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The first chapter is regarding Introduction. It is divided into four sections. A historical survey of the religious and social conditions before Saiyed Gaisudaras has been presented in first section. The biography of Saiyed Gaisudaras is the subject matter of the second section. The third section deals with the writings of Saiyed Gaisudaras. The fourth section contains the importance of the present study. The summary of the chapter is as follows:

Saiyed Muhammad Husaini, commonly known as Gaisudaras or Banda Nawas (1321-1426 A.D.), was one of the most outstanding personalities of the history of Islam in the 14th century. He dedicated his whole life for the propagation and revival of Islam. He finally settled at Gulbarga, now in Karnataka State. Apart from his theological importance, he also established his repute as a philosopher with extraordinary originality and fecundity of ideas.

A survey of the Muslim religious thought of the 13th and 14th centuries showed that there were three mystic orders in India, viz., Chishti, Suhrawardi and Firdosi. The followers of these orders were found not only among the mystics, but also among the theologians.

The Chishti order in India was established by Khwaja Muinuddin
Chishti (1197-1234 A.D.). In his time, the hereditary succession of the order came into existence. After his death, the Chishti order was popularised by Shaikh Qutbuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki, Shaikh Fariduddin Ganj-i-Shakar, Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya, Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi. The branches of the Chishti order sprang up almost in every corner of the country. In the death of Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi (1354/55 A.D.), the hereditary succession of the Chishti order came to an end. Saints of this period emphasised Tariqat instead of Shariat, and also laid emphasis on the purification of the heart from human infirmities, and on the love of God. They gave the message of love, equality and brotherhood to the Indians with the result that thousands of non-Muslims came into the fold of Islam.

But, on the death of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya (1325 A.D.), the atmosphere of the country was completely changed. The central system of the Chishti order (mazhab) became very weak. Shariat instead of Tariqat became the dominant feature of Muslim Religious Thought. Saints were there, but saints of the 13th century had become legends of the past. The country, at that time, was full of Ulema (scholars), but the Ulema confined themselves strictly to the formal rules of Shariat. Muslim religion was thus, reduced to a formal discipline. They (Ulema) disliked the ways of the mystics, misused the laws of Shariat for their personal gain, and also developed hatred and enmity among themselves. However, the Muslim mystics tried to assuage the wounds of the masses inflicted by the rulers. The so-called
Ulama, on the contrary, harassed them, and made them restless. Thus, the mass conversion of the non-Muslims to Islam, which was a notable feature of the 13th century, came to a stand still.

A survey of Muslim society during the 14th and 15th centuries showed that Muslim society was drifting away from the true ideals and spirit of Islam. Religion had become a mere formality and was full of superstitions and innovations. There appeared a group of persons during the above period who called themselves the lovers of God, but, in fact, they happened to be mere pretenders and heretics in the garb of saints.

After the death of Shaikh Mismuddin Auliya, the work of preaching and guidance of Islam took place by the Chishti saints (Khwajgan). The credit of preaching and expansion of Islam, in the Muslim State of Deccan, goes to Saiyed Muhammad Musaini Gaisudaras, a sufi of the Chishti order, and Khalifa of Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi. He settled at Gujbarga early in the 15th century.

Socio-religious conditions during the time of Saiyed Gaisudaras were going from bad to worse. Islam was passing through a critical phase. Ulama were engaged in earning their bread and butter for which they sold Islamic values. The Ulama interpreted Islam in their own way, keeping in mind their own interest first. Islam was weakened from all sides. Saiyed Gaisudaras felt the call and stood firm in eradicating the evils prevailing in the society in general and Muslims in particular with great success in his mission.
No saint of Chishti order wrote anything on Sufism before Saiyed Gaisudaras. Whatever records we find about the Chishti saints before the Shaikh, are only collection of their sayings (Malafuzat). Saiyed Gaisudaras was a prolific writer and had left behind a number of philosophical and quasi-philosophical treatise in Persian. Important among these are Sharah Risalah Quasiria, Sharah Subiatul Hayaq, Sharah al-Riqahul Akbar, Risalah Rayiat Rabbi, Pi Ahum Suratin, and Risalah Goshul Azam. These books are very important, and at the same time, helpful in understanding the Mystical Philosophy of Saiyed Gaisudaras. As the books written by Saiyed Gaisudaras are untouched and no work has been done yet, to bring out his philosophy, the present work is the need of the time in this sense.

The second chapter is on the 'Methodology of Saiyed Gaisudaras'. In his methodology, Gnosis (Marifat) is the main issue which has been discussed at length.

Saiyed Gaisudaras holds Gnosis of God (Marifat-Allah) as an extraordinary end of life, and this can only be achieved through self-knowledge. A gnostic who desires to seek the gnosis of God, should make his heart the mirror for the cognition of the Prophet, and again, in the mirror of the self of the Prophet, he ought to seek the cognition of God. But Saiyed Gaisudaras is firm that Gnosis (marifat) is not a matter of claim; it entirely depends upon the will and Mercy of God.

The faculty of reason has been used by Saiyed Gaisudaras in a special sense. Reason, according to Saiyed Gaisudaras is a
kind of 'Rassek' (light) endowed by God with the capacity to
distinguish virtue from sin, and truth from falsehood. Yet,
Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that it is only by the Grace and Guidance
of God with His 'Rassek' that reason recognises Him (God). He is
also of the view that logical reason cannot prove or disprove the
existence of God. He relies mainly on 'intuition' which he calls
Gnosis (marifat), and Gnosis is gained through intuition and
ecstasy. Progress in intuition (ilham) rests on self-discipline,
moral purity and Divine Grace. Reason, according to Saiyed
Gaisudaras, is handicapped as it pertains to and is part of the
contingent world. Therefore, it is incapable of providing us
divine knowledge. Intuition resembles very close to revelation
in its nature. The locus of intuition is heart (qalb) which has
an exalted place in the body of man. But it is not an authentic
source of knowledge. Reason, no doubt, helps us in ascertaining
true knowledge, but only as a criterion, and not as a perfect
criterion. Intuition is the only perfect criterion; it is the
most authentic and trustworthy source of knowledge.

Saiyed Gaisudaras speaks of the seven ways that God has
made into the heart of man. According to Saiyed Gaisudaras,
the complete realisation of God or the attainment of absolute
authentic certainty is possible only in the next world. Simply
a fraction of it may be achieved in this world and that only by a
chosen few.

The third chapter is regarding "Conception of Fauhida". This
chapter has been divided into three sections. In the first
section, Ibmul Arabi's view on Tawhid has been presented. The second section deals with Saiyed Gaisudaras's criticism on Ibmul Arabi's doctrine of wadat-ul-Mujid. And in the third section, the viewpoint of Saiyed Gaisudaras is discussed.

Ibmul Arabi propounded the theory of wadat-ul-Mujid or Pantheism. According to this theory, there exists nothing except God. He lays an exclusive emphasis on One Reality, and on the other hand denies any separate independent existence of the world. The phenomenal world, in the opinion of Ibmul Arabi, is nothing but the manifestation of Ayum-al-Thabita (quiddities) which are in God. The world is nothing, but the appearance of God. And therefore, Ibmul Arabi contends that the world has not its own existence. The world exists only on God. He further says that there is an identity between man and God, and the identity does exist from before-hand. Thus, widal (union) means the realisation of this identity. Ibmul Arabi explains his view points with the help of similes and metaphors. But Saiyed Gaisudaras disagrees with the views of Ibmul Arabi.

Ibmul Arabi, in order to establish his doctrine of wadat-ul-Mujid, takes help of the metaphor of the mirror and images which is closely allied to that of the object and its shadow. The One is regarded as an object whose image is reflected in different mirrors, the images appearing in different forms and shapes according to the nature of each mirror. He says that the Many (phenomenal world) is the mirror-image, the shadow of the Real object beyond. The whole world is like a shadow play. To rule
out any implication of duality, he states that the source of the shadow and the shadow itself are one.

Saiyed Gaisudaraz, on the other hand, opposes this view of Ibnul Arabi, and says that existence really belongs to God, but, at the same time, maintains that the existence of the world is also real as the existence to the world has been bestowed by God. There was a time when the world was devoid of existence, but once the world has been graced with existence, it is proper to hold that the world has separate existence and at the same time, it is other than God. Saiyed Gaisudaraz refutes the argument adduced by Ibnul Arabi, and thus, disproves the identity between God and world. He (Saiyed Gaisudaraz) says that the metaphor of the 'mirror and images' given by Ibnul Arabi is not true. He contends as to how the 'mirror and images' be one. He holds that undoubtedly the world is the manifestation of God's Will and Grace, yet the world is incapable of manifesting God as He is. The bestowing of existence, according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, is the work of God. The forms of the world are not the forms of Haqq, but are the workmanship of God.

Ibnul Arabi holds that God is the Real (Asl) and the world is His adumbration (wil). The adumbration is the appearance of the Real and it is the Real appearing or manifesting itself. Therefore, there is identity between the two. Saiyed Gaisudaraz attacks this view of Ibnul Arabi and says that the adumbration (wil) of a thing can never be identical with the Real (Asl), because adumbration can only be thought of as a copy or 'likeness'
of the Real (â€œ). Therefore, the question of identity between God and world does not arise.

Ibnul Arabi, further, maintains that there is an identity between man and God. And with this end in view, he interprets the Quranic verse and traditions to suit his scheme. But Saiyed Gaisudarasa disagrees with Ibnul Arabi.

Interpreting the verse: "We are nearer to him than (his) jugular vein", Ibnul Arabi holds that the world is the manifestation of the Attributes of God, and because of the fact that the Attributes are inseparable from God, the world is the manifestation of God Himself. Saiyed Gaisudarasa differs from Ibnul Arabi on his interpretation of the verse and says that the Attributes of God are not identical with God, but are over and above Him. It is the Grace of God that brings the world into existence.

Further, Saiyed Gaisudarasa says that there is no room for doubt that God is nearer to us than our jugular vein, but this nearness is through God's knowledge and Power; it is not a nearness in the sense of a companionship in space and time.

Again, Ibnul Arabi bases the identification of man with God on the tradition: "God created man after His own image". Ibnul Arabi thinks that man is the embodiment of all the Attributes of God. But Saiyed Gaisudarasa differs with Ibnul Arabi and holds that the tradition does not mean that man is the embodiment of all the Attributes of God. It simply means that God has not manifested His grace in any thing in the way He has manifested in man. Everything is the manifestation of the power of God,
but man is His secret. Saiyed Gaisudaras says that God's Creation of man in His own image does not mean that the 'essence' of God is the 'essence' of man. Saiyed Gaisudara, further, discusses the different grades of Faith (Iman) which a Sufi attains or has to attain for spiritual perfection. Saiyed Gaisudara explains five grades of faith, vis., Ila-ul yaqin, Ain-ul yaqin, Harq-ul yaqin, Harq-ul Haqicat and Harq-ul Haqq and explains these grades in a novel way.

Regarding Union (Nisal) the position of Iblul Arabi is that Nisal is the realization of the already existing identity of man with God. Saiyed Gaisudara differs with Iblul Arabi and says that Nisal does not mean that these two, man and God, become one, rather, the meaning of Nisal is that man is 'other' than God. Those who attain Nisal, they know this secret. Nisal, according to Saiyed Gaisudara, never implies fusion, but there always remains a separation. The duality between the lover and the beloved persists, because every separation (Firaq) has union (Nisal) and every union is followed by separation.

Saiyed Gaisudara lays emphasis on both the transcendent and immanent aspects of God. God is transcendent in the sense that He is beyond this Universe, and His immanence does not mean that God has manifested Himself in the Universe. Immanence does mean that the universe is the creation of God's Power and Grace. No doubt, every thing of the Universe is the manifestation of God's Grace, yet God is always above and beyond this universe. Thus, the core of Tawhid, according to Saiyed Gaisudara, is
that even at the highest stage of Tauhid, which is within the reach of man, there is never the identity between man (bunda) and God (Khuda). There is always a separation between the two; simply a man (bunda) due to the sight of the Glory and Grandeur of God, becomes oblivious of his own existence and finds God alone, which by mistake, he (man) considers the stage of identity between him and God. But the exact position is that even at that stage of Tauhid a slave remains a slave and Lord remains the Lord. There is no question of identity between man and God. In this way, Saiyed Qaisudaras, presents his system of thought which, in the present terminology, may be called Panentheism, and not Pantheism.

The fourth chapter deals with the 'Relation between man and God'. About the nature of man, Saiyed Qaisudaras refers to three opinions. The first holds that man is nothing other than the body. The second is that man is both body and soul, and the third maintains that man is only the soul. In the opinion of Saiyed Qaisudaras, the essential nature of man is both soul (ruh) and lower self (nafs). According to Saiyed Qaisudaras the soul never perishes and those who die in the way of God are not dead, rather they remain alive in this world and the world hereafter. Whatever attributes are in man, all relate to the soul and not to the body. Soul is the Shan (Grandeur) of God. Soul is that which makes man alive. Soul is a name among the Names of God such as Nafs-Hatiga, Ruh-i-Aman, Feis, Jibrassil, Ruh-i-Yudai, etc. Besides, there are animal and vegetative souls too.
According to Saiyed Gaisudaras, qalb (heart), in a physical sense, may be called a small piece of flesh, but it symbolises the place where Divinity or God rests in man. Qalb has a unique position in the life of man. It is very close to God and serves as a meeting point with God. It is God's centre of vision. The relation between man and God, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, is like the relation between soul and body.

As the soul is both external and internal to the body, so God is both external and internal to man.

Nafs, according to Saiyed Gaisudaras, is an evil power. It resides near the heart of man, instigates him to commit sins and keeps him away from the remembrance of God.

Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that the relation of man with God is never of identity, and man is other than God. He maintains that there is a personal relation between man and God. Man exists through the existence of God. He (man) loves Him, comes in contact with Him, prays to Him and submits to Him. In return, God accepts his prayers and bestows on him His Grace and Mercy.
The Mystical Philosophy
OF
Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaraz

A THESIS SUBMITTED
TO
ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY, ALIGARH.
FOR THE DEGREE
OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
PHILOSOPHY

Under the Supervision of
DR. MUHAMMAD NOOR NABI
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
ALIGARH MUSLIM UNIVERSITY
ALIGARH (INDIA)

BY
A. F. M. TAHIR
MAY, 1982
This is to certify that the thesis entitled, "The Mystical Philosophy of Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaraz", is the original work of Mr. A.F.M. Tahir and is suitable for submission for the award of Ph.D. degree in Philosophy.

(DR. MUHAMMAD NOOR NABI)
Supervisor
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to acknowledge my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Muhammad Noor Nabi, Department of Philosophy, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, to whose constant guidance and unfailing sympathy this work owes more than I can express. His keen interest has always been a great incentive to me in completing this Research Project.

I am also thankful to the Chairman, Department of Philosophy, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, and Dr. S.S. Verma, Principal, Sahibganj College, Sahibganj, Bihar, who provided every possible facility in pursuit of this study.

I must express my sincere thanks to Moulana Abdul Mannan Sahib and his colleagues of Madrasa Shamsul Huda, Dilalpur, Santhal Pargana, Bihar, who assisted me in going through the Persian manuscripts of Saiyed Husaini Gaisudaras.

My thanks are also due to Mr. Iqbal Ahmad, Department of English, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, for going through the manuscript and making some valuable suggestions from the language point of view, and to Mr. Mashhood Alam Ras, for typing the manuscript.

Last but not the least, I am thankful to all my friends and well-wishers.

21 May, 1982.

A. F. M. Tahir
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter I</td>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section A: The Times of Saiyed Gaisudaras</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section B: The Life of Saiyed Gaisudaras</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section C: The Writings of Saiyed Gaisudaras</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section D: The Importance of the Present Study</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter II</td>
<td>METHODOLOGY OF SAIYED GAISSUDARAZ: DISCUSSION ON GNOSIS</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter III</td>
<td>THE CONCEPTION OF TAUHID</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section A: Imam Arabi's Conception of Tauhid</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section B: Saiyed Gaisudaras's Criticism of Imam Arabi</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section C: Saiyed Gaisudaras's own Position</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter IV</td>
<td>THE RELATION BETWEEN MAN AND GOD</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter V</td>
<td>CONCLUSION</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

SECTION A

The Times of Saiyed Gaisudaraz

A historical survey of India between 1200 A.D. and 1325 A.D. persistently points towards the fact that Muslim religious thought in India was totally represented by Muslim mystics. The mystics of this period undoubtedly engaged themselves in the observation of Shariat, yet the dominant feature remained for them the fulfilment of Tariqat. They were not in favour of bringing rigidity in the external laws of Shariat. There were two mystic orders — the Chishti and Suhrwardi — which were mainly engaged in the work of preaching Islam. Being an autonomous institution, the Chishti order was practically divorced from political life. Shaikh Qutbuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki, Shaikh Hamiduddin Safi, Qazi Hamiduddin Nagawri, Shaikh Sadeuddin Zakariya, Shaikh Fariduddin Ganj-i-Shaker, Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya, and hundreds of their khalifas tried utmost to propagate Islam. They presented the true concept of Islam, not only theoretically, but also by living according to its doctrines. Their discourses on conception of God, knowledge of God, love of God, and vision of God, were in
strict conformity with the doctrines of Islam as interpreted by Al-Ghazali and others. They all preached determined freedom. Regarding the nature of soul, they confined themselves to the view that soul is the commandment of God.¹

A study of the Muslim rulers of the Slave and Khilji dynasties (1200 A.D. to 1320 A.D.) proves the fact that the rulers of the above mentioned period never dared to meddle with the affairs of the saints of the time. The rulers often regarded the saints with great reverence, awe and even respect.² A great number of Muslims of the time were attached either to Chishti or the Suhrawardi order. The majority of Muslims consisted of new converts to Islam. They embraced Islam because of its doctrines of brotherhood, liberty, and equality, and at the same time, were very much impressed by the spotless character of the saints together with their message of love and service to humanity at large. The period of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya (1238-1325 A.D.) was the golden period for the Chishti order as khanqahs were established in every part of the country, and these khanqahs were governed by a central organisation.³ Thus, there appears, besides political organisation, the existence of Muslim spiritual organisation working throughout India.

The first half of 13th century consisted of only a few divines. But thereafter hundreds of saints and divines migrated from Central Asia to India in the Alai regime due to Mongol invasion. At a speed, slow but gradual, Madrasahs were started for the education of the masses. In the syllabus at the madrasah,
Fiqh (jurisprudence), Hadith (Traditions) and Tafsir (interpretation) were the main subjects of study. Thus, the period ending with the 13th century showed par excellence development of religious consciousness, among at least, the literate Muslim masses.

The advent of 14th century brought with it a new phase. The death of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya (1325 A.D.) proved to be a very sad event, because, thereafter the atmosphere of the country was completely changed. The spiritual order of the Chishti silsilah became very weak. Shari'at, instead of tariqat, became the dominant feature of Muslim religious thought. Saints there were, yet those of the 13th century had become legends of the past.

The Tughlaqs, and after them the Saiyyads, took over the reigns of the country. This covered the period between 1320 A.D. and 1450 A.D. This span of one hundred and thirty years is very important for a study of the life and times of Saiyed Gaisudaras. And it should be worthwhile scanning the political, social and religious conditions that prevailed during the entire span. This may, to some extent, help understand the age when Saiyed Gaisudaras lived.

Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq who ruled from 1320 A.D. to 1325 A.D., was the founder of the Tughlaq dynasty. He proved to be an able ruler. His first concern was to restore the authority of the Sultanate in the Deccan. He died in 1325 A.D., but during his short reign of less than five years, he showed great ability in administration. Ghiyasuddin was a man of character and abstained from drinking and other vices that were amply current. Ideals of
Islam regulated his way of life. Punctual at the congregational prayers, he fasted in the holy month of Ramadan and also offered Tarawih. He firmly believed that Quranic laws should form the basis even of the civil administration. Tughlaq was very inclined to and interested in Muslim jurisprudence. For the execution of laws of Shari'at, he appointed judges (Gazis) all over his kingdom. Divines therefore gained power when Ghiyasuddin reigned. And yet, the Sultan had an aversion to Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya, to whom Ulugh Khan appeared devoutly attached. It appears that while attempting to save and revamp the otherwise depleting state treasury through reckless expenditures and grant of jagirs by Mubarak and Khusrau, Tughlaq had not only ordered the resumption of land unlawfully granted, he had also forced many to refund the amounts that had been bestowed. The celebrated saint, Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya, who had spent the money granted to him in charity and was unable to refund it, did not send any reply to the Sultan's demand. This estranged their relations, making Sultan Ghiyasuddin more angry at his son, Jauna Khan's expression of extreme reverence of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya. And yet the Sultan loved wisdom, and respected the divines, the muftis, teachers and students, and granted money to them according to their status, donating huge sums to the khanqahs.

By some quirk of fate, Jauna Khan, as Muhammad bin Tughlaq, ascended the throne after the death of Ghiyasuddin in 1325 A.D. Jauna Khan's reverence for Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya has already been noted. However, of all the monarchs that ever sat on the
throne of Delhi, Juana Khan or Muhammad bin Tughlaq has proved to be an enigma for historians, and has evoked from them, down the ages, a lively discussion. Barani writing about the Sultan says that Sultan Muhammad was the strange creation of God. His contradictions could hardly be comprehended and recounted by the rationalists and the divines. Thus, he had a high moral character. He abstained from drinking and was very strict in his relation with women. Even his subjects were forbidden intoxicating liquors. Even Barani, who is foremost in casting aspersions on the character of the Sultan, refers to his liberal gifts and acts of hospitality. He discouraged begging and fed the poor. Forty thousand beggars were fed each day at the public kitchens. The Sultan had a wonderful memory and was a veritable storehouse of knowledge. He was, in fact, one of the most learned and accomplished among his contemporaries. Various subjects had interested him. He was a serious scholar of logic, astronomy, philosophy, mathematics and even physical sciences. The Sultan was a rationalist and a firm believer in Islam. In his Memoirs he "acknowledges his faith in the existence of God, in the Prophet and his viceregent, the rightful Imam". However, the same Muhammad bin Tughlaq had an aspect that was entirely different from this commendable version. This was the Tughlaq full of cruelty and caprice. According to Barani, the Sultan "wantonly shed blood of innocent Muslims, so much so indeed that a stream of blood was always seen flowing before the threshold of the palace."
Muhammad bin Tughlaq was a rationalist, and was scrupulous about his religious practices. He keenly supported the rationalists (ahl-i-maqulat) against the traditionalists (ahl-i-manqulat). This was because of the fact that he was profoundly influenced by Sa'id, the heretic and logician, and Ubaid, the unbeliever, and Naja Intishar and Maulana Alimuddin, philosophers, from his early youth. Thus, Muhammad bin Tughlaq could doubt the traditions and sayings of saints, if these did not conform with his version of reason. And so, if the Sultan could be scrupulous about religious practices, he could also lack respect for Muslim divines, a respect not held back by orthodox Muslims. His preference for ahl-i-maqulat over ahl-i-manqulat has already been noted earlier.

In fact, the central organisation of the Chishti order received a death blow at the hands of the Sultan, when he shifted the capital from Delhi to Deogir. As a result, the khalifas and the sincere disciples of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya got scattered and the living traditions of the order came to an end. The Sultan came in open conflict with the elder Chishti saints. And thereafter, the khanqahs which were the chief source of guidance and education of the populace, came to an end. The literate masses reacted sharply. A vacuum was felt by many in their religious life. All this prompted in many the desire for a preservation of their past heritage, which took material shape when malfuzats were compiled. And we have Siyar-ul-Auliya compiled by Amir Khurd, and Surur-us-Sudur by Shaikh Fariduddin,
and *Khaizul Majalis* by Hamid Qalandar, and *Ahsan-ul-Aqwal* by Maulana Hamid bin Imad. A significant consequence of this was that interpretation of *Shari'at* became more rigid. Thus, though the right of *Ijtihad* had long been withdrawn by the Ulema, yet during this period, a clear and definite declaration was made against it. Muslim jurists and divines emphasized the four established schools only, viz., the Malik, the Hanafi, the Shafei, and the Hambali. The jurists and divines of this period did not bother to go to the original sources of Islam.  

After the death of Muhammad bin Tughlaq, Ferors Shah was hailed the emperor on March 23, 1351 A.D. Ferors Shah was born in 1309 A.D. (709 H). His father Rajab had come to India with his brothers, Abu Bukr and Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq, from Khorasan, sometime after the reign of Balban. When Ferors Shah attained the age of seven, his father Sipahsalar Rajab passed away. His widowed mother was worried about the future of her son, but Tughlaq consolated her, saying that he would look after the child as his own. While at Dilalpur, Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq frequently visited the khanqah (hospices) of Muslim saints and always took Ferors and Jauna Khan (future Muhammad bin Tughlaq) with him. Once he went to see Shaikhul-Islam Shaikh Alauddin, grandson of Shaikh Fariduddin Ganj-i-Shakar. Some cotton cloth was lying near the Shaikh. He gave four and half yards to Ghiyasuddin Tughlaq, twenty-seven yards to Jauna Khan, and forty yards to Ferors and asked them to wrap their pieces on their heads. After they had left, the Shaikh prophesied that the three would be
kings, for the respective periods, indicated by the yardage of the cloth given to each of them.

This fact shows that as a boy Feroz visited contemporary Muslim saints and spent some time in their company. But so had Jauna Khan, who later became Muhammad bin Tughlaq revered Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya! Be that as it may, Feroz Shah appeared different from the Sultan he succeeded to the throne of Delhi in this respect.

Feroz was an accomplished scholar and a great patron of learning. His interests were wide and varied. Astronomy, medicine, natural sciences, theology, religion, *fiqah* (law) and even falconry attracted him. He was more than forty when he became king. He had learnt good lessons from the reactions and revolts of the preceding age. And therefore, for the entire thirty-seven years of his reign, Feroz remained a passive instrument, and more so, in the hands of the Ulema. The theologian took over the reins of power. This made Feroz popular also. However, Feroz held liberal views too, which were far ahead of his age. Probably he was the first Muslim ruler in India who regarded the material welfare of his subjects a more important duty of the king, than wars and conquests. He changed many existing practices and customs and made them conform with the sacred law. And he followed the policy of appeasement. For this, he redressed the grievances of his subjects and also successfully appeased all sections of the Muslim population by lavish concessions. He bestowed upon them offices, rewards, jagirs,
and honours. To the needy, and men of letters, he showed special consideration and gave adequate stipends. A general amnesty was granted even to those guilty of venial and heinous crimes. Capital punishment and tortures were abolished. The victims of cruelty at the hands of Muhammad bin Tughlaq were amply compensated by granting them and their descendants, liberal gifts. In return, pardon deeds, duly witnessed, were obtained from them. These deeds not only recorded their satisfaction but also their reconciliation with the late Sultan.

Feroz Shah had firm belief in Abbasaid Caliphate. The title held by previous Sultans were uncertain, and also dubious, but his titles, on the other hand, were expressive of the relative position of the Sultan of Delhi with the Khalifa. In conformity with his convictions, he maintained regular contact with the Khalifa. He had the unique distinction of having been honoured four times by the Caliphate.

Feroz Shah even attempted to solve the problem of unemployment. With this purpose, he directed the Kotwal of Delhi to prepare a list of the names and particulars of the unemployed in the capital. Thus he could know the antecedents, skill and suitability of the unemployed. He interviewed them and employed each one of them to a post befitting his skill. Feroz had help for the womenfolk also. In keeping with the noble sentiments of the Prophet of Islam as embodied in the Hadith, exhorting people to help women and contribute liberally to marry girls, the Sultan Feroz Shah established a Diwan-i-Khairat (charity house) near the
central mosque of Perosabad. The object was to provide financial assistance for the marriages of the daughters of poor and needy Muslims. He also established a Darul Shifa (hospital) for the cure of the sick and the afflicted, whether Indians or strangers. Competent and skilled physicians were appointed to superintend it and provision was made for the supply of free Unani medicines, food, and drink to the patients. Poor and helpless patients immensely benefitted from these hospitals. Feros also granted pensions, stipends, and allowances. The aged, the poor and needy, orphans and widows, and even learned and devout Muslims were the beneficiaries. Nearly four thousand and two hundred poor and miserable Muslims benefitted from these pensions, which amounted to one hundred lakh tankas. Muftis received handsome stipends and subsistence allowances. Teachers of Quran were paid substantially, though according to their ability. Khanqahs (hospices) established by sufi saints like Shaikh Fariduddin, Shaikh Baha-ud-din, Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya and others, were given sufficient grants ranging from five thousand to thirty thousand tankas. In all, thirtysix lakh tankas were thus spent annually on these gifts to teachers and religious men.

Imbued with Islamic ideals of religion and politics, Feros made it the chief aim of his policy to convert India into an Islamic state. In every sphere of state policy, he earnestly endeavoured to follow the precepts of Islam. And the very essence of Islam is that it is both a religion and a system of government. The purpose of life is the service of God (ibada).
Barani says that since the days of Sultan Muizuddin Muhammad bin Sam, no ruler believed more firmly in the tenets of Islam than Feroz Tughlaq. The Sultan upheld the supremacy of Islam with fervour, and desired earnestly to strengthen it. He utilized the power, dignity, and prestige of kingship, to establish the supremacy of Sunnite Islam, elevate its customs, promulgate the commands of shariat, and, enforce what was ordained and prohibit what was forbidden. He believed in puritanism. He followed the Share in his personal life and applied it in his administration. He forbade the use of gold, silver, copper, brass, and metal vessels, and used only stone and earthen wares on the royal table. He ordered painting to be defaced, and forbade visits of women to tombs. He not only opposed Hinduism but was equally inimical to heretical sects in Islam. The execution of Ahmed Bihari proves this, and so does the suppression of Supposititious Mahdi. Ain-i-Mahru was also put to death for having said, 'I am God' (Anal-Huoq). Feroz thought himself deeply interested in the promotion of Islamic education and learning. He repaired madrasahs built by former Sultans, and established many afresh. Among them, 'Ferozi Madarasa' is worth a mention. Barani tells us that Ta'rif (Quranic exegesis), Hadith (traditions of the Prophet) and Fiqah (jurisprudence) were the chief subjects of study there. The Sultan established about one hundred and twenty khanqahs in Delhi and Firosabad.

