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in his own name'. Following his defeat by Khizr Khan, 'he was instantly confined in Hissar Feroza, where he died after a nominal reign of one year and three months.' Major-General J. Brigg, History of the Rise of the Mahomedan Power in India, 4 vols. (Calcutta, 1910), vol. I, p. 292.

23. See Digby, Warhorse and Elephant, p. 74. The ruins of Siri, Jahanpanah and Dehli-ye Kuhna convey no notion that they were once regarded as almost impregnable. The walls of Tughluqabad and of the palace-fort of Firuzabad remain impressive, even in decay. The art of fortification in the Tughluq period awaits detailed investigation, but see J. A. Page: A Memoir on Kotsa Firoz Shah, Delhi (Memoirs of the Archeological Survey of India, no. 52) (Delhi, 1937); and Hilary Waddington, 'Adilabad. A Part of the “fourth” Delhi', Ancient India (Bulletin of the Archeological Survey of India), no. 1, January 1946, pp. 60–76.


TABARRUKĀT AND SUCCESSION AMONG THE GREAT CHISHTI SHAYKHS OF THE DEHLI SULTANATE

SIMON DIGBY

A line of Ṣūfī Shaykhs of the Chishtī order enjoyed a pre-eminence in the Dehli sultanate of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries A.D. This pre-eminence over other Ṣūfī orders in the capital city was probably established by the 1230s, when, if hagiographical sources more than a century later in date are to be trusted, Shaykh Qūb al-Dīn Bakhtyār Kākī enjoyed the allegiance of the reigning sultan, Ilūtīnīsh, and of the urban population. The prestige of the Chishtī Shaykhs grew in the time of his successor Farīd al-Dīn, and perhaps reached its apogee after Niẓām al-Dīn established an extensive Khānsqāh at Dehli in the late thirteenth century. The prestige of the living Chishtī Shaykhs continued until the destruction of the capital city by Amīr Timūr in A.D. 1398. The principal heir of the Chishtī prestige migrated very shortly before this disaster to the territories and capital of the Bahmani sultanate of the Deccan, where in A.D. 1422 he played the role of kingmaker.

The fourteenth century also saw the beginnings of the exaltation of the first of the Chishtī Shaykhs in India, Muʿīn al-Dīn Siǧzī, in popular estimation to the position of being the pioneer saint of the Muslim presence in India—"the Representative of the Prophets and Saints in India" (naʿīb rasūlī ʿllāh fi 'l-hind) in the words of the late fourteenth-century hagiographer Amīr Khwurd. By this time the legend existed that by his spiritual powers he had delivered the Hindu ruler Prithvirāja into the hands of the victorious armies of Islam led by Sultan Muʿīzz al-Dīn Muḥammad bin Sām.

The historical memory of these six great Chishtī Shaykhs has ensured that they are much revered by the majority of Indian Muslims today. Around the graves of four of the six, the most
widely-attended Muslim rituals of pilgrimage in the Indian subcontinent take place.

All these six Chishti Shaykhs had a connection with the capital city of Dehli. The slightest connection perhaps is that of Mu'in al-Din, about whom we have so little indubitably genuine historical information. There is however no reason to doubt that Mu'in al-Din came to Dehli on a visit from Ajmer around A.d. 1235; he sought the intervention of the sultan in a dispute between the Muqta' or Governor of Ajmer and his own sons, who had brought into cultivation some barren land. Quṭb al-Din lived in Dehli during the latter part of his life and carefully sought a place for his own tomb there—the earliest recorded example, barring the founding inscriptions of the Qubbat al-Islām mosque, of a declaration that the earth of the capital city was hallowed by the Muslim presence. Farid al-Din came from a family long established in the Muslim townships of the Panjab; Nīzām al-Din from the important Muslim settlement of Badā'on (later Bulandshahr) some two days' distance away from Dehli; and Naṣīr al-Dīn Mahmūd from Awadh. Farid al-Din came to Dehli to receive instruction from his Pir, though he evidently had no liking for the capital and eventually established his Khānqāh elsewhere, Nīzām al-Dīn and Naṣīr al-Dīn Mahmūd passed the greater part of their lives in the suburbs of the capital, and established their Khānqāhs there; like Quṭb al-Dīn, they are also buried in Dehli. The last of the six great Chishti Shaykhs surveyed in this paper, Sayyid Muḥammad Gūsūdarāz, was born at Dehli and claimed to have been established there since the days of the original Muslim conquest. As a very young child he was taken to Daulatabad on the forced migration ordered by Ṣultān Muḥammad bin Tughluq; but he returned to Dehli as a student, and passed over half a century of his long life there, before the disorders of the late Dehli Sultanate made him turn back to the Deccan in his old age.

The problems of how authority was transmitted in this lineage of Chishti Shaykhs are examined in this paper. The principal conflict is between the claims of the kin of the Shaykh to succeed to this and the conviction that it should pass to the most worthy successor, designated by the dying Shaykh. A subsidiary conflict often also occurs between intimate disciples of the Shaykh, each of whom might feel that his individual claims for preferment were pre-eminent. In almost every transference of authority, the hagiographical tradition provides evidence of conflict; on several occasions we possess a conflict of evidence, which is examined in an attempt to establish which account is likely to be nearest to the truth.

The maintenance of claims to succession in spiritual authority, while apparently wholly dependent on the dying Shaykh's testament, could not in fact remain uninfluenced by the role which a great Shaykh had played in the society of the Dehli Sultanate. In spite of the often expressed desire by the Chishti Shaykhs for solitude and their injunctions to seek it, the role of a great Shaykh, on which his prestige depended, demanded unremitting attention to the spiritual needs, hopes and aspirations of devotees of every social class and occupation. If the Shaykh adequately fulfilled these functions, he was held by his followers to be the true principal heir of the baraka of his predecessor, and his hagiographers would be strongly inclined to believe that he had received from the latter the appropriate and unique tabarrukat or symbols of office. The nature of these, as well as the occasions of their bestowal, are discussed in the paper below.

The charisma wielded by Ṣūfī Shaykhs in the medieval Islamic world clearly reflects the role which they were performing in mediating between God and the secular societies of their period and locality. By the middle of the thirteenth century the lineage of the Chishti Shaykhs, in the person of Farid al-Din Ganji-i Shākar, appear to have established an ascendency over all other purveyors of baraka in the central domains of the Dehli Sultanate. However the rational historical explanations for the authority which they wielded do not correspond with the theories current at the time regarding its transmission. We are here concerned with contemporary beliefs as to how and to whom the baraka of a Ṣūfī Shaykh descended when he took his departure from the mortal world.

By the thirteenth century the cult of graves and pilgrimages to local sites was well-established in the Islamic world. A portion of the Shaykh's baraka, of his spiritual and mediatory authority over the wilāyah or territory in which this was supposed to prevail, survived in the tomb of the Shaykh, to which those who required his intercession would resort. By the ordinary Muslim process of inheritance, the Khānqāh or hospice which he had founded and his grave within it would devolve to his children or nearest kin. Yet a powerful alternative system of transmission existed in the relationship between the Shaykh or Pir and his Murids (disciples). The disciples might have
profited more greatly than the Shaykh's own kin from his spiritual instruction, and thereby acquired greater sanctity. Among his disciples, those who were wholly occupied with the Sufi way of life and had absorbed all the teachings which he could impart to them, could receive his licence as Khalifas or deputies, fully proficient to act in a similar role to his own as Sufi Shaykhs. Yet one among these Khalifas might be considered by the Shaykh and designated by him as a principal heir to his teaching and authority. Such a designation was symbolized not by a Khidashat-nama indicating unspecific competence to practise as a Sufi Shaykh approved by his teacher, but by the gift of the private and personal insignia or articles of common use of the Shaykh, which by their nature were not multiplicable except by fraudulent claims.

We have therefore two conflicting systems of inheritance which came into operation at the death of a Shaykh. A portion of his spiritual authority could be claimed by the custodians of his grave, among whom his immediate kin would have strong claims; but another claim to the whole of his authority might descend to a designated heir among his favoured disciples, who could exhibit the articles of intimate personal use of his Shaykh, which had been given to him, as proof of his claims to the spiritual inheritance.

At the time of the establishment of the Dehli Sultanate, the problem of the inheritance of baraka existed among Sufis in the Ghaznavid domains. One of the earliest recorded anecdotes of Shaykh Nizâm al-Din Awwiyya refers to the competition of interests between the children and the designated heir of a Shaykh:²

There was a Pir in Ghaznîn (Ghazni) who had a slave called Zirak. This Pir was exceedingly sincere and worthy. When that holy Pir was on his deathbed, his disciples asked, ‘Who will sit in your place?’ ‘Zirak,’ he replied. Zirak said, ‘O Khwaja, your sons will not permit me to sit in your place. They will make strife with me in every way.’ ‘Sit there with untroubled heart,’ the Pir replied. ‘If they oppose you, I shall avert their wickedness from you!’

So when the Pir joined the precinct of God’s mercy, Zirak sat in his place. The sons of the Pir began to oppose him, [declaring that] ‘You are one of our slaves. Have you the bile to sit in our father’s place?’

When their contumaciousness had waxed great, Zirak came to the head of the Pir’s grave and said, ‘O Khwaja, you stated that if your sons molested me, you would avert their wickedness. Now they are out to injure me; you must fulfill your promise!’

He said this and returned to his own place. Within a few days the Kafirs
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[i.e. the Mongols] assaulted the environs of Ghaznîn. The populace went out to fight them. All four sons of the Pir also went forth and joined the battle; and they all attained martyrdom.

Set forth in this anecdote is the conflict of claims between the kin of the Pir as legitimate heirs of his material property and those of the chosen heir of his spiritual authority, not a blood-relation and in this case even a slave. Here the slave takes all, the intercession of the dead Pir having brought about an honourable death for his own children. Unlike many anecdotes of confrontation, it does not end in the degradation of the wicked but rather a suitable end for those who have a reasonable claim. Though on more than one occasion we see a conflict between the family of the Pir and a disciple of his who could put forward claim to be principal heir of his baraka, in no case among the Chishti Shaykhs do we find an attempt to displace the kin as guardians of the tomb or as administrators of the Khânqâh or hospices which the Shaykh had founded.

Though Nizâm al-Din supported the claims of the slave in the anecdote which he related, the rise of the Chishti Shaykhs to their widely accepted position of spiritual dominance in the Dehli Sultanate was favoured by a reasonable accommodation between conflicting claims regarding the descent of spiritual authority. Their popular prestige was based on their early presence in the Dehli Sultanate after its first establishment, which gave them a historic identity with the Muslim presence in the Indo-Gangetic plain, and upon their early victory over rival claimants to spiritual authority: but their lineage derived from the relatively obscure dynasty of the Pir’s Chisht, where succession to baraka was among the founder’s kin.

