. With regard to the outer aspect of the sharī‘ah, I undertook a study of the Imamiyah sect and their juridical school (madhhab) – which is daily practised amongst the Shi‘ahs; and with regard to the inner, namely the study of the truth and reality (haqiqah), I devoted my attention to the Sufis and the masters of the science of the unity of Allah (Tawhid) (ibid.).

By considering the works by Āmulī we know that he was the master of both theology and jurisprudence. This is also evident through the permission by Fakhr al-Muhaqqiqīn that we already mentioned. Thus, Shi‘īsm, according to Āmulī, is not merely confined in theology and jurisprudence or a political movement as some scholar has asserted it to be or to put it between Ash‘arite and Mu‘tazilites. Āmulī, in other words, had a phenomenological encounter with the origin of Shi‘īsm. He asserts that every religion has three aspects of Sharī‘a, Tariqah and Haqiqah, and both Shi‘īsm and Sufism in their essence are dealing with these levels. In his in-depth studies, Āmulī grasps the truth:

The least of these truths was such that after seeing reality from both sides and the true and false aspects of each side, after perceiving in what manner the one was true and the other false, I was able to understand how every one of these matters was connected to a point of reality and Tawhid – just as the line which is drawn from circumference of a circle is connected to the central point. I was also able to understand the meaning of Allah’s words: “There is no living creature, but He holds it by its forelock; surely my Lord is on the right path” (Quran 11: 56), and “Allah’s is the East and the West, therefore, whither you turn, thither is Allah’s purpose” (2: 115); and the secret contained in the words of the Prophet: “The ways leading to the Real are as many as the persons in creation” (Amuli 1969b).

Almost in all of his works, he refers to this division and based on it redefines the Shi‘ī wisdom in which the issue of wilāya plays a vital role. He tries to say that the jurisprudence is the outer side of Shi‘īsm while its kernel is its secret. To understand Shi‘a mystical theology, one has to gain
an understanding of *wilāya* in both its theoretical and practical aspects. He meanwhile asserts that those who understand the inner secrets are in the minority and not all have the capacity of its comprehension. Thus, many came to deny it, and Imams thereupon did not openly talk about it in the presence of everyone. Āmulī refers to narration to show that Imams have already indicated the difficulty of this secret: “Truly our command is hard and complicated”.

Thus, he concludes that no one could endure it except Angel of Divine proximity (archangel), a messenger of God or a believer whose faith God has examined (*mu’min mumtaḥan*). Following this definition, he tries to question those Shiite that are merely following jurisprudence. Does he ask whether they feel bearing such secrets in their hearts? If not, then the result is that they are not *mu’min mumtaḥan*. So, a true Shi‘a, according to him, is the one who engaged with the secrets of *wilāya*. This introduction also helps him to separate the true Sufi from the wrong one and concludes that the real Sufi is the real Shiite and the real Shiite is the real Sufi. Therefore, as Kohlberg indicates; Āmulī is equally critical of Shi‘ītes who reduce their religion to a legalistic system and of Sufis who deny that their origins and doctrines go back to the Imams (see: Kohlberg 1996).

As noted above, his main point is to return to the origin of the Shi‘ītes, where he can bring together Sufism and Shi‘īsm. He, in fact, faces some disagreements from both Shi‘ītes and Sufis while making this proposal. He describes this problem in his introduction to *Jāmi‘ al-Asrār wa Manba‘ al-Anwār* as follows:

> After my affirmation of the truth of Sufism, certain persons were troubled by some of its more abstruse and esoteric aspects with regard to the Real – such people imagined that I was availing myself of invalid and other spurious means. May they realize that this was not the case and that in reality, I was only drawing upon the religion of my own forefathers – the infallible Imams. Because of their extreme ignorance, the majority of Sufis think that the Imams were devoid of the excellencies and superior insights of Sufism (Āmulī 1969a).

