

Genesis of the *Suhrawardiyyah* Sufi Order in Medieval Bengal: Reflections on the Contribution of Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī

Mohammad Irfan Shah^{*}

Exploring the phenomenon of the emergence, growth, impact and status of the Sufis or Sufi orders in the (medieval Indian) society has been of crucial significance in understanding not only the intellectual history or spiritual legacy but the overall development of Islam in South Asia or the Indian subcontinent. Sufis and Sufi fraternities/Salāsīl/Orders have been considered an integral part of Indian society during the medieval period. The Sufis indisputably played an instrumental role in promoting and sustaining the peaceful, tolerant and pluralistic character along with the unity amid diversity in the society. In particular, their remarkable piety and religiosity, egalitarian approach and advocacy of love, peace, harmony, sympathy, philanthropy and unconditional service to humanity (irrespective of caste, colour and creed), left an indelible mark on the Indian religious and social history besides engraving everlasting imprints on the minds and hearts of the people. Given the significance of the multi-dimensional role(s) played by the Sufis and the impact thereof on the socio-cultural, political, economic and religious milieu of medieval Indian society, any attempt to understand the historical development of Islam in the subcontinent would be incomplete and partial without referring to the Sufis or the Sufi orders that flourished in the Indian subcontinent.

With this backdrop, the current study humbly attempts to explore the role, activities and contributions made by a prominent Sufi master, Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī, in medieval Bengal, engaging with the sources through analytical, historical and descriptive methods. Tabrizi spearheaded the process of developing the Suhrawardiyyah Sufi Silsilah/Order– the earliest Sufi Order introduced in the subcontinent–in Bengal as early as the 13th century. The study will endeavour to analyse the role and activities played by Tabrīzī in the social, political, ritual and pedagogical domains of 13th-century Bengal furnishing an essential link to understand the religious and social structure of the then Bengali

^{*} Govt. Degree College for Women, Pulwama

society. The work aims to contribute to the field of existing literature on Sufi studies in the Indian context.

Keywords: Sufi, Sufi Orders, Medieval India, Bengal, Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī, Suhrawardiyyah Order

Preliminary Thoughts

Evidence from the historical (epigraphic/chronological/hagiographical) sources amply attests to the profuse transfusion of Sufis (bearing affiliations with different *Salāsīl/Orders*) into various provinces of the Indian subcontinent in a gradual yet unremitting process concurrently with the rise and expansion of Delhi Sultanate. In this backdrop, the major Sufi orders like (the) *Qādiriyyah*, *Suhrawardiyyah*, *Chishtiyyah*, *Naqshbandiyyah* and others were introduced to proliferate and grow in and experience the multicultural and multi-ethnic environment of the subcontinent. An analytical study of the historical development of the Sufi orders in the subcontinent reveals that, usually, each among the major Sufi orders exercised an unrivalled influence over (a) specific area(s) in a specific period. Delhi, for example, experienced an indomitable influence of the *Chishtiyyah* Order and its activities during the Sultanate period and meanwhile, Multan and Uch emerged and developed significantly as the *Suhrawardiyyah* strongholds with unparalleled sway in the region. Though the *Suhrawardiyyah* fraternity could hardly make any substantial stride in establishing strongholds elsewhere as influential as Multan and Uch yet, this order spread to distant places of the subcontinent during the Sultanate period from the western state, Gujarat, to the eastern province, Bengal, permeating through the north-central region, Delhi up to the northern-most region, Kashmir. To study and analyse the role of the Sufi masters representing this order in these culturally and topographically diverse regions is credibly important for an overall understanding of the process of the growth, development and impact of this order, in particular and of Sufism in general, in the subcontinent.

In this context, apart from being considered the cherished centre of some prominent Sufi orders like the *Chishtī*, *Madārī* and *Naqashbandī* orders, Bengal has also been recognized as a significant centre of the *Suhrawardiyyah* fraternity in the subcontinent. The forthcoming section of the monograph will be an attempt to explore and analyze the protagonist of the *Suhrawardiyyah* Sufi Order in Bengal, who greatly promoted and proliferated this Order in this region.

Muslim Bengal: A Brief Depiction of its Political History

The medieval/pre-modern province of Bengal or Bangālah (as it has been referred to in the medieval chronicles) stretched over modern-day Bangladesh (previously, East Pakistan) including the Indian states of West-Bengal, Tripura and Karīm Ganj district of Assam.¹ With a long and chequered socio-religious, cultural and political history, the territory of Bengal has been either ruled as a unified/single territory or at times, divided into small provinces governed by multiple dynasties/rulers simultaneously. Having witnessed, since antiquity, an array of Jain, Buddhist and Hindu rulers intermittently, this massive territory, Bengal, began to emerge as a lucrative province for the Muslim (Turkish/Delhi) Sultanate with the onset of the thirteenth century. However, the Hindu/Brahmanical hegemony of Bengal² began to fade away only with the unpredicted inroads of Ikhtiyār-al-Dīn Muḥammad Bakhtiyār Khiljī (d.1206 C.E), a military commander under (Ghorid) Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak (d. 1210 C.E). He gained control of the capital and other major cities of Bengal by defeating Lakshman Sena (of the erstwhile ruling Sena Dynasty) in 1203/04 C.E. Bakhtiyār's successful military campaigns (between 1199 to 1206 C.E.) effectively initiated the process of bringing the whole province of Bihar and Bengal under Muslim suzerainty. However, after Bakhtiyār Khiljī's death, it took the Muslim rulers/governors a further two and a half centuries to annex this grand and fertile province completely.³