The Pir of Chisht exercised not uncontested authority over a limited area to the north of Herat in modern west Afghanistan. With the reflected prestige of their representatives in the Dehli Sultanate to aid them in the later thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, a Khânqâh and the graves of their ancestors remained in their possession from the ninth century a.d. for at least eleven generations to around a.d. 1400. The tombs of the Pir’s Chisht have been deserted and ruined probably for some hundreds of years; but the descendants of their pre-Indian-conquest lineage survive in South Asia, a notable modern example being the Pakistani religious theorist and politician Mawâli‘A‘Alâ’ Mâwûdhî.³

Contacts with the Pir’s Chisht were maintained, obviously tenuously, by the Chishti Shaykhs of the Dehli Sultanate. There is no
reference to the Pirs of Chisht in the conversations of Shaykh Nizām al-Dīn Awhiyā' recorded by Amīr Hasan in the Fawā'id al-fuṣūl; but there are records of contacts in the much fuller Siyyar al-awliyā', possibly because the family of its author, Amīr Khwurd, late thirteenth-century aristocratic immigrants from Iran, attained initial acceptance and later high administrative position at the Khānqāh of Nizām al-Dīn after a previous bay'at (profession of allegiance) to the Sajjādā-nashīn (heir) at Chisht; and later were anxious to promote connections between the shrines at Dehlī and at Chisht.

On two points the example of the Pirs of Chisht may have exercised influence on problems of succession among the Chishti Shaykhs of the Dehlī Sultanate. In the reign of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Bahlūl at Dehlī (A.D. 1266–87) a dispute occurred with regard to the succession at Chisht. An elder member of the family had migrated to Dehlī and, according to the testimony of Amīr Khwurd, was greatly cherished and esteemed by the Dehlī Sultan. At Chisht a party supported the claims of a minor, Khwāja Qubṭ al-Dīn, and others at Chisht opposed these claims. A mission was then sent from Chisht to ascertain the views of Khwāja 'Ali, who had migrated to Dehlī. The two representatives bore the dubiously literate names of Khwāja Zūr and Khwāja Ghūr. Khwāja 'Ali at Dehlī indicated that he did not want to become the Sajjādā-nashīn at Chisht, and he supported the candidacy of Khwāja Qubṭ al-Dīn. The two delegates travelled back from Dehlī to Chisht via Ajdāhan, where they were feted by Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn. Farīd al-Dīn arranged for the kullāb-i ṣādiq (‘cap of profession’) to be bestowed on two of his sons, who had not previously been shaved (maḥlūq) and made a profession of Sufi allegiance. The transaction had elements of mutual acknowledgement and legitimation. The caps were selected and provided by Farīd al-Dīn himself and put on the heads of his sons by the two travelling members of the house of Chisht.

There is no record that Khānqāhs were established by the two earlier major Chishti Shaykhs of the Dehlī Sultanate, Mu'in al-Dīn at Ajmer or Qubṭ al-Dīn at Dehlī. Equally there is no evidence that their kin thought of being maintained as servitors at their tomb. The problems of succession to a hospice and pilgrimage cult appear to have arisen at the death of Farīd al-Dīn at Ajdāhan in A.D. 1265. Possibly Farīd’s elder sons did not want to undertake this task and the succession devolved to his third son, Shaykh Badr al-Dīn Sulaymān. In this situation the example of the Pirs of Chisht would probably have been recalled and possibly Farīd al-Dīn himself, when the two members of that family had come to visit him over their dispute about inheritance, may have visualized the contingency. Yet a modern historian overstates the case when he writes that Shaykh Badr al-Dīn Sulaymān was given the office of Sajjādā-nashīn ‘directly from the Chishti elders in Chisht, western Afghanistan’. What his source, Amīr Khwurd, in the Siyyar al-awliyā’ states is that two sons of Farīd were given the kullāb-i ṣādiq by the representatives of the Pirs of Chisht. One of these—Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn—became an ‘alim ba ṣarraf (an Islamic man-of-learning who put his theological knowledge into practice), and the other—Shaykh Badr al-Dīn Sulaymān—became the Sajjādā-nashīn of Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn at Ajdāhan.5

On another point the procedure at Chisht (as reported by an author of the Dehlī Sultanate) is relevant to the struggle for power among the Chishti Shaykhs of the Dehlī Sultanate. According to Amīr Khwurd, when the two-man delegation from Chisht returned to record Khwāja ‘Ali’s refusal of the office of Sajjādā-nashīn from Dehlī, a contest ensued between the remaining rivals at Chisht, presided over by the local ruler, Malik Shams al-Dīn Kar. The principal tomb in which the Pirs of Chisht were buried was locked, and in it were kept the prayer-carpet (ṣajjāda), and staff (ṣāda) which had been passed from one generation to another at the shrine. Khwāja Qubṭ al-Dīn was a child, and was brought forward by his attendant. As he approached the tomb, the lock miraculously opened and the two leaves of the door swung apart. At this Qubṭ al-Dīn’s claims were acknowledged.6 The anecdote demonstrates the importance attached to the personal insignia of the Shaykh (tabarrukāt) as symbols of accession to his authority. In the Dehlī Sultanate, struggles between the kin of Chishti Shaykhs and their designated successors centred upon the possession of these insignia.

In the transference of authority among the Chishti Shaykhs of the Dehlī Sultanate an important concession was the Kihlāf al-namā or Ijāza-namā, a licence of competence to teach and practise as a Sufi Shaykh, often with the injunction that the recipient should leave his master’s Khānqāh and dwell at a suitable distance. If it was granted to a new initiate, it might provoke resentment among the older Murids of the Shaykh at the Khānqāh, who, even if the Shaykh considered them less spiritually developed, saw themselves as better entitled to this recognition. However it was widely assumed that the main burden of the Shaykh’s authority was passed on to a single especially
chosen disciple. This transfer of authority could be accomplished by a wasiṣyat, or death bed testament, whether written or oral. However, such a testament might be disputed or fabricated. In these circumstances, the tabarrukāt, objects of daily use or insignia of the devotional life of the deceased Shaykh, became evidence of the validity of his successor’s claim. In the anecdote discussed above regarding the succession of Khwājā Qūṭb al-Dīn at Chisht, the locked door which guards these heirlooms miraculously flies open at the presence of a worthy heir, and his authority is recognized. This paper attempts to scrutinize the hagiographical evidence regarding the transmission of tabarrukāt in the succession of the six major Chishti Shaykhs of the Delhi Sultanate—Mu‘īn al-Dīn Si‘jī, Qūṭb al-Dīn Bakhtyār Kākī, Farīd al-Dīn Ga‘nji Shakar, Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā’, Naṣīr al-Dīn Mahmūd Chirāgh-i Dehli and Sayyid Muhammad Gūsūdarāz.

In all, our sources mention seven objects as tabarrukāt, the first four being of greater importance. These are:

1. The staff (bāsā). A symbol both of the wielding of authority and the venerability of age.

2. The prayer-carpet (mussallā or sajjāda). In the usage of the period sajjāda came to be applied to the carpet on which the Shaykh presided in his assemblies.

3. The robe or garment (khīrqa, jāma). To be distinguished from the ordinary khīrqa given to those who received a khilafat-nāma from the Shaykh. Often considered to be an heirloom passed down from the Prophet Muhammad himself.

4. The begging-bowl (kāsā).

5. The turban (dastār).

6. The finger-ring (angushtar). Mentioned only in the testamentary dispositions of Gūsūdarāz.


8. A Qurʿān. Mentioned only in a nineteenth-century account of the transmission from Mu‘īn al-Dīn to Qūṭb al-Dīn which is demonstrably untrue, examined below.

None of the authentic collections of malfūṣāt (accounts of the conversations of Sufi Shaykhs) contains a reference to the transference of tabarrukāt from the first Chishti Shaykh in India, Mu‘īn al-Dīn, to his successor Qūṭb al-Dīn Bakhtyār. Such a reference is found in

Tabarrukāt and Succession among the Great Chishti Shaykhs

the inauthentic but early Fawā'id al-sālikīn. This states that Qūṭb al-Dīn was absent at the time of Mu‘īn al-Dīn’s death, and that the khīrqa and sajjāda were despatched to Qūṭb al-Dīn. It occurs in a passage describing the transmission in the following generation, from Qūṭb al-Dīn to Farīd al-Dīn, which is directly modelled on the account of the genuine collection of Nizām al-Dīn’s malfūṣāt, Fawā'id al-fu‘ūl.

A late nineteenth-century narrative (possibly deriving from a seventeenth-century original) shows the hagiographer’s view of what ought to have happened:

[Khwaja Mu’in al-Dīn] said Shaykh ‘Ali Sanjari [sic] to compose a farman11 and khilafat-nama to the effect that—I give my Khilafat and Sajjadagi [office of Sajjadah-nashin] to Qūṭb al-Dīn Bakhtyār. His place is in Dehli. Hazrat Khwaja Qūṭb al-Dīn relates that ‘When the document had been composed and he had adorned it with his own signature, he gave it to me. Then he said, “Come near to me!”

‘When I was close he put a cap and a turban on my head, and he gave the staff of Khwaja ‘Uthmān2 into my hand. Bestowing the cloak of the Prophet Muhammad upon me, that is to say the cloak which was the gift of the Protector of the World, together with an ancient Holy Qurʾān, a prayer-carpet and a pair of sandals, he said, “These are a legacy from the true Prophet, upon whom be blessing and peace, which has come down to my elders, and I give them to you. As the Khwajas of Chisht have performed his works, so you should perform them!’

‘Taking these pure gifts I again saluted him and kissed the ground of service.

‘“Go!” he then said. “I have entrusted you to God!”

‘Having recited for me the Fatihah he then said:

‘“Wherever you abide, be the Man!”

‘Then I saluted again, and I left there and came back to Dehli and dwelt there. Forty days had passed when a man came from Ajmer, and told me that twenty days after I had returned the Khwaja had set from this perishable world.’

Both this account and the earlier narrative of the Fawā'id al-sālikīn are demonstrably unhistorical, as Qūṭb al-Dīn Bakhtyār died in A.D. 1235, pre-deceasing his Fir Mu‘in al-Dīn, who died in March 1236, by a few months.13

With regard to the next stage in the transmission of tabarrukāt, we have a verbatim account of only one generation later:

Then he [Shaykh Nizām al-Dīn] said:

‘When the time of the departure of Shaykh Qūṭb al-Dīn was near, the
name of a Buzurg [Shaykh] was mentioned who now rests at the feet of Shaykh Qubq al-Din, and had the ambition that he should sit in the place of the Shaykh [Qubq al-Din] after him. Shaykh Badr al-Din Ghaznavi also ... had that ambition. However in the Sama' [musical session] in which Shaykh Qubq al-Din was about to pass away, he ordered that his garment and staff and prayer-mat and wooden sandals should be given to Shaykh Farid al-Din.