The contemporary historians Barani and Afif are full of praise for Feroz Tughlaq and describe him just, merciful and
benevolent. Modern writers like Elliot and Elphinstone have gone so far as to regard him as the Akbar of the Sultanate period. He was essentially an honest, sincere, and well-meaning good man, with strong family affections and unstinted generosity, humanity, and affability. The Sultan breathed his last on Sunday, the 20th September, 1388 A.D. (18th Ramdan 790 A.H.), at the age of seventynine.

After the death of Feroush Shah, a civil war broke out between his sons and grandsons. His grandson, Sultan Tughlaq ascended the throne, but he was assassinated by Malik Ruknuddin in 1388-89 A.D. Next, another grandson of Feroush Shah, named Abu Bakr, came to the throne, but he could stay only for a year and a half. Abu Bakr was replaced by Sultan Muhammad who reigned for six and a half years, and was succeeded by Sultan Alauuddin who died after a bare month and a half, and was followed to the throne by the last king of the dynasty, Sultan Mahmood Shah. The last king held office for twenty years and two months. However, his reign was a nominal one. He was weak and incompetent in administration. It was during his rule that Taimur, the Amir of Central Asia, invaded the country and threw India into complete anarchy. Mahmood Shah died in 1413 A.D., and with that the dynasty of the Turkish Sultans came to an end. After them, the Sayyids took their turn at the throne, commencing in the year 1414 A.D.

Therefore an attempt shall next be made to describe briefly social and religious conditions during the Sayyid dynasty which
ruled from 1414 to 1450 A.D. Khizr Khan (1414-21 A.D.) was the founder of the Sayyid dynasty. He was a descendant of the Prophet of Islam and was hence styled a Sayyid. Khizr Khan held fast to the conviction that he owed his powers and prestige to Timur's patronage. He did not adopt the popular title of Shah and preferred to be addressed as Rayat-i-Ala (Sublime banners). India in those days was politically split up into a number of independent states, and the Sultanate of Delhi had, long before the rise of Sayyids, been considerably diminished in size and strength. The Turkish elements were far from being reconciled to the rule of the new dynasty, and in spite of Khizr Khan's conciliatory policy, organised uprisings and plots caused him considerable embarrassment. Khizr Khan possessed laudable traits of character which won him affection of the people. He was wise, just and benevolent, and was free from the vices common in those days. His record as a ruler was not, however, impressive, and the odds against him proved to be too great to allow him to achieve anything substantial. He fell ill during the campaign of Mewat, Gwalior, Elawa and after returning to Delhi, died on May 20, 1421 A.D.

Khizr Khan was succeeded by his son Mubarak (1421-34 A.D.), who did not hesitate to adopt the title of Shah and have the khutba read in his own name. The newly founded Sayyid kingdom under Mubarak Shah was threatened with danger from all sides. Mughal incursion into Indian territory during the latter part of his reign constituted perhaps the most vital danger to the
kingdom of Delhi. He proved to be the ablest king of the house of Khizr Khan. He endeavoured his best to preserve his father's gains, and exhibited qualities of a brave warrior, in overcoming the dangers that threatened his kingdom, both from within and without. He was wise and resourceful, and had always at his disposal a loyal army of his own. He was just and kind towards all his subjects, and even though a firm Muslim in belief and action, was free from the tint of bigotry.

After Mubarak Shah, Alauddin Alam Shah (1445-51 A.D.) ascended the throne. He adopted the high-sounding title of Alam Shah. He was perhaps the most unworthy king of his line. The only notable event of his reign was the transfer of power from the Sayyids to the Lodis, an act, which was more formal than real, for Bahlul already held more extensive territories than his nominal suzerain could claim. The Sultanate of Delhi had practically ceased to exist, and its place had been taken by petty kingdoms whose boundaries verged on the borders of Delhi. Alam Shah, who was morally perverse, realizing his inability to bring back into submission the rebellious amirs, retired to Badaun. Here he gave himself to pleasures and enjoyment, and here he remained for the rest of his life. After his death, Bahlul Lodi, the governor of Lahore, seized Delhi and thus the reign of Sayyid dynasty in Delhi ended. But as we see, the period between 1388 A.D. and 1451 A.D. was dead and dormant for Muslim religious thought. Feroz Shah Tughlaq died in 1388 and the last Sayyid, Sultan Alauddin Alam Shah in 1451. The time
span in between has a history of unrest, civil war, and anarchy, the rulers contributing always. 51

Now a survey of Muslim Religious Thought of the 13th and 14th centuries shows that there were three mystic orders in India, namely, Chishti, Suhrwardi and Firdosi. The followers of these orders were found not only among the mystics but also among the theologians. 52

The Chishti order in India was founded by Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti. He came to Ajmer in 1197 A.D. and died there in 1234 A.D. 53 From here, he started the work of preaching and guidance. In his time, the hereditary succession of the order came into existence. The khalifa and successor of Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti, Shaikh Qutbuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki popularised the Chishti order in Delhi and its surrounding areas. The Chishti order was further organised by Shaikh Fariduddin Ganj-i-Shakar, the khalifa and successor of Shaikh Qutbuddin. Chishti order reached its peak when Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya, the khalifa and the successor of Shaikh Fariduddin became its head. The branches of the Chishti order sprang up almost in every corner of the country. But after the death of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya (1325 A.D.), the policy of Muhammad bin Tughlaq (1325-1351 A.D.) gave a shattering blow to the Central organisation of the order, and after the death of Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi (1356/57 A.D.), the hereditary succession of the order came to an end. 54 The saints of this period emphasised Tariqat, and Shari‘at was declared a means for
the attainment of Tariqat. The saints also laid emphasis on the purification of the heart from human infirmities, and on love of God. They gave the message of love, equality and brotherhood to the Indians. The result was that thousands embraced Islam.55

But just after the death of Shaikh Mismuddin Auliya, Muslim religious thought took a new turn. The policy of Muslim rulers towards the saints changed. Sultan Muhammad bin Tughlaq compelled the Muslim saints to join government service. This was against their tradition. The saints revolted against the order of the Sultan and as a consequence, they were mercilessly punished and massacred. The result was obvious. The central spiritual organisation of the Muslim saints came to an end.56

The attitude of the Sultan brought rigidity to the external laws of Shariat. The country, at that time, was full of ulama (scholars). The ulama confined themselves strictly to the formal rules of Shariat. The doors of Ijtihad were already closed. They were not prepared to modify the rules framed by the four renowned jurists of Islam. The Muslim religion was reduced to a formal discipline. The Ulama disliked the ways of the mystics, misused the laws of Shariat for their personal gain, and developed hatred and enmity among themselves. However, Muslim mystics by their conduct tried to assuage the wounds of the masses who were tortured by the rulers. The so-called ulama, on the contrary, harassed them and made them restless. Mass conversion to Islam which was a notable feature of the 13th century thus failed to repeat itself.57
So far a general survey of the attitudes of Tughlaq and Sayyid Sultans has been made. But, what about the order of Muslim Society itself? A survey of that, during this period appropriately follows. In the 14th and 15th centuries, Muslim society was drifting away from the true ideals and spirit of Islam. It was in the process of degeneration each day. Religion was a dead formality, full of superstitions and innovation. The worship of the tombs of saints was in full swing. The Muslim masses of the time were generally attached either to Chishti or Suhrwardi order. They were more or less blind followers of their orders. Most of them were converts who had embraced Islam, but could not imbibe its influence deeply. They were habituated to idol worship from antiquity. Although Islam kept them away from their idols, yet it failed to bring them before the unseen God in the true sense. Furthermore, they had been too used to guidance from pandits and mahants. After the renunciation of their ancestral religion, they still clung to their directors. They formed a close relationship with them. Whenever they faced any difficulty, they ran to their directors for solution. This practice continued even after the death of spiritual guides. The graves of the spiritual served as places of refuge for the disciples. In course of time, the tombs of the saints were converted into places of worship and sanctity. 

There also appeared a group of persons at that time who called themselves the lovers of God, but in reality they happened to be mere pretenders. They were, so to say, heretics
in the garb of saints. They claimed not to be bound by the laws of Shariat as they had attained the tariqat. In Fatuhat-i-Firoz Shahi, we find mention of their names such as Ahmad Bihari, Ruknuddin and Mawla Zadahas (Freedman) of Ain-Mahru. Ahmad Bihari led people astray and uttered blasphemous words. He was thought as the religious head of these misguided people and was considered to be God by a body of men in Bihar. In Delhi, there was a man named Ruknuddin who claimed himself to be the Mehdi. He called himself the Mehdi-Akharassaman. He claimed to have been endowed with inspired knowledge, and the knowledge of all the created beings. He wrote books in support of his claim and invited people to accept these false and erroneous beliefs. He declared himself the apostle of God. Mawla Zadahas of Ain-Mahru proclaimed himself a religious leader in Gujarat. Before his disciples, he declared 'I am God', and asked them to repeat, 'Thou art', 'Thou art'. From the latter half of the 15th century onwards, differences appeared in the Muslim religious thought of the Chishti saints in the guise of Mehdavi movement, Bhakti movement and Sattari movement.

Such were the social and religious conditions of India at that time. But following the decentralisation of spiritual organisation in India, after the death of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya, preaching and guidance in Islam was continued by Chishti Saints (Khwajaqan). Among the Khalifas of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya, Khwaja Muntajabuddin and Khwaja Burhanuddin Gharib came to Daulatabad. Khwaja Shamsuddin Ghazi reached Usmanabad
and Shaikh Akhsaraj went to Bengal and began the work of preaching Islam there. In the Muslim state of Deccan, the great work of preaching and extension of Islamic teaching was taken up by Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras (1321-1425 A.D.), a Sufi of the Chishti order and Khalifa of Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi. He settled at Gulbarga early in the 15th century.65

SECTION B

The Life of Saiyed Gaisudaras

India in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries became the centre of Sufi activities. Illustrious personalities like Shaikh Muinuddin Chishti, Shaikh Qutbuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki, Shaikh Fariduddin Ganj-i-Shakar, Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya and Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi were busy with sufism, guiding humanity at large, and spreading wide the message of Islam.

After Ali bin Uthman Alhujwiri (d 465 H) that is, after the lapse of 125 years, the founder of the Chishti Silsila in India, Khwaja Muinuddin Chishti (1142/43 A.D. - 1235/36 A.D.) travelled alone from Madina with a stick and a water-pot (abriq) and reached Delhi at a time when practically the whole country worshipped idols. From Delhi he came to Ajmer which was the capital of a powerful Hindu king and a centre of the Hindu way of thought. Here he made his permanent abode. He established the Chishti order in India and popularised it. In view of his missionary efforts, Mir
Khurcl calls him the 'deputy of the prophet of God in India.'

Professor Arnold, in his book, 'The Preaching of Islam', writes that during Khwaja Saheb's short stay at Delhi, more than 700 people took to Islam, and the first batch which accepted Islam in Ajmer included the teacher and priest of the king. Professor Arnold has further written that the entire population of west Punjab became Muslim at the hands of Shaikh Baha'ud-Din Zakaria Multani and Baba Fariduddin Ganj-i-Shakar. Shaikh Jalaluddin Tabrezli along with Shaikh Bahauddin Zakaria came to Multan. Shaikh Bahauddin Zakaria remained in Multan and preached and spread Islam. Through him lakhs entered the fold and received the message of Allah.

Shaikh Qutbuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki was the khalifa and successor of Shaikh Muinuddin Chishti. He was born at Aush in 1186-67 A.D., and died in Delhi in 1235/36 A.D. Sultan Altutmish developed great faith in him. He was deeply loved and revered by the people. For the expansion of Chishti order, he trained a number of disciples and khalifas among whom Shaikh Fariduddin's name is outstanding.

Shaikh Fariduddin Ganj-i-Shakar was born in 1175 A.D. at Khatwal and died in 1265 A.D. at the age of ninety-five in Ajodhan, present Pakpattan. He was the khalifa and successor of Shaikh Qutbuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki. He trained a group of disciples among whom Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya's name is outstanding.

Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya was born in Badaun on 9th October, 1238 A.D. and died in Delhi in 1325 A.D. He was a disciple of
Shaikh Fariduddin Ganj-i-Shakar who granted him khilafat-namah and appointed him as his successor. The Chishti order under his able guidance spread out to most extensive areas of influence.  

Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi was born in Awadh and died in Delhi on 18th Ramadan 757 H (1358 A.D.) at the age of eighty-two years. He was the disciple of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya who granted him khilafat-namah and appointed him his successor in Delhi. He was a man of patience, vigil, and penitence. He suffered a lot at the hands of Sultan Muhammad bin Tughlaq.

Khwaja Muntajabuddin and Khwaja Burhanuddin Gharib, two khalifas of Khwaja Nizamuddin Auliya came to Daulatabad, Khwaja Shamsuddin Ghazi reached Osmanabad, and Shaikh Akhi Saraj went to Bengal to preach Islam there. Although there had been a Muslim State in the Deccan for about a century, yet the great mission of preaching and spread of Islam in this area, took place, according to Arnold, only at the hands of Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras. Saiyed Gaisudaras belonged to the Chishti order. He had settled at Gulbarga early in the 15th century.

Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras was the disciple of Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi who granted him the khilafat-namah. Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi had trained a group of scholars under his inspired guidance. Among them the name of Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras is worthy of mention. His name is Saiyed Muhammad, his kunniat is Abul Fatah, and his alqub
are Sadruddin Wali-ul Akbar-al-Sadiq. But commonly he is known as Khwaja Bandanawas and Khwaja Gaisudaras. 76

How Saiyed Muhammad Husaini earned the title of Gaisudaras is interesting to narrate. Once while he carried the planquin of his preceptor along with other disciples, his long hair got entangled with some projection of the planquin. But he did not stop and continued with the planquin to the destination, in spite of acute pain because of the entangled hair. He kept silent, out of reverence and love for his Shaikh who profoundly impressed by this gesture of his disciple, recited these lines: 77

Each disciple, accepting the fold with Saiyed Gaisudaras as Preceptor
Is pledged upon the name of Allah, not improperly, a great lover.

Saiyed Gaisudaras was born in Delhi on 4th Rajab-ul-Murajjab, 721 Hijri (1321 A.D.). 78 He died on 16th Ziqadah, 825 Hijri (1426 A.D.) at the age of 103 years, 4 months and 12 days. 79 The name of his father was Saiyed Yusuf, who was famous more as Saiyed Raja. His father died in Daulatabad which is situated near Aurangabad in the State of Hyderabad, 8 and is laid to rest near Luhri, the cave of Eloka. 80 The name of his mother was Bibi Rani. 81 The name of his wife was Bibi Rasa Khatoon. 82 At

* Now Daulatabad and Aurangabad are in the Maharashtra State.
the age of 40 years he was married, on the advice of his mother, to the daughter of Saiyed Ahmad, the son of Maulana Jamaluddin Mughrabi. Saiyed Gaisudaraz had two sons, namely, Saiyed Muhammad Akbar, and Saiyed Muhammad Ashghar. He had three daughters, namely, Bibi Fatimah, Bibi Batul, and Bibi Umtuddin.

Saiyed Gaisudaraz lived a very long life. Of particular interest is his narration of the odds if a person lives long. He says that relatives rejoice at old age and long life, but in reality, this long life was a curse to him. Had old age been thought good, Allah would have bestowed it on Prophet Muhammad. But, according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, Allah did not bestow two things on Prophet Muhammad. The first, which he explicitly said, was the art of poetry, as this was not in keeping with his position, and the second, which he implicitly said, was long life. Allah bestowed a longer time-span to lower a man's prestige, who crumbled even in his own time. But Allah does not want to lower the prestige of His friends in the eyes of the people.

Saiyed Gaisudaraz further says that he did not know why Allah gave him such a long life. He had never wanted it, but once, when Khwaja Shaiik Nasiruddin Chirag-i-Delhi, just a few days before his death, had granted to him the Khilafat-namah, a secret which his cousin Maulana Zainuddin did not know. Now after the death of Chiragh-i-Delhi, there was a great difference of opinion as to the Shaikh's Khilafat. Maulana Zainuddin declared, that he, who would live long even as the Shaikh, Khwaja Chiragh-i-Delhi himself did, should be the khalifa. And Saiyed Gaisudaraz says that it
was at this one juncture that he had for the first and last time wished a longer time span to live, so as to establish and prove the truth of his khilafat. And this did actually happened for Saiyed Gaisudaras lived to be 105.

According to lineage (shajra-i-nasab) he is related to Prophet Muhammad through twenty-two chains; and likewise, according to shajra-i-mashikhat, he is related to Prophet Muhammad through twenty-two chains.

When Emperor Muhammad bin Tughlaq had ordered a population transfer from Delhi to Daulatabad in 1326/27 A.D., Saiyed Gaisudaras was only four years old. And he too came to Daulatabad along with his father. In Daulatabad lived a highly religious and pious man named Shaikh Baba. His father took him to meet Shaikh Baba. Daulatabad was then called Deogir. The house of Shaikh Baba was near the door of a goldsmith. When Shaikh Baba used to sit at samah his mouth filled with foam and whatever was said at that time, came to be true later on. Shaikh Baba forecast many spiritual developments in Gaisudaras and these later came true.

From the early age of eight, Saiyed Gaisudaras engrossed himself in prayer and mortification. Friends of his age-group greatly respected him. Later, he began his studies and started with Misbah (a book on Naḥḥ) and Guduri (a book on Fiqah). The company of his maternal grandfather, who was a murid of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya proved to be a great advantage and benefit.

Saiyed Gaisudaras was hardly three years old when Shaikh
Nisamuddin Auliya had died in 1325 A.D. And yet the young boy, Saiyed Gaisudaras had occasion to see him, and that too at Daulatabad! A problem had long vexed the Saiyed. Did the hands first touch the ground or the knees, when one fell into sajdah, while at namaz? But once he watched a man pray in the mosque at Daulatabad and felt his problem solved. Later he described this man to his maternal grandfather who told him that the man was none else but Shaikh Nisamuddin Auliya himself, to whom the grandfather was beholden as a murid and therefore had very much seen.

Now the young Saiyed Gaisudaras had heard about the fame and grace of Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi. He longed to see the Shaikh, however, the distance of 700 miles, between Delhi and Daulatabad, was forbidding. Gaisudaras was then 15. But on a sudden something made his mother acutely enraged against her brother, Saiyed Ibrahim, whereafter she took Saiyed Gaisudaras and his brother Saiyed Husain, alias Chandan, and left Daulatabad for Delhi. By that time, the father of Saiyed Gaisudaras had been dead. The three reached Delhi after months. In Delhi, Saiyed Gaisudaras went to offer the Friday prayers in the mosque of Jama-i-Sultan Qutbuddin, situated inside the sarai. While he sat on the floor of the mosque, Shaikh Nasiruddin suddenly came. Saiyed Gaisudaras did not know him but was captivated by his charm and personality, and profoundly loved him from that moment. He began to think of his good luck if that man would turn out to be Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi. He asked from the people present there as to who this noble man was. They replied that he was Shaikh Nasiruddin
Mahmud Awadhi. Saiyed Gaisudaraz was extremely happy and thanked Allah. Later he requested his elder brother to accompany him for a visit to the Shaikh, and become his murid. They took bait from him on the 16th of Rajab, 1336 H. 92

The Shaikh held his disciple, Saiyed Muhammad Gaisudaraz, in great esteem. Once Mouiana Alauddin was brought by his cousin-brother, Malik Haji, before Shaikhul-Islam, to accept him as his murid. Shaikhul-Islam accepted him as his murid but said at the same time that he had no scope for keeping him in his service. He asked Mouiana Alauddin to choose one amongst his murids and remain with him. At this, Mouiana Alauddin found himself in a dilemma, but chose the murid with the very long hair. But he did not know Saiyed Muhammad Gaisudaraz. When Shaikh Nasiruddin came to know of the selection, he asked Saiyed Gaisudaraz to keep Mouiana Alauddin with him, and share with him whatever instructions he had been given. The mother of Saiyed Gaisudaraz called Mouiana Alauddin her son. 93

Saiyed Gaisudaraz was overwhelmed with his mediation of Allah, and finding no secluded place at home, chose for himself a place in Khajrah Shirkhan Jahan Panah. There was a hujra. For ten continuous years he remained there absorbed in remembrance of Allah. Mouana Alauddin also accompanied him there. 94 Saiyed Gaisudaraz, off and on, used to request his preceptor to permit him to give up the acquisition of external knowledge (Ilm-i-zahir), because whatever he had acquired till then was thought by him, quite sufficient. He requested him for guidance in internal
knowledge (Ilm-i-batin). Upon this, Shaikhul Islam Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi advised him to go through very minutely Hadithah Barudi, Rijalih Shamas and Kashif Mazahah, because the Shaikh had a mission for Saiyed Gaisudaras to fulfil. After finishing these books, Saiyed Gaisudaras informed his Shaikh who became very pleased. It was only thereafter that he started seeking internal knowledge and began Mujahida, fasting of taj, and prayers. Thus, he prepared himself for makashfat and taqalluayat. He narrated to his Shaikh all that transpired when he was at prayer as events and happenings. At these achievements of Saiyed Gaisudaras, Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi once remarked, "after 70 years a boy has again aroused in him a state of ecstasy and enabled him to recall the stories and events of the past times." Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi had great love for him, and showed too often his kindness towards him. Once Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi came down to Khatira Shirkhan to see Saiyed Gaisudaras. He had brought some money with him and gave it to Saiyed Gaisudaras as his presentation (nasrana). And from day onwards, Saiyed Gaisudaras's name became famous and all the great Shaikhs with one voice agreed that he had been bestowed in his youth, spiritualism having been completed. When Saiyed Gaisudaras was old by a little over 30 years, he began to pass his time more in seclusion, and became totally detached from human society. He began the journey as the traveller of the path (saluk) with perfection and reached the pitched hight par excellence. Till then he was a bachelor. He
used to spend his time much in *mujahida*. Saiyed Gaisudaraz by then had become famous and had been very dear to Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi. He got special attention from his preceptor. This is amply illustrated from an incident in which his Shaikh is described ill. The Shaikh suffered from a disease called *barsubadi* when constipation was excessive. Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi asked Saiyed Gaisudaraz and Moulana Alauddin to visit Khatirah Shaikh Qutbuddin and narrate his plight. It so happened that Saiyed Gaisudaraz could not find time to pay attention to Khwaja Qutbuddin and to meet him in the world of *burzakh*. Saiyed Gaisudaraz was very much perplexed, for what would he say if his preceptor asked him. So he asked Moulana Alauddin to return back and he himself went home. There he became absorbed in meditation in the *hujrah*. In the state between sleep and awakening (*alam-i-vaqia*), he saw an old roof on which Khwaja Khisr was standing and asking him, by way of hint, to present his salam to Shaikhul-Islam (Khwaja Nasiruddin). When Saiyed Gaisudaraz came back to *khanaah* (monastery), Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi asked him as to what he experienced. He narrated that he saw Khwaja Khisr asking him to convey his salam to him (Shaikh Nasiruddin). On this, Shaikh Nasiruddin became very glad. After sometime, by the grace of God, Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi recovered from his illness. He remained alive for another year. From the statement of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, it was inferred that the standing of Khwaja Khisr on the old roof meant that the life of Shaikhul-Islam had reached its last stage, and
Saiyed Gaisudaraz always received special attention and care from his Shaikh, as much almost as one who was privileged. When Saiyed Gaisudaraz was 37, Khula, in epidemic form, broke out in Delhi. The Saiyed also fell victim and became seriously ill, vomiting blood. Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi made it a point to be watchful and vigilant and had him treated with particular care, and so saved his life. Thus, the Shaikh attended Saiyed Gaisudaraz, for, the preceptor expected much from the disciple, and foresaw for him, a brilliant future. After the disciple visited the preceptor and narrated to him his experience during this illness. He had been adorned by people, not of this world, with attires of Malayat, Nabuat, Rasalat, Ittihad, and Rabubiyat. The face of the Shaikh, when he heard this, was aglow with delight. And finally, when Saiyed Gaisudaraz told his Shaikh that he had even seen all things, having different forms, returning to one Reality, the Shaikh became so pleased that he took up his blanket and with both hands offered it to Saiyed Gaisudaraz. The Shaikh then grasped both hands of Saiyed Gaisudaraz in his own, and asked him to accept from among the people, disciples, through bait. Saiyed Gaisudaraz with humility agreed to comply. His Shaikh had laid down only two conditions for him: first that he should maintain discipline through life, and the next, that he should be kind and affectionate to his relatives. Thereafter, the Shaikh threw his nehalcha towards Saiyed Gaisudaraz and asked him to take the cover to this bedding of his.
The fact outstands that Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi had recommended the Khilafat Namah to Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras, with his own hands. For when, Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi fell seriously ill, some of his disciples requested him to appoint a khalifa. He agreed, and asked for a list of names to be placed before him. Moulana Zalnuddin prepared a long list, which despite its length did not contain the name of Saiyed Gaisudaras. Anyway, this list was put before the Shaikh who, after going through it carefully commented that it contained trash, and even hinted that those mentioned in the roll had better take care of their own faiths, rather that is be named responsible as Shaikh or Khalifa, for the faith of others. He threw out the list. Then Moulana Zalnuddin presented to the Shaikh another roll, but this time, it was a shorter list. The Shaikh asked Moulana Zalnuddin to read out the names, and when he found that the name of Saiyed Gaisudaras did not figure in this also, he questioned why the name of Saiyed Gaisudaras had been omitted, at which all present began to tremble and the name of Saiyed Gaisudaras was immediately included, and the list was again read out to the Shaikh, who heard it, took it in his own hands, and certified the name of Saiyed Gaisudaras with his own signature.

Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi died on Friday, the 18th of Ramdan 757 H (1356 A.D.) at the age of 82 years. After observing the fourth day of the death of Shaikh Nasiruddin, Saiyed Gaisudaras sat on the seat of Waliyat and extended his hands to forthcoming disciples for bai't, and began to guide and give instructions to people after the fashion of his preceptor.
Saiyed Gaisudaras was either towards the end of his fifteenth year or the beginning of the sixteenth when he had prof erred his services to his preceptor. At that time, Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi was 70 years old. The kindness and goodness which his Shaikh bestowed upon him were unique and unparalleled and on this account people were jealous of him. Shaikh Nasiruddin had in seclusion told many things to Saiyed Gaisudaras, which could, if written take the shape of a book. Saiyed Gaisudaras esteemed and reverenced Shaikh and Peer, for it was they who guided their murid or disciples on to the right path and on the right path itself, and checked and prevented them from falling into sin.

Saiyed Gaisudaras always engaged himself in meditation and spiritual exercises. From the age of 12 he had slept very little. Throughout the night, he had remained engaged in contemplation of God. During the very lifetime of his Shaikh, he was aware of the art of wrapping the turban like his Peer, yet out of sheer respect for him, he had never practised it. Although Saiyed Gaisudaras was in the service of Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi, since the age of sixteen and had even attended many meetings, yet the experience of divine love was less talked about, for it was beyond the capacity of the common people to understand and visualize it. However, if, at any time his Shaikh uttered something about this love, Saiyed Gaisudaras fell into a trance. Saiyed Gaisudaras was 80 when the Mughals invaded Delhi. He had to leave Delhi with his entire family. He wrote to Moulana Alauddin of Gwalior, a truthful murid, for help. The letter was written
from Bahadurpur and described the trauma that Delhi faced.\textsuperscript{110} From Delhi, Saiyed Gaisudaras had gone to Bahadurpur, where he was received and welcomed by Malik Muhammad Ali Khan Afghan and Moulana Bahauddin. They spared a house for him and put their entire assets at the disposal of Saiyed Gaisudaras.\textsuperscript{111} On the 20th Rabiul-Awwal, 801 H, he left Bahadurpur for Gwalior. When Gwalior had remained twenty miles away, they were surrounded by robbers in the dense forest. Alarmed, they prayed to God. Suddenly they saw a group of soldiers approach. This party had come to receive Saiyed Gaisudaras and his people, and it was led by none other than Moulana Alauddin Owaliarl himself. Moulana Alauddin took the party home and offered all possible help and service.\textsuperscript{112} Saiyed Gaisudaras had great love for Moulana Alauddin Owaliarl and had granted the first Khilafat-namah to him. Saiyed Gaisudaras informed all present there that he had been told to do so, and not that he had given the Khilafat on his own. The Khilafat-namah was written by Moulana Hameed.\textsuperscript{113} After a short stay at Gwalior he went to Bhander and Erchi. At Bhander the sons of Moulana Zulqarnain, who was himself the murid of Shaikh Nasiruddin, and people of the place became his disciples or murida. At Erchi too, he was welcomed by both princes and the masses alike, as also by ulema, and mashaikh. People like Saiyed Ekram, Saiyed Mehman, Moulana Amiruddin, Kazi Burhanuddin, Saiyed Ahsan, along with others accepted his discipleship and became his murida. From there he went to Chhatrah, and there too people like Kazi Ishaque and Muhammad Rukun, the mufti of the place, along with his sons,
became his murid. From Chhatrah, Saiyed Gaisudaraz went to Chanderi. He was received at Chhatrah by Shaikh Nasiruddin, the son of Khwaja Yaqub Chanderi, who took him to his house. At Chhatrah, the son of the Mufti Chanderi, better known as Kazi Khwajqi and very many other people became his disciples. From there Saiyed Gaisudaraz left for Baroda and reached it on the night of Id-ul-Fitr of 801 H. Adam Khan, his sons, and other people preferred extreme hospitality. For some time, he also stayed elsewhere in Gujarat. Later again he expressed his desire to visit Baroda again and then left for Daulatabad, via Sultanpur. At Daulatabad, he visited the tomb of his father, Saiyed Yusuf. When he reached Patahbad alias Deogir, Asadul Mulk, the governor of the place, came to meet Saiyed Gaisudaraz with presents on behalf of King Feros Shah of Gulbarga. Feros Shah had heard that Saiyed Gaisudaraz approached the city so he had sent the word to his governor to receive Saiyed Gaisudaraz with the presents. Later Saiyed Gaisudaraz went on to Ahsanabad, the capital of Gulbarga.

