Introduction

SCENE AND BACKGROUND

According to an anecdote narrated by Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj al-Ṭūsī (d. 378/
988) and repeated in later biographies, Abū Ḥamza al-Ṣūfī (d. 269/
882–883 or 289/902), one of the earliest Sufi figures who comes to mind
when we speak of ecstatic situations and utterances (shaṭaḥāt),[1] came to
visit al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī (d. 243/857) at his house. When Abū Ḥamza
heard the rooster crowing, he started whooping: 'At Your service, My
Lord' (labbayka yā sayyidī). Allegedly, his guest's strange behaviour
made al-Muḥāsibī very nervous, so he took a knife and threatened to kill
Abū Ḥamza if the latter did not repent for his behaviour: 'If you do not
repent for this behaviour, then I will slay you', he told him. Abū Ḥamza's
reply was confusing. He told al-Muḥāsibī that if he, al Muḥāsibī, was
incapable of contemplating the sincere motivations behind this ecstatic

---

[1] There is a common confusion in relation to this character. Some sources refer to him as
Abū Ḥamza al-Baghdādī, while others mention him as Abū Ḥamza al-Khurāsānī or simply
as Abū Ḥamza al-Ṣūfī. Most probably, the references are made to the same character that
was a contemporary of Junayd and one of the famous Sufis of Baghdad, though he was
originally from Khurāsān. [See his biography in Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī, Ṭabaqāt
al-ṣūfiyya, ed. by Johannes Pedersen (Leiden: Brill, 1960), 328–331; Abū al-Qāsim ʿAbd
al-Karīm al-Qushayrī, al-Risāla al-qushayriyya (Cairo: al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1940), 26.]
Interestingly, Persian hagiographies provide us with two separate biographies of two so-
called different figures of the late third/ninth century who had close contacts with the circle
of Junayd: Abū Ḥamza al-Khurāsānī and Abū Ḥamza al-Baghdādī [see ʿAbd Allāh Anṣārī
Haravī, Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya, ed. by Akram Shifāʾī (Tehran: N.p., n.d.), 46–47 (www.sufi
.ir/books/download/farsi/khajeh-abdollah/tabaghat-sofieh.pdf, accessed 11 January
2017); ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Jāmī, Nafaḥāt al-uns, ed. by Mahdī Pūr (Tehran: Intishārāt-i
Kitābfurūshī-i Maḥmūdī, 1918), 70–71].

behaviour, then he should not allow himself to enjoy the life of wealth he was living. In other words, if al-Muḥāsibī allowed himself to enjoy a wealthy lifestyle, it was a proof that he had reached a high spiritual rank where wealth would not harm his renunciation, and therefore, he should be able to recognize the reasons for and nature of the state of intoxication underlying Abū Ḥamza's behaviour.[2]

This interesting anecdote might illustrate how the solidarity of the highly esteemed group of *ṣūfiyya*, the mystics of Baghdad, could have been challenged. Abū Ḥamza himself was one of the companions of Abū al-Qāsim al-Junayd, the great master of Baghdad (d. 298/910-911). He allegedly criticized the wealthy lifestyle of one of the pillars of this group, al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī. The anecdote also illustrates how Abū Ḥamza, an intoxicated personality of a passionate yet controversial mode of piety, was able to integrate into the general fabric of what became known in the history of early Sufism as the School of Baghdad.

According to the available sources, Abū Ḥamza committed himself to a life of hard renunciatory practices, and he would frequently roam alone as well as with other Sufi figures. His biographical account in Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī's (d. 412/1021) *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya* is fraught with statements in which he calls for a life of seclusion and constant roving. Interestingly, Sulamī chose to end this account with the following anecdote:

One day, Abū Ḥamza heard one of his companions criticising another for not refraining from showing his ecstatic state in the presence of non-Sufi associates (*izhār wajdihi wa-ghalabat al-ḥāl ʿalayhi wa-izhār sirrihi fī majlis fīhi baʿḍ al-aḍḍāḍ*). Abū Ḥamza, at that time, said to the critic: 'Leave behind your critique, since ecstasy (*wajd*) overwhelms the conciseness and removes the ability to differentiate between things. It turns all places into one single place, and all essences into one single essence. The one who becomes overwhelmed by ecstasy should not be blamed at all.'[3]