'I have seen that staff and garment,' Nizam al-Din said. 'It was a garment of fine cloth, embroidered. So, the night when Khwaja Qubq al-Din passed away, Shaykh Farid al-Din was in Hansi. That very night Shaykh Farid al-Din saw his Pir in a dream, calling him into his presence. On the next day he left Hansi and on the fourth day he reached the town [Dehli].18 Qazi Hamid al-Din Navigri was still alive, and he brought the garment to Shaykh Farid al-Din ... The Shaykh performed two prostrations of prayer, put on the garment and came into the house where ... Qubq al-Din had been. He was not more than three days there, or, according to another account, seven days, before he again set out for Hansi.'

This passage requires a commentary at several points. The Buzurg later buried at Qubq al-Din's feet, who aspired to succeed to his authority, may have been Qazi Hamid al-Din Navigri, who is buried there, but who also conveyed the tabarrukat in this anecdote to Farid al-Din. It could also be a reference to the only surviving son of Qubq al-Din, whom Nizam al-Din regarded with disapproval.17 It is curious that Nizam al-Din states that he had seen the staff and garment passed on by Qubq al-Din, as this would imply that they were not in Nizam al-Din's own possession. In other references Nizam al-Din was quite clear that his own staff was that which had been passed on by Qubq al-Din to Farid al-Din. There also seems to be no doubt, from his careful description, that the garment (jama) was not in his own possession. Certainly no khirqa alleged to be an heirloom of the Prophet had been passed on to him.

This anecdote is paraphrased in the inauthentic Fawa'id al-salikin, and it is reproduced verbatim in the Siyar al-sawiya', which appends it to another anecdote of this stage of the transmission of the tabarrukat.18

It is related that ... Shaykh Farid al-Din said:

'Once I was seated with Shaykh Qubq al-Din. I rose up with the intention of setting out for Hansi. Shaykh Qubq al-Din's blessed glance fell upon me. His eyes filled with tears and he said:

"Mawlanâ Farid al-Din, I know that you are going to go away!"'
Badr al-Dīn Ghaznavī has here taken the place of Qāżī Hamīd al-Dīn Nāgawrī as the intermediary, and there is but one object mentioned in place of the six of the previous anecdote. There is no suggestion of the dream which summoned Farīd from Hansī to Dehli. The detail of his refusal to take Qūb al-Dīn’s wife is not found in either of the other anecdotes; and the tale of his departure back to Hansī is again rather different. An event of about ninety to 120 years before from which they inherited their own authority was remembered with considerable vagueness by two of the great Chishti Shaykhs.

For the next stage in the transmission of the tabarrukat, from Farīd al-Dīn to Nīżām al-Dīn, we have the recorded testimony of the recipient, with references to the previous transfer. Once again there is a conflict of evidence as regards the details of the transfer in the earliest sources. Nīżām al-Dīn’s own narration, which may be accepted as historically the more accurate, maintains that the staff of his Fīr was given to him by Farīd al-Dīn in his lifetime. This corresponds with the account of the previous transmission from Qūb al-Dīn to Farīd al-Dīn in Amīr Khwurd’s Siyar al-awliyā’. However, regarding this transmission Amīr Khwurd includes the staff among the tabarrukat conveyed from Farīd al-Dīn to Nīżām al-Dīn after the death of the elder Shaykh, a transaction in which he maintains that his grandfather Sayyid Muhammad Kirmānī had played an important part. Nīżām al-Dīn’s own account of the gift of the staff, as recorded in the Fawā’id al-fu’ād is moving and circumstantial:20

There was a staff which he had received from Shaykh Qūb al-Dīn. They used to bring this and lay it at the head of his bed [khat, Anglo-Indian ‘cot’]. The Shaykh used to lean back on that staff and lie at ease, and every time he used to take down the staff with his hand and kiss it.

After describing further circumstances of Farīd’s terminal illness, Nīżām al-Dīn related how his Shaykh gave the staff to him:

He turned towards me and said:
’I have asked from God that whatsoever you ask from Him you shall find from Him.’
After this he gave the staff to me.
At this moment I [i.e. Amīr Hasan, the compiler of the Fawā’id al-fu’ād] asked:
‘Were you not there at the time of the Shaykh’s death?’
[Nīżām al-Dīn’s] eyes filled with tears, and he said:
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‘No, in the month of Shawwl the sent me to Dehli. His death was on the night of the fifth of Muharram [i.e. about three months later]. As he lay dying, he remembered me and said:
‘Such a one is in Dehli.’ And he added, ‘At the time of Shaykh Qūb al-Dīn’s death I also was not present; I was in Hansī.’

The Khwaja [Nīżām al-Dīn] told this story and he wept, so that all who were present were affected.

A similar pattern of transfer has been established in the last two transmissions in that the heir is absent at the death bed, subsequently falsely recorded in the transmission of the preceding generation from Mu’in al-Dīn to Qūb al-Dīn. Amīr Khwurd’s account in the Siyar al-awliyā’, though it may magnify the role of his own grandfather, Sayyid Muhammad Kirmānī, in the transmission, and though it is also not to be preferred against Nīżām al-Dīn’s own testimony regarding the gift of the staff in Farīd al-Dīn’s own lifetime, is circumstantially convincing in its description of the opposition of Farīd al-Dīn’s family to the transfer of tabarrukat to Nīżām al-Dīn:21

The author [Amīr Khwurd] has heard from his father, Sayyid Mubārak Kirmānī, that while Shaykh [Farīd al-Dīn] was ill from the illness through which he was to pass from this world to the next, Sayyid Muhammad Kirmānī, the author’s grandfather, arrived at Ajodhan from the city of Dehli. He saw that the Shaykh was lying on his cot within his room [būtara] and that his sons and devotees were sitting in front of the door of the room, in discussion about his authority [maqām] and succession [sajjāda].

In the midst of this Sayyid Muhammad Kirmānī wanted to go into the room to kiss the feet of the Shaykh, but his sons forbade him, saying that this was not the time for it. Sayyid Muhammad Kirmānī could bear it no longer. He opened the door of the room, went inside and fell at the feet of the Shaykh. The great Shaykh opened his eyes and said:
‘How are you, Sayyid? And when did you come?’
‘I have arrived this very moment’, said Sayyid Muhammad Kirmānī.

Then he desired to kiss the feet of the Shaykh. He wondered whether if in these circumstances he began to mention [Nīżām al-Dīn], Farīd al-Dīn would truly bestow his favour upon him. This would not please the sons of the Shaykh.

First he began to convey the salutations and inquiries [after Farīd al-Dīn’s health] of the Shaykhs who in those days were in the city [of Dehli, i.e. of Nīżām al-Dīn and his circle at Dehli]. The Shaykh heard these with satisfaction. When [Sayyid Muhammad Kirmānī] wanted to mention [Nīżām al-Dīn], he said:
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"Mawla Naqām al-Dīn, the slave of Your Lordship, has conveyed his submission and the kissing of your feet. He passes his time in the recollection of the prayer of the Shaykh of Shaykhs of the world."

This would appear to be a reference to Farīd al-Dīn’s prayer described in the incident related by Naqām al-Dīn himself, and is a reminder that Farīd al-Dīn had already chosen him as an especial successor. The account continues:

Shaykh Farīd showed favour towards Naqām al-Dīn and asked:

"How is he? Is he well?"

Then he said, 'Give him this garment (jāma) and prayer-mat (mūṣalla) and staff.'

In the previous anecdote we have noted that Naqām al-Dīn had already received a prayer-mat and staff. The quarrel with the kin of the Shaykh then reached a head:

When this matter reached the ears of the sons of the Shaykh, they grew angry and came forward, hostile and quarrelsome, saying:

"You have done this, and caused what we desired to be given to another!"

"What could I do?" said Sayyid Muhammad Kirmānī. 'I did not make any special mention of him. I conveyed the salutations which had been entrusted to me from the Shaykhs of Delhi, and in the course of these I also mentioned his name. When God... out of His grace gives something to a Man, what power have I that I should prevent that good fortune?"

When the news of the death of Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn reached Shaykh Naqām al-Dīn, he set out for Ajodhan. When he had performed the pilgrimage to Shaykh Farīd’s tomb, Mawla Naqām Badr al-Dīn Išāq [an important Khalīf of Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn] conveyed to him the garment and prayer-mat and staff. He mentioned Sayyid Muhammad Kirmānī:

"The Sayyid performed what was necessary for the obligations of [Farīd al-Dīn’s] love for you in your absence."

Naqām al-Dīn embraced Sayyid Muhammad, and the bond of love between these two Buzurgs grew greater.

This account illustrates both the rivalries and the mutual obligations which evolved in branches of a Sūfī order. The sons of Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn were hostile to Shaykh Naqām al-Dīn’s claim of succession to their father’s spiritual authority, and what must be regarded as material considerations made them make an ugly scene at the death of their father, when the symbols of authority were transferred to him. Yet one of Farīd al-Dīn’s prolific family came to dwell at Naqām al-Dīn’s...
[The Shaykh] performed the afternoon prayer, and the sunset had not yet come when he departed to the precinct of God's mercy.

Jamālī's construction is ambiguous, but he seems to imply that all these *tabarrukāt* came down from Farīd al-Dīn. This is too stereotyped a death bed scene not to arouse suspicion. In the *Siyyar al-sulṭānīya*, Amir Khwurd, who would personally have observed such a scene as a young man, is entirely silent about it; a number of remarks make it clear that the account of Jamālī is an entire fabrication. The mention by Jamālī of Shams al-Dīn Yahyā may have been prompted by the fact that Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Makhdūm-i Jāhānān, one of Jamālī's own spiritual predecessors had—as he observed *en passant*—received a 'garment of succession' (*jāma-yi khilafat*) from this Shaykh. The *Siyyar al-sulṭānīya* reproduces the text of the Khilafat-nāma granted to Shams al-Dīn Yahyā just under four months before Niẓām al-Dīn's death, written out by one of the Kirmānī Sayyids;²⁴ there is no mention of a gift of clothes. The other two Shaykhs mentioned by Jamālī stand for geographical areas of Chishti influence, in the lengthy list of the Khilafas of Niẓām al-Dīn in the *Siyyar al-sulṭānīya*, they are not singled out for special honour.²⁵ The case of Burhān al-Dīn was more extreme than this. We have noted that he was in Delhi until after the death of Niẓām al-Dīn, not as Jamālī implies already in the Deccan. He was a disciple of advanced age and considerable note, and had not been granted Khilafat by Niẓām al-Dīn. When the latter's final illness was far advanced, by a conspiracy of the higher Khādīms of the Khānqāh, including Amir Khwurd's Kirmānī relations, he was brought into the bedroom of the dying Shaykh, whose personal servant unpacked a frock and cap which the Shaykh had worn, and clothed Burhān al-Dīn in them. Niẓām al-Dīn did not speak and 'silence is the proof of satisfaction'.²⁶ As regards Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Māhmūd, four sections of the twenty-five in Amir Khwurd's notice of the Khilafas of Niẓām al-Dīn are devoted to him.²⁷ This is more than any other Khilafā, received, and it is acknowledged at the outset of the notice that Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Māhmūd 'nowadays occupies the place of Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn in the city of Delhi.'²⁸

The writer has heard his uncle, Sayyid Ḥusayn, remark: 'Nowadays the lofty position of Sulṭān al-Mashā’īkh [Niẓām al-Dīn] in the city of Delhi is occupied by Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Māhmūd; and inwardly and outwardly, to the best of his ability he does not pass beyond
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the practice of Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn. Among the Khalīfās of Niẓām al-Dīn, in this work he had achieved complete distinction and arrived at the stage of perfection ....