At Gulbarga, Feros Shah himself came out of the town to afford him a befitting welcome and reception. Feros Shah insisted that Saiyed Gaisudaraz stay at Gulbarga, whereupon Saiyed Gaisudaraz took time and meditated and later answered that although he wanted to stay, yet it would not be worthwhile as the king, Feros Shah, had not long to live. The king then requested Saiyed Gaisudaraz to pray to God for the enhancement of his age. Saiyed Gaisudaraz prayed and the king lived, dying only some days before the death of Saiyed Gaisudaraz himself.
The status and achievements of Saiyed Gaisudaraz were very high. He was simply and purely a man of God. His greatness is proved by the fact that whatever Bayazid Bistami and Khwaja Junaid Baghdadi had said and whatever had been written, were manifested and expressed through his thought, words and actions. His manner of Saluk was the same. He had great love for God and often remained so engaged in his meditation of God that he almost stopped eating food. He fasted to an extreme. It is reported by Saiyed Gaisudaraz, that a man of the unseen world used to remain with him always as guide since his very childhood and till the time of his hajj to Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi. Saiyed Gaisudaraz very often remained engaged in meditation of Haqq at lonely and secluded places, and even when he returned to town, he did not look either way and for this reason, earned himself the name of Saiyed Diwana.

It is stated in Sair-i-Muhawwadi that Saiyed Gaisudaraz had the grace and opportunity to meet the souls of Bayazid Bistami, Haurat Junaid Bughdadi and Imam Ahmad Ghazali, the brother of Imam Muhammad Ghazali. He had intimate connections with Abdals and learnt inner practices or exercises from them. He had also the gracious occasion to meet the souls of Prophet Muhammad and Hadrat Ali. Many miracles too are attributed to him. Thus he had forecast, two or three years earlier the Moghal invasion and the calamity that had been determined for Delhi.
Once a serious charge that he had spoken words against *Sharīa* was levelled against Saiyed Gaisudaras. He was charged so, because of his writing to the effect that togetherness of God with men is personal (nati), whereas books proved it to be conceptual (ilmī). The matter was reported to emperor Peros Shah. He asked for a clarification from Saiyed Gaisudaras. Saiyed Gaisudaras replied that ulama had spoken of attributive togetherness. Attribute is not separate from *dhāt* (Being), nor can it be separated. In togetherness (mâyeeat) *dhāt* and *sifat* are complementary, and therefore togetherness remains the same whether viewed from the perspective of *dhāt* or *sifat*. Besides this, said Saiyed Gaisudaras, that the attributive togetherness is symbolic (nithari), not real (jagig). Hence, belief be in *dhāt* or *sifat* (Being and Attribute) does not make any difference. The entire audience was satisfied.  

Saiyed Gaisudaras was a great lover and admirer of his preceptor, and used to help him in ablution. Wherein his Shaikh washed his face, hands and feet, while Saiyed Gaisudaras stood and poured water proferring in this manner his services to his preceptor. Saiyed Gaisudaras performed his prayer five times in congregation. He never prayed alone or with only one man. He followed his preceptor's methods in spiritual exercises, prayer and even day-to-day living. At Gulparga, the prayer (nash) was led by Mulana Bahauddin, and the prayer-call (azan) was given by Moulana Qutbuddin. During his last days Saiyed Gaisudaras was unable to stand and offered prayer each time in a sitting position. He used to
take rest at mid-day (qalula) without fail and used to say that the Sufi who did not take rest at mid-day, had not the intention of remaining awake at night. He even used to say that success came through sikr and murâqba. He had Chishti-like inclinations in sama. Now as was the practice, disciples (murids) bowed their heads before their peers. This matter was reported to Feroz Shah who ordered that sama could be heard but the condition was that it should be heard only in seclusion. Thereafter a curtain was put up behind which Saiyed Gaisudaras and the company sat to hear sama. He often preferred the recitation of Persian couplets at a sama. He said that the success with which he was crowned was also because of reciting the Quran and attending the sama. He always used to perform the 'ura' ceremony of his ancestors, such as Prophet Muhammad, the king of Sufis, and of Shaikh Qutbuddin and of Saiyed Ahmad, his own younger brother and Saiyed Muhammad Akbar, his own eldest son, and Shaikh Nasiruddin Auliya and Imam Hasan, and Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi and of others too. He spent huge sums of money at these celebrations.

It is reported that towards the end of the 14th century, Saiyed Muhammad Gaisudaras, a prominent Sufi, told a large audience of eminent men that the orthodox ulema had made faith dependent on the study of a few books and the remembering of a few words. They had reduced faith to something trivial. In fact, where there is perfection, there is beauty in faith. The ulema said that all one needs in prayer was to know prayer itself. Concentration on God,
according to them, was a condition of excellence, not of normal performance. Discussing the point, Seyed Gaisudaraz said on one occasion that if such questions were seen in their proper perspective, it would become apparent that there was no real difference of opinion between the orthodox Ulema and the Sufis, but as it happened, the only way the Sufis could obtain deliverance from this group was to call themselves a part of it. Even so they would be dubbed ignorant, irreligious and atheistic. Giving a vivid picture of the religion (din) of his time, Seyed Gaisudaraz says that in the time of Prophet Muhammad religion was like a lighted lamp and people saw whatever they wanted, expressly and manifestly. After Prophet Muhammad came the period of Hazrat Abu Bakar in which people receded a step back from the source of illumination. This was followed by the period of Hazrat Umar, when people withdrew further back. And so he says that in his time, people saw the light of the lamp from a far distance, not liking, nor even intending to come any near and be graced by this light. People have left religion behind them. The mat (basat) of religion (deen) had been folded, and the story could not go beyond this. Seyed Gaisudaraz says that in his time, people told, narrated and listened to stories of great, good and upright people, but no body cared to take up their way of life and follow them and thus do not benefit in this world and in the world hereafter. Seyed Gaisudaraz is of the firm view that the path and goal of Shariah was release from the physical self and from worldly
heriditaments. The path and goal of Tariqat was released from physical life and the heart, and the attainment of the lofty condition of unity. Saiyed Gaisudaras had the first Khilafat-namah written in the name of Shaikh Allauddin Gwaliari. After that, the second Khilafat-namah was prepared in the name of Moulana Ruknuddin, son of Shaikh Allauddin Gwaliari. At the instance of Saiyed Gaisudaras, the third general Khilafat-namah was prepared at Delhi, but the names of the Khalifas were included later on.

SECTION C

The Writings of Saiyed Gaisudaras

The honour of propagating and spreading the Chishti order in South India goes to Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras. No saint of Chishti order wrote anything on Sufism before him. Whatever records we find about the Chishti saints before the Shaikh, are only collections of their sayings (malfuzat). However, 'Kashif-al-Mahjub' is the first oldest Persian source for the study of Sufism. It was written by Shaikh Ali Bin Uthman Alhujwiri (died 465 A.H.), who came at a time when Mahmud Ghazi was attacking India. Saiyed Gaisudaras was a prolific writer and the author of numerous books. In Saiy-i-Muhammedi, Moulana Shah Muhammad Ali Samani has mentioned an exhaustive list of the
writings of Saiyed Gaisudaraz. The list contains the following:

1. Tafsir-i-Quran in the manner of Saluk.
2. Tafsir-i-Quran in the manner of Kashf.
3. Havasi-i-Kashaf.
4. Sharah Mashriq.
5. Tarjuman Mashariq.
6. Aarif Sharah Awarif.
7. Tarjuman Awarif.
8. Sharah Tawarruf.
10. Sharah Fasusul Hikam.
11. Sharah Tamhidat Gazi Ainul Oassat.
12. Sharah Risalah Qusairia.
13. Khatirul Oudus (Isque Name).
15. Tarjuman Risalah Shaikh Muhiuddin Ibn Arabi.
17. Sharah Al-Fiqahul Akbar.
18. Guwatul Gulub.
22. Sharah Qasida Amani.
23. Sharah Aqidah Haftiza.
25. Risalah dar kiyan Adab Saluk.
27. Risalah Zikr.
30. Risalah Bood Hast Basa.
32. Anisul Ushshaque.
33. Maktubat.
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34. Khatmah Sharif
35. Jawaharul Ushshaque
36. Tarikh Habibi
38. Khalifat Namah for Qazi Ishaque Chhatrah.
40. Khalifat Namah for Sadruddin Khondmir.
41. Khalifat Namah for Abul Fatah, son of Moulena Allauddin Gwaliari.
42. General Khilafat Namah written at Delhi in which names of Khalifas were incorporated later on.

But with the passage of time, a considerable number of the above books are either not available or they are deemed to have been lost. The management of Kutub Khana Rowza-Sharif has made arrangement for the publication of the available manuscripts for their preservation and at the same time for the benefit of the seeker of truth.

It will be proper here to present a brief analysis of the contents of the books, available so far:

1. **Sharah Risalah Qusairia**

Risalah Qusairia was written by Imam Abul Qasim Qusairi in 437 H. This had remained an authentic and important book on Sufism. Imam Abul Qasim Qusairi died on 6 Rabi-ul-Awwal 465 H at Nishapur. The Sharah on Risalah Qusairia was written in Persian by Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras in 807 H at Gulbarga. It was published from Ahad Afrin Burqi Press, Hyderabad in 1361 H. It contains the following material:
Preface

Part I  Beliefs and doctrines of Sufis.

Part II  A Brief Discussion of these Beliefs.

Chapter I  Discusses the Biographies of 82 Sufi Shaikhs.

Chapter II  Discusses the Sufi Terminology and Concepts.

2. Sharah Zubdatul Haqaiq

Zubdatul Haqaiq is written by Gazi Ainul-qassat Hamadani. This book contains Maarif or Haqaiq and has remained a very popular book among Sufis. Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaraz has written the Sharah on it. Because the Sharah on this has been in 10 Tamhids, it is famous as Tamhidat Ainul-qassat Hamadani or Sharah Tamhidat. It was published on 9th Ramzanul Mubarak, 1364 H, by Moin Press, Waqia Bazar Isa Mian, Hyderabad, Deccan. The Sharah contains 472 pages. Its contents are:

Tamhid I  Basarat-o-Basirat (vision and vision of heart).
Tamhid II  Talibo-matlub (Seeker and sought).
Tamhid III  People of the world.
Tamhid IV  Onosis of self.
Tamhid V  Irfan (Knowledge).
Tamhid VI  Ishq (Love).
Tamhid VII  Ruh (Soul).
Tamhid VIII  The Quran.
Tamhid IX  Kufr (Infidelity).
Tamhid X  Aim of Tamhids.

3. Sharah Al-figahul Akbar

Al-figahul Akbar was written by Imam-e-Azam Abu Hanifa Nauman bin Sabit Tabeyeskufi. Sharah on this book had been written by Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaraz at Gulbarga. Al-figahul
Akbar is a famous book on Sufism. Nine Sharah (interpretations) have been written by various scholars in different languages. Among all the nine Sharah, the Sharah written by Allama Mulla Ali Qadri Hanfi Nacci has been the best. The Sharah written in Persian by Saiyed Gaisudaraz is not included in these nine. Saiyed Gaisudaraz has written the Sharah of selected portions of the book. The Sharah contains 48 pages. It was published on 15th Shawwal-al-Mukarram, 1367 H by Sultan Burqi Press, Hyderabad, Deccan. The book contains the beliefs (aqaid) of Sufis.

4. Risalah Rajat Rabbi Fi Aheen Suratin

This Risalah has been written in Persian by Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaraz. The Urdu translation have been done by Saiyed Rahmuddin Chishti Bandanawazi. It was published in 1388 H (1969 A.D.) by Aijaz Printing Press, Chhatta Basar, Hyderabad. In this Risalah the conception of Tauhid and the relation of the world to God have been discussed. This Risalah is known as Mansoohan ke Sundar Darpan in Hindustani. It contains 36 pages.

5. Khatima Sharif

This book has been written by Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaraz Bandanawaz Chishti. It is an important book for Salik (Traveller on the Path), and for murida (disciples). In short, it is a guide-book for the seekers of truths. The preface has been written by Saiyed Shah Muhammad Husaini, Sajjadah Nashin, Roma-i-Basurg, Gulbarga Sharif. The date and year of
publication have not been mentioned. The book contains 40 pages.

6. **Adab-ul-Nuridain**

This book was written by Shaikhul Masahiyakh Ziauddin Abul Najib Abdul Gahir Suhrwardy, the Imam of Shariat and Tariqat. The **Sharah** on this book was written by Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaraz in 813 H. The **Sharah** is quite brief. In the **Sharah**, Saiyed Gaisudaraz has formulated a complete way of life for the **murids** — men and women, young and old. The Urdu translation has been rendered by Mashaque Yarjung Bahadur. The preface has been written by Saiyed Shah Muhammad Husaini, Sajjadah Reza Bandanawaz. The Urdu translation of the book contains only 24 pages. The date and year of publication have not been mentioned.

The contents of the book (**Adabul Muridain**) are the following:

- Chapter I Attributes of God.
- Chapter II All that God has said in His Book.
- Chapter III Quran as the Book of God.
- Chapter IV Vision of God.
- Chapter V God's sayings in Quran and proved by tradition such as heaven, hell, etc.
- Chapter VI Things created by God.
- Chapter VII Seeking of right livelihood.
- Chapter VIII Faith based on three things.
- Chapter IX Seeking of food by Sufis.
- Chapter X Preference of **Rajir** over wealthy persons.
- Chapter XI Difference between **Ruk** (poverty) and **Tasawwaf** (Islamic mysticism).
- Chapter XII Leaving **Kashf** by Sufis and again joining it.
- Chapter XIII Actions of a **banda**.
- Chapter XIV **Karamat**.
Chapter XV Dressing of Sufis.
Chapter XVI Reading Qur'an in good voice.
Chapter XVII Attainment of as much knowledge as possible.
Chapter XVIII Sufi's contribution to Tasawwaf.
Chapter XIX Religion of Sufis.
Chapter XX Manners of Sufis.
Chapter XXI Relation of a banda with God.
Chapter XXII Haj (ecstasy)
Chapter XXIII Maslak (relation or path) of Sufis.
Chapter XXIV Status of the Universe.
Chapter XXV Talks of Sufis.
Chapter XXVI Things besides Shariat.
Chapter XXVII Beginning of Ecstasy.
Chapter XXVIII Mushaqqat and Riyazat of Nafs.
Chapter XXIX Adab Subbat.
Chapter XXX Mainstay (gayrum) of murids.
Chapter XXXI Adab-i-Safar of Sufis.
Chapter XXXII Journey of Sufis for four things.
Chapter XXXIII Dress of Sufis.
Chapter XXXIV Food of Sufis.
Chapter XXXV Sleep of Sufis.
Chapter XXXVI Adab-i-Sama (music) and Kharqa (robe).
Chapter XXXVII Marriage of Murids.
Chapter XXXVIII Manners of questions.
Chapter XXXIX Various Diseases.
Chapter XL Manners to be retained at the time of death.
Chapter XLI Manners in times of calamity (bala).
Chapter XLII Manners of departure of Sufis.

7. Sharah Risalah Ghosul Azam known as Jawaharlal Ushshaque

Risalah Ghosia is a short revealed (ilhan) risalah of Ghose Azam Shaikh Abdul Qadir Jilani. It contains the revelations which came to him off and on. The risalah is written for the
kami fa so that they may reach the goal of irfan (knowledge). The people of Tariqat have given a high place and importance to it. Various Sharahs (interpretations) have been written on it, yet the Sharah written by Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras is superior and better than all. This Sharah written in Persian has been named as Jawaharul Ushshaque. The second Sharah is known as Ba Nashat-ul-Ishque written by Maluk Shah-al-Siddiqi-ul-Qadri in 9th Hijri. The third Sharah is by the name of Basatul Ishque written by Abdullah bin Hasan bin Ali-al-Makki-ul-Husaini-al-Jilani in the 10th Hijri. The fourth Sharah was perhaps written within this period, but its name is not known. Arrangement for verification and publication was made by Hafiz Saiyed Ate Husain. The Sharah, written by Saiyed Gaisudaras was published by Ahad Afrin Burqi Press, Hyderabad, Deccan in Shaban 1362 H. It contains 63 pages.

8. Taqallivat Rubbani (Urdu translation of Jawaharul Ushshaque or Sharah Risalah Ghos-e-Aasan).

The Sharah of Risalah Ghos-e-Aasan Shaikh Abdul Qadir Jilani, founder of Qadriya order, was written by Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras in Persian. Its Urdu translation was rendered by Moulvi Ahmad Hassan Khan, Vice-Principal, Gulbarga College. Its second edition was brought out in 1372 H. The preface was written by Saiyed Muhammad Husaini, Sajjadah Nashin, Rosa-i-Bandanasaw, Gulbarga, in Rajabul-Morrajab 1372 H. It was published from National Fine Printing Press, Hyderabad, Deccan. It contains 99 pages.
9. Diwan (known as Anisul-Ushahaque)

This 'Diwan' of Saiyed Gaisudaraz was compiled at the request of the second son of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, Saiyed Asghar Husaini by a murid of Gaisudaraz whose name is not mentioned. The murid compiled the Diwan and named it Anisul-Ushahaque. The preface of the Diwan had been written by the murid, but he had not mentioned his name there. The introduction of the Diwan has been written by Moulvi Hafiz Saiyed Ata Husain and the Diwan bears 14 Shawwal-al-Mokarram, 1360 H, as the date of publication. The Diwan has been published from Ahad Afrin Burqi Press, Hyderabad, Deccan. The introduction contains 16 pages and the Diwan contains 155 pages. The contents of the Diwan include 327 Ghasals, a Nashavi of 26 ashares and a Naima of 9 Rubayyat.

10. Maktubat

The preface of the Maktubat of Saiyed Gaisudaraz has been written by Saiyed Ata Husain. It was published in Shawwal-al-Mokarram, 1362 H from Ahad Afrin Burqi Press, Hyderabad, Deccan. This compilation of Saiyed Gaisudaraz contains 66 letters. Among these letters is letter No. 39 which was written to Sultan Feroz Bahmani, the ruler of Gulbarga, and Letter No. 66 written to Hazrat Masud Bak Chishti. The remaining letters are in the names of murids and khalifas. Besides this, Moulana Ruknuddin Abul Fatah has included in it seven letters of Saiyed Muhammad Akbar Husaini, the eldest son of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, four letters of Saiyed Muhammad Asghar Husaini, the second son of Saiyed Gaisudaraz,
and one letter of Qazi Sarajuddin, the murid of Saiyed Gaisudaras. Further, two letters are in the names of Qazi Sarajuddin and the rest are in the name of Hazrat Alauddin Kalpi. At the end of the maktubat, there are three copies of Khilafat-namah. The first Khilafat-namah relates to Shaikh Alauddin, the second relates to Hazrat Ruknuddin Abul Fatah, and the third Khilafat-namah is of general nature.

11. Risalah Iman Qusairi (Extracts)

This Risalah is written by Iman Qusairi in Arabic. Its Sharah has been written by Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras in Persian. This Sharah is not of the entire book, but upto the Chapter entitled Tawakkul. The Urdu translation of the Sharah Risalah Iman Qusairi has been rendered by Qazi Abdul Samad Chishti Nizami Mirzayee. In it, 35 Sufi Terminologies and concepts have been explained in Urdu. The preface has been written by Saiyed Shah Muhammad Husaini, Sajjadah Nashin, Roza-i-Busurg, Gulbarga Sharif. The book contains 100 pages. It is published from Ajaz Printing Press, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh. The date and year of publication are not mentioned.

12. Maimua Yazdah Rassil

This book is written by Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras. The introduction has been written by Ata Husain, Lingam Palli, Hyderabad, Deccan, on 27 Rabi-us-Sani, 1360 H. It is published from Intasami Press, Kaisri Building, Hyderabad, Deccan. The
date and year of publication have not been mentioned. *Hajma Yasdah* Rasail consists of eleven small *risalat* of Saiyed Gaisudaras. They are:

I  **Tafsir Surah Fateha Sharif** - It contains selected interpretations of the *Surah*.

II **Istundat-ul Shariat-kha Tariqat-ul Hexigat** - In it, the problem of determination and free will has been discussed. This was written by Saiyed Gaisudaras in 792 H.

III **Risalah** concerning the vision of God and miracles (*kararnat*) of Auliya - This *Risalah* deals with the problem of the vision of God, the problem of the status of apostles and angels, the problem of miracles of Auliya and a discussion of the inner meaning of the Quranic verses.

IV **Hadithul Anas** - In it Saiyed Gaisudaras has discussed some unique points and secrets of life, usefulness of wealth, importance of *zikr* and *mujahida* of God, love of God, and the creation within oneself the attribute of God as much as possible.

V **Mujudul Ashqin** - This short *risalah* was written by Saiyed Gaisudaras. It contains the statement about the reality of the love of God and its stage.

VI **Risalah Tashid Khas** - This *risalah* contains the conception of the unity of God (*tauhid*).

VII **Risalah Manzum-dar-Askar** - This *Risalah* contains the way of *zikr* in the Chishtia order which are imparted to the *murids* in general.

VIII **Risalah Muraqabah** - It contains 36 *muraqabas* for the teaching of *murids*.

IX **Risalah Askar Chishtia** - This *risalah*, as it is stated, has not been written by Saiyed Gaisudaras. From other sources,
it transpires that it might have been written by Saiyed Akbar Husaini, the eldest son of Saiyed Gaisudaraz. But no definite proof is available in this regard.

**Sharah Bait Hazrat Amir Khusrau Dehli** - Saiyed Gaisudaraz has written the Sharah on the above gisalah. Amir Khusrau was the murid of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya. He was very near and dear to the Shaikh, and was called 'Khwaja Turk Allah'. No body except Amir Khusrau had access to the hujrah of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya at night. He is laid to rest by the feet (southern side of the tomb) of Shaikh Nizamuddin Auliya.

**Burhanul Aahomin** - This is known as story of four brothers or Shikar Haram. It is an article of only one page in which Saiyed Gaisudaraz has discussed the reality of man beginning from birth to death. This Sharah became so famous that people of Tariqat wrote short sharah on it. In this compilation (mafmua), six sharaha of people of Tariqat have been included and the seventh Sharah was especially written for compilation by Moulana Hakim Mirza Qasim Ali Baig. The names of the writers of the first and second sharaha have not been mentioned. The third Sharah has been written by Shaikh Hasan Muhammad Chishti. The fourth sharah has been written by Mir Saiyed Abdul Wahid Bilgrami. The fifth Sharah has been written by Mir Saiyed Muhammad Kalpi. The sixth sharah has been written by Moulana Muhammad Rafiuddin Muhaddis Dehlvi. The seventh sharah has been written by Mirza Qasim Ali Baig Hyderabad.

**13. Tabbaratul-al Istalashat-al-Sufia**

This book is a sharah of 'Asmarul Aarar' authored by Saiyed Gaisudaraz, and the sharah was written by Saiyed Akbar Husaini, known as Saiyed Bade. He was the eldest son of Saiyed Gaisudaraz.
This book was written with the permission of Saiyed Gaisudaraz and was placed before him for perusal. It was written probably in 607 H. This was the first book written by Saiyed Akbar Husaini. Saiyed Akbar Husaini was granted khilafat-nawah by Saiyed Gaisudaraz in 811 H and was allowed to sit on his bedding (nehalcha). The book was published from Moin Press, Waqia Bazar Islamia, Hyderabad, Deccan, and released through Kutub Khana Rozaitin, Gulbarga Sharif, on 11 Rabi-ul-Awwal 1351 H. It contains 160 pages. The preface was written by Saiyed Ate Husain. The contents of the book are:

Chapter I

Auliya's words not to be told to unconcerned persons.

Chapter II

Sharah of Asmaul Aarar, Samar (short story) No.73, written by Saiyed Gaisudaraz. It deals with the conception of love (Ishque).

Chapter III

Sharah of Samar (short story) No. 49, which deals with Fatuhat Chaibi (unseen victories).

Chapter IV

Sharah of Samar (short story) No. 81, which deals with observation as certainty.

Chapter V

Sharah of Samar (short story) No. 78, in which Saiyed Gaisudaraz has criticised the thought of Ibnul Arabi.

Chapters VI & VII

Discussion about the utterances in the state of sukhr and ha'il.

Chapter VIII

Sharah of Samar No. 63 which deals with rajalli.

Chapter IX

Sharah of Samar No. 114 which deals with real sukhr.

Chapter X

Sharah of Samar No. 76 which deals with taubah of salik.

Chapter XI

Man and his knowledge of alam-e-aghir and kabir.

Chapter XII

Lovers of Prophet Muhammad.
14. **Kitabul Aqaid**

This is the second book written by Saiyed Akbar Husaini, the eldest son of Saiyed Gaisudaraz. Corrections and arrangement for publication were made by Moulvi Hafiz Ata Husain. It was published from Noor Press, Waqia Basar Ismail, Hyderabad, Deccan, and released through Kutab Khana Rozaitain, Gulbarga Sharif, in Jamadil-Sani 1366 H. The book was written at Gulbarga between 805 and 810 H. It contains 471 pages. Saiyed Gaisudaraz had wanted to write a book on Aqaid (beliefs) of the people of Sharf, but he left the idea of writing it when he came to know that his son Saiyed Akbar Husaini had started writing a book on aqaid. The book contains four chapters. They are:

Chapter I  Knowledge of God (*Ism-i-Dhat*).
Chapter II  Attributes of God (*Ism-i-Sifat*).
Chapter III  Various names of God.
Chapter IV  Reality of Faith and statements about the world hereafter.

The book had been written on the pattern of question and answer.

15. **Jawamal Kalam** (known as Malfuzat (sayings) of Saiyed Gaisudaraz)

This is a collection of the sayings of Saiyed Gaisudaraz and compiled by Saiyed Muhammad Akbar Husaini, the eldest son of Saiyed Gaisudaraz. The *Malfuzat* are in Persian but their Urdu translation has been done by Saiyed Rahimuddin Chishti. The *Malfuzat* are in two parts. The first part contains sayings of 70 sittings, and the second part contains sayings of 71 to 137 sittings. The
preface in both the parts has been written by Saiyed Shah Muhammad Husaini, Sajjadah Nashin, Rosa-i-Buzurg, Gulbarga Sharif, on 9th December, 1972. But the publication year differs. The first part bears 1392 A.H. (1972) and the second part bears 1394 A.H. (1974) as years of publication. The *Malfuzat* in both the parts have been published from Aijas Printing Press, Chhatta Bazar, Hyderabad.

16. *Sair-i-Muhammadi*

This book was written in Persian as a biography of Saiyed Gaisudaras by Moulana Shah Muhammad Ali Samani in 831 H. Urdu translation had been rendered by Moulana Saiyed Shah Nazir Ahmad Qadri, a murid of Saiyed Gaisudaras. The Urdu translation was published from Aijas Printing Press, Chhatta Bazar, Hyderabad, in 1389 H (1969 A.D.). In the preface of the Urdu translation Nazir Ahmed Sikandarpuri has mentioned that the original book written in Persian by M.A. Samani contained 9 chapters. But chapters 8 and 9 are not available. So the Urdu translation contains only 7 chapters, which deal with the following:

Chapter I Lineage and life of Saiyed Gaisudaras.
Chapter II Greatness (*fazilat*) of Saiyed Gaisudaras.
Chapter III Customs (*ravish*) of Saiyed Gaisudaras.
Chapter IV Preaching (*talkin*) of Saiyed Gaisudaras.
Chapter V Works of Saiyed Gaisudaras.
Chapter VI Children of Saiyed Gaisudaras.
Chapter VII Khalifas of Saiyed Gaisudaras.

Thus, we see that out of the 16 books 12 books have been written by Saiyed Gaisudaras himself, three by his eldest son,
Saiyed Akbar Husaini, and one by Saiyed Shah Muhammad Ali Samani. These books were with the Khanah of Saiyed Gaisudaras in Gulbarga and have been published recently by the Sajjadah Nashin, Saiyed Muhammad Husaini.

SECTION D

The Importance of the Present Study

The Chishti order in India was founded by Shaikh Mu'inuddin Chishti. It was propagated by Shaikh Qutbuddin Bakhtiyar Kaki and Shaikh Fariduddin Ganj-i-Shakar. But it reached its zenith at the time of Shaikh Nasruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi.

The dawn of the 14th century brought with itself an outstanding personality and Sufi named Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras (1321-1426 A.D.), the disciple and Khalifa of Saiyed Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi. The spiritual exercises carried out by Saiyed Gaisudaras were so remarkable and the achievement so high that Saiyed Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi had to say "after 70 years a boy has again aroused in me a state of ecstasy and enabled me to recall the stories and events of the past."141

The credit of preaching and expansion of Islam in South India goes to Saiyed Gaisudaras, who finally settled at Gulbarga in Karnataka in early fifteenth century. His writings in manuscript form are enshrined in a library near his tomb.
During the life time of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, his eldest son, Saiyed Akbar Husaini also wrote books interpreting his father’s thoughts, and compiled the sayings (malfuzat) of his father. Now, the management has taken over the entire responsibility of publishing and translating the original writings of Saiyed Gaisudaraz.