The case of Abū Ḥamza is not uncommon in the history of early Sufism. As the sources document, the unity of the Baghdadi group of *ṣūfiyya* could have been unavoidably disrupted by certain voices of controversy. As for the above anecdote of Abū Ḥamza with al-Ḥārith al-Muḥāsibī, it is

[2] See Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj al-Ṭūsī, *Ṣuḥuf min kitāb al-lumaʿ*, ed. by A. J. Arberry (London: Luzac, 1947), 6–7. The anecdote appears also in Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Dhahabī, *Siyar aʿlām al-nubalāʾ*, ed. by Shuʿayb al-Arnāʾūṭ and others (Beirut: Dār al-Risāla, 1982–1988), vol. 13, 167 (the biography of Abū Ḥamza al-Baghdādī).

[3] See Sulamī, *Ṭabaqāt*, 330–331.

interesting to note that, regardless of the historical authenticity or lack thereof in such texts, the reference to it in Sarrāj's work is very significant. Even if the anecdote comes from Sarrāj or from one of his contemporaries' imaginative work during the course of the fourth/tenth century, we should ask how such stories help portray the general boundaries of the Sufi ethos or establish the perception of key topics, such as wealth and poverty and sobriety and intoxication, in accordance with this ethos.

It seems most likely that, in al-Sarrāj's eyes, this anecdote was not going to defame the group of *ṣūfiyya* or destabilize the solidarity between them during the particular historical context of his time. It appears as though Sarrāj was convinced that the interpersonal controversy between Abū Ḥamza and al-Muḥāsibī and the mutual criticism was a legitimate feature of early Sufi life and that this was not enough in itself to hurt the desired ideal of solidarity. This is the most outspoken message of Sarrāj's discourse, as I perceive it.

From another perspective, this anecdote as well as similar material provided by Sufi works around Sarrāj's time leaves a strong impression that portraying the group of *ṣūfiyya* at harmony and solidarity was due to particular agendas, those of the group's leaders and of Sufi authors who supported them and were willing to disseminate such agendas.[4]

Early Sufis during the period under investigation succeeded in consolidating their identity as men of a distinct spiritual identity. They enjoyed a great degree of public veneration, being the most outspoken and undisputable representatives of Islamic piety in times that had witnessed the increasing distrust in the office of the Abbasid *khalīfa* and the latter's eventual loss of his religious authority in favour of the group of *ḥadīth* scholars, the *ahl al-ḥadīth*.[5] Many of the early Sufis were, in fact, scholars of *ḥadīth*, and this, beside other dynamics, advanced their increasing power and authority, led to their integration into the general fabric of the honoured group of *ahl al-ḥadīth*, and qualified them for a high position of public admiration since the early Abbasid era. *Ahl al-ḥadīth*, both Sufi and non-Sufi, had succeeded in the course of early medieval

---

[4] On this title and its reference to the particular group of the Baghdadi Sufis, see Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *Sufism: The Formative Period* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2007), 1–37; Christopher Melchert, 'Origins and Early Sufism', in *The Cambridge Companion to Sufism*, ed. by Lloyd Ridgeon (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 13–14.

[5] See a detailed discussion of the shifts that occurred in the office of *khalīfa* in Patricia Crone and Martin Hinds, *God's Caliph: Religious Authority in the First Centuries of Islam* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 80–96.