In this passage the suggestion that Naṣīr al-Dīn was the unique nominated heir of the Shaykh's *baraka* is obviously lacking and implicitly denied.²⁹ Elsewhere Amir Khwurd describes the granting of Khilafat by Niẓām al-Dīn to Naṣīr al-Dīn Māhmūd and to Qutb al-Dīn Munawwar, a Pir who enjoyed the esteem of Fē rõz Shāh Tughluq.³⁰ The grants of Khilafat were accompanied by the injunction, 'You are brothers and must keep your minds free of ideas of precedence and subsequence.'³¹

Further evidence of the falsity of Jamālī's account of Niẓām al-Dīn's end are the parenthetical remarks of Amir Khwurd about the Khilafat-nāmas drawn up when it was realized that Niẓām al-Dīn's end was approaching, designed to counter an opinion which was current, that they did not express the true intentions of the Shaykh.³²

... And what some people say or write in their compositions regarding the Khilafat-nāmas to these Buzurgs: that the blessed hand of the Shaykh was wholly paralysed; that he had no consciousness and they seized the hand of Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn and drew his signature, this was not in fact the case. The loss of faculties (*ghalba-yi tahayyar*) of the Shaykh was for not more than about forty days before his death; but the writing of the Khilafat-nāmas of these Buzurgs, and their being distinguished by bequests was three months and twenty-seven days before the death of Shaykh Niẓām al-Dīn.

This corresponds exactly with the date of the Khilafat-nāma to Shams al-Dīn Yahyā and appears to indicate an attempt, on the part of the higher Khādīms of the Khānqāh, to put in order claims to succession when it was realized that Niẓām al-Dīn's health was failing.

The claims of Burhān al-Dīn, a popular and widely admired elderly disciple who had incurred the Shaykh's displeasure, may have been satisfied at an even later date.

In these passages there is no reference to the disposition of the *tabarrukāt* which Niẓām al-Dīn had received from his own Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn. Niẓām al-Dīn appears to have been reluctant to grant Khilafat to his closest and oldest disciples. He was unmarried, and after his death the Khānqāh remained in the possession of its residents, led by those related to the Shaykh or performing services in his devotions.
One nephew of the Shaykh, Râfi’ al-Dîn, had been appointed Mutawalli (administrator) in the Shaykh’s lifetime; descendents of another nephew, carrier of the Shaykh’s prayer-carpet, and his Imam, remained among the leading Khâdîms families at the beginning of this century.  

In a different context the Siyar al-a’wliyâ’ states that two of the tabarrukat which Nizâm al-Dîn had received from Farîd al-Dîn were interred with him. Amir Khwurd’s description occurs in a section on the bestowal of khirqas, after three statements attributed to Nizâm al-Dîn:  

[Nizâm al-Dîn] used to say that the garments which have been received from the company of a Shaykh cannot be bestowed upon another. If they are washed, this is not prohibited, though it is better that they should not be washed. He also said:  

‘If the presents (tashrifat) received from the companionship of a Pir are bequeathed [by the recipient] and not placed inside his grave, this is permissible; or if he makes a testament giving them to his offspring who are worthy (sâlih).’  

And he said:  

‘Once (waqât) I received a cloak from the Shaykh of Shaykhs of the world, Farîd al-Dîn, a Chishti cloak of wool (gîlâm khirqâ-yi Chishti), and that is yet upon me.’  

The writer submits in this connection that when after his death they lowered Shaykh Nizâm al-Dîn into his grave, they stretched over his body the cloak (khirqa) which he had received from Shaykh Farîd al-Dîn; and they placed the prayer-carpet (musalla) of his Shaykh upon his blessed head.  

It is difficult to believe that the three sayings quoted before the description of the interment represent Nizâm al-Dîn’s views regarding the transmission of authority. The first is contrary to the example of the staff of Qub al-Dîn which he had inherited from Farîd, and the second is contrary to the moral of his story of the Pir at Ghazvin (p. 66 above). After two further anecdotes, one regarding a variety of khirqas inherited by the author, Amir Khwurd records:  

Shaykh Nizâm al-Dîn also said:  

‘On the morrow of the Resurrection, some of this [Sîfî] band (at’îfa) will be made to stand among the thieves, and they will say, “We have not stolen!” The answer will come, “You have put on the clothes of Men, and you have not acted [as such]!”’  

In the end they also will attain salvation through the intercession of Pirs.’  
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The inclusion of this saying here may be an oblique reference to claims and counterclaims among the Khalîfas of the Shaykh at the time of writing. Amir Khwurd’s separate account of the Shaykh’s last days suggests that Nizâm al-Dîn had not made adequate arrangements for the undisputed transfer of his authority. In default of an injunction (watîyat), the decision to inter the khirqa and musalla may have been taken by the principal Khâdîms. It is perhaps significant that in this passage Amir Khwurd does not mention the ‘aṣâb, which by Nizâm al-Dîn’s own testimony descended from the Pir of his Pir. According to surviving evidence two major Khalîfas, Nasîr al-Dîn Mahmûd and Burhân al-Dîn Gharib each claimed to possess the staff of Nizâm al-Dîn.  

By contrast with our lack of a coherent account of Nizâm al-Dîn’s dying wishes, we have a circumstantial account of the death of Shaykh Nasîr al-Dîn Mahmûd, which claims to be immediately contemporary. This also claims that he had no worthy successor, and that the tabarrukat which he had received from his Pir, or were his personal symbols of authority, were buried with him in his grave:  

On the eve of Friday, the eighteenth of the month of Ramaizân he wished to release the bird of his spirit from the cage of his body. Mawłânâ Zayn al-Dîn ‘Ali (his nephew) submitted:  

‘Lord, most of your disciples are the possessors of ecstasy and the folk of perfection. Among all these, indicate one who may sit in your place, so that the silsila [chain], Sufi lineage] may not be totally broken.’  

‘Go!’ he said. ‘Bring me [a list of] those Darvishes of whom you have a good opinion, so that I may examine it.’  

The Mawlnâ had a list in three rolls, best, middling and worst. When the Mawlnâ had placed the list in front of him and after he had studied it, he said:  

‘Shaykh Zayn al-Dîn, tell them to worry over their own faith; What capacity have they to bear the burdens of others?’  

After that he pronounced his testament (watîyat):  

‘At the time of my burial lay over my breast the cloak which I received from Haçrat... Nizâm al-Dîn, and bind the staff of my Pir upon me in the gravecloth. Twist the rosary around my forefinger, and place the wooden bowl beneath my head like a brick, and also place my wooden sandals by my side.’  

Those who were present at the time put into effect the wish of the
Shaykh. Sayyid Muhammad Güsûdarâz washed the corpse, and took up the woven threads of the cot on which the water had been poured over his blessed body. He said:

‘This is enough of a cloak for me!’

In the end the acceptance which that Sayyid obtained, was from the barakat (blessed influence) of it.

The author, Hamîd Qalandar, claims a few paragraphs later, at the conclusion, to have composed this account in the year of Naẓîr al-Dîn’s death. Yet the reference which he makes to the acceptance (gabuliyyat) which Sayyid Muhammad Güsûdarâz had obtained as heir to Naẓîr al-Dîn’s authority can hardly date from that year. This may be a later comment of the author, or even an interpolation by another hand; but the structure of the anecdote suggests the alternative conclusion that the anecdote achieved its present form a number of years, perhaps decades, afterwards, when the claims of Sayyid Muhammad Güsûdarâz were achieving widespread recognition.

The scene at the death bed of Shaykh Naẓîr al-Dîn Mahmûd has parallels with those at the demise of his two predecessors in the lineage. Like Nîzâm al-Dîn, he may have been unwilling to devise his spiritual authority to a single heir, and have desired that his tabarrukât should be buried with him. He would certainly have received a cloak from Nîzâm al-Dîn at the occasion of the issue of his Kbiâfat-nâma, which was probably not that passed on to Nîzâm al-Dîn. The staff could have been that which Nîzâm al-Dîn received from Farrî al-Dîn, though the evidence of the Siyâr al-aswâfiyyah does not favour this assumption. If ‘Abd al-Haq’s evidence regarding Nîzâm al-Dîn’s burial is accepted, the impulse may have been strong upon Naẓîr al-Dîn Mahmûd not to pass on tabarrukât to a chosen successor. On the other hand, his position resembled that of Farrî al-Dîn, in that his own kin within his lifetime had assumed control of the management of the shrine, and could limit access to the person of the Shaykh. They would be likely to oppose any impulse of the Shaykh to will his authority elsewhere. The parallel to the position described in the Siyâr al-aswâfiyyah, when Farrî al-Dîn lay dying with his sons anxious that no one else should get access to him, is obvious. Short of managing to persuade their uncle to appoint one of themselves to succeed him, the best thing which could happen for the nephews of Shaykh Naẓîr al-Dîn Mahmûd was that his tabarrukât should be buried on the premises.
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It is not surprising that the account of Shaykh Naẓîr al-Dîn Mahmûd’s wishes which has come down to us from the partisans of Sayyid Muhammad Güsûdarâz contradicts the relation by Hamîd Qalandar which we have quoted above in the most important particulars. In his conversations recorded in the Jawawî al-kilm, Güsûdarâz once refers to himself as the inheritor of the authority and tabarrukât of Shaykh Naẓîr al-Dîn Mahmûd. After mentioning that Sultân Muhammad b. Tîkhtuq was ashamed of his behaviour towards Naẓîr al-Dîn Mahmûd and therefore bestowed on him the distinction of a drum and standard, Güsûdarâz related: 18

He has a very high rank among the saints of God. After the Shaykh that wâlî [territorial spiritual authority] was divided among four people. The first was a Sufi. The second was a bot makar (baddaq tarkih). The third was a potter, and the fourth was a woman. As each one of these three, more of the wâliyat returned to that same Sufi until, after him, God knows best to whom it will come;

There can be little doubt that in this passage the Sufî referred to was Güsûdarâz himself, as such modest paraphrases are common in Sufi literature. In the Jawawî al-kilm, which records ten months of Güsûdarâz’s conversations, there is no more detailed account of his succession to Naẓîr al-Dîn Mahmûd, although there are some disparaging references to Hamîd Qalandar (author of the preceding account) and to Naẓîr al-Dîn’s kin. Of the early tadhkiras of the life of Güsûdarâz, the Siyâr-i Muhammadi has an extended notice of events at the time of Naẓîr al-Dîn Mahmûd’s death. The Siyâr-i Muhammadi was composed six years after the death of Güsûdarâz. Thus it should be regarded as a rather better authority for his life than the Siyâr al-aswâfiyyah is for that of Nîzâm al-Dîn. It states that Sayyid Muhammad Güsûdarâz had been severely ill, coughing and spitting blood, and he attributed his recovery to his Pir Naẓîr al-Dîn Mahmûd’s intercession. When he had recovered, he called upon Naẓîr al-Dîn Mahmûd; and he was told to wait in private after the other disciples had departed. Then Güsûdarâz related to him this dream: In this dream he was putting on and drawing off various garments, passing through wâliyat, nubuwawat and wâliyat to end in hu’yat (identification with God). Naẓîr al-Dîn Mahmûd’s face shone with joy as Sayyid Muhammad related this. Sayyid Muhammud then added: 19
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"I saw all different things with forms distinct from one another resolved into One Truth."