When an attempt is made to know whether the eminent Chishti saints of the 13th and 14th centuries ever wrote any book, we find that they did not take to writing their own thought. They have themselves denied having written any book. Whatever records we find about the Chishti saints before the Shaikh are only a collection of their sayings (malfuzat). Some Sufi books (malfuzat) which have been popularly attributed to the great saints of this period are in fact apocryphal and falsely ascribed to those famous sufiis. The 'A尼斯ul-Arvah' contains the conversations of Shaikh Usman Harooni and is alleged to have been written by Shaikh Muinuddin Ajmeri. The 'Dalilul-Arfin' is said to contain the conversations of Shaikh Muinuddin Chishti and it is alleged to have been written by Shaikh Bakhtiyar Kaki. The 'Fawa'idus-Salikin' contains the conversations of Shaikh Gududdin Bakhtiyar Kaki and it is alleged to have been written by Shaikh Fariduddin Ganj-i-Shakar. It is said that 'Agfarul-Auliya' contains the conversations of Shaikh Fariduddin Ganj-i-Shakar and is alleged to have been written by his son-in-law, Moulana Badr Ishaque. Again, 'Rahatul-Qulub' is said to contain the conversations of Baba Farid and is alleged to have been written by Shaikh Nisamuddin Auliya. The 'Miftahul-Ashiqin' contains
the conversations of Shaikh Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi and is alleged to have been written by Muhibullah. But Dr. M. Noor Nabi, having made an extensive survey of the writings of the Chishti saints of the above period in his book 'Development of Muslim Religious Thought in India' has brought the fact home that the above books are pure and simple fabrications.

Thus, we see that among the Chishti Saints, it is Saiyed Gaisudara who for the first time took to writing. He was a prolific writer and had written a good number of books both in Persian and Arabic. He also has written Sharah (interpretation) of important books of famous authors like Sharah Risalah Imam Gushairiya, Sharah Risalah Ghose-Azam, Sharah Adabul-Muridain and Sharah Fasusul Hikam of Shaikhul Akbar Shaikh Mohiuddin Imnul Arabi who dominated the thought of the Middle East in the 13th century and whose influence we again find in the 16th century in India. It would be interesting to see the view point of Saiyed Gaisudaras and how far he accepted and rejected the approach of Shaikh Mohiuddin Imnul Arabi and what he said about the latter's doctrine of Wahadat-al-Mujud (unity of Existence).

The books written by Saiyed Gaisudaras are till now untouched. No work, so far as my knowledge goes, has been done in any language on this illuminating personality of the Chishti order.

Further, the characteristic feature of the thought of the 13th century was that Tariqat was predominant over Shariyat. But in the 14th century, we find the position entirely changed. In
this period great emphasis had been laid on Sharī'at and at the same time innovations had found roots in Islam to a great extent. Saiyed Gaisudaraz had himself said that orthodox ulema had made the faith dependent on the study of a few books and the remembering of a few words. They had reduced the Faith to something trivial. Giving a vivid picture of the religion of his time, Saiyed Gaisudaraz says, that at the time of the Prophet Islam was like a lighted lamp and people saw in its light whatever they liked. But after Khulfa-i-Rashidin, the light of Islam began to recede. And so during the days of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, people saw the light of this lamp (religion) from a distance, but no body intended to come near and be graced by this light. Like his spiritual guide (pir), Saiyed Gaisudaraz too struggled hard against the innovations and misconceptions which were introduced in Islam at that time and which were sapping its very vitality. Different sects were appearing in the camp of Islam and they were putting forward baseless arguments and reasonings in favour of innovations then current. Saiyed Gaisudaraz, with the help of his writing and discussions, tried his best to refute their arguments in order to purify Islam from vulgarities and corruption.

From this point of view, this humble attempt to present the Sufi thought of Saiyed Gaisudaraz is very significant and occupies an important place in the development of Sufi thought in India. For the sake of systematisation, precision and brevity, the present work has been confined to the following scheme:
Title The Mystical Philosophy of Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaraz.

Chapter I Introduction
Section A: The Times of Saiyed Gaisudaraz.
Section B: The Life of Saiyed Gaisudaraz.
Section C: The Writings of Saiyed Gaisudaraz.
Section D: The Importance of the Present Study.

Chapter II Methodology of Saiyed Gaisudaraz: Discussion on Gnosis.

Chapter III The Conception of Tauhid
Section A: Ibmul Arabi's Conception of Tauhid.
Section B: Saiyed Gaisudaraz's Criticism of Ibmul Arabi.
Section C: Saiyed Gaisudaraz's Own Position.

Chapter IV The Relation Between Man and God.

Chapter V Conclusion
Chapter II

METHODOLOGY OF SAIYED GAISSUDARAZ:
DISCUSSION ON GNOSIS

In discussing the methodology of the mystical philosophy of Saiyed Husaini Gaisudaraz, we shall place a special emphasis on gnosis (marifat), because gnosis occupies a key position in his thought system. But before making an attempt to discuss the gnosis, it would be desirable to consider, in brief, the background of Sufi methodology.

Before Sufism, there were two schools of Muslim thought, viz., Mutaṣṣiliṣm and Asharism. The founder of Mutaṣṣiliṣte school was Wasil bin Ata (d. 699 A.D.). This school of Muslim thought came into existence partly as a reaction to the misdeeds of the Omayyad kings and partly as an attempt to meet the arguments of the Greek and non-Muslim Scholars against Islam. ¹ The Mutaṣṣiliṣtes made 'reason' (aqli) the chief source of religious knowledge. The point of view which dominated their theological reasoning was to purify the monotheistic idea of all the obscurities and deformations which it had made subject into popular belief, both in ethics and metaphysics. The passages of Quran and Hadith were explained by the Mutaṣṣiliṣtes strictly according to reason.² They discussed the problems of 'Freedom and Determination', 'Relation of Reason to Revelation', 'Relation of Action to Belief' and 'Attributes of Allah'. Although they preached the Unity of God, yet to safeguard
this Unity, they denied the Attributes of Allah as separate from His Essence (Dhat). In other words, the Attributes, in their opinion, were identical with the Essence of Allah. In this way, they were inspired by a desire to defend and understand Islam on the basis of reason, for they were the masters of the science of reasoning (Ilm-al Kalam) and argumentation. But in doing so, they overdid themselves and as a consequence, their rationalism began to make people sceptic and indifferent to religion. Not only that, it even led to a denial or distortion of religious doctrines.\(^3\)

The Second School of Muslim thought, known as Asharism, was founded by Abul Hasan al Ashari (d. 932 A.D.). This School of Muslim thought came into existence as a reaction to Mutazilism in order to safeguard religion against their attack. Asharism is a philosophico-religious school of thought which developed during the 10th and 11th centuries. This school of thought supported reason but gave revelation primary importance.\(^4\) They, like Mutazilites, upheld the Unity of Allah but affirmed His Attributes over and above His Essence. They did not undermine the importance of reason, but made it subservient to revelation.\(^5\) We see, then, that during the 8th and 9th centuries, Mutazilism remained a dominant trend of Islamic thought. But after the 9th century, decay of Mutazilism sets in. In the 10th and 11th centuries, Asharism gave a death blow to Mutazilism and became the chief trend of Islamic philosophy.\(^6\)

But in the meantime, a third school of Islamic philosophy came into limelight which is known as Sufism. Though the origin
of Sufism is found in the Qur'an and Tradition, yet the doctrinal system of Sufism developed during the 9th and 10th centuries and in the Ghazzalian system of philosophy, both Asharism and Sufism fused together.7

Saiyed Gaisudaras was a great Sufi and a disciple of Saiyed Nasiruddin Chiragh-i-Delhi. He was, as a consequence, most concerned with Sufism. What is Sufism? There are numerous definitions of Sufism, all defined from different angles. However, their gist is beautifully expressed in a definition formulated by Shaykh-al-Islam Zakariya Ansari, which is as follows:

"Sufism teaches how to purify one's self, improve one's morals, build up one's inner and outer life in order to attain perpetual bliss. Its subject matter is the purification of the soul and its end or aim is the attainment of eternal felicity and blessedness".8

Further, we see that Sufism owes much to Rabiah Basri, the mystic, and Dhul-Nun of Egypt for propounding the doctrines of Love and Tauhid respectively, in Islamic mysticism. Shaikh Bayazid of Bistam also played an important role in the development of Sufism. He introduced the Doctrine of Ecstasy and employed, for the first time, in Islamic mysticism, the word 'fana', which means annihilation of the self and this later became the basis of Sufi theosophy. Sufism owes much to Shaikh Junayd of Baghdad, Imam Al-Ghazzali, Shaikh Abdul Gadir Jilani and Shaikh Shihabuddin Suhrwardi, for they not only reconciled the divergent tendencies of Islamic mysticism but also won recognition for a sober Sufism
among the representatives of orthodox theology and religious law. 9

It is but fact that since the very inception of the world, the endeavour to have the knowledge of God has remained a matter of great importance. This is explicit and evident from what Allah has said, "I only created the genii and mankind that they ought to serve Me." 10 This comes to mean that people might know Him (God). The Prophet has also said that knowledge is obligatory on every Muslim, man and woman; and that knowledge may be had even if one has to go to China. 11 Therefore, the knowledge of God is the most important aspect of Sufism and it is concerned with the Gnosis of God — Marifat Allah.

Ali bin Uthman al-Hujwiri, in his famous book 'Kashf-al-Mahjub', had made a detailed survey of the problem concerning the Gnosis of God (Marifat Allah). It would be proper here to put the gist of his main contention with the only aim that this may serve as the basis for understanding the thought of Saiyed Qaied dates in this context.

In the opinion of Sayyedena Al-Hujwiri, Gnosis of God is of two kinds: (i) Cognitional (ilm) and (ii) Emotional (hali). 12 Theologians and jurists, says Ali Hujwiri, hold Gnosis is right cognition (ilm). But the sufis Shaikhs consider Gnosis as right feeling (hali) towards God, and hold that Gnosis (marifat) is more sublime than cognition, because, according to them, right feeling (hali) is the result of right cognition, but right cognition (ilm) is not the same thing as right feeling. Both groups try to get
Gnosis, which is described as the life of the heart through God, and, turning away of one's inmost thoughts from all that is not God. But both groups differ in their approach and hence, differences arise which often become quite acute. Describing these differences, Saiyedna Hujwiri says that laying emphasis on right cognition (Ijm) of God, the Mutazilites assert that Gnosis is intellectual. They hold that reasonable persons (aglil) can possibly have it. But this assertion is disproved by the fact that Majeed (the men overpowered by their emotional states, i.e., hal) are deemed to have Gnosis and that children, who are not rationally matured, are deemed to have faith. If the criterion of Gnosis be an intellectual one, then such persons must be without Gnosis and unbelievers could not be charged with infidelity, because many of them are rationally matured. Again, if it is supposed that reason is the cause of Gnosis, then it would follow that reasonable persons must know God, and that all who lack reason, must be ignorant of Him (God) which facts do not support.13

Again, we find, according to Saiyedna Hujwiri, that some persons adduce demonstration (istadilal) as the cause of the knowledge of God and maintain thereby that such knowledge is gained through the evidence deduced. But this doctrine too is futile, for Iblis saw many an evidence, such as Paradise, Hell, and the Throne of God, yet he had no Gnosis. It is not in the power and capacity of any body to have the Gnosis of God as God has Himself said that knowledge of Him depends on His will.14
At the same time, this doctrine is also not in keeping with the opinion of the orthodox Muslims who hold that soundness of reason and regard for evidences are means (gabab) to Gnosis. They are not the cause of Gnosis. They say that the sole cause is God’s Will and Grace, because without His Grace (insayat), reason is blind.15 Besides, we find heretics of all sorts using the demonstrative method (istidal), but majority of them do not know God. On the other hand, whenever one enjoys the Grace of God, all his actions are so many tokens of Gnosis. His demonstration is search (talab) and thereafter his neglect of demonstration is resignation to God’s will (kaslim). But with reference to perfect Gnosis, resignation is no better than search, for search is a principle that excludes the possibility of agitation (adtrab) and these two principles do not essentially involve Gnosis. Thus, reason and proofs adduced by reason are unable to direct any one to the right path. Demonstration is the first step of turning away from God, because it involves the consideration of some other things. But Gnosis is turning away from all that is not God. This cannot be attained by demonstration, because demonstration is an act of finding objects of search.16 Again, we find a declaration that Gnosis is the result of inspiration (ilham).17 But a little consideration testifies it to be impossible, because inspiration does not supply the criterion of distinguishing truth from falsehood, while Gnosis has that criterion.

Further, says Saiyedna Al-Hujuri, that some persons assert that knowledge of God is intuitive (dharuri).18 Here intuitive
knowledge means a necessary knowledge. This also is impossible. If intuition be the source of Gnosis, then whatever is known in this way, must be known by all reasonable men. However, on the contrary, we find reasonable men (aqil) denying the existence of God and holding the doctrine of assimilation (taṣbih) and nullification (ṭṭiḥl). If this principle, as it holds, is accepted, then the principle of religious obligation (taklif) would be destroyed. Some aspirants to Sufism hold that intuition may be termed as absolute certainty (yaqīn). It is on this certainty, they say, that they know God intuitively. Substantially it is right but the expression is defective. If intuitive knowledge which is equivalent to absolute certainty be the source of Gnosis, then it cannot be exclusively restricted to those who are perfect. On the contrary, this belongs to all reasonable men.

Really speaking Gnosis (ilm-i-marifat) is the basis for the knowledge of God. It is through marifat that God is known to all His prophets and saints. Gnosis is not acquired, it is the result of Divine guidance and grace. All objects other than God are but veils, and all such veils are the result of ignorance. When ignorance is removed, the veils vanish. And thus we may conclude that Gnosis is not acquired, it is absolutely based on Grace of God.

Now, we come to the position of Saiyed Gaisudaras. He considers Gnosis (marifat) as the right feeling (ḥali). The most important question that Saiyed Gaisudaras raises
is whether **Dhat** and **Sifat** (Essence and Attribute of God) are the subject matter of the knowledge of God. His answer is a definitive no. He says that knowledge of God is like a hidden diamond which is known to God only. This knowledge is exclusively for God and is hidden from mankind. It is called **ilm-i-Ladunni**. The origin and source of this type of knowledge is God Himself and it is only through His Grace that He (God) confers it on anybody. Saiyed Gaisudaraz says that it is not through questions that the secret of Reality is solved. It cannot be had even with treasures. The way to **Haqiqat** and **Tariqat**, has no place for conjectures. He further says that **Sharifat**, **Tariqat** and **Haqiqat** are all acquisitional (**kaabi**) and by achieving they are achieved. But **maarifat** can be had only through Grace (**inayat**) of God, and not by dint of labour (**kaab** or prayer (**ibadat**)). There is none to point out the way to God except God Himself; knowledge is sought only for the performance of His worship. Thus, it is obvious that no mortal being is capable of leading any one to God. This is explicit from the fact that although Abu Talib was in love with Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him) and the Prophet was very keen that he might embrace Islam but Abu Talib could not.

According to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, Sufis have laid great emphasis on Gnosis (**maarifat**), for the practical aim of the Sufi is to become completely absorbed in God. They are of the opinion that intellect is helpless in cognising God. Saiyed Gaisudaraz says that all the religions are unanimous on the point that the
best and extraordinary aim or end of life is Gnosis of God — **Marifat Allah.** It is of two kinds. The first kind of **Marifat** is concerned with theoretical questions such as: (i) what is infidelity (kufr), (ii) what are the logical or intellectual arguments for the existence of God, and (iii) what do we mean by the traditions, etc. The second kind of **marifat** is **mushahida** which is related to the vision (of God). **Mushahida** is of such nature that a gnostic may enjoy the vision of the attributes of God. This kind of **marifat** is the be-all and end-all of all human existence. This is possible through the help and guidance of those saints who have reached the zenith of piety and have known the secrets of God, and His manifestation (tajallī). Further, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, we come across the sayings of apostles that **marifat** (Gnosis) is of three kinds, viz., universal, particular, and particularly particular. Intellectual gnosis (**marifat-i-aal**l) is universal. It is open to all, for example, every believer agrees to the fact that God is the Creator, the Provider and the Sustainer.

The second kind of **marifat**, known as particular, may be granted by God with His Grace to those men who practise the teaching and guidance of **Mashaikha** and **Auliya.** Saiyed Gaisudaras further emphasises the tradition: 'whoe'er cognises himself, cognises God'. He says that cognition of the self is necessary for the gnosis of the attributes of God. The apostle's gnosis is particularly particular. This type of gnosis is concerned with the knowledge of God. God wants that He should be known, but
the nature of man, says Saiyed Gaisudaraz, is such that he cannot have the marifat-i-Dhat, i.e., the gnosis of the essence of God, and cannot distinguish otherness of the multiplicity (ghairiat) from the asl of God. It is in this sense that 'nobody knows God as God knows Himself'. God has His Attributes and unless those Attributes are known, the Being of God cannot be known. And God has His Being, and unless that is known, the Attributes cannot be known. The marifat of God cannot be described by similes, for if that were so, God would be determined, because God is always beyond the description and reach of the human mind. God is beyond, even beyond the beyond.30

Thus, according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, God can be cognised only through self-knowledge and for this he finds support in a Tradition of the Prophet31: 'One who cognises his self, cognises God' (خدا را می‌شناسد، خدا را می‌شناسد). Saiyed Gaisudaraz says that the man who obtains gnosis of his self and the man who attains the Gnosis of God, are like those who step into the Gnosis of the Dhat of God. Those who want to seek the Gnosis of God, should make their nafs (self) their mirror, and in this mirror, they should cognise the self of Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him), and again, they should make the self of Prophet Muhammad the mirror in which they ought to seek the cognition of God.32 This stage is the highest one. Not all can reach it or even know it. Man should seek cognition of God, because gnosis in this world is the seed for the Gnosis of God in the world to come. One who is with gnosis today, is with the vision of God tomorrow. It simply
means that whoever cognises God in this world, he will behold God in the next world. God says that one who forgets his self will be forgotten, and one who remembers his self will be remembered. In this way, Saiyed Gaisudaras interprets the Tradition: 'Whoever cognises himself, cognises God'.

In the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, there are three sources for the Gnosis of God. First, the Gnosis of the Being of God (Dhat). The second is the Gnosis of Attributes of God (Sifat). The third is the Gnosis of Actions and the Commands of God. The last is had from the gnosis of one's own self (nafs) which is proved from the fact that God says that He (God) has made the way for the truthful (sahid), in their nafs (self). Saiyed Gaisudaras says that one who has the perfect gnostic of his self has perfect Gnosis of the Actions of God. The second Gnosis is of the Attributes of God and can only be had when one has attained the Gnosis of the Self of Prophet Muhammad. However, Saiyed Gaisudaras also says, and categorically too, that nobody has the power and capacity for the Gnosis of the third kind, which is of the Dhat (Essence) of God. That is why God advises mankind to think over only of the bounties (niyamat) which He has bestowed. He (God) categorically forbids mankind to make interpretation of the Gnosis of His Dhat (Essence) as it is a guarded secret. God has said: (Ponder over God's bounties, but do not ponder over God's Essence).

Gazi Ainul Qussat Hamdani in his famous book Jadiatul Haqaiq has maintained that the creations of God are of two kinds,
Malak and Malakut. In the sharah (interpretation) on the book of Qazi Hamadani which is also known as Sharah Tamhidat, Saiyed Gaisudaras agreeing with the view of Qazi Hamadani further says that besides Malak and Malakut, there are other two worlds which he describes as Jabarut and Lahut.*

Malak is Alam-i-Shahadat. It is the physical or material world of forms and bodies. Malakut is the reality or basis of Malak. Malak exists because of Malakut. It is a higher world in comparison to Malak. It is also called Alam-i-Anam or Alam-i-Batin. Jabarut is that which consists of all that belong to these worlds. It is also called Alam-i-Ruh, Alam-i-maujud bil quwwat or Alam-i-Mumkinat. Lahut is Alam-i-Ilahi or Aluhiyat. It is such a world of which 'Arsh' is its 'Izzat' (honour) and Kurai is its Kibrayat (grandeur). It is the state of Eternity.

Saiyed Gaisudaras explains Malak, Malakut, Jabarut, and Lahut with a simile and says that Malak may be compared with Dogh (milk devoid of butter); Malakut with Maske (butter); Jabarut with joohrat (curd); and Lahut, with roohan (oil). 37 He (Saiyed Gaisudaras) has also explained the same as above with another simile of Chestnut, which resembles very much with the example given by Imam Al-ghazali. 38 Further, Saiyed Gaisudaras says that Malak, Malakut, Jabarut are related to each other. As roohan (oil) is present in dogh, maske and joohrat, so God is present in Malak, Malakut and Jabarut.

* Imam al-Ghazali has also discussed these four kinds of worlds.
These worlds may be divided into two only, namely, the Lower and the Higher. The Lower world, according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, is like rind (poor) and the Higher world is like kernel (much*). One should start from the Lower world and yearn for the spiritual world. Unless a man knows Malak and renounces it, he cannot reach Malakut, and unless one does know Malakut and renounces it, he cannot reach Jabarut and from there to Lahut. A salik can do this much that he reaches Malakut from Malak and from lower Malakut to the highest Malakut, and thus enable himself to observe the beauty of the originator of Malakut. Yet the Cognition of God is not complete. A salik has ought to proceed further from the reality of 'Rabubiat' to the reality of 'Aluhiyat'; again, from the reality of 'Aluhiyat' to the reality of 'Issat'; again, from the reality of 'Issat' to the reality of 'Asmat'; and finally, from the reality of 'Asmat' to the reality of 'Kibriva'. At the stage of 'Kibriva', he will find the exclusive Reality or Existence of God, and nothing else. But, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, it is an uphill task to combine Malak and Malakut to Lahut, and the gnosis of the Essence (Dhat) of God is but impossible. This very fact of creation has been explained by Al-Ghasali in the following words:

"Al-Ghasali conceives the world as having two faces, naming them differently as the material world (Alam al-Mahsus or 'Mushahada or Mulk), and the Celestial world (Alam al-Malakut), or the world of Senses (Alam-al-Hissi), and the world of
intelligence (A'lam al-Aqil) or, the Higher world (A'lam al-Alawi) and the Lower world (A'lam al-Sifili). The transcendental world is beyond the ken of sense and imagination. The physical world is a direct consequence, a manifestation, a symbol of the transcendental world. 'The seen world is to the World Celestial as mind is to the kernel, or as the form to the spirit, or, as darkness to light, and lowness to loftiness'. He who never yearns for the knowledge of the spiritual world and remains occupied wholly with the seen world is a brute, nay worse than that, for the brutes are not furnished with wings for flight to the unseen world as man is. It is only through the physical world that one can rise to the spiritual world, for they are related to each other intrinsically. The world that is beyond the apprehension of sense and imagination may, from the viewpoint of the pilgrim to God, be called the Fold of the Divine, the Holiness. There are folds within folds and no man shall attain unto Allah until he has traversed the highest. Thus, there are grades of ascension in the spiritual world, and the pilgrim's progress along the 'Straight Path' is his progress through these folds. The lowest heaven of the pilgrim is that of the earth from which proceeds his bodily movement, his sensation proceeds from the next heaven above, and his Reason from the next still above. From here the soul spreads wings for its upward flight to what seems Unity with Pure Deity, a Seven-Fold way.  

What is the proof of cognising God? This is another vital question that Saiyed Gaisudaras raises. He affirms that it is
the faculty of Reason (noor), through which a man can cognise God. This faculty of Reason has been called by various names, like insight, the light of the faith, reason, etc. There is a faculty in the heart of man about which it is said, "Is one whose heart God has opened to Islam, so that he has received Enlightenment from God..." The meaning given to the faculty of reason is not in the sense in which it is used by scholastic theologians, who denominate it as logical reason concerned with disputation. It has been used in the special sense of being the capacity to know metaphysical problems like God, Soul, etc. This faculty of Reason is beyond the reach of external and internal senses. Reason, according to Saiyed Qaisudaraz, is a kind of 'noor' (light) created by God inside man, and has the capacity of distinguishing virtue from sin, and truth from falsehood. But then, if intellect is temporal and God is Eternal, how can the temporal know the Eternal? Saiyed Qaisudaraz replies that the Eternal, i.e., God, with the help of His Eternal 'Noor' (light) shows the path to temporal 'noor'. But the intellect by itself (temporal 'noor'), is not capable of recognising the path leading to God. That is why, it has been said that nobody knows God except God Himself. Regarding the method of knowing God by the intellect, it is said that it is argumentation. No event is seen to remain in one condition, because it changes, so there must be its creator. The Creator should be eternal, immutable and one, otherwise an infinite regress will follow. Intellect, thus, leads to Unity. If truth is sought with the aid of intellect alone -- without the guidance of God, it may lead on to infidelity (kufr), because
God is the only guide to the right path.\textsuperscript{44} Again, the question arises, if intellect is the proof of mafirat-Allah and intellect is in the nature of man, then why often do not people recognise God? Why do people err in understanding His (God’s) Essence and Attributes and so go to hell? Saiyed Gaisudaras affirms that undoubtedly, the way to know God is intellect, yet while adopting this path with the aim to arrive at virtue and truth, the intellectual must need the guidance and grace of God. It is only through Grace and Guidance of God (with His ’Noor’), that the intellect recognises Him (God). God, with His Grace puts the ’Noor’ in the intellect of man, makes his heart open, and bosom expand, whereafter the intellect treads on the right path and gets rid of hellish ignorance. Intellect, of its own, could never tread the right path, but would instead, leave the way of mercy, and go on the path of sin and idolatry.\textsuperscript{45} Hence, it is beyond the power of man to know or to describe the Dhat (Essence) of God.\textsuperscript{46} It is Saiyed Gaisudaras’s own conviction that logical reason cannot prove or disprove the existence of God.\textsuperscript{*} And so Saiyed Gaisudaras relies mainly on intuition which he calls Marifat (Gnosis). Marifat in the terminology of the Sufis, is cognition gained through intuition and ecstasy.\textsuperscript{47} For intuition needs no intermediary. It is difficult to know where the knowledge comes from. Progress in intuition (ilham) rests on self-discipline, moral purity, and the Divine Grace.\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{*} This is the position which has been taken by the renowned German philosopher Kant and in our own century, the logical positivists have supported this stand.
The world from Hasut to Malakut, according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, is that which is manifest. This is the Shiriat of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be on him). By practising Shiriat, one reaches from Hasut to Malakut or from qalib to qalib. Saiyed Gaisudaraz says that God has put two things in man. One is the heart, and the other is soul (nafs). The heart is so delicate and holy that it bears nothing except one. The heart, says Saiyed Gaisudaraz, in which the world has found a place, has no place for God. That is, one who loves the world cannot love God; the love of the world and God cannot go together. The heart is the proper place of God. If the heart is pure and undefiled, its keeper gets near to God. The nafs is such that it bears whatever burden is put on it.

Now Saiyed Gaisudaraz explains through an analogy, how the heart acts as a place for God to be at. He says that God has made seven sources in the heart of man. They are as follows:

1. **Sadar or Sina** (Bosom)

   Inside Man, the first source is the bosom (sadar). Saiyed Gaisudaraz quotes the verse of the Quran:

   
   (When God opens the heart of man on Islam, he lives in the light of his Lord).

   But this source sometimes operates like a veil to keep away the light of the Lord, whereby the bosom is transformed into a centre, generating Satanic activity. Saiyed Gaisudaraz quotes
Quranic verse to support this:53

قُلْ إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزُولُ الْآخِرَةِ الَّذِينَ يُؤْمِنُونَ مَعَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ... الذُّوْرُومُ وَلَأَنتُمُ النُّورُ أَنَا مِنْ أَنفُسِّي وَأَنتُمُ النُّورُ إِلَّا بِالْيَدَاءِ وَالْبِكْرَةِ

(Say: I seek refuge with the Lord and Cherisher of Mankind... (the same) who whispers into the heart of Mankind — among Jinns and among Men)

2. *Qalb* (Heart) 

The second source is the *qalb* (heart). The *qalb* is the storehouse of faith (*iman*) and also a treasure of *Haq* or Truth. This *qalb* is the house of 'nour-i-qalb'. The vision that the heart has, which is called *hakirat* has its origins here. External observation is a reflection of this *hakirat*.

3. *Shaghaf* (شغف)

The third source inside Man is *shaghaf*. This houses the love and grace of Prophet Muhammad, and also the love (*ishque*) of the Apostles and Auliya. *Ishque majazi* (anthropomorphical love) does not find access here.

4. *Fawad* or Tahadil (فؤاد) 

This is the fourth source and is called *fawad*. This is the place inside Man, wherefrom the Majesty (*jalaal*), Beauty (*jamaal*) and other Attributes of God are observed.

5. *Jannatul qalb* (جنت القلب)

The fifth source inside Man is called *jannatul qalb*. It is the place of *Shawq* (longing), *Zauq* (pleasure) and *Ishque* (love).
of God, and functions when there is only exclusive love of God.

6. *sawda* (سیراء)

The sixth source is *sawda*. This houses the *ilm-i-ladunni* (qalbi makashfat) and is a treasure house of Divinity, Knowledge and Names (*ism*).

7. *Bahtajul qalb* (بَهْتَجِ الْقَلْبُ)

The seventh source is *Bahtajul qalb*. This is the place which manifests the Essence and Attributes (*Dhat-o-Sifat*) of God and wherefrom shine forth *tajalliyat* or Divinity.

In the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, the path from *malakut* to *jabarut*, is *tariqat*. Practising *tariqat* one reaches the 'Ruh' through the *Dil*. If *Ruh* is pure, the same man in his life, as if comes to birth again, and reaches Alam-i-jabarut. On being born, one sees first this physical world, and then himself. But then, when he is born of himself, so to say, and attains knowledge of his self, he sees the world here-after and God.

Saiyed Gaisudaraz explains at this stage that a child is to be considered at the receptive stage, at which he gains knowledge of the world through external and internal senses (*hawaas, suri, and hawaas-i-manwae*). At maturity, he reaches the reflective stage, when he reflects upon the workings of the world and of his self. It is at this stage that he gains knowledge of the after world and God. The *Dil* reaches *Ruh*, when it has reached *jabarut* from *malakut* and enjoys the sight of *jabarut*. And the source which lies
between jabarut and labut, that is Haqiqat. It is like going from Ruh to the profound secret. This is the stage when he gets access to God's profound secret and becomes His haqar (a sharer of the knowledge of His sacred Mystery).