Islam in inheriting the religious-spiritual authority which had been almost exclusively embedded into the ultimate institution of *khilāfa*.[6] Many Sufis sought to integrate their practice as *ḥadīth* transmitters into their distinctive Sufi training, encouraging a broad basis of public recognition for their unique integrative agenda. In the course of time, however, these Sufi *ḥadīth* scholars began to outline the distinguishing features of their agenda, namely the combination of the knowledge of the prophetic tradition with the inward spiritual conception of that tradition, which differed from the outward agenda of the non-Sufi *ḥadīth* scholars. Even though these attempts were not always undertaken openly, many of them could be deduced from the sources. The detailed comparisons between the terms *ʿilm* (*ḥadīth* science) and *maʿrifa* (Sufi knowledge) and the celebration of the desired position of *ʿārifūn* versus what could be seen as the inferior positions of *ʿulamāʾ* and *qurrāʾ* (lit. the reciters of the *Qurʾān*) in Sufi writings of this historical phase provide one such example. It is interesting to note that the group of *qurrāʾ* in particular appears frequently in some early Sufi sources with very negative connotations. Its members claimed to be the true heirs of the Prophet and the ultimate protectors of his message while they were, in fact, as Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī (d. 386/996) puts it, nothing but hypocrites. 'The most hypocritical people in the Muslim community are its *qurrāʾ*' (*akthar munāfiqī ummatī qurrāʾuhā*), declares Makkī while describing this situation.[7] A similar criticism of those who memorized the *Qurʾān* without being able to cleanse their inner selves of hypocrisy and utilitarianism is noted in other Sufi sources.[8]

---

[6] D. G. Tor relies on the above-mentioned work of Crone and Hinds to examine the transition from what he calls a 'Caliphal Sunna' towards a 'prophetic Sunna' and the rise of the group of *ahl al-ḥadīth* in which many of the early ascetics (*zuhhād*), not yet the *ṣūfiyya*, were embedded. A special reference to al-Fuḍayl b. ʿIyāḍ (d. 187/803) and his relationships with the Abbasid ruler as well as his powerful impact upon him is presented here. See D. G. Tor, 'God's Cleric: al-Fuḍayl b. ʿIyāḍ and the Transition from Caliphal to Prophetic Sunna', in *Islamic Cultures, Islamic Contexts: Essays in Honor of Professor Patricia Crone*, ed. by Behnam Sadeghi, Asad Ahmed, Adam Silverstein and Robert Hoyland (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015), 195–228.

[7] Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī, *Qūt al-qulūb fī muʿāmalat al-maḥbūb wa-waṣf ṭarīq al-murīd ilā maqām al-tawḥīd* (Cairo: al-Bābī al-Ḥalabī, 1961), vol. 1, 97.

[8] See e.g., Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj al-Ṭūsī, *Kitāb al-lumaʿ fī al-taṣawwuf*, ed. by Reynold A. Nicholson (Leiden: Brill, 1914), 266: 'Blot out your name from the list of *qurrāʾ*.' Cf. the introduction of the fourth/tenth century work, *Adab al-mulūk*, where the anonymous author asserts that the group of *qurrāʾ* in his days instead of being completely occupied with a thorough study of the holy texts went on to utilize their position for the sake of fulfilling material interests [see an anonymous author, *Adab*

The legacy of sayings and anecdotes and of complete compositions attributed to early Sufi personalities all document an identity that started to come into being and was clearly recognized in the general scene of Sufi activity and thinking. Even in this early phase, this identity was collective. Early Sufis were undoubtedly aware of their unique method of reaching God which distinguished them from 'normative' members of the Muslim community. The existence of different individual modes of piety did not contradict the emergence of that collective identity. Certain circles of power, which were fully controlled by charismatic Sufis in Iraq and Persia, sought to forcefully grab those on the edges of this diversity and to reunite individual intentions and aspirations, at least on the level of the idealized reality portrayed in Sufi works. The most influential circle of this kind was that of the incontrovertible Junayd. The main target of Junayd and his circle, the Baghdadi *ṣūfiyya*, was to constitute an overwhelming framework that could embed all appearances of individual identity by blurring their distinction and uniqueness as far as this was possible. The *ṣūfiyya* was not in fact the ultimate face of early Sufism in the period under investigation here. Various attempts to destabilize this position were documented in the sources. In certain cases, these attempts took the form of direct criticism against the high ethos imposed by the renowned leaders of the group. In other cases, such attempts were undertaken by means of adopting a lifestyle that set its members apart from that ethos, as in the case of Ruwaym b. Aḥmad (d. 303/915), or even through total self-exclusion from the centralized Baghdadi institution, as in the case of Niffarī.

It was remarkable that Junayd and his conformist circle of companions appeared to avoid attempts of marginalization. Instead of ignoring and separating Sufi figures with different yet problematic agendas, Junayd preferred to adopt procedures of integration for the sake of protecting *taṣawwuf*'s reputation for respect and dignity. If we follow Junayd's agenda throughout his teachings and writings, we come across his desired formula of establishing an individual identity that fully corresponds with a collective one instead of conflicting with it. This intended formula did not always seem to be successful.