The Shaykh was very joyful, and he brought both his hands down over his face, and said:

'Praise be to God, Lord of the Worlds.'

'He then added some words to the effect that his life appeared to be drawing to its close. Next he took the rug [gālim] from in front of him and gave it into both hands of Sayyid Muhammad . . . , and he grasped firmly his hand and said:

'Afterwards, anyone who sees difficulty sees it for a motive [i.e. critics of Sayyid Muhammad's spiritual inheritance must be so from self-interest].'

Then he said:

'Sayyid Muhammad, accept this act from me!' That is to say, 'give me your hand in bay'at'.

Sayyid Muhammad bent his head low and was silent.

'Have you accepted it?' the Shaykh then said.

'I have accepted it,' he replied.

Then the Shaykh made two testamentary admonitions, the first that he should not abandon his external recitations, and the second that he should cherish those who were attached to him.

Then the Mawlānā Zayn al-Dīn came.

'Go away, Zayn al-Dīn,' the Shaykh said. 'Make the arrangements for the ordering of the sweets for the kandūrā feast!' 839

When Mawlānā Zayn al-Dīn had gone away, he threw a nibālcha [thin stuffed quilt used as a mattress] to him, and said:

'Sayyid, draw off the cover of this quilt, and put it in your sleeve and go back!' 839

On the night of Tuesday, 15 Ramażān, Shaykh Naṣir al-Dīn Mahmūd fell ill. In the course of his illness several of his disciples represented to him that each Buzurg at the time of his own passing away had appointed some people in his place and for his own part (bi jihat-i khwos) had especially distinguished one of them. Several of the Shaykh's disciples had reached lofty spiritual stations and had become the recipients of revelations and illuminations. If he would give licence to several of them [i.e. Khilāfat-nāmas], and single out one of them, it would not be in disaccord with the practice of the Khwājas [of Chishti, the Chishti Sūfīs].

'Write out their names and bring them,' Shaykh Naṣir al-Dīn Mahmūd said.

They made out a list and Mawlānā Zayn al-Dīn brought that list to the Shaykh. The name of Sayyid Muhammad was not on the list. When the
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Shaykh had scanned the list, he said, 'What a sack[?] of stones and clods you have brought. Tell them to worry about their own faith!'

And he threw away the list.

Mawlānā Zayn al-Dīn again made a short list, and brought it back with some names omitted. He took it to the Shaykh who said:

'Read it out.'

He read it out and the Shaykh said:

'You have not written the name of Sayyid Muḥammad.'

Zayn al-Dīn grew afraid and began to tremble. Immediately he wrote the name of Sayyid Muḥammad. The Shaykh took the list, and with his pen made a ṣad [for sabūṭ, beside the name of Sayyid Muḥammad is implied].

On the eve of Friday, 18th of Ramażān Haṣrat Shaykh Naṣir al-Dīn departed from this perishable world and took his abode in the world everlasting. He was seventy-two years old. The gifts [mit'matī, i.e. the tabarrukāt] came to four people. One of these was Sayyid Muḥammad Gūnūdarāz; and when the other three died, all these gifts came to him. After his third visit to the grave of Shaykh Naṣir al-Dīn Mahmūd, Sayyid Muḥammad sat upon the carpet of spiritual authority (ṣaijāda yi wakālāt) and gave his hand in bay'at (acceptance of Murids); and instructed and guided seekers after God.

Of the two tabarrukāts mentioned in this passage, the gālim was a rug, probably without pile, which could be worn by a faqīr as a blanket or shawl around the shoulders. It counted therefore as a khīrqa, indicating that the recipient was a Khalīfa of the Shaykh. Gūnūdarāz was at this time thirty-five or thirty-six years old, a youthful age for the bestowal of Khīlāfat, especially in view of the practice of Naṣir al-Dīn's predecessor Niẓām al-Dīn, though justified by anecdotes related by both these Shaykhīs regarding the actions of Farād al-Dīn and of Shihāb al-Dīn 'Umar Suhrawardī. 40 The nibālcha or quilt was something on which the Shaykh reposed. If we may judge by later Indian examples (no textiles from the Delhi Sultanate having survived) it was almost certainly patterned. It was an adequate sajjāda, or carpet of authority, and its bestowal by the Shaykh indicated the transfer of an important part of the Shaykh's spiritual authority. It was probably to this gift that Gūnūdarāz himself, in the conversation recorded in the Jawāmī al-kīm, and his biographer in the Siyar-i Muḥammadī were referring, as the single gift in the possession of Gūnūdarāz at the time of Naṣir al-Dīn's death. To this were added the three others which had been entrusted to persons—a box-maker, a potter and a woman—who from their status in life must
be interpreted as hidden Abdāls secretly promoting the well-being of the world.\textsuperscript{43} We may find the story of this subsequent transmission of the further three \textit{tabarrukāt}, which completed Gūsūdarāz’s claim to the entire \textit{waliyād} or spiritual authority of Naṣīr al-Dīn, improbable; if it is an invention, it can only be that of Gūsūdarāz himself.

Hamīd Qalander’s account in the \textit{Khāyīr al-majālis} of the role of Gūsūdarāz at Naṣīr al-Dīn’s death bears the marks of hagiographical invention to explain away an awkward fact that was a matter of common knowledge, viz., that Gūsūdarāz possessed a \textit{saijādā} given by Naṣīr al-Dīn, when the latter’s family, represented by Zayn al-Dīn, had done their best to prevent the transfer of such a gift. It is therefore explained as the threads of the cot or charpoy which Gūsūdarāz bore away (without permission) when he had washed the Shaykh’s corpse. The \textit{Sīyār-i Muḥammadī} contains no mention of Gūsūdarāz performing the \textit{ghusl} (washing) of the corpse, and as he was neither a relation of the Shaykh nor a permanent inmate in the  Kháňqāh, it is unlikely that he would have been allowed this intimate distinction by those in control of the obsequies; or that his own biographers, if he had undertaken the \textit{ghusl}, would have remained silent about it.

Hamīd Qalander, both from the information which he gives of himself in the \textit{Khāyīr al-majālis} and other contemporary evidence, was a man of somewhat precious character, a ‘hanger-on’ at both the Kháňqāh and the Sultan’s court.\textsuperscript{44} Gūsūdarāz in conversation expressed his dislike for him, and the favour of Zayn al-Dīn and his brothers would have been important to him. We have noted above that his reference to the ‘acceptance’ which Gūsūdarāz had gained amid the populace conflicts with the very early date at which Hamīd Qalander states that he completed the account of the Shaykh’s death. Opposition to the claims of Gūsūdarāz provides a specific motive for an otherwise not very meaningful falsification of the date of composition. The textual tradition of the \textit{Khāyīr al-majālis}, in which two of the three manuscripts on which the modern critical edition was based lack the appendix describing the Shaykh’s death, also suggests that the work was already in circulation in manuscript form, before the appendix was composed. This evidence is significant rather than conclusive, as the hundredth and last \textit{majālīs} is followed by a colophon dated Wednesday, 4 Šafār, without mention of the year. As composition of the work was begun in A.H. 754, these conversations must have been recorded between then and the year of the Shaykh’s death, viz.

Tabarrukāt and Succession among the Great Chishti Shaykhs \textsuperscript{87} A.H. 757, in a year when the 1st Muḥarram fell on Thursday. Of the years in question, assuming that there was no unusually early sighting of the new moon, and bearing in mind that the Muslim day begins at dusk, 1 Muḥarram A.H. 757 exactly corresponds with Wednesday night/Thursday, 9–10 January A.D. 1356, and no such close correspondence can be found in the previous three years. The \textit{Khāyīr al-majālis} (without the appendix) was therefore completed only a little more than seven months before the death of Naṣīr al-Dīn Māhmūd. In this period or in the three and a half months from the Shaykh’s death to the end of the Muslim year, transcriptions could have been made, from which the two surviving manuscripts which do not contain the appendix descend. This is, however, an uncomfortably short period, if the appendix was added before the end of A.H. 757, a proposition which we are inclined to deny. As regards the veracity of the two conflicting accounts of Naṣīr al-Dīn’s death bed scenes, the story in the \textit{Sīyār-i Muḥammadī} of the \textit{nīḥalcha} being smuggled out by Gūsūdarāz with the goodwill and complicity of the dying Shaykh past the vigilance of his relations appears the more worthy of belief.

Some evidence of the bitterness of the quarrel regarding the succession between Gūsūdarāz and Zayn al-Dīn may be adduced from Gūsūdarāz’s own remarks, in the course of reflections upon his own remarkable longevity.\textsuperscript{45}

He then said:

‘Mawlānā, I don’t know why God gave me this long life. I never asked from God but once for a long life. This was when my master, Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Māhmūd . . ., departed from this world to the next. He had given me Khīlāfāt and he had kept it hidden from Mawlānā Zayn al-Dīn. After the death of the Shaykh they cast doubt upon my Khīlāfāt.’

‘Anyone who will be the Khalīfa of Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Māhmūd’, said Mawlānā Zayn al-Dīn, ‘will reach a fulfilled age (\textit{umr-i mukammal}) like the Shaykh; and he will teach and guide God’s servants, and the Sīsīla of the Shaykhs will continue from him.’

‘At the time it passed through my mind that it would be good if God gave me a long life, so that the genuineness of my Khīlāfāt would be manifest to them.’