It is the discipline which prepares the heart for the intuitive knowledge of God, and with this end in view, Saiyed Gaisudaras lays much emphasis on Mujahida (mortification) and Muraqaba (concentrated contemplation). Mujahida means cleansing of the heart and purification of the soul. Saiyed Gaisudaras says that mortification (mujahida) is more important and is meant for the truthful (sadiq). Muraqaba, on the other hand, means concentrated contemplation. It is a particular form of practice which prepares the heart for immediate intuitive experience. For this, the heart should already be sufficiently purified. Muraqaba consists of complete mental detachment from all things other than God and concentration upon the physical heart, and then, as it were, waiting for the light to come to the heart. This knowledge from God is directly flashed or communicated to the heart.

Ghose-ul-Asam, Saiyed Abdul Qadir Jilani, in his Risalah Ghosia says that a human being (insan) is the mirror of God, and the universe, the mirror of insan. This means that God has made man (insan) His vehicle and the universe, the vehicle of man. Saiyed Gaisudaras interpreting this saying of Ghose-ul-Asam says that God has made man, i.e., Prophet Muhammad, as His vehicle. God says that when He demanded the angels to prostrate before
Adam, it was because the 'Nur' of Prophet Muhammad was present in Adam. And so, the Prophets, the protected friends of God, and the entire mankind are vehicles, and God is the rider, i.e., everything is in the grip of God. God sees Himself in man (insan) and man (insan) sees himself in every particles of the universe. This means that the entire universe serves as mirror for man, and man is the mirror of God. Here the meaning of 'cognition of self' (IQATAT) becomes clear. And when man sees God in his mirror, the meaning of 'cognition of God' (IQATAT) becomes clear also. Saiyed Gaisudaraz finds support for this in the traditions: (The heart of woman is the mirror of God). He says that as the body of a man is the vehicle and soul (ruh) is the rider, so soul (ruh) is the vehicle and God is the rider. Now the people of Sharia are those who possess Gnosis. The people of Tariqat are men of love (Muhabbat). The people of Haqiqat (ahl-i-haqqat) are those who have reached the beloved (masih), i.e., God. These people, at this stage are perfect in love. No stage is higher than this stage. This stage is such that there is no annihilation (fana); instead everywhere, there is everlasting (baqta). This is the secret hidden in the lover which, in this way, becomes manifest.

Saiyed Gaisudaraz lays an exclusive emphasis on love (ishq) as it begets Gnosis and nearness to God. If this was not so, the investiture (khitab) of being highest in rank of all

* This matter has been taken from Jawaharul Usahaque which is the Urdu translation of Risalah Ghosul Aam written by Saiyed Gaisudaraz. Here in this Risalah, Saiyed Gaisudaraz interprets and clarifies the points raised by Saiyed Ghosul Aam.
apostles would not have been bestowed on Prophet Muhammad (Peace be on him). At this stage of love (\textit{ashiq}), outer duality of lover (\textit{ashiq}) and beloved (\textit{maashiq}) becomes imaginary one and the love between the two is real. This stage is not limited only to the Prophet, but persons following the Prophet may also have it. At this stage of love one relates himself with the beloved and follows whatever He says. However, the purification of soul remains the pre-requisite condition for such love.\textsuperscript{59}

Saiyed Abdul Qadir Jilani, in his \textit{Risalah Ghosiya}, has mentioned that even love is a veil between the lover and the beloved; when the lover is annihilated in love, he is united with his beloved. Saiyed Gaisudaraz, interpreting the views of Ghosul Asam, comments that the above assertion means that the letter \textit{Majnun} (\textbullet) in \textit{Muhabbat} is a veil between Ahmad and Ahad. When Ahmad is relieved of this \textit{Majnun} of Muhabbat, he becomes united with 'Ahad'. In other words, Muhabbat in the shape of the body (\textit{qalib}) of Prophet Muhammad was a veil between Ahmad and Ahad. When the Prophet got relieved of the body, then Ahmad was united with Ahad. Thus, Muhabbat is the \textit{qalib} (body) of a man (\textit{insan}). In other words, Ruh (soul) is the 'Noor' of God and His 'Noor' is Eternal and Imperishable. God created the \textit{qalib} of Aadam and mankind for His \textit{muhabbat}. When soul becomes separated from the body, it reaches God, as if the drop becomes united with the ocean. Thus, the body (\textit{qalib}) is the veil between God and man, as God has Himself said, 'Your \textit{wjud} (existence) is the veil between you and Me'.\textsuperscript{60} But here it should be borne
in mind that by 'unity' Saiyed Gaisudaras never means a fusion or identity; rather, he maintains that it (unity) but seems only to be so, when actually at this stage man remains man and God. What He Is. It is only the nature of nearness that greatly increases and therefore, becomes significant.

Like other sufis, Saiyed Gaisudaras also affirms that love of God begets the vision of God. The vision of God is possible in life hereafter (akhirat), and people shall behold God with eyes open. The vision of God is also possible in this world, but not while man is in a waking condition. Prophet Muhammad (Peace be on him) too had the vision of God in the night of ascension. However, there is a controversy whether that vision was an eyeful or of the heart. The vision of God is possible in dream. When God manifested His tajalli on Koh-i-Tur, the mountain broke into pieces and Prophet Moses fainted. This was a vision to the mountain. Saiyed Gaisudaras criticises the Mutazilites who deny the vision of God. He says that if God could make the mountain see, then why should there be astonishment if God bestows vision on Man, the prime creation.

Explaining that knowledge is the greatest veil between man and God, Saiyed Gaisudaras says that every thing other than God (maa'-layla-Allah) is the veil of the Dhak (Allah). All other veils are bad (qabah), but the veil of knowledge is holy, beautiful, full of praise and above all difficult to be lifted. The other veils such as jealousy, anger, bad feeling, back biting, etc., are easy to be lifted. But knowledge here does not mean the
knowledge of any particular subject or thing, such as knowledge of mathematics, jurisprudence, interpretation and tradition, etc. It simply means the knowledge of God, i.e., knowledge of the Dhat-o-Sifat of Allah which is not based on reasoning and argument; rather its basis is observation (mushahida) and is received directly from God without any medium. This is the greatest veil and no other knowledge is called knowledge in comparison to it, because other knowledge is earthly or temporal (majazi), but not real (haqiqi). It is called the greatest because it is difficult to lift this veil. The heart (qalb) is the meeting point of God and man. For a traveller on the path (qalik), the heart (qalb) is the mirror for God’s Creation when turned outward, but when the heart (qalb) of such a man is turned inward, it serves as the mirror wherein he sees the vision of God Himself.

Saiyed Gusudaras also lays much emphasis on Tasbiyyat-un-nafs (purification of soul). It is realized through ‘sala’ (good action) and ‘mujahida’ (struggle). In the words of Al-Ghasali, “verily the aim of all struggle and training by means of good actions is the perfection of the self, its purifying and cleansing in order to polish its character.” There are two elements in man; the negative and the positive. The negative element means that something is to be removed from the heart and the positive element means that something else is to be brought in its place. The things to be removed are evil character, the evil of the within and the actions which begets misery. The soul has the capacity to act as a mirror, but the dust and impurities
must be removed from the heart. The attainment of this stage is the perfection of a man. The power of self-reflection in man is potential, not actual. It can be acquired by man if he struggles against evil tooth and nail and cleanses his soul from it altogether. 48

Thus, according to Saiyed Gaisudaras, the knowledge of God (Gnosis or marifat) is only possible through self-knowledge and not through intellect. Self-knowledge means knowing the self as an integrated whole, and also knowing its component parts. Saiyed Gaisudarar's emphasis on good conduct and purification of the heart from all human infirmities is in agreement with the views of Al-Ghazali, on Ilm-ul-mukashafa. In the system of Al-Ghazali, the 'Ileads-ul-Mukashafa' is used for what the Sufis call 'Marifat' meaning intuition or direct apprehension of super-sensory realities. 69 Ilm-ul-mukashafa is a certitude which is the result of the light (Noor) that God instills into the heart when it is purged of vices and filled with virtues through Ilm-ul-Mu'mana. 70
Chapter III

THE CONCEPTION OF TAUHID

SECTION A

Ibnul Arabi's Conception of Tauhid

After having touched upon the thought underlying the doctrine of Gnosis in the previous chapter, we now come to discuss Saiyed Gaisudaras's Conception of Unity of God (Tauhid), as his views on Gnosis and Conception of Tauhid are very much inter-related. We may in fact say that his Conception of Tauhid is based on his doctrine of Gnosis. But before making an attempt to discuss the position of Saiyed Gaisudaras regarding Unity of God (Tauhid), it is desirable to look into the Conception of Unity of God as held by Ibnul Arabi (1165-1240 A.D.). This is so because, in the book 'Tabaraturul Istalihat al-Sufia', written by Saiyed Akbar Husaini, the eldest son of Saiyed Gaisudaras, the stand taken by Ibnul Arabi has been criticised.

* Shaikh Muhid-din Muhammad Ibn Ali, commonly known as Ibnul Arabi and Ash-Shaikh-ul-Akbar, was born at Murcia in the south-east of Spain, in A.H. 560 (A.D. 1165), during the reign of Sultan Muhammad. He died in A.H. 638 (A.D. 1240). This great Shaikh has been called the father of Islamic Pantheism. It is but fact that the teaching and example of Ibnul Arabi have been a great source of inspiration to practically every Pantheistic Sufi that came after him. Even Jalaluddin Rumi is supposed to have had his share of this influence. The system of Ibnul Arabi has been discussed by various authors in the east and treatises have been written on him. The vital

(Contd.)
Influenced by Neoplatonism on the one hand, and Ishraqis and Hallaj on the other, Ibnul Arabi shaped his doctrine of *Wahdatul Wujud* (Unity of Existence). The Quran declares: "There is nothing to be worshipped except God", and Ibnul Arabi emphasises, "there is nothing in Existence except God" (لا واجباً ولا شيء لا إله إلا الله). The Prophet presents a Conception of God Who is the Creator and the entire universe is His Creation. Muslim philosophers like Al-Kindi, Farabi and Ibn Sina, propounded the theory of Emanation. On the basis of this theory, God is the First Cause, and from God, emanated the *First Intelligence* as Effect. From *First Intelligence* emanated the *Second Intelligence* and the first heaven, and thus, one after another, ten intelligences and seven heavens came into existence. From the tenth intelligence, emanated the world of souls and from the world of souls came human souls, till in the end, emanated the world of bodies. Now Ibnul Arabi will have none of these intermediaries. His emphasis is only on 'absolute unification'.

To understand the Doctrine of Unity of Being or Unity of Existence, we must grasp first what is meant by Being (*wujud*)

question with which these authors were more concerned was the question of his orthodoxy, and not as much with his mysticism or philosophy as such. There was an endeavour to know as to how far such philosophy agreed or disagreed with Islamic principles. As a result, controversies on this subject occupied the minds of the Muslims for centuries. Books were written by such men as Ibn Taymiyya, Jalaluddin as-Suyuti, Payrusahadi, Makhumi, Taftanami, etc., either to defend Ibnul Arabi's orthodoxy or prove his infidelity. There has never been such a diversity of opinion on the orthodoxy of a man before. He has been regarded by some people as one of the greatest saints of Islam and by others as a heretic of the worst kind. (A.E. Affifi, The Mystical Philosophy of Ibnul Arabi, University Press, Cambridge, 1939, Preface).
and the phrase "God is Absolute Being" (الله هو الوجود الإلهي). This is so because Ibnul Arabi considers Reality as an 'Absolute Being' (الوجود المنفرد) or 'Universal Being' (الوجود الغير منفرد). But then it becomes difficult to determine the meaning of 'Absolute Being' for Ibnul Arabi appears to use the term 'Being' in two different senses.

In the first sense, 'Being' may mean a 'Concept', the 'Idea of Being', or, Existence (الوجود من من约为). In the second sense, it may mean that which has being, i.e., that which exists or subsists (الوجود المنفرد). While interpreting the meaning of 'Being' as held by Ibnul Arabi, quotes Jami. Jami says that 'Being' may have two different interpretations. First, 'Being' is an "idea of the second intention" which has no external object corresponding to it. This is one of the accidents of the 'Quidity' or Real Nature of the thing which exists only in thought, as has been proved by the reasonings of scholastic theologians and philosophers. In the second sense, 'Being' signifies that Real Being, who is Self-Existent, and on whom the existence of all other beings depends, and in truth, no real objective existence could exist apart from Him. All other beings are merely accidents accessory to Him, as is attributed by the intuitive apprehension of the most famous gnostics and 'men of certitude'.

Though Ibnul Arabi at one moment looks inclined to favour the first sense, and at another adheres to the second, and though he sometimes mixes the two together, yet he definitely accepts,
in form and practice, the second meaning of the term "wujud", i.e., Being as One, and as That, Which Exists. This Being is Allah and every thing else is His manifestation.

Therefore, the question naturally arises that is ultimate 'Being' an abstraction, an idea, existing only in mind, and uniting in itself, as all universal concepts do, or, is it an Absolute Existing Reality which is identical with the "All"? The confusion arises because he holds that 'Being', that is, existence as an abstract idea, can be conceived apart from the existing object. He holds that we can mentally separate 'existence' as concept, from our concepts of things. For example, we can separate mentally the universal concept, "existence", from our concept of horse, man, etc. Besides this, Ibnul Arabi also holds that 'Being', that is, existence, is identical with and inseparable from things in the external world. In fact, he seems to believe that Reality as Substance, is ultimately One, and 'Being', that is, Existence, as Concept, which is externally identical with Existing Object, finds its complete identification in the one Existing Reality which is the source of all that has existence. It follows, then, that Absolute Existence which is a 'Universal Concept' and Absolute Reality which is an existing object, coincide. Ibnul Arabi, further maintains that Absolute Being, that is existence, can only be applied to Absolute Reality which is the universal Existent. All that we are acquainted with has but limited existence. This cannot be the origin of itself. Therefore, there must be an Absolute Existence
which is the source of all limited existences. Hence, it appears to make no difference, for Ibnul Arabi, if the term 'Absolute Being' is taken to mean either 'Absolute Existence' or 'Absolute Existent', since they are both externally identical with it. It would then mean that Reality which is an Absolute Being is actually one with Absolute Existence though they may be separated in thought. When Ibnul Arabi says that Absolute Existence is the source and cause of all existence, he simply means that Absolute Reality that is, Being, is the source and cause of all beings. Therefore, for Ibnul Arabi, it does not mean that God is an Abstract Concept of *Majid* only, which has no external existence.  

Ibnul Arabi holds that the 'Absolute Being' is the source of all beings in the sense of a Reality or a Being whose existence is identical with its Essence, or a Being whose existence is necessary. This could mean that for Ibnul Arabi, Being is identical with attributes. This Essence is at once all the realised and the realisable quiddity (*mahiyat*) of the external world, with all its properties and accidents, and upon this Essence, the human mind bases its notion of 'abstract existence'. Thus, when Ibnul Arabi considers 'Absolute Being or Existence', the source of all existence, he means that Absolute Being which is identical with and inseparable from the Absolute Existent, is the ultimate source and ground of all existence and all that exists.  

It is appropriate at this stage to bring out the distinction
which Ibmul Arabi makes between 'Being' and 'Existence'. He considers 'Existence' a species of 'Being', and holds that every thing that has being may be said to have existence if manifested at one or the other planes or stages of 'Being'. He speaks of four planes of Being. They are:

1. Being of a thing in the external world.
2. Intelligible beings.
3. Being of a thing in spoken words.
4. Being of a thing in script.

Ibmul Arabi says that every thing that has 'being' be it temporal or eternal, must exist at one, or the other, or, all these 'Planes'. That which does not exist at all or some of them is a pure not-being, and nothing further can be said about it. A thing may be said to be a not-being if it does not exist at one of these 'planes of being', and if it exists in another, then it is a not-being in those particular planes in which it does not exist.

Ibmul Arabi holds that things have existence in God's knowledge, prior to their existence in the external world. The Universe and Man are both eternal and temporal; existent and non-existent. They are eternal because they exist in the eternal knowledge of God, and are temporal as concretes and external 'form'. Thus, according to Ibmul Arabi, relative 'being' means the actual physical objects in the phenomenal world or those that exist potentially as ideas in the mind of God; he sometimes calls it 'possible'. Not-being, according to Ibmul Arabi has no
existence at any of the 'planes' of being. This may be called a pure non-existent. Again by Not-being, he means things, which exist in one plane, and not in another. In the latter sense, this would mean things, which exist only as ideas or concepts in a mind, and cannot possibly exist in the external world, as also those things which are possible, or even probable existents, but, which do not actually exist in the external world. Pure Not-being can never itself be an object of our thought, and other non-existents can and actually are as Ibnul Arabi holds. 8

Thus we see that under the influence of Plato and Aristotle, Muslim philosophy was greatly preoccupied with the question of what constitutes a thing. According to Mutazilites, a thing was a concept that could be known regardless of whether it actually existed or not, existence being only one of its various qualities. Ibnul Arabi too, conceives of being as possible, apart from things, that actually exist. It is only in the phenomenal world that the quality of being must be possessed by an object in order that it may exist. He divides things that have no being into two categories. The first category consists of things that have no existence in any of the planes of Pure Being (God). These he considers purely non-existent. The second category consists of things, which exist in one plane, but not in another. He divides them into two sub-categories. First are those things which exist only as intellectual concepts, without the possibility of existence in the actual world. For example, the concept of a man with a hundred heads, or, a fire that is wet. Second come those things which have a potential existence
in the actual world without, however, existing in it for example, the telephone or the jet plane a hundred years ago. Ibnul Arabi maintains that while the last two categories of Not-being can be objects of our thought, pure Not-being cannot. Ibnul Arabi also distinguishes between necessary being, contingent being, and impossible being. He says that a necessary being is that whose existence is self-necessitated. In other words, it is that which exists per se, and this could be God alone. Contingent being, he says, is that for whose existence there is no essential or necessary reason. Its being and not-being are equally possible. An impossible being is one whose non-existence is necessitated by some formal reason. Ibnul Arabi emphatically denies the contingent or possible being. In spite of this fact, he calls the *ayn al-thabita* 'possible being'. He defines it by saying that they are necessary in the sense that they are potentialities which must of necessity be actualised. Thus, he admits only two categories of being: necessary, and impossible.

Ibnul Arabi, therefore, strictly maintains that there is one Reality in existence. This Reality can be viewed from two different angles. When we regard this Reality as the essence of phenomena, it is the Real (*Haqq*). When we regard it as the phenomena manifesting that Essence, it is the Creation (*Khalq*). Thus, *Haqq* and *Khalq*, Reality and Creation, the One and the Many, are only names for two subjective aspects of One Reality. Therefore, *Haqq* is the real unity and *Khalq* is its empirical diversity.
Ibnul Arabi says that if God is regarded through Himself, or as Essence from the point of view of the Essence, then this is the state of unity. But if God is regarded as form, then the unity vanishes. All this amounts to saying, that unity has no other meaning than that, two or more things, being actually identical are distinguishable conceptually, the one from the other. Multiplicity is merely due to different angles of vision, and not due to an actual division in the One Essence. It is in this way we find that Ibnul Arabi does not wish to assert a real duality of being. Ontologically, there is but one Reality and epistemically, there are two aspects— a Reality which transcends the phenomenal world, and a multiplicity of subjectivities, which find their ultimate explanation and basis in the essential unity of the Real. Ibnul Arabi also sometimes distinguishes between these two aspects on logical grounds. He says that the manifold existents in the external world are contingent, temporal and dependent for their existence on something which must of necessity be self-subsistent, eternal, independent and necessary. The One stands to the Many in relation of a substance to its accidents, logically different from them but actually one with them. Ibnul Arabi says that owing to our finite minds and our inability to grasp the whole as a whole, we regard it as a plurality of beings ascribing to each one characteristics which distinguish it from the rest. A person who is possessed of the vision of a mystic can transcend in super-mental state of intuition all the multiplicity of forms and see the Reality that underlies them. In itself the One is simple and indivisible but what seems to
multiply the One is the predications which we predicate of external objects, that is, we bring them under categories of colour, shape, size, temporal and spatial relations.

The Hallajian element in particular is predominant in Ibnul Arabi's thought about the One and the Many, although sometimes he uses the terms 'form' and 'essence' as equivalent to Hallaj's Nasut and La'ut, yet the two terms La'ut and Nasut which for Hallaj meant ultimately two different natures or beings, underwent radical modification in the system of Ibnul Arabi. These two terms have been reduced to mere aspects of Reality. La'ut and Nasut, i.e., essence and form, become simply names for the outward and inward aspects of the One being complementary sides of this One Reality, and enjoy equal status in the monistic theory of Ibnul Arabi. Hallaj's famous utterances, "And I am the Real, for I have never ceased to be real through the Real", and again, "There is no difference between me and Thee except Godhead and Lordship", admit all the time, the reality of the two elements in Man -- the divine and the human -- which in certain mystical states are allowed to become united. But Ibnul Arabi, on the other hand, admits neither 'Union' nor fusion, nor even incarnation. He either speaks of One Reality, or two aspects of Reality keeping the distinction between them always rigid and clear before his mind. He says that 'I am the mystery (secret) of the Real, not the Real Himself', and the mystery here being the phenomenal aspect in which the Real is distinguished. The two are always there, and there is no sense
in saying that one becomes the other. Thus, there is no place of 'becoming' in the philosophy of Ibnul Arabi. At times he takes the help of metaphors for explaining the relation between One and Many. But the least error that can result from misinterpreting such metaphors is the assumption that he is really a theist rather than a pantheist or that he is a dualist rather than a monist.

Take the metaphor of the 'mirror' and 'images' which is closely allied to that of the object and its shadow. The One is regarded as an object whose image is reflected in different mirrors, the images appearing in different forms and shapes according to the nature of each mirror. The Many (Phenomenal world) is the mirror-image, the shadow of the Real object beyond. The whole world is like a shadow play. He is well aware of the ambiguity of this metaphor, and wishing to rule out any implication of duality, he definitely states that the source of the shadow and the shadow itself are one. Again, take the mathematical metaphors of number 'One' and the diacritical point, and the centre of circle. According to Ibnul Arabi, the One stands to Many in the same relation as the mathematical one stands to the infinite numbers based on it. But although numbers are based on 'one' it would be absurd to call them manifestations of 'one' in the sense that phenomenal objects are manifestations of the one. Numbers are aggregates of units of ones and if the analogy holds good we should regard the phenomenal objects as conglomerations of units each of which is the one, which they are not, not even in Ibnul Arabi's view. 

But no metaphor, whatever,
can adequately serve as a medium of expressing a philosophical theory. That is why Ibnul Arabi does not appeal to intellect and formal reasoning in order to apprehend such a doctrine. On the contrary, the ultimate solution of the problem rests with the Supra-mental intuition of the mystics, which alone perceives the unity as a unity.

Therefore, the distinction between One, and Many, or Real and the Phenomenal, thus, explained as Essence and Form, or, Reality and Appearance, if at all maintained should not be to predicate of one, what is predicable of the other, except in the strict sense of regarding them as ultimately and essentially One. He maintains that every thing is a Reality (Haqq), but not the Real (Alhaqq): the slave, therefore, remains a slave, and God, the Lord. The One Essence transcends all the forms, and whatever characteristics belong to them. The Many, have two aspects. First, as different from one another, and as different from the One, which signifies the aspect of difference. Second, as essentially identical with one another, and with the One, which expresses the aspect of unity. The former aspect is summed up as contingency, servanthood and temporalness, and, the latter aspect is what he calls Necessity, Lordship and Eternity. Therefore, the duality of Haqq and Khalq is not, according to Ibnul Arabi, a real duality of beings, rather, it is a duality of differentiating attributes. These differentiating attributes are identified in his philosophy as transcendence and immanence. The two Arabic terms, tashbih and tanbih, which were used by Muslim theologians,
for a long time, to mean the comparability and incomparability of God to created beings, in connection with the doctrine of anthropomorphism and corporealism, seem to have undergone a serious modification at the hands of Ibnul Arabi, because he uses them in a more philosophical sense. An anthropomorphist, or a corporealist, is one who attributes to God qualities which are analogous to those of men and other created beings. A transcendentalist is one who holds that God is above such qualities. A man, we may say, may very well be an anthropomorphist, or a corporealist, without being a pantheist. It would mean that God may very well be assumed to have qualities, and attributes, comparable to those of men and physical objects, and yet, remain different from, and at the same time not in any way be identical with, either men, or other physical objects, or with the whole universe. But such a position, according to Ibnul Arabi, could not possibly be maintained. He uses the terms transcendence (tanzih) and immanence (taabbih) in quite a different sense. He says, that the assertions, that God 'hears', or 'sees', or, has 'hands', etc., which anthropomorphists make, do not mean that God possesses 'hearing', or 'sight', or 'hands', rather that God is immanent in all that hears, sees, or has hands. God hears and sees, in every being, that hears and sees, and this constitutes His immanence. Further, God's Essence, is not limited to one being, or a group of beings, that hear and see, but is manifested in all such beings whatever. In this sense, God is transcendent, because He is above all limitations and divisions. As a universal
substance. He is the Essence of all that is. In this way Ibnul Arabi, reduces **tanzih** and **tasbih**, to absoluteness and limitedness. He emphatically denies the anthropomorphism, or corporealism as held by the old theologians. The mention in the Quran about God having hands and feet should, in the opinion of Ibnul Arabi, be interpreted not in the anthropomorphic sense, but in the sense that God is essentially the hands and feet of all that have hands and feet. God's manifestation, in such limited forms as hands and feet, etc., constitutes His **tasbih**, but, His being in Himself above such limitations, constitutes His **tanzih**.¹⁷

Therefore, Ibnul Arabi holds that transcendence and immanence are two fundamental aspects of Reality. Neither of them would be sufficient without the other if we want to give a complete account of Reality, and in support of this he says that Islam is the only religion which asserts both aspects in an equal degree. It is true that Ibnul Arabi asserts that every thing and all things are God, yet he takes care not to assert, that is, that God is all things in the sense of being an aggregation of existents. He asserts that God is the unity behind the multiplicity and Reality behind the Appearance. Hence, there are two alternatives, that, either the phenomenal world is a mere illusion, or the Real Being is God alone; or God is a mere fabrication of the human mind and the phenomenal world is the only Reality. Ibnul Arabi chooses the former alternative. In this way, his assertion of transcendence saves him from falling into gross materialism.¹⁸ Ibnul Arabi makes this clear by emphasizing that it is not transcendence
as asserted by man, which explains the real nature of God as the Absolute. He says that even the most abstract transcendence conceived by man is a form of limitation, because it implies, at least, the existence of an assister, besides that of God. To assert any thing about any thing is to limit it and therefore, the assertion even of absolute transcendence of God is a limitation. The assertion made by the intellect, of the transcendence of God is only a convenient way of contrasting the two aspects of Reality, but, in fact, it does not explain its nature. Imam Arabi says that Tawhid, which is unification, equivalent to transcendence, belongs to the Muwahhid, not to God, since God is above all assertions. This amounts to saying that no one, except God Himself, knows His real transcendent aspect. In other words, no one, except God, can fully comprehend His essential Unity. The perfect Sufi, in his ecstatic flight, might have a glimpse of this Unity, not through the intellect, but by means of supra-mental intuition, which belongs only to such a state. This higher form of transcendence is independent of all assertion. It belongs to the Divine Essence per se. The absolute unity and simplicity of the Divine Essence are only known to the Divine Essence. Here there is no duality of the subject and the object, knower and the known. This form of transcendence is not the same as that which we usually contrast with immanence, because, the latter belongs to the intellect, as the logical correlative of immanence. It is predicative of God, as al-Haqiq, when contrasted with the phenomenal world, al-Khalq. This is ultimately subjective. The higher transcendence is objective and follows from the nature
of the Absolute Himself. Of such transcendence, Ibnul Arabi holds, we have no knowledge and cannot take it as a part of our definition of God. The only possible definition of God, if possible at all, can be made by taking into account both transcendence and immanence.  

Ibnul Arabi says, that the so-called attributes of transcendence (ṣifat al-ṭansilḥ), should be predicated of the Godhead (al-Haqq), not of the Essence, for the Essence, in its bare abstraction, is attributeless. These attributes of transcendence are summed up in what he calls absoluteness (āl-ḥaq), as contrasted with the limitedness (taqyid) of the phenomenal world. So, Reality as Ibnul Arabi understands it, has both aspects — transcendence and immanence.

Thus, the Divine Essence is one Universal Substance, and it is identified with Absolute Reality. In its absolute indeterminateness, the Divine Essence is a bare Monad. It has no quality and relations. It is a being-in-itself. It is indestructible, independent, and unchangeable.

Reality is not a substance, but the one substance which, in itself, embraces all substances so-called, material and non-material. What are fleeting, destructible, and changeable, are its accidents, forms and manifestations. Ibnul Arabi differs from the Asharites with respect to doctrine of Attributes. The Asharites regard the attributes as over and above the essence of God, and not identical with the essence of God as the Mutazilites hold. But Ibnul Arabi has more in common with the
Mutazilites here. He says that the Attributes have no existent a'yan, and neither do they subsist as entities in, nor, have any meaning apart from, the Divine Essence; they are mere relations.

If Ibnul Arabi sometimes speaks of the a'yan of Names or Attributes, it is only in a metaphorical sense, and not in the sense that they are any thing superadded to the Essence. This establishes that for Ibnul Arabi Dhat or Being is identical with Sifat or Attributes, and Sifat express themselves in Manifestations (tajalliyyat), or Modes, which are the world and its objects. The same identity of the Divine Modes with His Attributes, and of Attributes with the Being, is brought out in another way. Ibnul Arabi maintains that 'Divine Names are identical with the Named (Musamma), and the Musamma is the very being of Allah; and that, the Divine Names, although they are many, denote the same entity; and further that, whatever is denoted by each name, separately, is denoted by all of them together. God can be praised with any name or with all the names together, because, all the names denote the same Being. Just as He (God) is manifold as regards His Names, and One as regards His Being, so He (God) is Ahadiyyat-i-Manzila like Hayula, or 'matter', or a conceptual unity, as regards His Being, and manifold as regards His existence, because the created beings are nothing but He Himself in Self-Emanation. Now, this identification of Aama, or Names, and Musamma, the Named, is only another way for the indentification of Dhat and Sifat, i.e., Being and Attributes because 'Ism' (Name), is nothing but the
description of the object by virtue of an attribute of the Being. 22

The Reality which is ultimately one, and indivisible, may
be regarded from three different points of view, in relation
to our knowledge. Firstly, Reality as we know it, that is, Reality
as manifested in the external world. In this sense, it is
subject to the limitations of our senses and intellect. We know
it as multiplicity of existence, asserting for it relations of
all kinds — casual or otherwise. This Ibnul Arabi calls the
phenomenal world, appearance and not-being. He says that though
an apparent multiplicity, the phenomenal world is an essential
unity, each part of which is the whole, and is capable of
manifesting all the realities of the whole.