Imams in Āmulī’s view are “the repositories and embodiments of *wilāya*”, which indicates that they receive their knowledge from a metaphysical source. Thus, it is not mere knowledge of *Sharī‘a*, instead, they are the source of all knowledge whether intellectual, spiritual or transmitted. There is no knowledge that is hidden to them, and therefore they are the source of knowledge of *Sharī‘a*, *Tariqa* and *Haqiqa*, as Āmulī puts it:
Moreover, many Shi’ahs also believe that the knowledge of their Imams is restricted to that same knowledge which is in common use amongst themselves. In fact, there is not a single form of knowledge but that the Imams are the source of that knowledge; there is not a secret or hidden wisdom but that they are the mine from which it may be extracted; they are the teachers of the sharī'ah and the leaders of the tariqāh and the poles of the haqīqah; they are the caliphs and the vicegerents of Allah in the heavens and the earth; they are the manifestation of the power and majesty of Allah in His mulk – the earth and heavens – and in His malakut – the realm of the spirits and angels. I swear by God that if they did not exist, then the heavens would not be standing, the earth would not be outspread, and the creatures would not be living in them (ibid.).

Each aspect of religion is a reference to cosmic and metaphysical reality. Sharī'ah is the state of jurisprudence and tariqāh is the state of mysticism or spiritual journey. Āmulī comes to this division based on a prophetic tradition in which he says: “The Shari‘a are my words (aqwal), the tariqāh are my actions (a’mal), and the haqīqah is my interior states (ahwal)”. It should be said that according to him, these are not a separated division, rather metaphorical interpretations (i’tibar) of a single reality. So, the inability to perceive religion in the form of the three-fold reality, according to him, is equal to misapprehending it. He, on the other hand, by comparing the three Abrahamic religion tries to show that in Judaism it is Sharī'ah that bolded, while in Christianity, tariqāh is much more canonical, the Qiblah of Judaism is in the West where the sun falls, while for Christianity it is the East where the sun rises, and the Qiblah of Muhammad’s religion is between east and west. There he refers to a prophetic tradition in which he said: “My Qiblah is between the east and the west” and sometimes he quotes the Quran: “The East and the West belong to God. Wherever you turn, you are always in the presence of God” (Quran 2: 115).

Āmulī tries to emphasise that the reality of Islam is the union of the Sharī'ah and tariqāh, therefore, Quran includes the truth of both Moses and Jesus. Thereupon the meaning of the word “Quran” in Arabic is not merely derived from q-r-a to read, and rather it is from q-r-‘a (jama‘a) which means collect, comprehend and embarrassed, which is to refer to the comprehensiveness of the Quran. He thus concludes that those interested in Sharī'ah are taking the Mosaian part of the Quran and those devoted to tariqāh are asserting the Jesusian reality of the Quran and merely people of the truth (haqīqāh) pay attention to the inclusiveness and comprehensiveness of it. As a result, dealing only with one of the angles does not lead one to understanding the comprehensiveness of the Quran. Here he uses the three concepts of
Islam, Imān and Itqān to refer the relation of the outer and inner side of the Quran and Islam. Islam in this scheme is equal to Sharī'ah, Imān is a respond to tariqāh, and Itqān corresponds haqīqāh. In other words, the messenger (risālah) is corresponding to the state of Sharī'ah, prophecy (nubuwwah) is the state of tariqāh in which prophet informs man about the unseen and invisible worlds. The third stage, i.e. is wilāyah is equal to the truth or the inner aspect of religion. Āmulī, following the teachings of Ibn ‘Arabi, states that the wilāyah of Muhammad is more significant than his nubuwwah and risalāh. The reason is that wilāyah corresponds to the interrelation of God and Muhammad. It was to refer to this state that Muhammad said that “I have some states with God that no any prophet or archangel could reach to the truth of that” (Majlisi 1983). It is with referring to this three-fold division that Āmulī states that all the religions (Abrahamic religions) in the state of haqīqāh are the same. It is as Quran indicates:

The Messengers and the believers have faith in what was revealed to them from their Lord. Every one of them believed in God, His angels, His Books, and His Messengers, saying “We find no difference among the Messengers of God”. They also have said “We heard God’s commands and obeyed them. Lord, we need Your forgiveness and to You, we shall return” (Quran 2: 285).