The remark about \textit{umr-i mukammal} is a sneer at the comparative youth of Gūsūdarāz, and perhaps takes into consideration the fact that Gūsūdarāz had only recently recovered from a severe illness. Its circumstantiality gives the conversation the ring of truth.
Sayyid Muhammad Gūsūdarāz stands in contrast to his predecessors in the Chishti Silsila, whose conversations were recorded, but who were themselves never impelled to commit their teachings to writing. Some of Gūsūdarāz extensive literary oeuvre has been published in the original Persian or in Urdu translation. He made observations regarding succession within the Śūfī Silsilas. With regard to the difficulties of the earnest seeker in choosing a Silsila to which to attach himself, he remarked that ‘nowadays’ these were much increased by the failure of certain Shaykhīs to appoint a true successor, either by testament (waṣīyat), or on their death bed. One may see in this a reflection of Gūsūdarāz’s own difficulties at the death of Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd. This led, he continued, to ‘certain people’ putting the son of the Shaykh in his father’s place three days after the death, and clothing the son in his father’s kbirqa. Relations of the Shaykh, also, without the necessary permission from him, began themselves to take disciples, a sure path into error. Elsewhere he complained of the sons of Shaykhīs who usurped their father’s authority, and he added to this a denunciation of the luxury and ease which they permitted their disciples.

Gūsūdarāz admitted to some flagging in his powers of concentration after he had attained the age of ninety. He then found it easier to dictate an important work on dreams, visions and allegories than to concentrate on the exposition of works on the traditional Islamic religious sciences and earlier Śūfī classics. He may have felt that he had suffered unduly from Naṣīr al-Dīn’s inability fully and publicly to express his intentions with regard to the succession while on his death bed. In his own case he provided for the contingency many years before the event. Before, as a septuagenarian, he decided to leave Dehli in anticipation of the disasters of Timur’s invasion of 1398—in retrospect a move of political prescience unparalleled in this period—he drew up a waṣīyat-nāma in Arabic. In the next two decades of his life some of his disciples and kin predeceased him, and a number of alterations were made until his death, at the age of 105 Muslim years, in Gulbarga in the Deccan in A.H. 825/A.D. 1422.

Although Gūsūdarāz had denounced the practice of seating unsuitable sons of Śūfī Shaykhīs in their father’s place, he did not doubt the spiritual competence of his own sons. He may have had cause for this confidence, for he himself was clearly an excellent teacher and his elder son, Sayyid Muhammad Akbar, was the author of a work on Śūfī terminology as well as the compiler of the most reputed collection of his father’s maṣlaqat, the Jawārī al-kihl. Sayyid Muhammad Akbar predeceased his father, who after his death testified to his high spiritual rank and his abilities, and constructed a tomb around which he performed the ziyrat or pilgrimage appropriate to the grave of a Śūfī Shaykh of consequence. After the death of Muhammad Akbar, Gūsūdarāz altered his waṣīyat-nāma in favour of his surviving son, Muhammad Asghar; and he eventually bequested to him his kbirqa, sajjāda and finger-ring. The kbirqa and sajjāda may have been identical with the galim and nībālcha, which his biographer claims with plausibility that he had received from Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd. The finger-ring, nowhere else mentioned as one of the tabarrukāt, may have been a personal inheritance of Gūsūdarāz from his honourable patrilineal ancestors established (according to his own testimony) as Sayyids in the Dehli Sultanate from the period when this was founded: or it could have been a personal signet which many Muslims in South Asia and probably most of the Islamic world are predisposed to wear, regardless of any Śūfī connection. There is no mention of the disposal of the three remaining tabarrukāt which Gūsūdarāz claimed to have received through humble intermediaries from Naṣīr al-Dīn. Possibly these may have been assumed to have passed once more into the keeping of the Abdāls, to be produced again when a need for spiritual leadership arose.

At the death of Gūsūdarāz a minor claim remained unsatisfied. Under Muslim law an orphaned grandson in the male line lacks any major and ascertained claims on his grandfather’s estate. This was the case of Miān Ṣafīr Allāh, son of Muhammad Akbar. At the death of Gūsūdarāz the lack of generosity which is so conspicuous a feature in most of the incidents which we have surveyed again recurred. Only after the mediation of the Sultan of the Deccan, Ahmad Shāh Bahmanī, was he recognized as custodian and Sajjāda-nashin of his father’s tomb. Ṣafīr Allāh died without issue, and the main line of the Sajjāda-nashins of Gūsūdarāz at Gulbarga are referred to as inheritors of the Rawżatāīn, the two tombs of Gūsūdarāz and his elder son Muhammad Akbar.

At the death of Sayyid Muhammad Gūsūdarāz, the alternative means by which spiritual authority could be inherited among the Chishti Shaykhīs, by the transmission of tabarrukāt and by consanguinity, were united. At the same time the sources for such a conflict in
succession were removed by the destruction of the political authority of the Delhi Sultanate over a large area of the Indian subcontinent after the invasion of Timur in A.D. 1398. It may be argued that the conflict regarding succession became of less importance with the fragmentation of political authority in the provincial sultanates, though the prestige of the Chishti lineage led to Gesūdarāz, in his old age, playing a decisive part in supplanting Hasan, the son of the Bahmani Sultan of the Deccan, Fērōz Shāh, by Ahmad, the Sultan's brother. This Sūfī authority of the Chishti Shaykhīs was so overwhelming that it led to a search for an alternative with similar prestige. Ahmad Shāh Bahmani, set on the throne with the approval of Sayyid Muhammad Gesūdarāz, quarrelled with the latter's grandson, and sought the support of one of the most notable Shaykhs of the early fifteenth century in Iran, Shāh Ni'amat Allāh Wali of Māhān, who himself declined to come to the Deccan, but despatched his grandsons there. Khilāfāt was conferred upon the Sultan, and with this spiritual authority he and his successors were described on their coinage and in inscriptions as al-wālī, implying spiritual as well as temporal dominion.

The anecdotes of conflicts regarding succession which we have examined in this paper sufficiently demonstrate that possession of the Shaykhī’s tomb was an important asset, representing inheritance of a portion of his spiritual authority. Yet against this was balanced the claims to charisma by living Shaykhīs and, in popular estimation, a single living Shaykh to whom the tabarrukāt had passed. But after the invasion of Timur in A.D. 1398, we have no record of any living Chishti Shaykh of note to whom such an inheritance might have passed, or by whom the prestige of his predecessors might have been maintained. The power of the Delhi Sultanate was in eclipse, and the ruined city was no rival to the glittering capitals of the provincial sultanates. Delhi was a place of hallowed memories, a city of the sanctified Muslim dead. The Lōdī sultans and many Afghan nobles erected their splendid mausolea there, at a time when Agra was the administrative capital. By the sixteenth century this strong consciousness of the hallowed past is expressed by such authors as ‘Abd al-Ḥaq Muhaddith and Rizq Allāh Mushtaqī.¹⁹ Only in the late seventeenth century, with the arrival of Shāh Kalīm Allāh
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Awrangābādī at Shahjahanabad, do living Chishti Shaykhīs again exert a significant influence on the religious life of the revived capital.

The memory of the great Chishti Shaykhīs of the Delhi Sultanate continued to command widespread allegiance among Muslims of the subcontinent, and led to a hagiographical tradition blossoming into more and more fantastic anecdotes attesting their miraculous powers. Muʿīn al-Dīn, a figure about whom there is the most meagre information in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century sources, was enshrouded in a mass of symbolic legend, the motivation of which it is not difficult to perceive. First of the Chishti Sīsilā in India, his arrival was the counterpart of the great triumph of Muslim arms which established the Delhi Sultanate. The fortress city of Ajmer in which he was buried was a symbol of the fragility of this military triumph. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it was lost to Rajput chieftains, retaken and lost again by provincial sultans, and finally brought under Mughal domination.

The end of the Chishti tradition of bequeathing tabarrukāt to a chosen successor led not only to the hereditization of sanctity at the Chishti shrines, but also to transferring the centre of devotion from the person of a living Pir to the graves of the dead Pirīs, accentuating a tendency which was at work with varying force among Sūfī orders throughout the Islamic world. As we have noted in our account of the succession at Chishtī, in Khurasan and elsewhere the cult of Sūfī graves was firmly established before the creation of the Delhi Sultanate. In Delhi itself Niẓām al-Dīn and Naṣīr al-Dīn Māhmūd were in the habit of performing the ziyārat of the tomb of their predecessor Qubh al-Dīn,²⁰ which the Arab traveller Ibn Baṭṭūta also remembered as the principal mazār of the capital city.²¹ The Suhrwardī Shaykh Sayyid Jaʿlal al-Dīn ‘Akhund-i Jahanīyān’, visiting Delhi in A.D. 1381–2, paid his respects at the tomb of Niẓām al-Dīn.²² Another late fourteenth-century Shaykh, Sayyid Ashraf Jahlānīr, remarks on the pleasure which the scanty dead experience from the graves being visited. The process of the identification of the baraka with the tomb is exemplified by Ibn Baṭṭūta’s account of his visit to Ajudhān, where the Arab traveller confused the incumbent Sajjāda-nashin, Shaykh ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Mawj-i Daryā’ with the latter’s grandfather, Farid al-Dīn himself.²³
Neither Farid al-Din nor Nizam al-Din nor Nasir al-Din Makhmud had felt it incumbent on them to undertake the possibly dangerous journey to perform the "ziyarat" of the grave of the founder of the Order in India, Mu'in al-Din, at Ajmer. The scanty records which we possess suggest that all his sons had settled elsewhere, and the grave was possibly undented at this time. Sayyid Muhammad Ghashidraz, in a conversation of A.D. 1399-1400, notes a recommendation given to him by an unnamed Darvish that a follower should have been told to perform the "ziyarat" of the five previous Chishti Pirs, but evidently did not consider this advice binding. On the other hand Shaykh Zayn al-Din, Khalifa of Shaykh Burhan al-Din Gharib whose settlement in the Deccan we have mentioned earlier, when he came to northern India visited the five graves at Ajmer, Delhi and Pakpattan. Sultan Muhammad bin Tughluq, while campaigning in Rajasthan around A.D. 1332, visited the tomb of Mu'in al-Din, as did Zafar Khan of Gujarat in the course of his march upon Delhi at the close of the century.

The subsequent history of the Dargahs ("royal courts")—i.e. Khangahs, around the graves of the six Chishti Shykh of this paper shows remarkable variation in their fortunes and in the pattern of development in their individual geographical settings. A full account would be far beyond the scope of this paper, beyond indeed the limits of my own researches. I can only indicate some salient features of their history. We may turn first to the three Dargahs away from Delhi, at Ajmer, Ajudhan (Pakpattan), and Gulbarga.