Secondly, Reality as such we do not know directly, except
by mystical intuition, but its existence we logically infer
following our reason. Ibnul Arabi says that of this we predicate
attributes characteristic only of a Necessary Being. This he
chooses to call God in the theistic sense, that is, God as
'Created in our belief'. 23 However, this is only a fictitious
and subjective God, and our Conception of Him varies from person
to person or community to community. But Ibnul Arabi is
emphatic and says that any conception, which deprives God of His
Absoluteness and Universality, or renders His Unity in any way
incomplete, either by admitting the reality of any other deity,
or even of the phenomenal world, is polytheistic. 24 A true
conception of God, therefore, is one which comprises the two
aspects, i.e., transcendence and immanence — that God as being both above, and in the universe. This may be called the starting point of Ibnul Arabi's Philosophy of Religion. He says that we are compelled to do this, because the Attributes we predicate of the phenomenal world, demand their logical correlative, such as, contingency demands necessity, relativity demands absoluteness, finitude demands infinity and so on. We must not, therefore, predicate of God such attributes as 'green' or 'circular' or 'hearing' and 'seeing', etc., although His Essence is the essence of all that is green, circular, and all that hears and sees. This is only to mark out the Godhead, from the phenomenal world, as two subjective aspects. When Ibnul Arabi says that 'we ourselves, including the phenomenal world and the attributes, with which we describe God', and, 'there is not a single Name or Attribute, with which He is Characterised, the meaning, or the spirit of which is not found in the phenomenal world', it means, on the one hand, that the phenomenal world possesses unique characteristics which explain God's immanent side, and on the other, that, through these characteristics we are formally led to ascribe to Him (God), attributes which explain His transcendent side. But regarding Reality as the Essence of All, all attributes whatever, transcendent and immanent, may be predicated of it.25

Thirdly, Reality as we do not directly know, or perceive, but which following our reason, we logically infer, as we infer the existence of a substance, when we perceive its accidents. Therefore, Reality, in the opinion of Ibnul Arabi, is the Divine Essence of which we
can predicate nothing except bare existence. It is unknowable and incommunicable when regarded in abstraction. It is ultimately indefinable and like a substance, it can only be described in terms of its 'States' which are the phenomenal world. Its nature admits of no opposition and contradiction or comparison, yet it unites in itself all opposites and similars. It has no qualities or quantities, yet it is the source of all qualities or quantities. It is generally referred to by such vague terms as "Pure Light" or "Pure Good" or the blindness (al'ama). This is the state of Unity (ahadiyyat) which admits of no plurality whatever. This unity is the sumtotal of all Potentialities. As such, it is not the object of worship. The object of worship is the Lord (al-Rabb), not the One (al-Ahad). Ibnul Arabi says that such unity becomes intelligible once we admit the other aspect, that is, multiplicity, because in itself, it transcends all multiplicity so that nothing would remain except the Real. Therefore, in Ibnul Arabi's metaphysical system we find that God as a personality existing apart from, or in any sense other than the universe, yet controlling it and directing its movements, has no place.27 We find then that there is no place for an Ethical God of Islam in the Philosophy of Ibnul Arabi. God as an object of belief, is a mere concept, which we derive from our knowledge of ourselves. The positive Attributes we ascribe to Him are based on our positive attributes, and the negative, on the negative. Ibnul Arabi says that we know God through the knowledge of ourselves, so we create Him; God describes Himself to us by us, and as such, "God is but a mere phrase".28 In this way, in
place of the Ethical God of Islam, we find, in his system, a
God who, while regarded as identical with the Universe, is a
Principle, which controls and animates the Universe. Ibnul
Arabi maintains, that any Attribute we predicate of God, belongs
to Him, only by virtue of His rank as God. God, therefore,
does not actually create, but creation belongs to His rank. In
reality the Creator and the Created are one. The same may be
said of Omnipotence, and the rest of the Attributes, which
express any relation between Him and the Universe. Throughout
his system, Ibnul Arabi preserves the conception of a
pantheistic God, and for this purpose, he adopts the ingenious
manner of explaining away that class of Attributes which form the
conception of the Ethical God of Islam. He employs, in this
connection, two methods. First, he reduces all the Names and
Attributes to a mere subjective relation, and regards them as
logical and psychological, rather than as actual. Secondly,
through a linguistic interpretation of terms, he completely
alters their usual significance. By the first method he
identifies the divine Names with what he calls the Hadarat, that
is, Divine Presence. He uses the term Hadarat in a different
sense from that, in which it is used in connection with the
Five Divine Hadarat, that is, Five Planes of Being. By a Hadra
he means a mystic state in which God presents Himself to the
heart of the gnostic in the form of a Divine Name, revealed in
its Absolute Abstraction. Each Hadra reveals the twofold
implications of a Divine Name. First, its immanent aspect, that
is, its reference to the spatial point of view from which God is regarded. Second, its transcendent aspect, that is, its reference to the Divine Essence. The linguistic method, on the other hand, is simply an attempt to interpret the Names of God themselves. Let us take some examples in this regard.

1. The Divine Name, **al-Amin** (the Giver of Peace):

   This is explained by Ibnul Arabi as coming from 'aman' (peace). *Hadda* of the giver of peace, according to him, means the 'presence of peace', wherein the soul ceases to be troubled by reflective thinking on the nature of God, and becomes identified with the state of mystic intuition.

2. The Name, **al-Jabbar** (the All Compeller):

   Ibnul Arabi interprets it as the one by whom every thing is compelled to proceed. He understands compulsion (jabr) as equivalent to necessity. This compulsion is the underlying principle of all creation. There is even compulsion in choice. Compulsion is not an external force according to him, but it is in the sense that things obey their own inner laws of necessity which are the laws of the One.

3. The Name, **Mutakabbir** (the Proud):

   He interprets it to mean the One who is so great that He transcends all contingent attributes. Proud is, in his view equivalent to Transcendent.

4. The Name, **al-Ghafrar** (the Pardoner):

   Ibnul Arabi takes it as a derivation from 'ghafara' meaning
a cover or veil. *Al Ghaffar*, therefore, means the One, who veils Himself, in forms, or Names.

5. The Name, *al'Adl* (the Just One):

He derives it from *'adala* which means inclination towards one thing rather than another. God is *al Adl*, because He has 'inclined' from the state of essential necessity to that of phenomenal necessity, that is, God has inclined to be manifested in the external world.

6. The Name, *al Hafiz* (the All-Preserving One):

Ibnul Ai'abl interprets it as the maintainer of all existence, in the sense of being one, who subsists in all and preserves all as their essences.

7. The Name, *al Raqib* (the Watchful):

He interprets it as the One, who watches every thing, because He is the Essence of everything. In this way we find him taking all the Qumranic passages and Prophetic Traditions, making Pantheistic interpretations, to support his view of the immanence of the Divine Essence in all beings.31

This way of interpretation of the Divine Names and Attributes by Ibnul Arabi goes to prove the Conversion of Islamic principles and ideas into unflinching pantheism. The creative God of Islam no longer means the Creator, but the One who reveals Himself in the infinite forms of the universe. It is obvious, then, that Ethical and Personal Attributes have significance only where there is a real duality of God and the Man, or, where there is,
something other than God. But Ibnul Arabi's system allows no 'other'. When he is moved by a religious feeling, the Orthodox God of religion stands firm and clear before his mind, but this is his feeling, not his philosophy. Often this Orthodox God is a mere shadow and a dream.32

Thus, the theory of Reality, as held by Ibnul Arabi, is a pantheistic one. It may be summed up in his own few words, "Glory be to God who created things, being Himself their essences (a'yanuha)."33 His pantheism is of the type which, starting from the assumption that God is an absolute, infinite, and eternal being, who is the source and ultimate ground of all that is, was, and will be, gradually assumes a form of acosmism, according to which, the phenomenal world is but a passing shadow of the Reality which lies behind it. Every thing that is finite and temporal, is illusory and unreal. The pantheism of Ibnul Arabi is definitely the outcome of a religious conception of God as the all — embracing and all — eternal Reality, a conception, which usually has its roots in mystical experience. It is not the outcome of any philosophical channel, which assumes that the Real or the Absolute, which is all that is, is ultimately One, Eternal and Infinite; in itself unknowable, and, above all experiences. Yet in Ibnul Arabi's case we find that he is obliged to resort to some philosophical form of dialectic in order to give a logical shape to his doctrine. But this dialectic, in his case, does not endeavour to prove the existence of God, for God is beyond all proofs. God alone is the
proof for His own existence which is manifested in the ayat of contingent beings. God needs no proof for His existence, for He exists everywhere and at all times. Ihnul Arabi takes the help of dialectic only to show the inherent deficiency of the human intellect, and its failure to grasp the essential whole, as a whole, and, at the same time to prove that the so-called multiplicity of the phenomenal objects, have no reality in themselves. In this way we see him passing from the conception of the Islamic God to that of a metaphysical Reality — from the oneness of Islam, that is, from the simple Islamic doctrine of monotheism to the philosophical doctrine of unity of Being (Wahdatul wujud). In other words, from the proposition that "there is only one God who is to be worshipped" to the entirely different proposition that "there is nothing in existence except God". It was his fear of falling into polytheism (shirk) that made him conceive of God not only as the only Deity in existence, but also as the only Reality and the only Being as well.  

Thus, we may conclude that according to Ihnul Arabi, the term 'Union' must be taken in a metaphorical sense. According to him, the so-called 'Union' is but a state of 'waking up' for the particular soul, and the realisation of the already existing union between itself and All-soul, rather than, an amalgamation of two different souls. Ihnul Arabi maintains that the final achievement of the mystic, and the ultimate goal of his endeavours, is not to become one with God, but to realise the meaning of such oneness.
Ibnul Arabi propounded the theory of *Wahdat-ul-Wujud* (Unity of Existence). *Wahdat-ul-Wujud* or Pantheism is the theory which regards all finite things as merely aspects, modifications or parts of one eternal and self-existent Being, and views all material objects, and all particular minds, as necessarily derived from a single infinite substance. This one absolute substance — the one all comprehensive being — it calls God.\(^3^7\)

For the purposes of the doctrine of *Wahdat-ul-Wujud*, monism and determinism must be combined. It is only then that the All of Nature is believed to be coextensive with God — only then the Divine Being is supposed to be fully or exhaustively expressed in the Divine manifestations. Thus, no system, which does not include determination, and exclude freedom, is truly descriptive of the doctrine of *Wahdat-ul-Wujud*.\(^3^8\)

---

* A comparative exposition of Pantheism, Deism and Theism shows that Deism represents God as a personal Being, who exists only above and apart from the world, and the world as a something which, although God's creation is independent of Him. It is capable of sustaining and developing itself and acts without His aid in virtue of its own inherent energies. Deism not only distinguishes God from the world, but separates and excludes Him from it also. Pantheism, on the contrary, denies that God and Nature either do, or, can exist apart. It therefore represents, God and Nature, as eternally and necessarily co-existent, as the indissoluble phases of an absolute unity. Theism takes an intermediate view. It maintains with Deism, that God is a personal Being,
Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaras is in disagreement with Ibnul Arabi's philosophy. Saiyed Gaisudaras holds a monotheistic system of philosophy, and presents a conception of God, which, later on, was termed as Wahdat-us-Shahid by Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi, a great Sufi of the 17th century. Ibnul Arabi holds that Allah is the only existence and everything else is His manifestation. But, according to Saiyed Gaisudaras, Being signifies the real being which is self-existent, and on whom the existence of all other beings depends.

Ibnul Arabi holds that Dhat or Being is identical with Sifat or Attributes, and Sifat express themselves in manifestation (tajalliyat), or modes, which are the world and its objects. Saiyed Gaisudaras vehemently opposes this view of Ibnul Arabi, and says, in plain language, that the Sifat or the nature of the Attributes is not the Dhat or Being. They are not essentially identical. The Attributes of Dhat are numerous. For example, the Attribute of Jamal (beauty) is quite different from the Attribute of Jalal (majesty). Saiyed Gaisudaras explains these two Attributes by quoting two incidents. In the first, Iblis is who created the world, intelligently and freely, and is above, and independent of it. But, it maintains also with Pantheism, that He is everywhere present and active in the world, "upholding all things by the word of His power" and so inspiring and working in them that "in Him they live, and move, and have their being". Theism contradicts Deism, in so far as that system represents the universe as independent of God, and Pantheism, is so far as it represents God as dependent on the universe. Theism, in this way, excludes what is erroneous and retains what is correct in both Deism and Pantheism.
said to have seen God on a night of the brittling away of stars and God is said to have put His feet on the devil's chest out of which the devil felt warmth. In this incident, the Attribute of Jalal (majesty) is presented in the form of God's curse on the devil. In the second incident, Prophet Muhammad (Peace be on him), the lover of God, speaks of the Jamal and Tajalli of God on the night of Ascension (Mawajid). Here God is said to have put his hand on the Prophet's shoulder, out of which his heart felt the coolness of His fingers. These incidents describe the Jalal and Jamal of God. Saiyed Gaisudaras maintains that the Sifat or Attributes of God are over and above the essence (Dhat) of God. This fact is proved by the genuine Sufi experience and is also in accordance with Revelation wherein the Quran speaks, "... verily God is wholly sufficient unto Himself, He needs none of the world." According to Ikhun Arabi, the world is the actual realisation of God's Sifat or Attributes. But Saiyed Gaisudaras emphasizes that the Attributes by which God creates the world are definitely different from His Dhat. Right reason also demands that the Attributes must be other than His Being. Therefore, the world can never be accepted as the Tajalli (the manifestation) of the Attributes of God. God's Sifat (Attributes) are perfect in themselves, while the world is full of imperfections. Thereafter the question of identification between God and the world does not arise. Human knowledge is different from God's knowledge. So, the one cannot be called the Tajalli or manifestation of the other. Revelation also goes to testify that the
world is not the manifestation of God's Attributes, for the Quran says: "... Thy Lord is holier than the qualities which they ascribe to Him." 42

Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that Attributes of God are of two kinds, viz., Dhati and Faali. 43 Dhati Attributes are those which cannot even be conceived; neither is it possible to think of them as being separate from the Dhat or Essence of God. These are essentially and necessarily with the Dhat; their separation from the Essence is impossible and unimaginable. The Dhati Attributes are such as eternity, life, knowledge and power. If eternity were to end, finitude would be the result; when life ceases, death occurs; where knowledge ends, ignorance follows, and helplessness replaces power. All these Attributes, viz., finitude, death, ignorance, and helplessness, says Saiyed Gaisudaras, are limited whereas God is free of such limitations. On the other hand, Faali Attributes are expressed in otherness. These may be thought of as separate from the Dhat (Essence of God). Examples of Faali Attributes include 'Riza' (providence), 'Takwin' (creation), and 'Mashtirat' (forgiveness). Saiyed Gaisudaras further says that these two Attributes are also known as Haqqi (Real) and Asaafi (Related Attributes). Haqqi Attributes such as life, eternity, existence, etc., are inseparable from God, but an Asaafi Attribute is the relation between two things. For example, Ilm (knowledge) is a relation between Alim (knower) and malum (known). Qudrat (power) is a relation between Qadir (one having power) and maddur (upon whom the power is exerted). Mutakallisum (the dialecticians) hold that knowledge
and power are Hadgi Attributes and count them like power, hearing, will, sight and speech. Saiyed Gaisudaras, upto a great extent, agrees with the view of the dialecticians. \[4^4\] Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that the Attributes of God cannot be said to be accidental or contingent, because a contingent is that which is related with other (ghair), whereas Dhat or Essence is that which is self-existent. Thus, the Attributes of God can never be thought of as contingent, for in that case temporality will follow. The Attributes of God are eternal, and there is no decay in eternity. The Attributes of God cannot be treated as identical with the Essence (Dhat) of God also, as it would imply plurality in the essence of God. Saiyed Gaisudaras here refers to Christianity, according to which, God is the composition of three essences, namely, God, Christ and the holy ghost. This, says Saiyed Gaisudaras, is infidelity (kufr). Thus, it can be concluded that the Attributes of Allah are existent with the Dhat of Allah, and are neither identical with Him, nor other than Him. \[45\]

As to the question whether the Attributes of God are identical with the Dhat of God, or are they other than the Dhat, Saiyed Gaisudaras says the religion of ahlu-sunnat-o-jamayat is that the Attributes are neither identical with the Dhat, nor are they other than the Dhat (Essence). Some say that all the Attributes are ghair (other than the Dhat), and some hint that the Sifat-i-Dhati are identical with the Dhat, and that Sifat-i-Faali are ghair. The Mutazilites deny the Attributes of God as being other than the Dhat of God, and the Karamiah also deny
the eternal Attributes of God. But, according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, this is sheer ignorance. A question may arise here that identity and otherness are contradictory to each other, how can the Attributes be called identical, and other, at the same time. Saiyed Gaisudaraz says that identity and otherness are not contradictory, because identity is that, the meaning of which is to be united and be one with other things, and otherness is that, the meaning of which is not to be united, and be one, with other things, and the presence of one can be thought of in the absence of the other. There is also a third group which holds that the Attributes are neither identical, nor other, like the relation between one, and ten, and the part, and the whole. The number one is not identical with number 10, nor is other than it. The meaning of 10 is not the same meaning as that of one, nor does it mean other than 10, because without 1, 10 can never be 10, and the same relation exists between the part and the whole. As to the question whether the Attributes in themselves are identical or other, Saiyed Gaisudaraz says that Attributes of God are La-Ain Wala-Ghairahu (neither identical nor other than the essence of God).

If Dhat (Essence) and Sifat (Attributes) are identical as Ibnul Arabi holds, then it will be construed that God has manifested His Attributes in the world and thus, the world is identical with God. In this sense, Ibnul Arabi and his followers will say that there is no other Existence (Haajuj) except the existent world, and that God is Completely Nature (Kulli-tabayyae).
Thus, the position of Ibnul Arabi is that as there is no existence other than the existence of God, so the Nature is identical with God. Ibnul Arabi regards the identity between God and the world as literal and real, and otherness as hypothetical and suppositional. Saiyed Gaisudaras attacks this view of Ibnul Arabi and says that this is infidelity in faith, and is the creed of the atheists and the heretics. According to them the relation between God and the world is the same which is found between Zaid and his limbs, or between wax and its different shapes, or, between the sea and its waves. Ibnul Arabi, says Saiyed Gaisudaras, has left the unseen world and concentrates on the existent world. He holds the figures and forms of this world as an end and has no knowledge of the world beyond vara-ul-vara. Saiyed Gaisudaras says that had Ibnul Arabi lived in his times, he would have turned back from the belief that there is nothing except this Alam-i-Shuhud (Existent world) and believed in the Alam-i-Alavi (Higher world). 49

Saiyed Gaisudaras says that Ibnul Arabi holds God as Kulli-tabayee (purely Nature). This is the belief of the philosophers. It has nothing to do with faith. No body has said this in the world of tasawwaf (Sufism), because the sufis call God as eternal — the First and the Last. And the Eternal cannot be equated to the temporal. 'Unity' does not mean that these two, Alam-i-shuhud and God, should become One. Rather, the meaning of 'Unity' is that there is 'other' than Him (God). In the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras it is incorrect to say that
God is absolutely limited or determined, for God is all comprehensive. His grace is absolute. To determine or limit, is the way of philosophers. It has no relation of any kind with sufism. Those who have tasted the visāl (union), they know the secret. Visāl never implies fusion, and there always remains a separation, i.e., the duality between the lover and the beloved persists, because every separation (fīraq) has union (visāl) and every union is followed by separation.\(^{50}\)

Ibnul Arabi holds that God is purely immanent in the universe. Saiyed Gaisudaras differs with Ibnul Arabi and maintains that the world is by the Grace of God and not the manifestation of Attributes, to which Ibnul Arabi gives the name of determinateness. But God and the world cannot by any stretch of imagination be equated with each other.\(^{51}\) Saiyed Gaisudaras says that it is no secret that the Dhat-o-Sifat (Essence and Attributes) and Isma (Names) of God are eternal, and the world has been created by His power, and only because of this, God is called 'Mabda' (the Creator). God is also known by the name of Faivyā. Hence, the created and the Creator are viewed from different angles or meanings. Firstly, one may say that the Sifat is not different from the created (makhluq), and therefore, the status of the created is Sifat-i-dhati and thus, real (haqiqi); it cannot be called Sifat-i-Awafi. This view, very rightly can be attributed to Ibnul Arabi and it has been criticized by Saiyed Gaisudaras. Secondly, the creation may be taken as due to Sifat-i-faali-awafi, and the relation between God and the creation as the
cause and the effect. The third view may be that Creation is
due to the Faiz (Grace) and Qudrat (Power) of God, and these
ibarat (interpretations) are asnaad-i-majazi, since Power and
Faiz are Attributes of God. The Ultimate Cause is the real
Dhat. Saiyed Gaisudaraz adopts the third view point.

The theory of Reality, as held by Ibnul Arabi, is a
Pantheistic one. It is in his own words, "Glory be to God who
created things being Himself their essences (ayanahu)." Ibnul
Arabi assumes that God is an Absolute, Infinite, Eternal Being.
He is the source and ultimate ground of all that is, was, and
will be. In this way, his philosophy becomes a form of acosmism,
according to which, the phenomenal world is but a passing
shadow of the reality which lies behind it. Every thing that is
finite and temporal, is illusory and unreal. Saiyed Gaisudaraz
criticises this view of Ibnul Arabi, and holds that it is wrong
to deny the objective reality and external existence of the
world, and thereby call it unreal and non-existent. Saiyed
Gaisudaraz holds that the relation between the created and the
Creator is one of 'otherness', and, never of identity. A
relation of complete otherness is found between the essence of
God and the essence of things, between the knower and the known.
Tajalli-i-Dhat were things in His Knowledge as existential
potentialities, and came to exist by His Grace or Faiz. This
means that the essences of things are the Ideas of God, subsisting
in His mind as existential potential. These essences of things
(ayan) are the Faiz of God and are graced by Him. Saiyed
Gaisudaras finds support from the Tradition: "God was a hidden treasure. He wanted that He should be known, so He created the Creation". The essences of things before creation subsist in Divine knowledge and so are the objects of God's knowledge, and these alone are the objects of His Command, and have the aptitude for emerging from the inward into the outward. The world may be termed 'contingent', meaning thereby that it depends for its mental, as well as external existence, on something else. The world of things owes its mental existence to God because things are the ideas of the Divine Self, and are existing externally on account of Him for they are gifted with external existence only at the Command of the Almighty alone. For their existence, the things are absolutely dependent on Him. The known is a form possessing limitation or determination, or individualisation, whereas the knower, is free from any limitation or determination. The known subsists in the mind of the knower and does not possess its own independent existence. It is a relative non-existent. The knower, on the other hand, exists in Himself and depends on nothing else but Himself. The known possesses no attributes, viz., life, knowledge, will, etc., though it possesses the capacity of acquiring these attributes. The knower possesses positive attributes, viz., life, knowledge, will, power, hearing, sight and speech. The known is passive. It possesses no activity of its own. The knower, on the other hand, is active. Saiyed Gaisudaras says that these Attributes of God are present in Him from eternity. A change in Sifat-i-Awasi does not compel a change in the Dhat of Allah. Therefore,
there is no possibility of any change in the Dhat of Allah. Thus, the relation between the knower and the known, according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, is not one of identity but is definitely that of 'otherness'. If God not be wholly other than the world, and that world exists, there would be no religious codes (Sharī'at). The observance of commands, and performance of actions in accordance with commands, would become meaningless. For the people of Sharī'at, the world is real and it is that which is other than God.55 Only because the world exists, do the imperatives and the actions obtain meaning. If that is not the case, the conception of reward and punishment cannot rightly follow.56 Thus, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, the position of Ibnul Arabi is not in keeping with Nabi (revelation).57

Saiyed Gaisudaraz attacks Ibnul Arabi when the latter says that the Dhat-o-Sifat (Being and Attributes) are identical, and that the world is the manifestation of the Attributes of God in toto. Saiyed Gaisudaraz, criticising this view, says that it is the philosophers who take Fals (Grade) as equivalent to transformation of the Attributes as such. But this interpretation is incorrect. When the world has no being by itself, how can it manifest or create itself? It is because of the Fals (Grace) of God, that the manifestation takes place. The world is not the actual manifestation of the essences of things, subsisting in the mind of God, as His ideas or potentialities.58 Therefore, we cannot deny the objective reality as well as external existence of the world, and thereby call it unreal or non-existent. In
fact, it would amount to the denial of God's Attribute of Creation, and also a denial of the fact that God really and actually created the world. Therefore, whatever name, which is besides the name of God, is the other (ghair). Although ghair (the other) is because of God, yet it is not God. 

Ho-um-Zahir is the shah of God. As regards existence, God is the creator of everything, and at the same time, as regards His essence, the created things (khalaq) are other than His essence. God is the only Being (wujud). He is that which exists, and nothing exists save Him. This is the Kalama-i-tariqat. All things are devoid of being or existence. Fais (Grace) of God has made the world holy, and has bestowed existence or being to possibilities or potentialities. God is living and eternal. He is the bestower of life and existence to everything. The seen objects or forms, which are composed of matter and attached with the body, are material and perishable, but God is immune from all signs of defects and perishability. The forms of the objects of the world, and these qualities of the objects of the world, cannot be related to the Dhat (essence) of God. The Attributes of God are Dhati; they can never be separated from the Essence. 

Saiyed Gasudaras says that an Ashique (lover of God) is one who does not concern himself with the forms of the world, but in reality, he hankers for the underlying reality beneath all these, which is 'Formless'.

The world at first was non-existent. The bestowing of existence is the work of God. The forms of the world are not the form of Haqq, but are the workmanship of God. As compared to His Dhat,
the world is the 'other' of the Dhat of God. The Creator of forms is God, and thus the vision of God through these forms is possible.\textsuperscript{62}

Saiyed Gaisudaras says that the manifestation of God is proved only by way of a possibility, and there are two elements involved in it. They are: (1) God Himself manifested in the form of possibility and knowledge, and (2) in this manifestation, all the signs and commands, i.e., all the latent possibilities with their aptitudes that were in the knowledge of God, find their expression or manifestation.

Saiyed Gaisudaras rejects the first possibility. He says that all the luxuries of life (jayamat), are not God, Who is Pure Being, the inconceivable and incomparable. God manifesting Himself in various forms, would simply mean the manifestation of possibilities, and a manifestation of the forms, which were present as such in His knowledge.\textsuperscript{63} Saiyed Gaisudaras elaborates this point with an example. He says that we usually eat apples, mangoes, etc., but we do not pay any attention to the seeds inside, in which all the colours, sweetness and tastes are inherently present. From these seeds grow the trees, branches, flowers, and fruits. We remain eating cheese for the whole of our lives, yet milk remain veiled from our vision. Likewise, says Saiyed Gaisudaras, we see the forms each time, and think them as only forms, but that which is behind these forms, we do not know. However, the seekers of truth always remain in love with the 'formless', i.e., God.\textsuperscript{64} The men of vision (sahib-i-shahud)
observed only God in each manifestation, and never diffuse the
difference between the manifested and the manifestor. They are
called men of divine insight (mulmurain), because although they
observe the manifested, yet they keep their eyes on the manifestor.
But then those who only keep their eyes on the manifested, and
do not keep their eyes on the manifestor are called men of
Intelect (muqiiq). Therefore, to those whose eyes are fixed on
the state of things which are the signs of the world, Reality of
Haqq is hidden, and they become veiled (mahiub) who perceive only
the creation of God, but fail to perceive the reality behind this
creation. It is because the creation is manifest, so they see
it first, but Reality which is subtle is not accessible to their
eyes and becomes known to them, only after strenuous effort and
mortification. 65

Saiyed Gaisudaraz says that the travellers on the path of
Tarifat (Salik), know better that separation between Dhat (Essence)
and Sifat (Attributes) is impossible. However, there can be two
kinds of separation:

1. External or Formal separation (Infakak-surii)
2. Internal separation (Infakak- manslaughter)

Infakak-surii is the separation in a spatio-temporal order.
For example, Zaid is different from Omar, and so is the separation
between God and the world which is in space and time. Land and
skies, kings and subjects, and Laila and Majnu, are the example
of external separation which can be observed every day. But
besides this separation, the 'being togetherness (maiyyat) is
present everywhere which is not observed, and that being
togetherness becomes observable only through *kashf*, or direct
intuition.

*Infakak-waayyi* is known through the Attributes of *Haqq* and
*khalq*. This separation is above time and space. The essence of
God is Absolute or Pure Existence, where there is no non-existence
(adam), and thus, there is complete separation between existence
and non-existence. The perfect Attributes of God like life,
knowledge, will, and power, are quite separate from the attributes
of the defects and decay of the created world. In spite of these
external and internal separations, there exists external
togetherness (*maiyat-i-surfi*) between the two (God and the creation).
The Qur'an says:

"... And He is with you wheresoever ye may be..." 66

The men of externality (*ahl-i-shahir*) take God seated on *Arsh*
(Throne) and they cannot rightly cognise the being-together of
God with His creation. Therefore, they are in veil. But, being
aware of this otherness, they turn from finite things to God, and
absorb themselves in the oneness (*Anniyat*) of God. And then
they recite: 67
(I am not, oh my friend, by God I am not. I am the soul and I have no body. The life has come from a handful of dust. But the blinded (people) have no light to see it).