With regard to the transcendental unity of religion, Āmulī, in his works, also refers to another verse of the Quran to show that all religions in the state of haqīqāh are the same:

He has plainly clarified the religion which is revealed to you and that which Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus were commanded to follow (He has explained it) so that you would be steadfast and united in your religion. What you call the pagans to is extremely grave for them. God attracts to (the religion) whomever He wants and guides to it whoever turns to Him in repentance (Quran 42: 13).

---

1 It should be noticed that meanwhile one of the most important disagreements of Āmulī with Ibn al-‘Arabi is on the issue of the seal of wilāyah, which needs to be analyzed in a separate paper. Āmulī in one passage states that: “The unveiling of the Shaykh and his aforementioned masters is that Jesus has more right and is more fitting to be the Seal of Absolute wilāya. Our unveiling and the unveiling of other masters is that ‘Alī has more right and is more fitting for this rank. Along with this, if you were to reflect, you would come to recognize that the unveiling of the Shaykh also bears witness to this (Āmulī 1969a: 413).
As we mentioned before, Āmulī is, in a way, in the school of Ibn al-‘Arabī, who regarding the transcendental unity of religions had clarified his own ideas in his major works such as Al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah and Fūṣūṣ al-ḥikam. It is under the light of such mystical and spiritual understanding of the truth that he also asserts the transcendental unity. It is noteworthy to consider how Ibn al-‘Arabī, for instance, justifies the core meaning of trinity and its relation to Tawhid:

The people of the Trinity (Tathlith), because of the state of being odd (Al-Fardiyyah), which is hidden in the Trinity, will be saved. For odd is among the attributions of the One. They are, therefore, monotheists (Muwahhidun) through the Tawhid of combination (Tawhid-a Tarkibi). And it is to be hoped that they will be covered by combined mercy (Al-Rahmatu al-Murakkabatu). [...] It is likely that the people of Trinity will be included among the monotheists because they hold to this oddness in God (Hazrat al-fardaniyyah) and not because they hold to the oneness of God (Hazrat al-Wahdaniyyah). I found them in this way through intuition, and I was not able to make a distinction between monotheists and the people of the Trinity (Ibn al-‘Arabī 1968; Kakaie 2009).

The three stages of Sharī‘ah, tariqāh and haqīqāh for Āmulī are three different realities of religion; meanwhile, they are interconnected. A real Sufi does not ignore the Sharī‘ah, but when he performs the daily prayer, the spiritual level of his prayer is higher than the prayer of the one who merely performs the outer and mere jurisprudential standards of the prayer.

4. Opponents

It is apparent that each scholarly work may encounter opposition. Āmulī is not an exception in this regard. There are two groups of opponents to Āmulī’s approach in synthesizing Shi‘ism with Sufism. One, among the Shi‘a scholars who were not admitting Sufi’s as something not only close to Shi‘ism but also the religion of Islam at all. The other group were among the Sunni theologians and probably of the Hanbalite School who rejected both Shi‘i and Sufi theology.

The disagreement on the status of philosophy and Sufism in the Islamic world dates to the Graeco-Arabic Translation Movement during the ‘Abbāsid dynasty. It is clear, however, that early philosophers among the Muslims strived first and foremost to reconcile philosophical notions with Islamic revelation. Such attempts began mainly with al-Fārābī’s (d. 951) efforts in linking the notions of the Philosopher King and prophet in his Utopia. Such trends
are clearly articulated in the works of Ibn Sīnā (d. 1037) and Suhrāwardī (d. 1191). Mullā Ṣadrā’s (ca. 1571–1636) opus during the Safavid period provides another example, in which Sufism, philosophy, and Shi‘ite beliefs merge. The above-mentioned debate continued among Shi‘i scholars, more specifically, the dilemma of whether philosophizing or referring to Sufi masters was a deviation from the path of pure Islam as apparently defined by Shi‘i Imams – about which there are disagreements – or it was in compliance with their teachings. For such detractors in the seminary, the direct consequence of engagement with philosophy and Sufism was the negligence of Shi‘i Imams, implying the disagreement with their teachings.