There is no evidence of a major Khangah establishment at Ajmer before the conquest of that city by Suljan Makhmud Shah of Malwa in A.D. 1455. There were however some attendants at the grave when he visited it. In the reign of his successor Suljan Ghiyath al-Din a mausoleum was built over the grave, and a Shaykh previously resident at Mandu was installed as custodian. It is probably also to these Sultans that the great gate now known as the 'Alai Darwaza should be attributed. The custodian or his descendants claimed to be of the lineage of Mu'in al-Din himself, and they are the ancestors of the present line of Divanjs or Sajjada-nashins. Some of the families of Khadims also claim descent from Mu'in al-Din. Both claims were held in doubt in the sixteenth century, and are contested to the present day. Nevertheless the shrine became increasingly important as a place of pilgrimage from the late fifteenth century onwards, while the corpus of legends about Mu'in al-Din, the first great Sufi in the heartland of India, grew apace. The almost annual pilgrimages of the emperor Akbar in the 1570s and 1580s assured its uncontested pre-eminence as the major Muslim pilgrimage centre of the sub-continent. Later Mughal emperors also made substantial grants of maddad-i ma'ash to its inhabitants, after which the donations of Muslims of all ranks from the Nizam of Hyderabad downwards have contributed to the upkeep and embellishment of the shrine. In 1975 there were said to be 300,000 visitors to the 'Urs or festival of the death anniversary of Mu'in al-Din.

The Dargah of Farid al-Din at Ajudhan (called Pakpattan in his honour from the sixteenth century onwards) was in fact the first Khangah establishment founded by a Chishti Shaykh in India. Ajudhan was a staging-post along a main route from Delhi to Multan and even during the lifetime of Farid al-Din, the Khangah attended to the needs of travellers in the qa'is or that passed on this route, including the staunch of their mounts. Like the Suhrwardi establishment at Multan, the Khangah was at almost the highest point of an ancient tell which had been transformed into a fortified medieval town. Strategic as well as pious considerations may have influenced the massive patronage of the shrine by Muhammad bin Tughluq and Feroz Shah Tughluq, who assigned the cultivable land of the adjacent riverain region to the incumbents at the shrine, a grant which was repeated in Mughal times. Richard M. Eaton has cogently argued that in consequence the shrine played a decisive role in the agricultural settlement and Islamicization of the pastoral transhumant Jat and Rajput tribes of the area.

Succession to the Sajjada or Gaddi devolved through the third son of Farid al-Din, installed (as at Chisht) by a consensus of the relatives. The descendants of Farid al-Din, either resident in the vicinity or emigrating to other parts of India, multiplied so greatly that in the sixteenth century he was known as Adam-i thani 'the second Adam'. Unlike many other Sufi lineages, they developed a characteristically north Indian social system of taking brides from tribes which were clients of the shrine. Their ascendency over the local tribes parallels that of the Safavid Shykh of Ardabil over the Turkmans in the late fifteenth century. When a power-vacuum occurred in the Panjab in the late eighteenth century, it is not surprising that the then Sajjada-nashin or Divan made a bid for independent power, which was
ultimately crushed by Ranjit Singh. In the late nineteenth century the Chishti settled around Pakpattan could appear to a British administrator as ‘a semi-religious Mussalman tribe’, who owned land but did not cultivate it themselves. A few years ago the Darqâh maintained a characteristic variety of permanent or temporary inmates, but was under the charge of a Mutawalli or custodian appointed by the Awqaf Department of the Pakistan Government.

We have earlier noted the kingmaking role of Gisudaraz in the Bahmani sultanate in his old age, and the fact that the Bahmani sultans, following their quarrel with a grandson of Gisudaraz, relied on an alternative source of Sufi legitimation until the downfall of the dynasty a century later. However the prestige of the Darqâh or Deorhi (another term for ‘court’) of the tomb of Sayyid Muhammad Gisudaraz at Gulbarga survived this disfavour. Later there were marital alliances between his offspring and the families of the ‘Adilshahs of Bijapur and the Quvbshahs of Golconda, despite the professed Shi‘ism of these ruling houses; and even more recently with the house of the Nizams of Hyderabad. The shrine attained greater splendour and possessions than any other in the Deccan. Colonel Meadows Taylor, in a novel published in 1875, described the lavish celebration of the ‘Urs by the Prince of Goolburga’, though his description was probably based on his observations of about twenty years earlier. He called the incumbent ‘the Geesoomaraaz’, a similar identification to that made by the fourteenth-century traveller Ibn Batuta regarding the incumbent of the shrine of Ajmadan. In 1963 I attended the ‘Urs at Gulbarga. Most of the devotees came from a more localized catchment area than was the case in the pan-Indian festivals of Nizám al-Din and Mu’in al-Din, and this had the advantage that modernizing influences were less apparent. Nevertheless a crowd of many tens of thousands of pilgrims were present. The fervour of the pilgrims was intense. A cordon of men linked arm-in-arm had to be formed around the person of the Sajjada-nashin when he went in procession, to prevent his physical injury by those pressing to touch the hem of his garments; and I was privileged to participate in this.

The cults of the three Chishti graves in Dehli fared unequally, and the course of their development were different from those of the Ajmer, Ajudhan and Gulbarga shrines. Quvb al-Din had maintained no Khâmâs in his lifetime, but had chosen his burial-place with care, and purchased it. According to Nizám al-Din, he had remarked:

‘From this place comes the smell of hearts!’

It is situated at Mehrami, close to the outskirts of the first Muslim settlement at Dehli, Dehl-i kuhr, the ‘old Dehli’ of that day. As Ibn Batuta testifies, his grave was the principal maâzâr among all the townships of Dehli in the fourteenth century. There appears to be no evidence for the continuous occupation of the shrine after Timur’s invasion in A.D. 1398, but a factor in favour of the cult of the grave was its proximity to the great Quwwat al-Islâm (or more correctly Qubbat al-Islâm) mosque, the outstanding architectural monument of the establishment of the Dehli Sultanate. A fortuitous coincidence of name led to the Quvb Minâr there being considered in popular folklore as ‘Quvb Sâhib ki lath’, ‘the staff of Quvb Sâhib’. This proximity evidently led the Emperor Bâbur to visit the tomb when he went sight-seeing in Dehli in A.D. 1526; he had visited the tomb of Nizám al-Din the evening before, and makes no note of a visit to that of Naâsir al-Din Mahmûd. The paucity of sixteenth and seventeenth-century structures at the Darqâh seems to indicate that the shrine did not attract great patronage at this period; but in the late eighteenth century a Chishti Shaykh of note, Fakhîr al-Din, took up residence there. When, in the twilight of the Mughal emperors living under British ‘protection’, Akbar Shâh II and Bahâdur Shâh Zafar sought an alternative, less oppressive part-time residence in Mehrami during spells of absence from the Red Fort, the Darqâh benefited from the move. An elegant open pavilion was erected over the grave and a large entrance-gate added, which is a fine example of Mughal architecture in its latest period. An ‘Urs is celebrated on a modest local scale not to be compared to the major festivals at the shrine of Nizám al-Din and at Ajmer and Gulbarga. The main officiant is a member of the leading Khâdim family of the Darqâh. Among the Sufi Shaykhs of India today, or should I say twenty years ago, he does not appear to rank as a major Sajjâda-nashin, and doubt is cast on the claims of this family to be descendants of Quvb al-Din himself.

The Dargâh of Naâsir al-Din Mahmûd appears to have fared even worse. The ascendency of the Shaykh’s eldest nephew, Mawlanâ Zayn al-Din, and of the latter’s brothers was established at the
Shaykh’s death. The tomb itself, the entrance-gate and the massive and defensible walls date from this period and indicate the patronage of Sultan Feroz Shah Tughluq. It was clearly a major Khângâq before Timur’s invasion in A.D. 1398. Either during the urban disturbances before this event or shortly after, the family of the Shaykh appear to have abandoned the Khângâq. Among their descendants were a noted sixteenth-century Sufi of Gujarat, Shaykh Hasan Muhammad ‘Miyânjî’; his son, Shaykh Muhammed, author of a Sufi manual Adâb al-jalîlin, which was lithographed in the nineteenth century; and the early eighteenth-century poet and lexicographer Siraj al-Dîn ‘Ali Khân ârzu. Though Arzu lived in Delhi in the early eighteenth century, the poetical tadkhiras which record his life make no reference to his taking an interest in the Dargâh of his ancestor. In the Dargâh itself the only post-fourteenth century structure of note is a minor rectangular tomb of the Lodî period, which was said in the nineteenth century to be the grave of Sultan Buhûlî Lodi. I have argued elsewhere that this is incorrect. In spite of the pressure of population in Delhi after Independence, the Dargâh was very scantily populated in the 1950s and 1960s. I was then informed by one of the inhabitants that the descendants of Shaykh Naṣîr al-Dîn Mahmûd in Gujarat still continued to make provision for the celebration of the ‘Urs at the Dargâh on a small scale.

Unlike the graves of Qâb al-Dîn and Naṣîr al-Dîn, the grave of Nizâm al-Dîn at Delhi appears to possess a Khâdîm population which has been continuously resident from the time of the Shaykh’s death. The celebration of the ‘Urs is on a comparable scale to those at Ajmer, Gujûl and Pakpattan, though it differs from them in its more popular and less well-regulated character. The Dargâh also differs from these shrines inasmuch as there is no clearly established tradition of Sajjâdaqî. Historically the reason for the failure of such a tradition to emerge must be seen to spring from the circumstances of Nizâm al-Dîn’s death which we have surveyed earlier in this paper. At the time of the Shaykh’s death, his Khânqâh was under the administration of Khâdîms who were either intimate personal servants or distinguished residents who were not blood-relations. This may be contrasted with the situations at the Khânqâhs of Farâd al-Dîn and Naṣîr al-Dîn Mahmûd. Some of the figures of importance in the Khânqâh at the death of Nizám al-Dîn and later in the fourteenth century, notably the Khâmî Sâyîds, appear to have left no extant lineage at the Dargâh, but the four main groups of the Khâdîm population of the twentieth century are from lineages which appear authentic.

The apparently continuous preservation of the Dargâh, in contrast with the periods of neglect of the other two Chishti Dargâhs in Delhi, suggests an element of choice among the local Muslim population in determining which was to be the single great Sufi shrine of the area. The claims of Nizâm al-Dîn were clearly stronger than those of Qâb al-Dîn, except on the grounds of antiquity. About the role of Qâb al-Dîn in the capital city we have no contemporary record; by contrast we have the contemporary testimony of the historian Barânî as to the enormous influence wielded by Nizâm al-Dîn, as well as the easily comprehensible account of Nizâm al-Dîn’s conversations in the Faw’â’id al-fu’âd. The attachment of the most celebrated poet of the Delhi Sultanate, Amîr Khursâw, who lies buried at the feet of Nizâm al-Dîn would doubtless also contribute to his posthumous esteem. The Khâyir al-majalis, which records the conversations of Naṣîr al-Dîn Mahmûd, is a work of literary merit almost equal to that of the Faw’â’id al-fu’âd; but it never enjoyed an equally wide circulation and popularity. Moreover Nizâm al-Dîn’s life spanned the apogee of the Delhi Sultanate, while that of Naṣîr al-Dîn Mahmûd ended when the sultanate was entering into decline. Historic memories put forth the strongest claims for the shrine of Nizâm al-Dîn. A final factor in its favour was the continuous habitation which we have suggested above.