Attempts to challenge the Baghdadi-centric ideal of communal solidarity were frequent. In some cases, challenging this formula took the form of disagreeing with the criteria based on which Junayd imposed his collective

al-mulūk, ed. by Bernd Radtke (Beirut: Beiruter Texte und Studien Herausgegeben vom Orient-Istitut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft in Kommission bei Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart, 1991), 4].

identity, while in other cases the individual identity dominated the lives and work of certain figures and led them to totally reject the very formula of Junayd with all its criteria and potential outcomes.

This book seeks to examine how the pragmatic leaders of *ṣūfiyya* tended to stretch the boundaries of the high Sufi ethos that they had created so that those boundaries could be able to embrace as many as possible of the individual modes of piety of those days. What were the different strategies that these leaders employed for the purpose of establishing a centralized Baghdadi-based system of *taṣawwuf* with a well-defined theoretical, ethical and practical agenda? As the following chapters will show, this pragmatism manifested itself in sophisticated processes of absorbing controversial personalities and trends for the purpose of bringing them under one broad and multicoloured umbrella. Such processes relied primarily on a lengthy interpretative campaign for what was considered problematic and shocking from the texts and sayings attributed to certain Sufi personalities. In order to present a harmonious reconciliatory image of *taṣawwuf*, the leaders of *ṣūfiyya* went on to promote the doctrinal basis of concepts such as *fanāʾ* (annihilation), *ghayba* (spiritual absence) and *shaṭḥ* (ecstatic utterance). I argue, for instance, that the doctrinal basis of the last concept, *shaṭḥ*, is the ultimate product of the *ṣūfiyya* and their leaders' mentality. Only this group could really provide brilliant interpretations of the emotionally intensive states of intoxication and passion. The detailed treatment of *shaṭḥ* and *shaṭaḥāt* in Sarrāj's *Lumaʿ* is one example of such work. It is here that the controversial behaviour of certain Sufis managed to gain moral and religious justification, even if these Sufis themselves were not supposed to agree with such intellectual discussions of their forms of behaviour.

The most prominent objective of *ṣūfiyya*'s life work, as I see it, was to impose the Baghdadi umbrella over as many people as possible. A close reading between the lines of the available sources, nevertheless, guarantees unveiling the actual controversies among all who lost their uniqueness and individuality under the common umbrella. Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī during the late fourth/tenth century provided the biography of Ibn Yazdānyār, the Sufi of northwestern Persia, even though Ibn Yazdānyār himself was one of the early figures who challenged the ideal of Sufi solidarity. Sarrāj devotes a separate section to him in which he criticizes him and reveals what he considers Ibn Yazdānyār's attempts to defame the Sufis of Baghdad. In the meantime, we find that another Sufi author of the late fourth/tenth century, ʿAbd al-Malik al-Kharkūshī (d. 407/1016), relies heavily on Ibn Yazdānyār's detailed discussion of the concept of *ḥayāʾ*

(modesty) and its various categories in his *Tahdhīb al-asrār*.[9] Like other
Sufi authors, Kharkūshī refers to Ibn Yazdānyār on many occasions in his
work. The case of Ibn Yazdānyār, as will be thoroughly examined later,
demonstrates the interesting mechanism behind some particularly daring
attempts to bypass the homogeneous image of the *ṣūfiyya* as well as the
sophisticated strategies of the representatives of *ṣūfiyya* themselves to con-
front such attempts. Apart from Sarrāj who chose to defame Ibn
Yazdānyār, there was a sort of a general consensus among the majority
of Sufi authors to keep this personality within the walls of *taṣawwuf*.