A typology of the inner Shi‘i objection could be found in the works of people like Qummi (d. 1689) who lived during the Iranian Safavid era, when an anti-Sufi wave was established by him, Majlisī (1699) and Mir Lawḥī (d. 1671). These people who held the highest position of muftis (Shaykh al-Islam) in the cities of Mashhad, Isfahan and Qum had two things in common. They all were known as great jurists and at the same time as firm opponents to philosophy and Sufism.

In a standard language of these opponents, Qummi posits his opponents as those who are having a corrupt belief. A sample of his style in anti-Sufi and philosophy writing is as follows:

In these times, there are many people of corrupt belief. […] There is a group of them who call themselves seekers of knowledge and, by doing so, soil the name of the seekers of [religious] knowledge. That is because they embark upon reading the books of philosophers and Sufis without [first] having the power of certainty and without seeking the knowledge of religion. Thus, they have become corrupt in their beliefs, and most of them go on to deceive ignorant people. [However] let me emphasize that it is permissible for those among the Twelver ulama who possess divine souls and the perfect power of certainty to study books of philosophy and other books after finishing their studies in religious sciences in order to break the glasses of misgivings (shubahat) and corrupt imaginings with stones of refutation thrown from the sling of reasoning and syllogism… [as] for others, it is better for them to turn away from reading and hearing such books so that they do not come to grievous ends (Anzali 2017).

1 Majlisī has a major role in preserving Shi‘i tradition by supervising the collection of a voluminous Shi‘i encyclopedia in the 17th century. He managed the support of the Safavid court in gathering every extant Shi‘i manuscript and creating an encyclopedic compendium of Shi‘i ḥadīth in 110 modern volume entitled Bihar al-Anwār. For more on Bihar al-Anwār see: Mahdi & Farzin (2012–2021), "Bihar al-Anwar", in: Encyclopaedia Islamica.
The above excerpt suggests that a true Shi‘ī scholar according to Qummi is the one who merely follows the tradition as he limits it in the Quran and hadith literature and narrows it only based on his reading and understanding. In the viewpoint that he represents, the best approach to any religious tradition is to look at them as sacred text and avoid rationality. As the text suggests, philosophy and Sufism cause corruption in faith for they originated from a source that is not only not Divine, but also are human product that is associated with false claims and astray. There is only one option to study these subjects according to Qummi and that is to study them in order to refute them. The principal premise of these authors is that philosophy is already corrupted and the duty of religious scholar is to refute them. A contemporary example of this viewpoint in the Shi‘ī seminary belongs to Mīrzā Mahdī Iṣfahānī (1885–1946) who, in his works, severely attacked philosophy and Sufism and established Maktab-i Tafkīk (the School of Separation). Maktab-i Tafkīk is considered the most influential movement opposing Islamic philosophy and Sufism in contemporary Shi‘īsm with seeking refuge in the transmitted hadith by Ahl al-Bayt (the Household of Prophet Muhammad). He applies the same language as Qummi applies. In his Abwāb al-Hudā, Iṣfahānī describes the translation movement in the early Islamic centuries as follows:

To anyone who is aware of the policy of the Caliphs, it will be evident that the reason of translating Greek philosophy and spreading Sufism was nothing but the policy of eclipsing the knowledge of Ahl al-Bayt and making people feel no need for them (Isfahani 2008).