In otherwords, at this stage, a salik observes his own helplessness and nothing sees, but realises the glory and power of God. 67

Ibnul Arabi holds that being-togetherness of God with the world is attributive, because Attributes can never be separated from Dhat. God has manifested His Attributes in the world, and as such the world is identical with God. Saiyed Gaisudaras differs from Ibnul Arabi, saying that attributive-togetherness of God with the world is apparent (aithari) and not real. 68 'Aithar' is a significant well known usage of Sufism. It is often not differentiated from "maddul", although a difference does exist. Shah Waliullah explains 'Aithar' as follows. When a gnostic (arif) hears a verse or tradition recited, and his mind is turned towards the State of Gnosis, and, this turning be not due to the real meaning of the verse or tradition, but a consequence of the meaning or interpretation, he himself gave to the verse or tradition, this would be 'Aithar'. Likewise, when a thought is begotten from another thought, and after that a particular meaning is determined, this too is the meaning of Aithar. But this 'Aithar' can often proceed from the humanself, sometimes also from a satanic feeling and yet again from the intellect. If it proceeds from the intellect, it becomes an intellectual inspiration for the gnostic. This Aithar is attained by a gnostic, according to his state, and position, after hearing the tradition of the Prophet or perceiving
any sign of God. The gnostic identifies himself with his own union and separation, and enjoys an ecstatic state. 'Aither' is never La-Aither. The Prophet, while understanding the Quran, always considered that this 'Aither' could unveil, the secret of Gnosis.69

Ibnul Arabi calls the world 'Mawhum' (imaginary) and on this basis, he tries to explain away the objective reality and external existence of the world. Saiyed Gaisudaras differs with this view of Ibnul Arabi, saying that it deprives God of His Attribute as a Creator. It is but fact that God has created the world, and as such, He is the God of the entire creation.70 Moreover, Saiyed Gaisudaras says that Ibnul Arabi's conception of the world as 'Mawhum', has no positive basis after the correct meaning of Mawhum is made clear. In one sense, Mawhum may mean that this world, consisting of different figures and modes, is simply an invention of our own imagination, and consequently, is nothing save our own ideas. It is, so long as our ideas are; it disappears, the sooner our ideas disappear. This is, therefore, pure scepticism and amounts, at the same time, to the denial of the creative power of God. This is totally untenable. In another sense, Mawhum may mean that the world has no objective existence, and that, any kind of existence of the world, is insignificant, as compared to the existence of God. It will be existence of a mere imaginary thing. If this be the case, says Saiyed Gaisudaras, it would be wrong to hold that the relation of the world and God is one of identity, because the world is
contingent, whereas God is necessary; the world is temporal, while God is eternal; the world is subject to how and why, whereas God is above all these. Therefore, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, both from rational and religious points of view, it is erroneous to maintain that the world does not exist, or, that the world is identical with God.  

Again, Ibnul Arabi holds that Mansur Hallaj had the **tajalli-i-Dhat** or vision of God. Saiyed Gaisudaras vehemently attacks this view of Ibnul Arabi and says that if Mansur Hallaj had had the vision of God, he could not have uttered *Anal Haqq* (I am the Truth), and would not have sung the *murtah-i-Subahani*. Saiyed Gaisudaras maintains that in **tajalli-i-Dhat**, annihilation in the Dhat of Allah is necessary and when intoxication or concentration is achieved to the maximum, then, there remains no possibility of any consciousness to utter *Anal Haqq* (I am the Truth), for, there is no scope for any speech in **tajalli-i-Dhat**. Thus, according to Saiyed Gaisudaras, it is not correct to say *Anal Haqq*. To speak it is only permissible in **tajalli-i-Sifat**, as speech is justified at this stage.

Further, Ibnul Arabi starts with God as the only Reality. He holds that 'there is nothing in existence except God'. Saiyed Gaisudaras points out that Ibnul Arabi is speaking of the stage of **tajalli-i-Dhat** (vision of God). This is the stage at which the mystic feels that he is directly apprehending the being of God. But according to Saiyed Gaisudaras, the mystic discovers his error when he surpasses that stage. Only then does he realise
that God is wholly other, and beyond the world; he cannot approach Him, and the identity of the world with God is a mere fabrication of his own mind. Ibnul Arabi took the world to be identical with God, for he could not pass beyond this stage. Had he advanced further, he would have realised that God is beyond all Kashf-o-Shuhud (Gnosis and inspiration). If it be a fact that Ibnul Arabi had realised tajalli-i-Dhat, then, according to Saiyed Gaisudaras, he should have spoken of God only, and not, in any case, about the world and its identification with God, because there is no possibility of speech in tajalli-i-Dhat. Saiyed Gaisudaras says that Ibnul Arabi seems to be in the state of Sukr (intoxication), and as such he cannot explain the Oneness of Dhat, because he is far too intoxicated. Saiyed Gaisudaras maintains that one who has the kashf of tajalli-i-Dhat becomes dumb, for, there is no scope of speech at this stage, as the Prophet has said that 'one who cognises his God, becomes dumb'. It is only in tajalli-i-sifat that speech is possible, as has been said by the Prophet that one who cognises himself, finds a tongue long enough for speech, i.e., he comes to a position where he expresses himself. In the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras a man is absorbed in the thought of the Noor of Dhat, when he attains the glory of God. Saiyed Gaisudaras criticises Ibnul Arabi for remaining in tajalli-i-Dhat. He favours a turning towards tajalli-i-sifat as this stage is higher than the first one. At this stage of tajalli-i-sifat, Ibnul Arabi would see one of the Attributes of God, in the form of Jamal (beauty), and
at this place, the distinction between 'Dhat Jalsul Mujud' and 'Sifat Jalibul Mujud' becomes clear. He says that had Ikhul Arabi been alive, he would have been told and shown that tajalli-i-Dhat is the stage of individuality (farde-i-yat). One having this stage, loses his self-consciousness and attains union. But this is an unparalleled, and a unique stage, which could be achieved only by the Prophet. At this stage, there is a close nearness and intoxication. It is in this sense that the heart of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be on him) was the Noor as has been spoken of in the Quran: "There hath come to you from God a (new) light and a perspicuous Book..." Therefore, Saiyed Gaisudaras says that there is no benefit or gain in remaining at the stage of tajalli-i-Dhat. He is of the opinion that a Surveyeh having enjoyed tajalli-i-Dhat, should turn towards tajalli-i-sifat. He says that Ikhul Arabi was content with the tajalli-i-Dhat and considered that the Dhat determines Himself by transforming into forms and shapes. Thus, the position of Ikhul Arabi, according to Saiyed Gaisudaras, is wholly untenable. Saiyed Gaisudaras says that 'ashique', a lover (of God) is one who always longs for fitraq (separation), but there is no fitraq in tajalli-i-Dhat. All apostles of God keep an eye on tajalli-i-sifat than on tajalli-i-Dhat. God Himself says that 'He has comprehended or surrounded them from all sides'. Saiyed Gaisudaras further holds that tajalli-i-Dhat with instances, and forms is not possible for a lover. Therefore, one should believe in divinity (alhuliyat), and servitude (ahadiyat). God is always divine and man is nothing but the slave of God and this is the right faith.
Ibnul Arabi categorically holds that when one absorbs himself in *tajalli-i-Dhat*, he never comes to sobriety (*gahu*) from intoxication (*aukr*). But according to Saiyed Gaisudaras, this stand of Ibnul Arabi is not right, because then, in that case, nothing can be pronounced of God. At this stage, the tongue becomes tied. It would have been better, says Saiyed Gaisudaras, had Ibnul Arabi turned himself to *tajalli-i-Sifat*, so that he could see God beyond, and there would then have been the possibility of expressing himself. Saiyed Gaisudaras maintains that at the stage of *tajalli-i-Dhat*, whatever and however much description of God is given, God is not described at all, like the fish which swims in the river but does not know how much length and breadth the river has. Saiyed Gaisudaras explains that when the *Salik*, the traveller on the path, attains *tajalli-i-Dhat*, he annihilates his attribute of action, and sees the *Dhat* as one devoid of Names and Attributes. At this stage, the *Salik* speaks "I am pure", "What a great shan have I?", "I speak", "I hear", "Nothing is like me in both the worlds". At this stage, the position of the *Salik* becomes like the tree of *kalem* (one who speaks) through which it was expressed — 'of course, I am God and there is nothing to be worshipped except Me'. In the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, this stage, in the usage of Sufi, is called *sukr* (intoxication), and it is real infidelity in faith (*kufr*), because at this stage there is a negation of every thing except God. Saiyed Gaisudaras favours that a *salik* should return from *sukr* (intoxication), to *gahu* (sobriety).
Ibnul Arabi shapes his doctrine of Mahdat-ul-Majud on the identity of Asl and Zill, and to explain the relation between one and many, he takes the help of the metaphor of the mirror and images. The many, the phenomenal world is the mirror-image, the shadow of the real object beyond. The whole world is like a shadow play. To rule out any implication of duality, he (Ibnul Arabi) states that the source of the shadow and the shadow itself are one. Ibnul Arabi holds that God is the 'Real' (Asl) and the world is His adumbration (zill). The adumbration is the appearance of the 'Real' (Asl) and it is the 'Real' (Asl) appearing or manifesting itself. Saiyed Gaisudaraz challenges this view of Ibnul Arabi, and says that the zill or adumbration of a thing, can never be identical with the Asl (Dhat), because the zill can only be thought of as a copy of likeness of the Asl. As contrasted to God, the zill is contingent, whereas the Asl is necessary; the essence of the contingent is non-being and that of the Asl, being. Saiyed Gaisudaraz says that though the world acts as a mirror, yet it does not reflect God as He is. The duality between the lover and the beloved is always present, for fiqiq (separation) is after wilayl, and wilayl follows fiqiq. Saiyed Gaisudaraz explains this fact with an example. Suppose, two thin pieces of paper are put one on top of the other and a seal is affixed. In that case, the seal and its impression would appear like one, yet the seals on both the papers can never be said to be identical. Saiyed Gaisudaraz says that the world is the reflection of the power of God. The existence of the world is
because of God's Grace. There is nothing in wiljul except God. According to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, the world is the shadow of God, means that God has manifested His power in the world, with so many forms. If God is supposed to be a person, the world is the shadow of that person. God is apparent (gahir) because of the world and the world is existent because of Him. But the world and God can never be thought to be identical. Saiyed Gaisudaraz further tries to explain the relation between the world and God by an example of the relation between ink and the letters. It is true that the ink is in the letters and some one may say that the letters are identical with the ink. But according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, it is erroneous to say so, for the letters, as such, can never be said to be identical with the ink. Therefore, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, Ibnul Arabi is not justified in holding asl and jil to be identical.

Ibnul Arabi, in order to prove the identity between man and God, takes the help of the following verse and the Traditions:

1. "... We are nearer to him than (his) jugular vein". 86
2. "God created man after His own image". 87
3. "One who comes to cognise his self, comes to cognise God."

But, Saiyed Gaisudaraz does not agree with this interpretation of Ibnul Arabi.

Ibnul Arabi interpretes the verse, "We are nearer to him than (his) jugular vein" in the sense that the world is the sajall of the Attributes of God, and because of the fact that
the Attributes are inseparable from the Dhat, the world is the manifestation of God Himself, i.e., God has manifested Himself, in every thing of the world. Therefore, man and God are identical.

But Saiyed Gaisudaraz differs from Ikhul Arabi in his interpretation of the verse. He says that there is no room for doubt that God is nearer to us than our jugular vein, but this nearness is the nearness through God’s knowledge and power. It is not a nearness in the sense of a companionship in space and time. The nearness of God refers to the immanent aspect of God. God has manifested His power in the world, but not exhausted Himself in it, as there is no possibility of any separation between Dhat (essence), and Sifat (attributes). Saiyed Gaisudaraz holds that as the Attributes can never be separated from the Dhat, so this world cannot be said to be the actual realisation of the Attributes of God. Saiyed Gaisudaraz maintains that if the view of Ikhul Arabi be accepted as such, then God becomes wholly immanent and as a result, the transcendental aspect of God is ruled out. This is against revelation, because God has been regarded as both transcendent and immanent. Saiyed Gaisudaraz holds that the immanent aspect of God is asserted in the fact that the world is the creation of God, out of His Faiz (Grace). The Divine Light (noor) has been manifested in the world as a mirror which, in turn reflects the Noor of God. Said Gaisudaraz says that God’s tajalli or manifestation is certainly in every atom of the world. God is immanent in the sense of His being in every thing, being nearer to ‘you than the neck of your camel’. But this nearness is in the cognitive sense and not in the sense
of being together in Spatio-Temporal order, for "to God belong
the East and the West: withersoever ye turn, there is the presence
of God. For God is All-Pervading, All-Knowing." According to
Saiyed Gaisudaras, God is in the skies, in the land, by virtue
of His knowledge and power, and not in the sense of being
together. Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that man is as near to God,
as a finger, which when brought closest to the eyes is not
seen. It is in this sense that God is nearer to us than our
jugular vein. The highest stage of nearness or proximity of
man to God was achieved at the Ascension (Muraq) by the Prophet.
God is present everywhere as the essence of all, because He is
unlimited and infinite Noor, and is an ocean of such an un-
phathomable depth, that about it nothing can be said. Hence,
Saiyed Gaisudaras emphatically says that nearness to
God is beyond man's comprehension.

Again, Ibnuul Arabi bases the identification of man with God
on the Hadith "... God created man after His own image". He
thinks that man is the embodiment of all the Attributes of God.
Saiyed Gaisudaras differs from Ibnuul Arabi on the interpretation
of the above tradition. Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that the
tradition does not mean that man is the embodiment of all the
Attributes of God. It simply means that God has not manifested
Himself in any thing, in the way He has manifested Himself in
man. Every thing is the manifestation of the power of God, but
man is His Secret. Man is the mirror of God, and God is the
mirror of man. The secret between man and God is, that the
heart of man is between the two fingers of God, i.e., man is closest to God.\(^95\) Saiyed Galsudaras says, that God's creation of man in His own image, does not mean that the essence of God is the essence of man (created thing), for the essence of God is eternity and infinity, whereas the essence of man is temporality and finitude. The finite can never become the infinite. It simply means that man is created by the Attribute of the Grace of God. God's Grace and Mercy play a dominant role in man's creation.

Man is the creation of God, out of His \textit{Rahman} and \textit{Lutf}, whereas Satan is the creation of God, out of His \textit{qahar} and \textit{ghnasab}.\(^96\) The image which is seen as man in the human body is the best image of God, but the two can never be identified, because body is a solid, while God is subtle. God and human soul resemble in the sense that both of them are non-spatial. In the opinion of Saiyed Galsudaras, God has made man His mirror. The capacity of unfolding the mysteries of God is more in man than in other created being.\(^97\) Man may have acquired as many Attributes of God as possible, still, man is devoid of two Attributes, which make him different from God. These Attributes are the Attribute of providence (\textit{Sifat-i-Rabbaniya}) and the Attribute of God-hood (\textit{Sifat-i-Aluhia}). Saiyed Galsudaras says that there is no room for doubt, that man's existence is because of God, his life is because of God, yet, man can never become God as such. On the other hand, Lord (\textit{Allah}) remains the Lord, and the slave (\textit{bandah}) remains a slave.\(^98\)
Further, Ibnul Arabi takes the help of Tradition, "One who cognises himself, comes to cognise God", to prove the identity of man with God. According to Ibnul Arabi, the meaning of 'he that knows himself, knows his Lord', is that such a man is himself God. The essences of both of them are one; identity is not that of existence; it is one of the essences. Saiyed Gaisudaraz criticises this view of Ibnul Arabi. He says that the cognition of the self, does mean the cognition of God, but, it does not, in any way, refer to the identification of man and God. Saiyed Gaisudaraz holds that man is Aleem-i-Saghir. In the present terminology, it may be said that man is the microcosm of the macrocosm. Thus, man is the mirror of God. Hence, one who knows himself, knows God.99 According to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, this kind of cognition is an uphill task. Sirat-i-Mustaqeem (right path) is the only gnosis (marifat).

In the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, a man has to cognise his self first. He has to see how much his heart mirrors the Attributes of God. He may inculcate in himself as many Attributes of God as he can, but he cannot become identical with God. By acquiring the Attributes of God, the weakness and shortcomings of manhood (uhdidiyat) will go away, and one will attain the vision of God, and will feel also that he is nearer the Truth.100 At this stage, a man is coloured with the colour of God, but he never becomes identical with God.101 Man is the shadow of God. How can the shadow become the real self (God)? That is why, it has been advised to adore in oneself the Attributes of God, but
there is no capacity in the accomplisher to say stop, nor is there any limit of God's virtues (Akhlq-i-Ilahi). Therefore, marifat-i-nafs (gnosis of self) is essential for the marifat-i-sifat (gnosis of Attribute) of God. Saiyed Gaisudaras says that God has his Attributes and unless these Attributes are known, the Dhat cannot be known. Further, that God has His Dhat, and unless that is known, the Attributes cannot be known. But the Dhat of God Who is Beyond, and Beyond the Beyond, cannot be expressed in language, because in that case, God will become a determined entity. Saiyed Gaisudaras maintains that a man may cognise his self as much as he can, adore in himself the Attributes of God as many as he can, may reach a stage where his self is annihilated, and at that stage God's Command becomes his command, yet he cannot become God as such, for the part can never become the whole. Because, it has been said that 'God knows all that is in you, but you cannot know all that is in God.'

Ibnul Arabi, with the help of the above verse, and Traditions, holds the identity between man and God as literal and real, and otherness as hypothetical and suppositional. Saiyed Gaisudaras emphatically says, that this is the creed of the philosophers, and the heretics.

External quiddities (Ayan-i-kharjii), so holds Ibnul Arabi, have not had the slightest touch of existence. In this connection Saiyed Gaisudaras says, that if this be the case, as held by Ibnul Arabi, the question then naturally arises, how God who is a transcendent Being can change His infinitude into finitude? Further, Ibnul Arabi holds God as existent, and the world, as non-existent
and imaginary. Then, the question again arises, as to how an imaginary being (the world) can set limit to that which is existentially real. Of course, it would amount to saying that the "mere idea of God's equal" shall destroy the quality of "God's uniqueness". Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that the world also exists, but its existence is contingent, and the world is the creation of God, out of His Power and Grace.

Ibnul Arabi says that immanence (تَشْبِیح) must be taken together with transcendence (تَانْسِب). God must not be viewed as transcendent alone, or immanent alone. If the position of Ibnul Arabi is taken as true, then things other than God (مَا-سِیْبَا-آللَّه) cease to be. With this fear in mind, Ibnul Arabi maintained that worship of any other object whatsoever is the worship of Allah. Saiyed Gaisudaras says that this view of Ibnul Arabi is totally against and opposed to revelation. He maintains that we never worship any other thing except Allah. The Quran declares "... Is it some one other than God that ye order me to worship, 0! ye ignorant ones"? Saiyed Gaisudaras says that when Ibnul Arabi combines immanence with transcendence, he fails to realise that God is beyond our reason and comprehension. At the same time Ibnul Arabi is ignorant of the fact that what he regards as immanence is only a fabrication of his own mind, otherwise God is beyond our intuition and experience.

Further, Ibnul Arabi tries to shape his doctrine of Wahdat-ul-wujud on the conception of difference after identity (فَرْقُ-هد-ال-یم). Saiyed Gaisudaras criticises Ibnul Arabi, and says,
that what Ibnul Arabi thinks the stage of 'difference after
identity' is not actually difference after identity, because
this stage is only possible, when the world and God have been
realised as different from one another. But, in the opinion of
Saiyed Gaisudaras, Ibnul Arabi has not attained that type of
realisation. It is a higher stage than that reached by Ibnul
Arabi. Ibnul Arabi could not go beyond that stage, and that is
why he formulates that one may call the real as God, or he may
call it the world, or he may express his perplexity on account
of their indistinguishability. Saiyed Gaisudaras points out that
Ibnul Arabi has taken 'Marifat' as the cognition of Dhat, and
has, thus, limited or determined Allah. Ibnul Arabi had not turned
to the tajalli-i-sifat which he ought to have done. There is no
gain remaining at the stage of tajalli-i-Dhat because nothing
can be spoken of at that stage. Therefore, it is better to turn
to tajalli-i-sifat so that attempts for the cognition of God
be made, and the principles of Shariat be observed and fulfilled.108

The identity of the divine Names with God's Attributes, and
of Attributes with Dhat, are brought out in another way by Ibnul
Arabi. He (Ibnul Arabi) maintains that Divine Names are
identical with the Named (Muzamma), and the Named is the very
being of Allah. Therefore, Ibnul Arabi presents the concepts of
a pantheistic God in the whole of his system, and for this
purpose, he explains away those Attributes which form the conception
of the Ethical God of Islam. Ibnul Arabi either identifies the
Divine Names with Hadrat, i.e., Divine Presence, or completely
alters their usual significance. Saiyed Gaisudaras, in this connection, says that Name is identical with **Musaema**, the Named, if it is taken in the sense in which it is applicable, i.e., the Named. But if Name is taken in the sense that this is **Dhat Musama**, and that is the word or letter, then it is **qhair Musama**. Saiyed Gaisudaras further holds that Ibnul Arabi failed to ascertain the meaning of **Itlaq** and **Taqyid** (Absoluteness and Limitedness). Ibnul Arabi, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, either viewed God from the transcendent aspect and conceived Him as the Absolute Reality, the only Being, or, he viewed God, from the immanent aspect, and thought that the world is the actual manifestation of the Attributes of God, and thus, the world is God Himself. Therefore, there is only one **wjud** (existence), and the world is identical with God. Saiyed Gaisudaras differs from Ibnul Arabi, and says that the nature of Attributes is not like the **Dhat**. The Attributes are numerous. Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that there is no doubt that there is only one **wjud**, i.e., God alone exists. But when Ibnul Arabi says that the world is the total manifestation of the Attributes of God, and therefore, both the world and God are identical, then he goes against faith. God has numerous Attributes, and there is no possibility of any change in them. Therefore, the world can never be said to be the actual realization of the Attributes of God, because the world is changing, the world is the creation of God out of His Power and Grace.

Ibnul Arabi defines **Hadra** with an unusual meaning, and thus
takes away the ethical conception of God. Saiyed Gaisudaras criticises this stand of Ibnul Arabi, as it is against the Quran, and the Tradition. The ethical conception of God has been very much maintained in Islam.

Saiyed Gaisudaras differs from Ibnul Arabi in his interpretation of the Attributes of God. Among the various interpretations, two of them are being discussed here, viz., Mutakabbir (the Proud) and Jabbar (All Compellor).

Ibnul Arabi interprets Mutakabbir to mean that God is so great that He transcends all contingent Attributes. Proud, for Ibnul Arabi, is equivalent to transcendence. But in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, Kibyr is the Attribute of Kibriya, meaning Asmat and Jalalat, as has been said by Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him), that Kibriya is the chadar and Asmat is the tahbund of God. They are necessary, and can never be separated from God, in the way as chadar and tahbund are necessary for men.

Ibnul Arabi interprets Jabbar (All Compellor), one by whom everything is compelled to proceed. He understands compulsion (jabr), as equivalent to necessity. This compulsion is the underlyling principle in all creation. There is even compulsion in choice. Compulsion is not an external force according to him. It is in this sense that things obey their own inner laws of necessity, which are the laws of the One. But Saiyed Gaisudaras differs from Ibnul Arabi, and says that Jabbar is an Attribute of God with the meaning of Jabirah, i.e., the dresser of the broken hearts of man.
According to Saiyed Gaisudaras, if there appears any defect in man, God removes the defect by providing the thing according to his (man's) nature. In this way, Saiyed Gaisudaras upholds the conception of Ethical God of Islam, which is very much in keeping with the Quran and the Tradition.¹¹³

As to the purpose of creation, the position of Ibnul Arabi is that God was not perfect in Himself, and that for His self perfection, He depends on world, and that is why He created the world, thereby actualising all the potentialities that were in Him. Saiyed Gaisudaras criticises this stand of Ibnul Arabi, saying that what he propounds is against Islam and revelation. Saiyed Gaisudaras says that according to revelation, God is absolutely independent of the world. "There is nothing whatever like unto Him" is its proof.¹¹⁴ According to Saiyed Gaisudaras, God is Self-Caused, and does not depend on any other thing, for His existence, or perfection.¹¹⁵ God is eternal. He is the First and the Last. Nothing went before Him, and nothing shall come after Him. The Quran speaks, "Verily Allah is Sufficient unto Himself and needs no worlds".¹¹⁶ Explaining the purpose of creation, Saiyed Gaisudaras says that when God was a hidden treasure, a love developed in Him, that although He is the knower (aleem), He should become the known (khabeer). With this end in view, God brought things into existence, and became the known also.¹¹⁷ This implies, and very rightly, that the purpose of creation is Ibadat, and certainly not knowledge, as is evident from the Quran, "... I have not created man and jinn but exclusively for Ibadat".¹¹⁸
Ibnul Arabi shapes his doctrine of unity of Existence on the interpretation of the verse:

"... Of Him seeks (its need) every creature in the heavens and on earth; Every day in (new) Splendour doth He (shine)."

Ibnul Arabi seems to understand by this Sifat (Attribute) at a phase of theirs, at a transverse section of the world-process, the universe of God at a certain point of time. But Saiyed Gaisudaras disagrees with this interpretation of the verse by Ibnul Arabi, and goes on to say that 'Shan' is one of the Commands of God. It relates to the manifestation of God's Power, and is not God Himself at a certain point of time. It is the Shan of God that bestows prestige on man, and lowers it too; makes a diseased man healthy and a healthy man diseased; turns a pauper rich, and reduces a rich man to poverty.

SECTION C

Saiyed Gaisudaras's Own Position

To understand Saiyed Gaisudaras's position regarding Tauhid, let us start from the stage of Haqiqat which is explained by him as follows:

Discussing the reality of Tauhid (Unity of God), Saiyed Gaisudaras says that the mystery of God, i.e., Haqiqat, is not in
one state, and, at every moment, from the unseen world, a
different state of tajalli is brought forth. At this stage, an
Arif, speaks the words of Haqiqat, and reveals the mystery of
Mahdaniyat (Unity). This is a state of ecstasy. At this
stage, an Arif absorbs himself in the tajalli, his sense perception
is suspended, and he gets a vision of Tauhid (Unity). At this
stage of unity, there is no Name, no Attribute, no sky and no
earth. The Absolute is One. Duality there has no meaning. Tauhid,
at this stage, is of pure Ehut (Essence). And so, 'Existence'
belongs only to Allah. God is pure Being — the inconceivable
and incomparable. Non-being (adam) has no access there.
A man who keeps an eye only on himself, finds the One to be more
in number, but when he is annihilated, finds all to be One.
The stage of Tauhid (Unity), according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, is
not a stage of pure identity. He (Saiyed Gaisudaraz) explains
this with the help of an example. He says that 'colour of the
water and colour of the pot look alike. Some one after seeing
the water in the pot, thinks that the water is in the colour of
the pot. When this thought assumes the shape of a firm belief, the
man begins to say: Pot is water and water is pot, and therefore,
both of them are identical. Then one feels convinced that
there is water, but not the pot, or, there is pot, but not the
water. But to say that water is pot, and then, water is like the
pot, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, are two different things.

According to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, Migal never implies fusion,
rather, there always remains separation. The duality between the
lover, and the beloved is an undeniable fact. God's Unity is real, and not numerical. The Essence of God is only known to Him. It is beyond the capacity and power of man to know the Essence of God. Thus, Saiyed Gaisudaras maintains that there is no gain in remaining in taalli-i-Dhat. A Survosh should turn his eyes towards taalli-i-Sifat.

Having discussed the stage of Haqiqat, now we come to the discussion of the grades of faith (Iman). According to Saiyed Gaisudaras, there are five grades of faith (Iman):

1. Ilm-ul Yaqin
2. Ain-ul Yaqin
3. Haqq-ul Yaqin
4. Haqq-ul Haqiqat
5. Haqiqat-ul Haqq

The first grade is Ilm-ul Yaqin. It is acquired through sensory knowledge. This stage is for the masses, who have faith in the unseen God after hearing the learned and going through the Scripture.

The second grade is Ain-ul Yaqin. Faith at this stage is based on argument and discussion. When Faith, in the unseen God is augmented more, the veil is removed. Quoting Hazrat Ali, Saiyed Gaisudaras says, that once the veil between God and the world is removed, the truth of the world is revealed. This is meant for particular people (khas) only.

The third grade is Haqqul Yaqin. At this grade, a gnostic sees the object with his open eyes. He, in other words, tastes it
and adores in himself the Attributes of God.

The fourth grade is Haqqu-I Haqiqat. At this grade, a man, after adorning in himself the Attributes of God, finds himself annihilated (fana), and thereafter similies (hibarat) and metaphor (jatiyarah) lose significance. This grade is realisable by man, and it may be called the grade of a perfect man. And this is the first stage of Union (Misaal).

The fifth grade is Haqiqat-ul-Haqq. A man when annihilated in the Attributes of God, openly speaks that he observes nothing, except God. At this stage, he even fails either to recall or deny even his fana and baqa. Thereafter, for him, every moment is fana (annihilation), and baqa (subsistence). There is no stability at this stage. And this is the second stage of Union. Higher than this grade is the grade of Haqqu-I Haqq, which is beyond the reach of a human being. Even the Prophet and Wali cannot realize this stage.