In the early sixteenth century the Dargâh of Nizâm al-Dîn remained one of the centres of the religious life of Delhi. The historian Rizq Allah Muhsiqâvi recalled his brother’s manner of life in the reign of Sikandar Lodî (d. a.d. 1517). He was a man of great piety, who used to spend eight months of the year at Delhi and four at Agra. When he was at Delhi, he would spend six days of the week in assemblies of Âlims, men of accomplishment, Sufi Shyiqhs and Qawwâls (singers)—Mondays at the Hâwz-i Shamsî, Wednesdays at the Khânqâh of Nizâm al-Dîn, Thursdays at Qadam Sharif (the shrine of the Prophet’s footprint), Fridays at Ferozâbâd (Feroz Shâh Kotlâ), and Saturdays at the Mâlcha Maqâll, with some shikar to vary the routine.

In the early twentieth century the Khâdîms who divided the offices and offerings of Nizâm al-Dîn’s shrine were divided into four families:
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the 'Urs of Nizām al-Dīn, the general content of the singing is more of a disorderly entertainment than a purgative spiritual experience, and most of the audience appear to regard it in this light. The latest fashions in the music of the Bombay film-industry make their appearance. Equally the commercial modern style of Qawwāls which fills the seats of theatres in Bombay owes much to the manner of certain mid-twentieth century Qawwāls attached to the Dargāh of Nizām al-Dīn.

NOTES

3. Sayyid Ashraf Jahangir Simnani, Maktabāt-i Aṣṣaf, B. M. Ms. Or. 267, fols. 119r, affords evidence of the contacts between the Khwājas of Chisht and the Shaykhs of the Dehlī Sultanate at the close of the fourteenth century. It is clear that there was considerable Khāniqāh at Chisht during this period. By contrast I have not found any evidence that the Khānqāh continued to function through the fifteenth century. There is no mention of it in the descriptions of the topography of the Ferzat area in Khwāndmār, Mukarrām al-Abkāri, ed. T. Gandel (London, 1979).
7. Fawa'id al-salākin (Dehli, a.h. 1311), p. 35.
10. The nishāba Sanjari, almost universally applied in the subcontinent to Mu'in al-Dīn, is a misreading for Siyās—i.e. from Siyās/Sīsān. An identical corruption of the nishā has occurred in the case of Amir Husain, poet and compiler of the Fawa'id al-fa'ād.

The 'Urs of Nizām al-Dīn continues to draw very large crowds and is one of the highlights of the year among the local urban population, both Muslim and non-Muslim; it also draws visitors of all classes from distant parts of the subcontinent. Yet it is celebrated in a fashion which is in some contrast to the ritual of the 'Urs at Ajmer and in even greater contrast to the ritual at Gubarga, which is the Chishti shrine least open to modernistic influences. In all these shrines Sama' (listening to singing) is a very prominent part of the ceremonies, but at the two more distant shrines this does not completely overshadow the rites of pilgrimage, and the washing of the tomb and the renewal of the shroud. Moreover at both these shrines there is an attempt to observe propriety in the singing and the choice of singers, and in the admission of proper people to listen to the Qawwāls conducted in the presence of the Sajjāda-nashin. Though some more or less traditional Qawwāls are among the performers at

1. Nabīragān ('grandsons'), so called because they were the descendants of Khwāja Sayyid Muhammad, a grandson of Farīd al-Dīn who acted as Imām of the Khānqāh during Nizām al-Dīn's lifetime.
2. Hārūnī (more correctly Ḥārvanī), descendants of Khwāja 'Uthmān of Hārvan, Pir of Mu'in al-Dīn, and of Khwāja Rafī al-Dīn Hārvanī, whose mother was a sister of Nizām al-Dīn. In 1919 the family became extinct in the male line, but two women from it were still alive.
3. Hindostānī, the descendants of Khwāja Abū Bakr, the Muṣalla-bārdār (bearer of the prayer-carpet) of Nizām al-Dīn.
4. Qāzī-zādāgān, descendants of Qāzī Muḥyī al-Dīn Kāshānī, a Khalīfā of Nizām al-Dīn, who was also in some way related to him. Though the position of the great Chishti Shaykhs in their lifetimes depended on the military power of the sultanate and the great nucleus of population in the capital city, they never ceased to emphasise that the pursuit of the spiritual life was hindered by lack of solitude and the worldly concerns which pressed on them when they were in the proximity of the capital. Farīd al-Dīn as well as Mu'in al-Dīn, if one is to believe the testimony of the Siyar al-awliyāʾ, believed that it was not a suitable place for a Sūfī Shaykh to reside. One may feel today that such proximity does not aid the preservation of Sūfī traditions at the Nizām al-Dīn Dargāh.
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on the date of decease, this is a detail on which hagiographic sources are least likely to be in error.

16. As the name of Badr al-Din Ghaznavi has been mentioned earlier in the anecdote, it is possible that the second name may have been omitted not through reticence by Nizām al-Din but by the negligence of the recorder. On the other hand this may be a reference to the only surviving son of Qubq al-Din; whom Nizām al-Din regarded with disapproval, remarking once that this son bore no likeness to his father, and Qubq al-Din’s true offspring was Farid al-Din. This unnamed son may be conjectured not to have sought any portion of his father’s authority as a Sufi Shaykh.

26. Siyar al-auliya, pp. 281–2. This recognition of Burhān al-Din Gharib’s claims, the account of which bears the mark of plausibility, conflicts with that Shaykh’s own behaviour when, three years later, he was compelled by Muhammad bin Tughluq to participate in the forced migration from Delhi to Daulatabad. A staff, matching that which Naṣīr al-Din Mahmūd claimed to have received as tabarruk from Nizām al-Din was attached to the head of the palanquin in which Burhān al-Din travelled; Ḥamād Kāshānī, Aḥsan al-aqwal, Urdu tr. by M. Ḍabāl-Majdūd (Bombay, n.d.), p. 33.
27. Siyar al-auliya, pp. 236–47.
29. See also the account of the relations between Burhān al-Din Gharib and Naṣīr al-Din Mahmūd in Sayyid Muhammad Aqbar Ḥusaynī, Jawāmī’ al-kilm (Hyderabad, Deccan, Faṣl 1356), pp. 239–40.
30. ‘Afīf’s account not only agrees with that of Amir Khwurd, but also runs counter to the assumption that a greater share of tabarruk was and authority were transferred to Naṣīr al-Din Mahmūd. It shows that, in accordance with the general arguments of this paper, the actual influence wielded by Naṣīr al-Din Mahmūd, then accompanying the Sultan’s army on the march, reflected his proximity to the Sultan’s council.
32. Ibid., pp. 222–3.
34. Ibid., pp. 142–3; quoted with omissions and slight verbal alterations by Abd al Haq in Akbar al Akhyār, p. 59. [I am grateful to Professor Bruce Lawrence for drawing my attention to this passage]. Either a failure to make any disposition with regard to the tabarruk or a decision to have them buried beside him would have been in accord with Nizām al-Din’s disposition and behaviour, described in this essay, as he approached death.
35. Some support for the idea that this was a conscious decision of the Shaykh is given by Hamid Qalandar’s account of what occurred at the death of the next heritor, Naṣīr al-Din Mahmūd. The account, examined below, is unlikely to be true in all particulars; but it might well have been modelled on the true course of events at the previous transmission.
39. A feast held in honour of the Prophet’s daughter, Fāṭima, attended by women (Steinberg).
40. The word used is nihālca, meaning a stuffed quilt used as a bed-covering or mattress, with a detachable cover. If, as in the case of most modern Indian rathis, this was patterned, it would be particularly apt for service as a prayer-curtain.
41. Geṣdārāz had professed his allegiance to Naṣīr al-Din Mahmūd when he returned from the Deccan as a student, aged fifteen, about twenty years earlier; see Siyar-i Muḥammadi, pp. 3, 6, 10–11.
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42. The character and activities of Hamid Qalandar are examined in my 'Qalandars and related groups' (see n. 41 above). Hamid Qalandar's testimony with regard to one incident is rejected as less accurate than that of Gisūdarz.

43. Siyār-i Muhammadi, p. 5.


48. Siyār-i Muhammadi, p. 117; Ta’rikh-i Ḥabībī, p. 49.

49. ‘Abd al-Maqīd Ḥabībī, Ta’dīrīyī-i Muṣaṣṣīfīn-i Dehlī, ed. Shams Allāh Qādirī (Hyderabad, Deccan, n.d. (c. 1930)), text, p. 6; Rizq Allāh Muṣṭaḥqīq, Waqī‘āt-i Muṣṭaḥqīq, p. 26. By this time the idea that Dehlī was the true capital of India, possession of which or enthronement in which assured the legitimacy of the sovereign, was so entrenched in popular belief that it was repeated by European travellers of the first decade of the seventeenth century: cf. Hawkins and Finch in W. Foster (ed.), Early Travels in India, 1582–1619 (Oxford, 1921), pp. 100, 126.


51. Rihla, III, p. 156.

52. Sayyid Abū ‘Abdullāh, Khulasat al-ajzā’, Digby MS. 11, fol. 426; see Jawāmi’ al-kīlm, p. 143, for the continuance of ziyarat to the tombs of Qub-al-Dīn and Nizām al-Dīn after the ruins of Dehlī caused by the forced migration to Daulatabad, when many other graves fell into neglect.


62. Currie, in Cult of Mu’in al-Dīn, discusses the annual numbers of pilgrims, according to census figures and newspaper reports.


68. In the later fifteenth century Sultan Buhār Lodi of Dehlī is said to have seen Qub al-Dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī in a dream, encouraging him in his war with Sultan Husayn Shāh Shārqi of Jumnapur; al-Makki, Žafar al-walīb, ed. S. Denison Ross (London, 1910), I, p. 130.


72. See also p. 98 below.

73. In the Dangāh, inscribed dated structures or tombs are lacking in the period from 1198 to the reign of the Mughal emperor Bābur (1526–30); see M. Žafar Ḥasan, ‘A Guide to Nizām ud Din’s, Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 10, 1921, pp. 9, 10, 23–4. Structures erected from the reign of the emperor Akbar in the later sixteenth century down to the present day are numerous. Nevertheless the quotation from Muṣṭaḥqīq, immediately below, indicates that the Dangāh was frequented during the period from which there are no monuments.

74. Rizq Allāh Muṣṭaḥqīq, Waqī‘āt-i Muṣṭaḥqīq, B. M. Ms. Add. 11, 6333, fol. 31a; B. M. Ms. Or. 1929, fol. 31.

75. Bashir al-Dīn Ahmad, Waqī‘āt-i dār al-bukhārāt-i Dehlī (Dehlī, 1919), III, pp. 821–3; Žafar Ḥasan, ‘Guide to Nizām ud Din’, p. 6, writes, ‘The attendants of the shrine who reside in the village of Nizām ud Din and are styled Pirzādās are descendants of his sister.’