The centralization of the Baghdadi-based mode of piety, with the power-
ful and pragmatic personality of Junayd and his circle of Sufi companions
and novices, left its marks on diverse aspects of the family lives and
interpersonal ties of early Sufis. The attempts of certain figures to release
themselves from the chains imposed by the creators of the high Sufi ethos
according to which all members of *ṣūfiyya* should live and work were not
restricted to the religious-spiritual arenas, but these attempts began to
appear also in personal domains of life. In order to challenge the agenda
of Junayd, his contemporary, Ruwaym b. Aḥmad, for instance, appears in
the sources as very eager to proclaim his paternal feelings towards his
daughter in the presence of his Sufi companions who had a different
perception of familial emotions and personal forms of expressing them in
Sufi spheres. For Ruwaym, the mystic's involvement in courtly affairs was
not expected by any means to harm his pure state of *tawakkul* (the
principle of maintaining trust in God). This latter notion provided the
theoretical basis for two alleged contradictory procedures most probably
undertaken by the *ṣūfiyya* then: disseminating a criticism of Ruwaym's
involvement in the Sulṭān's affairs, yet investing sufficient effort for the
sake of keeping his individual piety inside the Sufi consensual ethos. The
different patterns of the attempts led by certain Sufi figures to disengage
themselves from the authority of *ṣūfiyya*'s unifying ethos attracted our
interest from various perspectives in this book. Such attempts and
counter-attempts to bring back those who dared to rebel against the desired
consensus of the Sufis constitute the fascinating story told in this book.

Early Sufis had active social lives, and they led sophisticated interper-
sonal relationships more than what has been suggested. In the course of
time, the social engagements of early Sufis took place around particular
centres of power and authority in Syria, Iraq and Persia. Internal power

---

[9] See ʿAbd al-Malik b. Muḥammad al-Naysābūrī al-Kharkūshī, *Tahdhīb al-asrār*, ed. by
Bassām Bārūd (Abū Ẓabī: al-Majmaʿ al-Thaqāfī, 1999), 440–445.

struggles among certain Sufi figures, those that the authors of Sufi compendia did not feel free to discuss, seemed to be one of the inevitable outcomes of this sophisticated social fabric. Behind the praiseworthy principles that early Sufis usually celebrated, such as companionship (*ṣuḥba*), brotherhood (*ukhuwwa*) and altruism (*īthār*, *futuwwa*), emotions of mutual envy and rancour appeared not uncommon. I would argue that the frequency of works entirely dedicated to *ṣuḥba* and its rules and ethics in the early history of Sufism is a clear evidence, somehow, of a pragmatic need that early Sufi authors felt for such material in light of a reality fraught with tension among their contemporaries, those who were expected to act in perfect brotherhood and cultivate their virtuous relationships springing from their shared spiritual aspirations and destiny. Once we develop an understanding of these relationships, albeit partly and selectively as far as our sources allow, we shall obtain a clearer picture of the ways and dynamics according to which Sufi doctrinal systems developed and branched out in the period under consideration. Going into the personal-social and day-to-day lives of those who contributed to the work of consolidating the various Sufi theories should help explain how such theories were, in fact, products of particular social environments. In order to properly understand the Sufi concept of *ṣuḥba*, we need to examine the nature and structures of the social ties and the personal interests of the Sufis in the particular context of the term's genesis rather than approach *ṣuḥba* as a mere theoretical term isolated from any possible body of human needs and contextual necessities. Such necessities likely stood behind the shifts that occurred in the content and clues of the term *ṣuḥba*.

Early Sufis, similar to other men of letters in medieval Islam, conducted lives that were not completely free of personal conflicts that could potentially escalate into mutual defamation and calumny. Such situations contained the very human essence of actual living Sufi figures while literary Sufi heroes, with whom Sufi oeuvres were filled, were portrayed as perfectly harmonious and generally compatible. It would be worthwhile to inquire into the reasons underlying the appearance of a consistent Sufi ethos and the identity of those with an interest in guaranteeing this ethos, as well as their motivations and strategies.

This book presents an attempt to reread known sources with human concerns in mind. It is an attempt to again contemplate the relationships between the Sufi text and its cultural–social and communal contexts. At its very core, this method involved the act of re-examining the possible meeting points between the linguistic indicator and the contextual-human-personal meaning when approaching texts dominated by

theoretical agendas and literary contents. Examining this method throughout the various chapters of the book provides an example that might be useful for other endeavours to investigate the social lives of non-Sufi groups who, like the Sufis, have left us a rich legacy of writings.