Bakhtiyār Khiljī, though, ostensibly ruled over the region (Lakhnawī or Lakshmanwatī near the current city, Gaur in Maldah district) as a regent of Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak but his installation laid the foundations of Muslim rule in Bengal. The successors of Bakhtiyār Khiljī, the Khiljī Amīrs of Bengal, though, ruled over the region while recognizing the supremacy of the Delhi Sultanate yet, repeatedly made rebellions against the central authority to declare their independence. Bengal remained under the control of the Delhi Sultanate intermittently mostly through the governors/*Wālīs* appointed by the central authority (Delhi Sultanate). Even the celebrated sovereigns/Sultans of Delhi like Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish (d.1236 C.E) and Ghiyās al-Dīn Balban (d.1287 C.E) personally went to Bengal to exterminate the ascendancy of Khiljī Amīrs, the successors of Bakhtiyār Khiljī but gained only an interim success while nominating governors for the province. Naṣīr al-Dīn Bughrā Khan, the son of Balban, having assisted his father in sabotaging the rebellion of Muḥīth al-Dīn Tughral Khan (the erstwhile governor of Bengal), was made governor of Bengal (between 1281 to 1287 C.E). However, he declared himself as the independent

ruler/Sultan (in 1287-91 C.E.) of Bengal in the aftermath of his father's death. His successors continued to rule independently until 1324 C.E., when the last ruler of this branch Ghiyāth al-Dīn Bahādur Shah was defeated by Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq in 1324 C.E., and was later nominated by Muhammad bin Tughluq as governor of the province (1324-28 C.E). Following an interlude of the administration by the Tughluq governors between 1328 – 1338 C.E., the independent Muslim Sultanate was once again reinstated in Bengal starting with the rule of Fakhr al-Dīn Mubārak Shāh and his successors (up to 1352 C.E). This was succeeded by the rule of Ilyās Shāhī Dynasty of Shams al-Dīn Ilyās Shāh (d. 1358 C.E) from 1352 C.E up to 1487 C.E, with an interlude of by Raja Ganesha (d.1418 C.E), his converted son, Jadu/Yadu (later, Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad Shāh) between 1414 C.E. to 1435 C.E. The Ilyās Shāhī rule was taken over by few *Habshī*/Abyssinian rulers (commencing with Bārbak 1487 C.E. and ending in 1494), who were slaves of the erstwhile Bengal Sultans and rose to such prominence in the court as to hold the sceptre in their hands. Sultan Alā' al-Dīn Ḥusayn Shāh eliminated the Abyssinian rule and laid the foundations of Ḥusayn Shāhī Dynasty that survived between 1494 C.E. to 1538 C.E. meanwhile, leaving Bengal under the governorship of (Afghan) Surī Empire (of Sher Shāh Sūrī) between 1532 to 1556 C.E. The Sūrī governors also laid foundations of independent dynastic rule like Muḥammad Shāh Dynasty (1554-1564 C.E) and Karrānī Dynasty (1564-1576 C.E). With the extermination of Dāwūd Khān Karrānī (d. 1576 C.E), the Bengal Sultanate came to an end turning Bengal into a *Ṣūbah*/province of the Mughal Empire.⁴ The central authority (Delhi Sultanate) could establish its absolute control over Bengal only sporadically and this region would often resort to revolts as appears from the reports of the medieval chroniclers (rather the eyewitnesses) like, Minhāj-i Sirāj Juzjānī and Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Baranī. In his *Tārīkh-i Fīrōz Shāhī*, Baranī disparagingly records:

*The wise and the experienced had called Lakhnauti [capital/prime city of Bengal] 'Balghakpur' (the abode of sedition) because ever since the occupation of Delhi by Sultan Muizz ud Din Muhammad Sam [Shihāb al-Dīn Muḥammad Ghorī– d. 1206 C.E], the governors who were assigned Lakhnauti have frequently rebelled, the reason being that Lakhnauti is a far-off region, and is a big and wide territory, and the way from Delhi to that place is beset with many hurdles. If the governor had not resorted to rebellion, the mischievous people have somehow misled him, pulled him down, taken over the country, and rendered him ineffective, as if rebellion has become second nature to the people of that region.*⁵

Bakhtiyār Khiljī and his successors—Khiljī Amīrs, acted as regents/governors of Bengal bringing the province formally under the control of the Delhi Sultanate (Ghorids, Khiljīs, Tughluqs, the Sayyids and Lodīs). From the beginning of Muslim rule, the governors would enjoy significant autonomy/authority and in the later period, often acted as *de facto* rulers rebelling frequently against the central authority. Thus, the control of the centre (Delhi) here was only intermittent rather than persistent and the province enjoyed the establishment of its independent Sultanate (though interrupted by the Central authority) to be brought under the Mughal suzerainty in the seventeenth century and absorbed in the *Ṣubah* (province) of Bengal of this grand empire. However, it is to be noted here that Bakhtiyār Khiljī's inroads (at the onset of the thirteenth century) could bring only a small principality under Muslim rule and it took almost more than two and half centuries for the subsequent Muslim rulers/governors to establish a full-fledged and mighty Muslim empire over the whole of Bengal. With the fall of the Mughal empire, Bengal began to be administered by the *Nawābs* and with the extermination of the last *Nawāb*, Sirāj al-Dawlah in the decisive battle of Plassey (June 23, 1757 C.E), the British Empire finally annexed this fertile territory as one of its provinces (Bengal Presidency).⁶ Later on, after the independence and creation of India and Pakistan, Bengal was divided into West-Bengal (India) and East-Bengal (Pakistan) and the latter, finally emerged as an independent country, Bangladesh, after the historic war of 1971 between the East-Pakistan (Bangladesh) and the (West) Pakistan.