The general argument of the opponents is that the revelation is rooted in the Divine while philosophy and Sufism are of human origin. The same notion exists in the Sunni polemics against the Sufi and philosophy-oriented approach. In any contemplation about opponents to Āmulī it must be taken into consideration that the same people similar to Āmulī whose agenda was reconciliation between Shi‘īsm and Sufism and following were under attack in the areas like Damascus. Historians like ‘Abd al-Ḥayy ibn Aḥmad Ibn al-‘Imād in his Shadharât al-Dhahab fi Akhbār man Dhahab and Ibn Kathīr in his Al-Bidāyah wa-Al-Nihāyah and Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī in his Al-Durar Al-Kāminah fi A‘yān Al-Mi‘āh Al-Thāminah in narrating the history of Damascus of 14th century tell us that heretics were beheaded in the city under the Hanbalite ruling judges (see: Ibn Hajar al-‘Asqalani 1972: VI/152; III/95; Dhahabi 1980: III/68). It must be noticed that Ibn Taymiyyah had a major role in creating such harsh approach.¹

¹ For Ibn Taymiyya’s role in this crisis see his Fatwā against the Nusayris in which he climes that they are not Muslims, rather more heretic than most of the heretics. Yaron Friedman
3. Conclusion

Āmulī, as a prolific Shi'a author of the 14th century, was among the followers of the mystical school of Ibn al-'Arabī in Iran. He nevertheless emphasized the identical core reality of Sufism and Shi'ism. The importance of Āmulī is laid on the fact that he lived in pre-Safavid Iran and a sound study of his works is an important gate to the understanding of the development of Shi'a mystical philosophy prior to Safavid Iran. The aim of this paper was to make a general overview to Āmulī's, Jāmiʿ al-Asrār wa Manbaʿ al-Anwār, in which he was developing his Shi'a mystical theology while he was under influence of the school of Ibn al-'Arabī. There are scholars prior and post Āmulī who followed the same path. These scholars nevertheless, faced an opposition among other Shi'i scholars. Some tried to indicate that Āmulī's approach was marginalized in the Shi'i seminary. If this is the case, even if the official curricula of the Shi'a seminary focused on the study of jurisprudence, yet a large number of commentaries on Ibn 'Arabī and the view that synthesizes Shi'ism and Sufism produced by Shi'a scholars. A marginalized approach cannot produce such a movement. A more detailed and careful reading of his book is needed to study his agreement and disagreement with the school of Ibn ‘Arabī and to indicate that what the final meaning of his theory of identical unity of Shi'ism and Sufism is and what it demands.
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Mistička teologija u šiizmu:
beleške o Sajidu Hajdaru Amoliju i njegovoj knjizi
Džami al asrar va manba al anvar

Sejed Amir-Hosein Asgari
Univerzitet Indijana Blumington, SAD

U nekim krugovima šiitskih učenjaka u islamu postoji određena tenden-
cija da se šiizam i sufizam sjedine u ukupnom islamskom stadijumu. Glavni
predstavnik ovih učenjaka jeste Bahaudin Hajdar ibn Ali ibn Hajdar al Ubajdi
Amoli (rođen 1319. ili 1320. i umro posle 1385), poznat kao Hajdar Amoli,
a njegova knjiga Džami al asrar va manba al anvar predstavlja markantno
delo u kojem se obrazlažu sličnosti između šiizma i sufizma. U ovom radu
pokušaćemo da se bliže upoznamo s knjigom Džami al asrar kako bismo
ilustrovali Amolijeve metode i njegov poseban pristup pitanju sjedinjenosti
šiizma i sufizma. U okviru iste analize, ispitujemo i način na koji on razume
Ibn Arabija. Amolijev pristup gdekada se smatra marginalizovanim u šiitskoj
teološkoj misli. U ovom radu pak pokazujemo da Amolijev pristup treba
zapravo razumeti kao proces koji ima kontinuitet i dinamiku, a ne kao neku
vrstu marginalizovanog istorijskog pristupa.

Ključne reči: Sajid Hajdar Amoli, šiizam, sufizam, misticizam, teologija