Saiyed Gaisudaraz explains these different grades through the example of sugarcane. He says that a man hears that sugar is sweet, and has some colour and smell. This is Ilmul Yaqin. Later, when this man argues it as he had heard about it, this would be Ain-ul-Yaqin. And when he actually tastes it, is Haqqu-ul-Yaqin. Again when he finds himself annihilated in the sweetness, this would be Haqqu-ul-Haqiqat. The annihilation of this man in the attribute of sweetness is baqa for him. Finally, when he forgets the sweetness, and even its recollection, this would be the stage of Haqiqat-ul-Haqq. Thus, we see, that at the fifth grade, only
God is perceived. This is called by sufis 'annihilation in One'. At this grade, a truthful (sadiq) does not perceive any thing but God. He even becomes oblivious of the awareness of his own self. When due to deep absorption in the One Reality, he loses consciousness of his self, and becomes annihilated, he attains the stage of visal.136

Saiyed Gaisudaraz holds Marifat (Gnosis) to mean right feeling (hali), and points out that the best and extraordinary aim or end of life is Gnosis of God (Marifat Allah). He (Saiyed Gaisudaraz), further says, that it is general discipline which prepares the heart for the intuitive knowledge of God, and for this end in view, he lays much emphasis on Mujahida (mortification), and Muraqaba (concentrated contemplation). Thus, Marifat (Gnosis) of God is only possible through self-knowledge, and not through intellect. Marifat is not a matter of claim; it entirely depends upon the Grace of God.

Saiyed Gaisudaraz holds an ethical conception of God in his mystical philosophy, and maintains that God responds when His creatures (bandah) implore.

Thus, the core of the discussion of Tauhid, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, is that, even at the highest stage of Tauhid which could be within the reach of a man, there is never identity between man (bandah) and God (Khuda). Rather there always remains a distinction between the two. A man (bandah), due to the vision of the Glory of God becomes oblivious of his own existence, and finds God alone, which by mistake, he (man) considers the stage of identity between him and God.
Chapter XV

THE RELATION BETWEEN MAN AND GOD

Having discussed the comparative positions of both Ibnul Arabi and Saiyed Gaisudaras, regarding Tauhid in the previous Chapter, we now come to Saiyed Gaisudaras's view about the relation between man and God.

In order to explain the relation between man and God, we would like to quote the Tradition which has also been cited by Saiyed Gaisudaras. The Tradition is:

(I was a hidden treasure, I wanted to be known, so I created the creation).

Next, Saiyed Gaisudaras quotes the verse of the Quran:

(We have indeed created man in the best of moulds).

Thus, man is, according to Saiyed Gaisudaras, the prime creation.

What is man? In order to explain the nature and place of man in the scheme of creation, Saiyed Gaisudaras offers an example. There is a seed, out of which grows a big tree which gives shadow. The tree consists of branches, leaves, flowers, and fruit. Here,
in this example, the seed symbolises God, the tree, comprising of branches, leaves and flowers/the world, and the fruit is man. Thus, man becomes the prime creation; he is the fruit which is undoubtedly the best form of creation in comparison to leaves, flowers, and branches. As the seed, says Saiyed Gaisudaras, grows into a plant, and the culmination of a plant are the flowers and the fruit, so, man is the culmination of creation, and the mirror of God as well. Thus, man is one of God's mysteries. And the mystery between man and God is, that the heart of a believer in God (momin) is very close to God, and although God is present everywhere, yet His nearness to man is the closest. The heart of a Momin is like the mirror; it mirrors nothing but God.5

In the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, when God was a hidden treasure and was in Himself, a love developed in Him that although He is the Knower, He should also become the Known. With this end in view, God came from the sphere of power into the field of action, and created the world.6 Saiyed Gaisudaras definitely holds the world as the 'other' (ghair) of God. Although the world is because of God, yet it is not God.7 According to Saiyed Gaisudaras, when God says that He created the world so that He may be known, He created Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him), as His mirror, so as to observe His own Beauty (Jamal) by Himself. Thus, it would be proper to say that God created everything for the Prophet, and created the Prophet for Himself. That is why, God has said that if any body wants to cognise Him (God), he should first cognise the Prophet. The same view is corroborated by the Tradition that
On who cognise me (the Prophet), cognises the Haqq (God). —

Against the theory of Manifestation, Saiyed Gaisudaraz holds the theory of Creation. It would be appropriate here to briefly describe his theory of Creation, so that the position of man may become clear. Saiyed Gaisudaraz says that Allah is the stage of Unity. This stage of Unity (Ahdiyat) of God implies the Absolute Dhat of God. The Dhat is not like anything; the Essence of God (Dhat) is spoken of as the Absolute Unknown (ghayab) — the Incomparable and Inexplicable. Four things emanated from the Absolute Unity, viz., Mujud (Existence), IIm (Knowledge), Noor (Light) and Shahud (the existent). In Ilm (Knowledge) are present the essences of things, or latent potentialities. From Ilm proceeds the world, and then man, as prime creation. To make this more clear, it may be said, that Existence belongs only to Allah. Before Creation, the essences of objects are known to God as His ideas, because, "I did indeed create thee before when thou hadst been nothing", is the proof. Because of this, the world has been termed 'contingent'. The world depends for its mental, as well as external existence, on God, because things are the ideas of the Divine Self, and exist externally, because of Him. God knows His own thoughts, being the objects of His Knowledge. Even as ideas, things are not identical with God, because, there exists a difference between the known and the knower; the known possesses limitation, whereas the knower is free from such limitation. The manifestation of the Attributes of God, thus, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, has significance of its own;
and it cannot be called God, but remains only manifestation of the power of God. Thus, God is called Махди (Creator), and Фа́йяма (Gracious). Фа́йяма (Grace), in the usage of Sufis, is called та́йяля (manifestation). Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that the айа́н (the essences of things) which are the Grace of God, are bestowed by God. The Grace of God is the sign of Махди, Махди (Necessary Being), and the things are in His (God's) knowledge as existential potentialities. These айа́н when manifested by the Grace of God, take the form of 'world', as well as the form of man. Фа́йяма is not the transformation of the Attributes of God as such.

Regarding Creation, Saiyed Gaisudaras says that Essence of God (Дат-и-Аллах) is the first ocean. The first ocean makes its та́йяля in the second ocean. The second ocean is Рух-и-Асфар. Рух-и-Асфар is known by various terms, such as First Intellect, Supreme Spirit, Рух-и-Мухаммад. From Рух-и-Асфар, the creation of sky, moon, stars, etc., took place, and man was the last of Creation. By adoring the name Allah, He (Дат) came from Lahut to the field of power, and became Илля (to be worshipped). He (God), then manifested the Attributes of Godhood, and created mankind. God was One (Ахад) in Ибараут and manifested oneness (Аддиа). Again, in Накут, He expressed Himself in Ахад. In Насут (the phenomenal world), He (God) manifested His Нур (light) in the form of Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him). The relation that exists between soul and body, the same relation exists between God and the Prophet. Ахад is the figure of Ахад, and it points to the fact that 'one who obeys the Prophet, obeys
That is why, it has been said that the Prophet is from the ‘Noor’ of God, and the world is from the Noor of the Prophet. So in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, when a gnostic comes to know what happens after death, he does not long for life in this world, but each time would desire death, for death is a bridge which takes man after fana (annihilation) to the stage of baqa (subsistence in God).

We now come to the discussion about man. What is the nature of man? In this regard, Saiyed Gaisudaras refers to three opinions. The first of these holds that man is nothing other than the body. The second believes that man is both body and soul. The third maintains that man is only the soul. But in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras the essential nature of man is both ruh (soul), and nafs (a lower self). The soul is the rider, whereas body is the vehicle. A man sitting on a horse is certainly different from the horse. The materialists say that man is only the body and shall perish after death. They also believe that soul (jan) is the byproduct of the body. This view, according to Saiyed Gaisudaras is not correct. He finds support in the tradition of the Prophet. The Prophet says that he will meet his beloved (God) after death. Again, once the Prophet told his daughter, Bibi Fatima, that she will soon meet him (the Prophet). Hazrat Bilal, at the time of death, said that on the day following, he will meet his friend, the Prophet and his companions. The result of this, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, is that ruh (soul) never perishes, and those who die in the way of God are not dead; rather, they remain
alive in this world, and in the world hereafter as well. Auliya\textsuperscript{e} of God never die; they are simply transferred from one house to another. Thus, Saiyed Gaisudaras holds, that although the body perishes, the soul remains alive, and, when the body is taken to the grave, the soul goes to the place of truth. The soul commands the body. Whatever attributes are in man, all relate to the soul, and not to the body. At the time of death, if the body has also become dear to God, it does not perish completely.\textsuperscript{18} Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that soul has been created, from the noor (light) of issat (God), and jinns have been created, from the nar (fire) of issat.\textsuperscript{19} He also maintains that the soul has the power to feel fragrance. The flowers and incense that are offered at a tomb, the soul inhales.\textsuperscript{20} But the question here arises, what is soul? Gazi Ainul Gazzat Hamadani, in his book 'Zahdatul Qgsaq', commonly known as 'Tahhidat', says that when people of the Book (shi\textsubscript{i}-kitab) asked the Prophet about the soul, God said, "People ask thee (Prophet Muhammad) about the existence of soul". Say, "Soul is the command of God", and it is known to God alone.\textsuperscript{21} Gazi Hamadani further says that qalb (heart) is latif (subtle), and belongs to Alam-i-Alwi, and qalib (body) is kaseef (material) and belongs to Alam-i-Sifli. And there is neither any relation between soul and body nor there can be any.\textsuperscript{22}

Saiyed Gaisudaras, interpreting the above views of Gazi Hamadani in Sharah Tahhidat, holds that 'Ruh' is the Shan (Grandeur) of God. When God asked Prophet Muhammad (peace be on him) to say that Ruh (soul) is the command of God, this, according to
Saiyed Gaisudaras does not mean that the Prophet was not aware of the secret of the soul, and at the same time, it will not be correct to hold that soul is beyond the sphere of understanding. Saiyed Gaisudaras maintains that 'Ruh' as being a command means that it is a span of God, like 'kun' (Be). Ruh is that which makes man live. 'Kun' (Be) is the ruh, and whatever is connected with it, finds movement and action. Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that ruh is a name among the Names of God, such as Name-Nature, Ruh-i-Azar, Fais, Jibrail, Ruh-i-Qudsi. Besides, there are animal and vegetative souls too. If qalib (body) adores the attribute of Grace, then Grace is expressed in the form of beautiful things, but if qalib adores the attribute of Qahar, then Qahar functions in the shapes of snakes, and scorpions. Thus, there are many virtuous and vicious attributes in man. Again, Saiyed Gaisudaras holds, that the opinion of Qazi Hamadani, that soul id universal, may be correct in one sense, i.e., all the souls have something common in them, but, to say that the soul has no particular attributes of its own is totally wrong.

Saiyed Gaisudaras again differs, when Qazi Hamadani says, that there is no relation of any kind between qalib and qalib (soul and body), as they belong to different worlds. Saiyed Gaisudaras explains it through an example. He says that a child is born of a mother. The father may be an Arab, and the mother, an Indian. The child would be to some extent like the father, and to some extent, like the mother. There is a dual relation in the production of the child. When Qazi Hamadani says that the child is born from
Alam-i-Alvi, it means that the child has its origin in the ṭuh (soul), and no connection with the mother exists. But Saiyed Gaisudaraz holds that though the child is related to the father, as being his son, yet it is necessary for the child to remain in the womb of the mother and be born of her. Thus, there is a perpetual relation between them. 24

Saiyed Gaisudaraz further says that as there are five external senses in man, so there are five internal senses also. The five external senses are qalīb (pertaining to body), and the five internal senses are vehādi (pertaining to heart). Man, according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, is nothing other than ṭuh (soul) and nafsa (lower self). 25

What is heart? According to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, there is a piece of flesh in the body of man. When it remains uncorrupted, the whole body remains uncorrupt; and when it becomes corrupted, the whole body becomes corrupt. This is heart. Saiyed Gaisudaraz finds support from the Tradition: "Listen! in man there is a lump of flesh, if it is kept wholesome, the whole body remains in a healthy condition and if it is corrupted, the whole body is corrupted, and it is the heart." 26 The qalb (heart) in a physical sense, may be called a small piece of flesh, but it symbolises as the resting place of God in man. According to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, it has a unique position, and a vital significance in the life of man. Qalb, says Saiyed Gaisudaraz, is placed between the two fingers of God. This means that the heart is very close to God and serves as a meeting point with God. If it is pure, the whole
body is pure, but if it becomes corrupt, the whole body becomes polluted, i.e., the heart is the sheet of virtues and vices. The heart is very dear to God. Saiyed Gaisudaras says that God does not look towards the face and outward actions of man; God looks towards the heart of man. The heart is God's centre of vision. When the qalib (body) adores the colour of qalb (heart), it also becomes dear to God. The heart has got an elevated position. The heart of a Momin has been called the Arsh of God, and it keeps the attribute of bakhshiat (servantship). Saiyed Gaisudaras here quotes the Companions, Hazrat Suhail Abdullah and Hazrat Ibn Abbas. Hazrat Suhail Abdullah says that qalb is the Arsh, and Sadar is the Kursi. Hazrat Ibn Abbas says that the Lauh-i-Mahfus (Guarded Tablet) is in the heart of a momin. The trust of God was assumed by the heart of man. The Quran speaks: "Lo! we offered the trust unto the heavens and the earth and the hills, but they shrank from bearing it, and were afraid of it. And man assumed it. Lo! he hath proved a tyrant and a fool." Saiyed Gaisudaras further holds that the Prophet has also advised man to seek God in his heart; and when the heart will be known, the soul itself shall show the beauty. Thus, the soul has been sent by God, into the body of man, and it is the 'kun' (Be) or Shan of God. The soul is the Will and Power of God.

According to Saiyed Gaisudaras, the first soul God created is Ruh-i-Qudsi (Celestial Soul). Besides this, there are two other kind of souls. The first, in the opinion of philosophers, is animal soul, and the second, according to Sufis, is spiritual soul.
The spiritual soul is over and above the body, while the animal soul is not. In the sphere of animal soul, it is believed that the life (jan) of man is his reality, and it has two states. In one state, it controls man and in the other, it does not control him. This has been explained by Saiyed Gaisudaras through an example. He says that if some one wants, he can give movement to the pen, or, if he wants, he can even stop this movement. The control of life in the body is called Hayat, and when the control of life in the body is severed, it is called Mowt (death). Again, the returning of the control of life after separation from the body, is called Ahva. This separation (ingara) may be either partial, or complete. If the separation is partial, it is called Nava (sleep), and if it is complete, it is called mowt (death). In the same manner, the returning of the soul also may be partial or complete. If it is partial, it is called Antabah, and if it is complete, it is called Qaymat. If the period during which the soul is to reside in the body becomes complete, then, the connection of soul to body is severed all of a sudden. Saiyed Gaisudaras after all maintains, that it is an uphill task to know every detail about the soul. Yet, Saiyed Gaisudaras says, that the secret of the soul can be revealed to the heart, only when one becomes the servant, and disciple of the heart. At this stage, one can know as to what is the relation between soul and heart, and again, between world and God. In the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, the soul is both external, and internal to the body; God is also both external and internal to the world.
Again, soul is neither external, nor internal to the body, and God is neither external nor internal to the world. In short, soul is neither muttasil (contiguous) with the body, nor munfassil (non-contiguous) with the body. The same relation too, exists between world and God. 35

What is nafs? Saiyed Gaisudaraz holds that there is something inside man which is called nafs (lower self). 36 The nafs is also called khannas. 37 Nafs is an evil power. 38 It resides near the heart of man, instigates him to commit evil, keeps him away from the right path, and also keeps him away from the remembrance of God. 39 In the beginning, nafs is only of one kind, i.e., nafs ammarah, but, afterwards, due to Hijrah and Rayyat, it becomes Lawwamah and Mutmayyana. Thus, nafs comes to be of three types. 40 According to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, the nafs of a Momin is safe in the world, as God has closed its way to the heart. 41

Now, the question we face pertains to the relation between man and God. Is the relation between man and God one of identity, or man is other than God? Saiyed Gaisudaraz definitely holds the second alternative. He says, that the relation of man with God is never of identity, and so man is other than God. He maintains, that there is a personal relation between man and God. Man is near to God. God’s nearness is very close to man, as is quoted in the Quran: “We are nearer to him than his jugular vein”. 42 But this nearness, according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, is through God’s knowledge and power, it is not a nearness in the sense of a companionship in space and time, or that, of being together in
Saiyed Gaisudaraz holds that man is the mirror of God; God has definitely manifested His power in man. The essence of man is different from the essence of God. The Attributes of God are perfect, absolute, and eternal but man's attributes are imperfect, limited and contingent. Therefore, man is a faqir (helpless). The Quran speaks:

(‘O ye men! it is ye that have need of God, but God is the One Free of all wants, Worthy of all praise).  

Man exists through the existence of God alone, lives through His life alone, and knows through His knowledge alone. Through His Will and Power, he has power and will, hears through His hearing alone, sees through His sight, speaks through His speech. For this, Saiyed Gaisudaraz finds support from the Tradition: "My servant continually seeks to win favour by works of supererogation until I love him; and when I love him, I am to him an ear, and an eye, and a hand. Through me he hears, and through me, he sees, and through me, he talks." Really speaking, God's Grace and Mercy, play a dominant role in the formation of man. That is why, Saiyed Gaisudaraz says, that a man may cognise his self, as much as he can, may adore in himself as many Attributes of God as possible, may reach a stage where his khudi (self) is annihilated and, at that stage, God's Command becomes his command, yet man can never be identical with God.
Saiyed Gaisudaraz holds an Ethical conception of God who responds to the call of His creatures affectionately and with warmth. He also maintains a conception of Personal God, who has Will, Power, Self-consciousness, Justice and Grace, as Attributes. In the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, God has a personal relation with His creatures. God confers on them high rank or position. He provides them with all types of things. He loves them, and rewards them, by granting them His own vision.

On the basis of the above discussion, we may conclude that the relation between man and God stands out to be a personal one, and not one of identity.
Chapter V

CONCLUSION

After due analysis of the mystical philosophy of Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaraz, we come to conclude that Gnosis forms the basic point of his methodology. Saiyed Gaisudaraz, on the basis of his own kashf (inspiration), and marifat (gnosis), presents a Panentheistic system of philosophy. He holds marifat (gnosis) as a sense of right feeling (hali). He is of the firm view that knowledge of God is like a hidden diamond, which is known to God only; it cannot be bought even with treasures. He says that it is not through questions that the secret of Reality is solved; on the way to marifat, there is no place for conjecture. Marifat, according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, can be had only by the Grace of God; it cannot be acquired. Thus, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, it is through Gnosis, that God can be cognised. Gnosis is named as insight, the light of faith, etc. But this Gnosis is not at par with the faculty of reason, which philosophers denominate as logical reason. Saiyed Gaisudaraz gives reason a special sense, meaning, a capacity to know the metaphysical problems like God, soul, etc. It is beyond the reach of external and internal senses.

According to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, Gnosis is a kind of 'Noor' (light) which enables mankind to distinguish virtue from sin, and
truth from falsehood. At the same time, Saiyed Gaisudaraz affirms, that the proof through which God is known is reason, yet, while adopting this proof, and going beyond virtue and truth, man must come to know his limitations, for it is only through the Grace and guidance of God that reason cognises Him. Hence, it is beyond the power of man, to know, or to describe the Essence of God. Saiyed Gaisudaraz is of the firm conviction that logical or theoretical reason, cannot prove or disprove the existence of God. The same position was held by the famous German philosopher, Kant, and in our time, finds support in the stand of the Logical Positivists. Thus, we find Saiyed Gaisudaraz relying mainly on kashf (intuition) which he calls marifat (Gnosis). Marifat (Gnosis), then, is a cognition, gained through intuition and ecstasy. Intuition requires no intermediary. Progress in intuition rests on self-discipline, moral purity and Divine Grace.

We see, then, that according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, God can be cognised only through self-knowledge, and for this, he finds support from the Tradition: 'One who knows his own self, knows God'. He says that in order to arrive at the Gnosis of God, one should make his heart a mirror, and in this mirror, he should cognise the self of the Prophet; and again, he should make the self of the Prophet, the mirror, in which he ought to seek cognition of God. This stage is the highest one. Not everybody can reach it.

In the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, Gnosis of God is of three kinds. First, Gnosis of the Essence of God; second, Gnosis of the
Attributes of God, and third, Gnosis of His Actions and Commands. The Gnosis of the Actions and Commands of God one can attain through the Gnosis of one's own self. This is proved when God says that He had made way for the truthful in their ḥāfa. Thus, perfect Gnosis of one's self, begets perfect Gnosis of the actions of God. The Gnosis of the Attributes of God can be had by attaining the Gnosis of the self of the Prophet. Gnosis of the Essence of God is beyond the power and capacity of man. It is for this reason that God advises mankind to ponder over the bounties He has bestowed on it, and forbids it to make interpretations of the Gnosis of His Essence, as this is a guarded secret.

Saiyed Gaisudaras gives a very significant position to the qaḥiḥ (heart). He says, that the heart is so delicate and holy, that it bears nothing save One. Whatever comes into it, remains there, and there is no possibility of any other. This simply means that one who loves the world cannot love God; the love of the world, and love of God cannot go together. Thus, heart is the proper place of God. If the heart is pure and undefiled, the keeper gets nearness to God.

Saiyed Gaisudaras, on the basis of the experiences gained through ḵaṣṣaf, comes to make a critical evaluation of the thought system of Ibnul Arabi. The theory of Reality, as held by Ibnul Arabi, is the doctrine of Ḥaḥdatul-wujūd (Unity of Existence). We may call it a Pantheistic Theory. It may be summed up in Ibnul Arabi's own words, "Glory be to God who created things, being
Himself their essence (ayamuka). His pantheism starts from the assumption, that God is an absolute, infinite, and eternal being; God is the source and ultimate ground of all that is, was, and will be. But his pantheism gradually assumes a form of acosmism, according to which, the phenomenal world is but a passing shadow of the Reality which lies behind it. In other words, God is Andiyat-i-Maqula, or a conceptual Unity as regards His being, and manifold as regards His existence, because created beings are nothing but He (God) Himself, in self-emmanation. Ibnul Arabi, thus, identifies Dhat and Sifat (Essence and Attributes). The manifestation of God's Attributes in the form of world means the identification of world and God. The pantheism of Ibnul Arabi is definitely the outcome of a conception of God, as the all-embracing and all-eternal Reality — a conception which usually has its root in mystical experience. It is not a result of having adopted a route through philosophy which assumes that the Real or the Absolute, is ultimately one, eternal and infinite; in itself unknowable, and above all experiences. Yet, we find Ibnul Arabi obliged to resort to some philosophical form of dialectic, in order to give his doctrine some logical shape. But this dialectic does not endeavour to prove the existence of God, for God is beyond all proofs. God alone is the proof for His own existence, which is manifested in the 'ayan' of contingent beings. God needs no proof for His existence, for He exists everywhere and at all times. Ibnul Arabi takes help of the dialectic only to show the inherent deficiency of human intellect, and its failure
to grasp the essential whole, as a whole, and at the same time, to prove, that the so-called multiplicity of the phenomenal world has no reality in itself.\textsuperscript{12} As such, we find him (Ibnul Arabi) passing from the conception of the Islamic God, to that of a metaphysical Reality — from the oneness of Islam, i.e., from the simple Islamic doctrine of 'Monotheism' to the philosophical doctrine of \textit{Wahdatul-wujud} (Unity of Existence or Pantheism). In other words, we find him passing from the proposition that "there is nothing to be worshipped except God" (\textit{La Ilaha Illa Allah}), to an entirely different proposition, that "there is nothing in existence except God" (\textit{La 'Amma 'ilah wajab}). Ibnul Arabi understands 'Union' in a metaphorical sense. Union, in his opinion, is not a stage of 'waking up' for the particular soul, and, the realisation of the already existing union, between itself and All-soul, rather than an amalgamation of two different souls.\textsuperscript{13}

Saiyed Gaisudaras criticises the view of Ibnul Arabi. He says that the nature of the Attributes is not like the Essence. They are not identical as Ibnul Arabi holds.\textsuperscript{14} Saiyed Gaisudaras says that Attributes of God are numerous. The Attributes of \textit{Jamal} (Beauty) is quite different from the Attributes of \textit{Jalal} (Majesty). He maintains that Attributes of God are over and above the Essence of God. This is proved by Sufi experience, and is also in accordance with revelation, wherein the Quran speaks: "Verily, God is wholly sufficient unto Himself, He needs none of the world."\textsuperscript{15} Opposing the view of Ibnul Arabi, that the world is the actual realisation of God's Attributes, Saiyed Gaisudaras
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Unity does not mean that these two, alam-i-shuhud and God, become One. But there always remains a distinction. He says that those who have had wisal, know the mystery. Wisal never implies fusion or identity, but there always remains a separation, i.e., the duality between the lover and the beloved (man and God), because every firaq (separation) ends in wisal (Union), and every wisal (union) is followed by firaq (separation). Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that it is no secret that the Essence, Attributes and Names of God, are eternal, and the world has been created from His power, and because of this, God is called 'Mabda' (the Creator).

Saiyed Gaisudaras accepts the existence of God, on the one hand, and the existence of creation on the other. He holds that it is scepticism to deny the objective reality, and external existence of the world. A relation of complete otherness exists between the Essence of God and the essence of things, between the Knower and the known. He maintains that the ayaan, the essence of things, are the Faiz (Grace) of God. They have been graced by God with His Faiz, and Faiz of God is the ijabat of Najibul-wujud (Necessary Being). Though the existence of creation, says Saiyed Gaisudaras, is based on the Will and Power of the Creator (God), yet it cannot be declared identical with God. The existence of creation, i.e., soul and the universe is real, and also different from God.

According to Saiyed Gaisudaras, the reflection of takalli-i-ism-i-mujib (Divine Names) means Grace of God that manifests the ayaan externally, whichever of them He (God) wants. He (Saiyed
maintains, that the Attributes by which God turns to the world and creates it, are definitely other than His essence. Right reason also demands that Attributes must be other than His Being. As such, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, the world can never be accepted as the emanation of the Attributes of God, because the Attributes of God are perfect in themselves, while the world is full of imperfections. Revelation goes to testify that the world is not the manifestation of God's Attributes, for the Quran says: "Thy Lord is holier than the qualities which they ascribed to Him."  

According to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, Attributes are of two kinds, namely, *Dhati* and *Faqli*. *Dhati* Attributes cannot even be conceived of being separated from the Essence. The *Dhati* Attributes are said to be Eternity, Life, Knowledge and Power. *Faqli* Attributes are *Rizq* (Providence), *Takvin* (Creation) and *Maphfirat* (Forgiveness) and can be thought of as being separate from the Essence. Thus, according to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, the Attributes of God cannot be treated as identical with the Essence of God, as this would imply plurality in His Essence. Therefore, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, the Attributes of God are existent with the *Dhat*, and are neither identical with Him, nor other than Him.

In the opinion of Ibnul Arabi, there is identity between God and man in the state of Union. Saiyed Gaisudaraz criticises this view of Ibnul Arabi, and says that this is *kufur* (infidelity) in faith. This is the creed of the atheists and heretics. No body has done so in the world of *tasawwuf* (sufism). In his opinion,
Gaisudaras) says that the manifestation of God is proved only by way of possibilities, and two elements are involved in it: (1) God Himself manifested in the form of possibility, and (2) All the latent possibilities with their aptitude found expression or manifestation.

Saiyed Gaisudaras rejects the first possibility and accepts the second. He says that God, manifesting Himself in various forms, simply means the manifestation of possibilities, and the manifestation of God, in the forms which were present, as such, in His knowledge, goes to prove that every thing is from Him (hame-as-oost). According to Saiyed Gaisudaras, the stage of absolute self-annihilation, in which a gnostic does not see anything except the existence of God, is out of love for God. It was at this stage that Mansur Hallaj said: "I am the Truth", and Bayazid of Bistam uttered, "Holy am I, How great is my glory". This stage is the outcome of the ecstatic mood of the gnostic. It does not efface the distinction between the created and the Creator. In reality, the created can never be identical with God. Thus, the core of Tauhid, in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaras, is that even at the highest stage of Unity, there is never an identity between hondah (man) and Khuda (God). A separation between the two is forever present, and a man, due simply to the sight of the glory of God, becomes oblivious of his own existence, and finding God alone, by mistake, considers it the stage of identity between himself and God.

Admitting the separate existence of God and man, the question
that naturally arises is about the type of relation that exists between them. According to Saiyed Gaisudaras, there is a personal relation between bandah (the created) and Khuda (the Creator). The created love God, worship Him, come in contact with Him, implore Him at the time of need and distress, endeavour to attain His nearness, and enjoy His Vision. All these yearnings on the part of the created imply the conception of a personal God.

Saiyed Gaisudaras emphasises the importance of love. He says that love begets Gamels and nearness to God. No stage is higher than the stage of love. At the stage of love, the outer duality of lover and the beloved is but imaginary, and the friendship between them is actual and real. 23

Like other Sufis, Saiyed Gaisudaras also holds that love of God begets the vision of God. The vision of God is possible in the life hereafter, and people shall see God with eyes open. 24 The vision of God is also possible in this world, but not in a waking condition. He also believes in the possibility of the vision of God in dream. 25 He criticises the Mutazilites who deny the possibility of the vision of God. 26

Next comes the problem of soul. Saiyed Gaisudaras holds that man is the prime creation. When God wanted to manifest Himself, He created man. What is Man? According to him, there are three opinions about it. The materialists do not accept the independent existence of soul. They hold soul as the product of the body (matter). The next opinion is that man is a composite of body and soul. This is the opinion of the theologians and a
majority of the philosophers. The third opinion is that man, in reality, is simply the soul. But in the opinion of Saiyed Gaisudaraz, man is the composite of both soul and body. Soul, as he holds, is the 'Shan' of God. Soul, as the command of God, means a Shan of God like 'kun' (Be). Soul makes man live.

According to Saiyed Gaisudaraz, there is a creature inside man which resembles man, yet is not man. This is called nafs (the lower self). It is also called khannas. It is an evil power. It resides near the heart of man, instigates him to commit sin, keeps him away from the right path, and also holds him from the remembrance of God.

Therefore, we may rightly conclude that Saiyed Muhammad Husaini Gaisudaraz presents a system of thought in which God is One, the Absolute Creator, unparalleled, and unique, and, the entire universe is His creation out of His Power and Will. The relation between the Creator and the created is never of identity, but always a duality. It is a philosophy of Hama-az-oost (All is from God), and not of Hama-oost (All is God). In modern terminology, this may be called Panentheism, and not Pantheism.
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