With the rise and development of Muslim power, the province of Bengal, on the political front, witnessed many dramatic changes and periodic waves of peace and war. Meanwhile, the socio-cultural and educational setup of the Muslim community began to emerge and transfuse into Bengali society steadily. The spread/proliferation of Islam and Muslims into the province, however, was not an immediate effect of a single factor or cause. This was rather a gradual and complex process engaging mainly, the early trade relations and interactions with the Muslim community or Arab traders, the Muslim preachers especially Sufis and the degenerated religious/political and social structure of the caste-ridden Hindu-Brahmanical society. The establishment of Muslim rule also played a significant role in this process by facilitating the emigration of Muslim scholars/'*Ulamā*', Sufis, and preachers at a stupendous rate in addition to the promotion/patronage and establishment of religious and educational institutions seminaries/*Madāris* (sing., *Madrasah*) and *Masājid*/mosques. These factors played a significant role in building a strong edifice of Muslim culture and linking the society of

Bengal with the Islamic commonwealth/Caliphate. The Muslim rulers, immigrant scholars and Sufis acted, in their respective capacities, as the key figures in this process of promotion and transfusion of Muslim culture into the Bengali society in particular and the whole of the subcontinent in general.⁷ Annemarie Schimmel's analyses corroborate these statements by supplementing:

*For the largely Buddhist peasantry [of medieval Bengal] the advent of the Muslims meant liberation from Brahmanical oppression (in a certain way similar to the situation in Sind in the early 8th century); therefore the conversions took place on a rather large scale. In some areas, conversion to Islam was affected immediately on a virtually animistic society. As a logical result, Islam in Bengal remained for a long time mainly connected with the lower classes ... Here, as elsewhere, conversions were largely carried out by Sufis, among whom Jalal Tabrizi, the Suhrawradi saint (d.1244) played a decisive role.*⁸

To substantiate further, the observations of T.W. Arnold, in his much-celebrated work, *The Preaching of Islam*, appear to be relatable, as he admits, "it is in Bengal, however, that the Muhammadan missionaries [chiefly the Sufis] in India have achieved their greatest success, as far as numbers are concerned." For him, "the long continuance of the Muhammadan rule would naturally assist the spread of Islam." Substantiating it further, he relates that, in Bengal "Islam met with no consolidated religious system to bar its progress and "the Muslim missionaries were welcomed with open arms by the aborigines and the low castes on the very outskirts of Hinduism, despised and condemned by their proud Aryan rulers."⁹ Validating the statement further, Arnold quotes W.W. Hunter, who evaluates:

*To the poor people, fishermen, hunters, pirates and low-caste tillers of the soil, Islam came as a revelation from on high. It was the creed of the ruling race, its missionaries were men of zeal who brought the Gospel of the unity of God [Tawhīd] and the equality of men in its sight to a despised and neglected population ... Compulsory conversions are occasionally recorded. But it was not to force that Islam owed its permanent success in Lower Bengal. [Rather] It appealed to the people, and it derived the great mass of its converts from the poor [depraved sections]. It brought in a higher conception of God, and a nobler idea of the brotherhood of man ... [and] offered to the teeming low castes of Bengal ... a free entrance into a new social organisation [with a respectable status].*¹⁰

This evidence from the well-acclaimed Orientalists suffices to emphasize the role of the peaceful preachers (most of whom were the Sufis belonging to different Orders and patronized by the rulers), towards the rise and growth of the Muslim community in the subcontinent especially Bengal. The unequivocally humane, philanthropic, egalitarian, genuine and peaceful approach espoused by the Sufis, as reflected in their biographies, would have evidently produced a much appealing effect on the commoners, who would consider these saintly persons as the representatives of this (Divinely revealed) faith (Islam) and would naturally feel blessed to join their creed wholeheartedly. Unsurprisingly, as per the hagiographical records, the Sufis were often found to be visited by magnanimous public gatherings from among the Hindus and Muslims alike, a tradition that would even continue posthumously at their shrines/tombs.

With the emergence of Muslim rule, Bengal attracted many towering scholars, intellectuals and Sufis and became a permanent abode of many aboriginal as well as immigrant Sufis belonging to different Orders/*Salāsīl* (sing., *Silsilah*). This luxuriant province turned not only to be a hub of intellectual activities but also the domicile of many famous scholars and experts of the Sufi path belonging to mainly the *Chishtī*, *Suhrawardī*, *Madārī*, *Qalandarī*, *Naqashbandī* and *Qādirī* Orders. Apart from the permanent settlers, renowned bards of the medieval (Indian) Sufi world like Bābā Farīd, Makhdūm Jahāniyān, Sayyid Ashraf Jahāngīr Simnānī, Shāh Madār and others are reported to have been the visitors of Bengal. The most prominent and influential Sufis of Bengal mainly belonged to the *Suhrawardiyyah* and *Chishtiyyah* orders. Shah Jalāl Gujarātī, Shaykh Akhī Sirāj al-Dīn (born in Badā'ūn and died at Gaur in Bengal in 1357 C.E, and a disciple of Khwāja Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā'), Shaykh 'Alā al-Dīn 'Alā al-Haq (d.1398 C.E) of Pānduwā (the famous disciple of Akhī Sirāj) and his successor, Nūr al-Dīn Quṭb-i 'Ālam (d. 1415 C.E) and his successors have survived as the most famous immigrant and aboriginal *Chishtiyyah* Sufis of Bengal. Shāh Jalāl Mujarrad (in Sylhet) and Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī have been counted as the most influential and highly instrumental Sufis of the *Suhrawardiyyah* fraternity in Bengal.¹¹