RECENT SCHOLARSHIP AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE CURRENT BOOK

The main reason that motivated me to undertake the writing of this book is the crucial need I felt for a new scholarly work to thoroughly investigate the private lives of early Sufis as well as the relationships within their circles and communities in the period between the third/ninth and seventh/thirteenth centuries. Recent scholarship into early Sufism lacks attempts to reveal some of the hidden facets of early Sufis' everyday lives, their emotions, concerns, interpersonal relationships and conflicts. It does not attempt to expose the sophisticated dynamics between the personal spheres of the early Sufis' family lives and engagements and the communal spheres involving their engagement in Muslim societies in general and in the activities of the Sufi communities in particular.

To reconstruct the early stage of development, I usually consulted the compelling work of Ahmet Karamustafa, *Sufism: The Formative Period* (2007). This book adopts an uncompromising historical approach while integrating early developments into a clear and homogeneous narrative of the emergence of Sufism. Karamustafa's work puts the focus on what he terms 'Baghdad Sufism' as a special mode of Iraqi piety whose major characteristics are clearly presented. His narrative is centred around the theme of how between the third/ninth and sixth/twelfth centuries, Sufism became a self-conscious mode of piety, developed a distinctive system of doctrines and practices that came to be enhanced by an influential body of literary tradition, and eventually occupied the forefront of both early medieval Islamic intellectual life and actual social-religious life. Karamustafa's work is of enormous importance for our understanding of the socio-historical scope of the emergence of Sufism and its development in one of the most ambiguous phases in the history of this movement.

Modern scholarship on early Sufism is typically shaped by two major arguments. The first involves the strict dichotomy between what are seen as 'a-social' trends in the early period of Sufism and what can be considered as socially active Sufism. This argument regards early Sufism as a-social, very quiet and 'genuine' pattern of Sufism, while considering later Sufism in the

period that followed the fifth/eleventh century as 'social' and 'popular'. The
second argument concerns the way in which multifarious developments of
Sufism were described as a part of 'huge' and influential historical shifts in
the world of Islam. The latter argument is best demonstrated in the scholarly
trend to classify early Sufism in various stages and the attempts to draw upon
shared theoretical and practical features of each stage. I argue that the first
argument is imprecise and says little about the actual life and interpersonal
relations of the early Sufis in the individual and communal realms, while the
second needs to be combined with a scholarly endeavour to shed significant
new light on individual arenas and interpersonal ties among early Sufis.

In recent years, an increasing number of studies have adopted a new
scholarly attitude, placing the Sufi movement in Islam in different cultural
and social spheres. The articles in John Curry and Erik Ohlanders' work,
Sufism and Society (2012), keenly illustrate the different types of sources
that scholars are turning to for the history of Sufism and the new view-
points they suggest when incorporating long-ignored sources such as hagi-
ographies and court records. The main challenge facing the contributors of
Sufism and Society was how to reread the existing sources and interpret the
various narrative voices and strategies used by their authors in order to
reconstruct the varied activities of the Sufis in the period with which most
of the articles in the volume are concerned, that is, 1200–1800 CE.
Although the period between the fourth/tenth and seventh/thirteenth cen-
turies is given some attention, the period that follows the seventh/thirteenth
century and lasts until the premodern era has caught the interest of most of
the contributors. This is the period that saw the consolidation of the
sheikh–disciple relationship into the basic manifestation of the Sufi insti-
tution, which may help explain why for modern scholarship it forms one of
the 'most attractive' periods in the history of the Sufi movement in Islam.
A major strength of *Sufism and Society* for our purposes here is the critical
attention it pays to hagiographical material, reclaiming its historical power
as a legitimate source for social and historical study. In my book, therefore,
hagiographical sources, long deemed a-historical and therefore without
sociopolitical implications, will be treated, in additional to other types of
material, in the same light as the recent positive approach.

Sufism and Society brings to the surface the sociopolitical contexts of
Sufi activities at different points of time and place by providing us with
new research tools that cover a broader spectrum. I will take these
benefits, as I focus on the third/ninth to the seventh/thirteenth century,
and seek to reappraise the diverse religious projects of the Sufi actors of
this period as creators of unique individual identities.