The role of the Sufis in introducing and promoting the Islamic/Muslim identity in the medieval social, religious and cultural milieu of Bengal is of crucial significance. Even many accounts recorded in the hagiographical sources also allude to the direct engagement/involvement of many Sufis in the political affairs of this province. To discuss the role, contribution and activities of all these Sufis (belonging to different orders) in the socio-

cultural and religious history of Bengal is beyond the scope of the current monograph except for the prominent Sufi preachers representing the *Suhrawardiyyah* Sufi Order in Bengal (as will be discussed in the forthcoming section)

Emergence of the *Suhrawardiyyah* Sufi Order in Bengal

The *Suhrawardiyyah* order derives its eponym from the term ‘Suhraward’ – a town in Iran – the native place of Shaykh Abū Najīb Suhrawardī, the founder of this order. His chief successor/*Khalīfah* was his nephew, Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Ḥafs ‘Umar al-Suhrawardī, under whose aegis this Order developed and systematized profoundly gaining extensive prominence in the majority of the Muslim lands especially the Indian subcontinent. Some eminent and direct disciples of Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn – including, Nūḥ Bhakkarī, Sultan Sakhī Sarwar, Bahā’ al-Dīn Zakariyyā Multānī, Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrizī, Ḍiyā al-Dīn Rūmī, Nūr al-Dīn Mubārak Ghaznawī and Ḥamīd al-Dīn Nagawrī – introduced the *Suhrawardiyyah* order into the subcontinent. However, the prime and most instrumental promulgator of this order in the subcontinent was Bahā’ al-Dīn Zakariyyā Multānī, the illustrious disciple and successor of Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī. Though, the order spread to different regions of the subcontinent like Punjab, Sind, Gujarat, Delhi, Bengal, Kashmir, and Uttar Pradesh, yet, the prominence and centrality of this order remained circumscribed around its two main centres i.e., Multan (established by Shaykh Zakariyyā) and Uch (established by Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Surkh Bukhārī, a disciple of Shaykh Zakariyyā). The unrivalled glory of the Multan *Khānqāh*/convent was intact up to the period of Shaykh Rukn al-Dīn, the grandson of Shaykh Zakariyyā Multānī, while as the Centres at Uch rose to unparalleled prominence under the aegis of Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Makhdūm Jahāniyān, the grandson of Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Surkh. This order was unable to make any tremendous sway in the northern regions of India like Delhi (during the Sultanate period), owing to the activities and predominance of the *Chishtiyyah* leaders like, Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī and Niẓām al-Dīn Awliyā’ and their disciples.

Shaykh Bahā’ al-Dīn Zakariyyā Multānī undoubtedly spearheaded the process of introducing and promoting the *Suhrawardiyyah* fraternity in the Indian subcontinent. Through his spiritual heirs (disciples/descendants), this order flourished greatly in regions around Multan and Uch (Sind) and reached Delhi and many other places of the subcontinent. In Bengal, however, this order was introduced, not through the endeavours of Shaykh

Multānī or his disciples but, with the arrival of Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī, another direct disciple of Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawradī. Tabrīzī has been considered one of the most influential Sufis in the religious history of Bengal and has received approbation from most of the historians and hagiographers for his role in spreading Islam and introducing the *Suhrawardiyyah* order in the province.

Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī (d. c. 1226 or 1244 C.E): The Vanguard of *Suhrawardiyyah* Sufi Order in Bengal

Abū al-Qāsim Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī was a native of Tabrīz (one of the capitals of Ancient Iran/Persia, currently the capital city of Azerbaijani Province, in Northwestern Iran).¹² The sources are too scanty to reveal anything about his early life, except that he along with his father, were the disciples of Shaykh Badr al-Dīn Abū Sa‘īd Tabrīzī after whose death, he went to Baghdad and joined the circle of Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawradī. The hagiographical sources unanimously attest that with his devotion and dedication Shaykh Tabrīzī excelled over all other disciples of Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawradī in being dutiful to him.¹³ This has been substantiated by the hagiographers with an event, as per which, Shaykh al-Suhrawradī was considerably old when Shaykh Tabrīzī was enrolled into his discipleship and despite his being old, Shaykh al-Suhrawradī would consistently perform the annual *Hajj*/pilgrimage. However, due to ageing, he was required to take only warm/hot food, which was too difficult to arrange while on a journey from Baghdad to Makkah. In order to cater warm food, Shaykh Tabrīzī would lift a stove (*Dayghdānī*) on his head all through the journey to provide his *Pīr/Shaykh* with hot/warm food. This practice of Shaykh Tabrīzī, which he continued for many years (seven), undoubtedly reflects his magnitude of devotional and emotional attachment to his *Pīr*/master. The historical records suggest that Shaykh Tabrīzī accompanied Bahā’ al-Dīn Zakariyyā Multānī on the latter’s way back to India (Multan) from Baghdad. However, during their sojourn in Nīshāpūr, Shaykh Tabrīzī visited Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn ‘Aṭṭār (d. c.between, 1221–1230 C.E)¹⁴, the famous medieval Sufi bard, owing to whose awe-inspiring personality he was not able to recapture the image of his *Shaykh*, Shihāb al-Dīn Suhrawradī, in his mind. However, relating this to Shaykh Multānī, invited him Shaykh Multānī’s displeasure,¹⁵ for whom it was tantamount to disrespecting their *Shaykh*/master and as a result, both of them parted away in Nīshāpūr and reached Multan separately. Shaykh Tabrīzī left Multan after a short stay and finally reached Delhi, where he faced some troubles

(as will be discussed below) and finally moved to Bengal, which became his final abode.¹⁶

Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī's Sojourn at Delhi and Badā'ūn

Leaving Multan, Shaykh Tabrīzī travelled via Ajodhan and reached Delhi in the reign of Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish (d.1236 C.E)¹⁷, who was known for his extraordinary munificence upon and reverence towards the Sufis. Owing to the conducive atmosphere of the subcontinent and an appealing environment for spreading the religious teachings and spiritual guidance of Islam, during this period, the Sufis from the adjoining Muslim lands (especially Central Asia and Persia), would immigrate to different regions of the country (India) and most often, settle down permanently. Thus, it is most probable that Shaykh Tabrīzī would have intended to make Delhi his abode to familiarize the *Suhrawardiyyah* Order there and to enjoy the company of his cherished companion, the *Chishtī* doyen, Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī.¹⁸ While reaching the skirts of Delhi, the Sultan (Iltutmish), as reported by the hagiographers, having already been apprised of and overawed with the spiritual status of Shaykh Tabrīzī, went out along with his courtiers and religious dignitaries to receive him. Jamālī substantiates this by recounting that:

سلطان باجمع مشائخ حاضر بود، سلطان چون حضرت شیخ جلال الدین را دید از اسب فرود آمده بجانب ایشان

دوید

The Sultan went out (to receive him) along with the [band of] religious dignitaries, and the moment he saw Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn [Tabrīzī], he descended from the horse and ran towards him [to welcome him].¹⁹

The Sultan, after a formal reception and warm welcome, humbly requested the *Shaykh* to proceed ahead and himself (along with the entourage) followed the *Shaykh*, a fine reflection of his reverence for the Sufi masters and at this instance, for Shaykh Tabrīzī, who was lodged in proximity with the royal palace. Iltutmish's homage towards Shaykh Tabrīzī unveils both the Sultan's temperament towards the religious dignitaries (Sufis/scholars) as well as the indisputable status of the Sufi *Shuyūkh*/masters and their influence over the State in that epoch of medieval Indian society. However, the Shaykh's presence and his sway

over the Sultan exasperated Najm al-Dīn Ṣughra, the then *Shaykh al-Islam*,²⁰ who, from the outset, began to defame Shaykh Tabrīzī, though vainly, in his private conversations with the Sultan. Out of his jealousy, Najm al-Dīn made several futile attempts to dishonour and denigrate the Shaykh in the imperial court.²¹

At the very outset, in pursuance of the imperial orders, Najm al-Dīn had arranged for the Shaykh an abandoned house called, *Bayt al-Jinn* or the house haunted by the evil spirits/*Jinns*. Upon the inquiry of the Sultan, Najm al-Dīn justified this action on the pretext that it was to check the spiritual powers of the *Shaykh*. However, this was undoubtedly the first explicit exhibition of his envious impulses against Shaykh Tabrīzī and to his dismay, there were no signs that would signify the presence of the evil spirits or as pleaded by the hagiographers, the evil spirits/*Jinns* had already departed with the arrival of Shaykh Tabrīzī into the house. In his second attempt, Najm al-Dīn tried to discredit the *Shaykh* in front of the Sultan by accusing him of exhibiting uncalled behaviour towards his (*Shaykh's*) slave (who was a Turk lad, bought for 1500 dinars). However, his charges proved baseless and the Sultan warned him of meddling with the affairs of the *Shaykh*.²² Having been disgraced and aroused by jealousy, Najm al-Dīn finally devised the obnoxious conspiracy of charging the *Shaykh* with adultery and to execute this plot, he hired a disreputable *Maṭribah*/singer/dancer (girl), named Gawhar, for a sum of 500 *dinars*. He paid half of the payment in advance and the rest was to be paid through Aḥmad Ashraf, a *Baqqāl* (grocer/merchant), after the completion of the task. She accordingly blamed Shaykh Tabrīzī for having committed adultery with her and recorded the statement in front of the Sultan. This, finally, led Sultan Iltutmish to organize a *Maḥḍar*²³ (trial session) to investigate the charges levied against the *Shaykh*. Again, to execute his plot successfully, Najm al-Dīn, who mistakenly thought that the relation between Shaykh Tabrīzī and Multānī was not cordial, recommended the Sultan to invite Shaykh Bahā' al-Dīn Zakariyyā from Multan to preside over the *Maḥḍar*. However, to his dismay, upon Shaykh Tabrīzī's arrival (into the assembly), Shaykh Bahā' al-Dīn proceeded hastily to receive him and carried his shoes. Such an exhibition of respect would have bewildered everyone there let alone Najm al-Dīn Ṣughra. The Sultan questioned Bahā' al-Dīn on such a gesture and told him that it had turned the *Maḥḍar* into a futile endeavour, as Shaykh Tabrīzī was accused and Shaykh Zakariyyā was to preside the trial. However, Shaykh Zakariyyā replied that he (Tabrīzī) had served his *Pīr*/master (Shaykh Shihāb al-Dīn) for at least seven years with utmost devotion and thus, such an act was justified (on that ground)

and would not have any effect on the integrity of the judgement. The presence of the grand assembly of Sufi experts and scholars (at least 200) and their stately appearance overawed the (dancer) girl and she confessed her sin (of charging the *Shaykh* with false allegations) and disclosed the plot of Najm al-Dīn in front of the august gathering, which was also testified by the *Baqqāl*/grocer. The session, finally, led to the respectful acquittal of Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī and the disgraceful dismissal of Najm al-Dīn from the post of *Shaykh al-Islam* and Bahā' al-Dīn Zakariyyā replaced him as the new *Shaykh al-Islam* of the Sultanate.²⁴

The evidence from the relevant *Tadhkirah* works (hagiographies) and *Malfūzāt* (discourses of Sufi masters) provide a clear depiction of the envious/jealous, shrewd and haughty nature of Najm al-Dīn Ṣughrā. The author of *Siyar al-Awliyā'*, records that despite his cordial relations with Mu'īn al-Dīn Chishtī, Najm al-Dīn disliked the overwhelming sway and popularity of Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī in Delhi regarding which, he once even complained to Khwāja Ajmerī.²⁵ Plausibly, Khwāja Ajmerī lived at a far-off place (Ajmer) from the capital for which, he would hardly overshadow Ṣughrā's position in the capital and hence, Najm al-Dīn Ṣughrā had no hesitation in nurturing friendly relations with him. However, for Shaykh Tabrīzī and Bakhtiyār Kākī, the situation was different and their very presence in Delhi was perceived (by Najm al-Dīn) as a threat to his (Najm al-Dīn's) status in the imperial court.²⁶ Najm al-Dīn's behaviour with regard to the Sufis (especially Shaykh Tabrīzī) would also help in understanding the probable dichotomy between the religious (externalist) scholars and the Sufis.

This unpleasant experience confronted by Shaykh Tabrīzī obviously would have disenchanted him from staying in Delhi and in the aftermath of this *Maḥḍar*, as the sources report, he left Delhi for Badā'ūn and finally went to Bengal, where he lived the rest of his life. Ṣughrā's indecorous attempts had affected the Shaykh so gravely that upon leaving Delhi, he is reported to have remarked abjectly, [as narrated by Khwāja Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā' in *Fawā'id al-Fu'ād*]:

بعد از آن فرمود که شیخ جلال الدین تبریزی [قدس سره العزیز] چون در دلی آمد و بعد از چند گاه روان
شد می گفت که من درین شهر آدم زر صرف بودم این ساعت نقره ام تا بیشتر چه خواهم شد!

... Thereupon, he [Khwāja Nizām al-Dīn] said that when Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī [May God sanctify him] reached Delhi and left after some time, he said [while leaving Delhi], I was gold, when I came to Delhi, [but] now, I am silver and do not know what I would become [in future].²⁷

Subsequently, Badā'ūn/Badāyūn appears to have been comparatively comfortable for Shaykh Tabrīzī as compared to Delhi, as here, he received much hospitable and cordial treatment from its chief administrator, Qādī Kamāl al-Dīn Ja'farī. The Qādī was greatly impressed with the Shaykh's spiritual merit and requested Shaykh to enrol his son, Burhān al-Dīn, as his disciple and also received a *Kulāh*/cap from him (as a mark of blessings).²⁸ Having stayed at Badā'ūn for a transitory period, Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn left for Lakhnauti/Bengal and prior to his departure, he is reported to have converted a Hindu curd-seller (and actually a robber) of Katheir/Katihār (known for dwellings of highway-robbers) to Islam, who came to be called as 'Alī or 'Alī Mawlā. He gifted a handsome amount (about one Lakh *Jitals*)²⁹ to the *Shaykh*, who as per reports subsequently spent the whole of it in charity. Later on, Shaykh 'Alī Mawlā survived as the chief successor of Shaykh Tabrīzī at Badā'ūn and gained unparalleled fame in the town for his piety and spirituality. He is reported to have been invited to grace the turban-tying occasion/ceremony of Khwāja Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā' (at the completion of his formal education/course).³⁰

Shaykh Tabrīzī left Delhi for obvious reasons (as expounded above), but the reason behind his departure from Badā'ūn remains obscure owing to the unavailability of sources/evidence. However, it may be pleaded that the town (Badā'ūn) was already jam-packed with scholars and Sufis of great repute. Provided this, the town had the least appeal for a Sufi like Shaykh Tabrīzī, who would have been in search of a peaceful place (where his presence would not be felt apprehensive) without any annoying episodes as he had already left a place (Delhi) on facing an insolent charge from a religious scholar (Najm al-Dīn Ṣughra).

Arrival and Activities of Shaykh Tabrīzī in Bengal

The lifelong journeys of Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī finally ended with his departure from Badā'ūn to Bengal. Pertinent evidences from the sources corroborate that Shaykh Tabrīzī reached Delhi during Iltutmish's reign (r.1210-36 C.E) and thus, he would have travelled to Bengal not before 1210 C.E., (when Iltutmish ascended the throne). However, contending this

statement, the ‘allegedly contemporary’ Sanskrit source, *Seka Subhodaya* [*Shaykh Shubhodaya*] mentions his arrival in Bengal during LakshmanSena’s rule, which terminated with the arrival of Muslim commander, Bakhtiyār Khiljī (d.1206 C.E). Thus, as per this statement, Shaykh Tabrīzī might have reached Bengal not after 1202/03 (the year of the conquest of Lakshman Sena’s capital Nūdiāh).³¹ The account of *Seka Subhodaya* seems to be improbable as far as a multitude of references (contrasting it) from hagiographical sources are taken into account.³² Shaykh Tabrīzī, as per Rizvi’s statement (provided without reference to any source), lodged initially at Lakhnawti/Lakhnauti, where he established a *Khānqāh* with an attached *Langar Khāna*/public-charity kitchen in addition to appending few gardens and land to it. However, he did not stay there permanently and moved to northern Bengal, where he is recorded to have constructed a *Khānqāh* in Deotalla/Devatalla or Deva Mahal near Pandua. Here, Shaykh Tabrīzī, as per Jamālī’s *Siyar*, converted many people to Islam and the place, Devtalla/Deva Mahal came to be known as Tabrīzābād. As per Gītānjali’s analysis Shaykh Tabrīzī has been projected as an extraordinary ‘miracle making saint in ‘*Seka Subhodaya*’, and his miraculous feats are recorded to have appealed to a considerable section of the populace to accept Islam. Unsurprisingly, a section among the courtiers of the Lakshman Sena, as per Gītānjali’s assessment, though helpless before the Shaykh’s miraculous powers, would be found apprehensive of his proselytizing/preaching of Islam.³³ Many historical evidences including various religious structures/mausoleums, inscriptions etc., have testified to the stay of Shaykh Tabrīzī in Pandua. The Shaykh is reported to have acquired land, planted gardens and established *Khānqāh* with *Langar Khāna*/public-charity kitchen (open to all regardless of religion, caste and colour) in Pandua for the public charity. Owing to his charitable outlook, people would flock to his *Khānqāh* and *Langar Khāna*, which would have naturally inspired the local population to listen to his call/message (of Islam). Plausibly, such a philanthropic attitude, as has been a characteristic of Sufis, could be considered a well-founded reason behind (apart from other factors) the large-scale conversions attributed to Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī in Bengal.³⁴

The *Memoirs of Gaur and Pandua* provides a detailed account of the monuments/religious structures attributed at many places (in Pandua) to Shaykh Tabrīzī and as per its reports the Shaykh “acquired considerable property in Pandua and elsewhere in Bengal, e.g., Deotala [DevMahal], and this estate, which is known as *Bā’īs Hazārī* (twenty-two thousand), is still held by a *mutawallī* [care-taker] for the benefit of the *faqīrs* and the poor.”

Enamul Haq, in his *A History of Sufism in Bengal*, corroborates this assertion by maintaining that Shaykh Tabrīzī “purchased lands to plant gardens thereon and then he dedicated the property by way of “*Waqf*” [voluntary endowment for the public welfare] so that thousands of travellers and permanent residents of the place (*muqīm*) might be maintained.”³⁵ The presence of *Chilla Khānās*³⁶ apart from other structures like *Langar Khāna*, *Masjid*/mosque etc., as testified by these sources, strongly endorse the proposition that Shaykh Tabrīzī acted as a philanthropist, a dedicated proselytizer/preacher (of Islam) and a spiritual guide in Bengal, with *Dev Mahal*, as his primary stronghold.

The paucity of the sources has shrouded (a major portion of) the life and activities of Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī’s in myths, mysteries and legendary narratives with contrasting statements (related in the available sources) often leading to confusions and uncertainties. In this regard, the narrations of Ibn Baṭṭūṭah (1304-69 C.E), *Seka Subhodaya* and the *Memoirs of Gaur and Pandua* (by ‘Ābid ‘Alī Khan) confuse Shāh Jalāl Mujaṛrad (d.1347 C.E) of Sylhet with Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī. Ibn Baṭṭūṭah appears to have visited Shāh Jalāl (of Sylhet) but, he has erroneously mentioned the name “Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī” (creating a confusion thereof) and the author of the *Memoirs of Gaur and Pandua* is too confused while differentiating between the two and mistakenly asserts that both names/figures represent the same personality.³⁷ Likewise, his date of birth, arrival in Bengal and actual date and place of death have always been a point of variance and controversy among historians, writers and academicians. However, as per the mostly endorsed opinions, he died around 1225 C.E (though Ghulām Sarwar in his *Khazīnat al-Aṣfiyā* claims it to be 642 A.H/1244 C.E) and lies buried at Dev Mahal or Devtalla (in Pandua, Bengal).³⁸ Shaykh Tabrīzī would have left a considerable number of followers but there is a lack of pertinent sources that would provide any information regarding his followers/disciples or their activities in Bengal. Appositely, Rizvi based on the *Maktūbāt* of Sayyid Ashraf Jahāngīr Simnānī, asserts that:

A letter by Sayyid Muhammad Ashraf Jahāngīr Simnānī refers to Bengal as the chief Sufi centre in the Islamic world. He mentions the tombs of seventy important *khalīfas* [successor] of Shaikh Shihabu’d-din Suhrawardi in Devagaon, and refers to other Suhrawardi tombs in Mahisun (or Mahasthan), in the Bogra district and those of the Jalaliyya order in Devatalla ... it seems that the Suhrawradis mentioned by Sayyid Muhammad Ashraf were largely disciples of Shaikh Jalalu’d-din Tabrizi

and members of the Jalaliyya branch, which he founded, although no further details have survived.³⁹

Shaykh Tabrīzī's Mystic Outlook

The unavailability of any work (prose/poetry either written by or attributed to him or any of his successors) pertaining to the mystic ideas of Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī places a strong hurdle in deciphering his ideas/thoughts or attitude as a Sufi and a member of the *Suhrawardiyyah* fraternity. However, some insinuations from the above discussion may succeed in analysing and understanding his ideas.

The above discussion reveals that Sultan Shams al-Dīn Iltutmish warmly received and welcomed Shaykh Tabrīzī on his arrival to Delhi and treated him as a royal guest. Likewise, his friendly relationship with the local administrator (Qādī Kamāl al-Dīn) of Badā'un (as mentioned previously) suggests his friendly attitude towards the bureaucracy. This explicitly indicates Shaykh Tabrīzī's stance, in pursuance with the *Suhrawardiyyah* teachings, of cultivating cordial relations with the *Salāṭīn*/rulers or aristocracy.

Likewise, it also appears that Shaykh Tabrīzī, unlike the *Chishtiyyah* Sufis, would not despise money/wealth and would hardly feel any hesitation in receiving grants/gifts//*Futūḥ* (from people as well as bureaucrats) or acquiring wealth/property (like the *Suhrawardiyyah* Sufis). However, he would hardly hoard wealth as the evidence suggests of his keen eagerness in profuse charity, spending wealth (for the destitute and poor) and endowing lands for public welfare. Thus, he, on one hand, as a *Suhrawardī*, would acquire wealth/money and would not devalue it (as a worthless item) and on the other hand, in much accordance with the *Chishtī* norms, he would give it away in charity without bringing it under personal use. He would have adopted this (zealous) charitable disposition in the aftermath of his (transitory) association with the *Chishtī* leader, Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī.

The influence of *Chishtī* ideals on Shaykh Tabrīzī's mystic attitude is evident from a letter that, as per *Fawā'id al-Fu'ād*, he had sent to Shaykh Bahā' al-Dīn Zakariyyā mentioning that "one who liked to be in the arms of women [means marrying women], would never prosper" and had also mentioned that "whosoever was engaged heart and soul in *Day'ah* ضيعة [land, fields, and farms] ... he had become a slave of the world."⁴⁰

Pointing towards Shaykh Multānī (who was copiously endowed with riches) in this letter, the Shaykh appears to have expressed his point of divergence from the *Suhrawardiyyah* ideals, who espoused living a normal married life with (at least the required) material sources while being a Sufi practitioner. The letter seems to have been drafted by Shaykh Tabrīzī during his stay at Badā'ūn or Bengal and reflects the influence/impact of the *Chishtī* ideals on his thoughts, thanks to his association and exchange of ideas with Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī. The *Chishtī* model (of practising *Taṣawwuf*), which espouses extreme self-denial through incessant fasting, restriction on seeking (sensual) pleasure (through multiple marriages), disapproval of accumulation of wealth and association with the aristocrats, would have appeared more appealing to Shaykh Tabrīzī (who largely lived as an itinerant and was most probably a celibate) eventually dominating his mystic outlook. Hence, he seems to have been dissatisfied with a (Sufi) seeker, who would enjoy the pleasure of keeping wife/wives and living in affluence meanwhile being a *Sālik*/Sufi or aspirant of the spiritual path/*Ṭarīqah*. Though, the affiliation of Shaykh Tabrīzī with the *Suhrawardiyyah* Order could not be questioned on these grounds however, to overlook the glide/drift of his attitude/ideas toward the *Chishtīya* teachings/ideals would be hardly justified, while assessing his mystic ideas.⁴¹

The information (though scanty) furnished by the historical sources regarding the activities of Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī leads us to assume that the *Suhrawardiyyah* order would have flourished greatly under his aegis in Bengal (as also fortified by the above related *Maktūb*/letter of Sayyid Ashraf Jahāngīr). However, as mentioned previously, the unavailability of sufficient records/information about his successors/disciples makes it impossible to delineate precisely/accurately the impact and influence of their activities on the society of medieval Bengal. This shortcoming also places a strong hurdle in extending the (ongoing) discussion around the role of Shaykh Tabrīzī towards the proliferation of the *Suhrawardiyyah* order in Bengal.

There might have been a significant number of the Sufis belonging to the *Suhrawardiyyah* Order, owing to the early presence of the pioneers of this *Silsilah*/Order like Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī. However, their lives, activities/contributions are inaccessible shrouded in myths or legendary narrations due to the inadequacy of relevant sources of information/evidence.

Conclusion

Sufis and Sufi Orders have made significant contributions to the growth and development of medieval Indo-Muslim society and culture. Following the development and proliferation of the different Sufi Orders in Central Asia and Persia, the Indian subcontinent became a fertile ground for the germination of many prominent Sufi Orders that were introduced by reputed Sufi experts in different regions respectively. Among the major Sufi orders (like the *Qadiriyyah*, *Chishtiyyah*, *Naqashbandiyyah*, *Kubrawiyyah* etc) that flourished on Indian soil, the *Suhrawardiyyah* Sufi Order made a considerable impact on the society and culture of medieval India. With its primary strongholds at Multan and Uch and known for its peculiar features of establishing cordial relations with the *Salāṭīn*/rulers and living a balanced mundane life, this distinctive Sufi *Silsilah*/Order reached every corner of the subcontinent including the culturally and politically important region of Bengal. The chief protagonist of this fraternity in Bengal was undoubtedly Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī, who made significant contributions to the propagation of Islam, enrichment of Indo-Muslim culture, philanthropic demeanour, and sustenance of peace, brotherhood and mutual harmony in Bengal. Situating Tabrīzī's life and activities in Bengal as an ambassador of Islamic spiritual tradition in a proper context greatly helps in understanding the phenomenon of the preaching of Islam in medieval Indian society and also helps in estimating the role of the Sufis and Sufi brotherhoods in this regard.

References

¹ Richard Eaton describes Bengal Delta as “a flat, low-lying floodplain in the shape of a great horse-shoe, its open part, facing the Bay of Bengal to the south. Surrounding its rim to the west, north and east are disconnected hill systems, out of which flow some of the largest rivers in southern Asia –the Ganga, the Brahmaputra, and the Meghna.” See, Richard M. Eaton, *Rise of Islam and the Bengal Frontier: 1204-1760* (California: University of California Press, 1993), p.3 and fn., 1 on p.3.

² For a detailed account of Pre-Muslim political history of Bengal, vide, Ghulām Ḥusayn Salīm, *Riyāḍ al-Salāṭīn* (originally Persian compiled in 1788 C.E.), Eng., tr., ‘Abd al-Salam (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1902) [Henceforth, Salīm, *RS*]; R.C. Majumdar, ed., *The History of Bengal* (Dacca, Bangladesh: The University of Dacca, 1943), Vol. I; For an account of the analysis of the historical sources related to medieval Bengal, vide, Ziauddin Desai, “Some New Data Regarding the Pre-Mughal Muslim Rulers of Bengal”, in, *Islamic Culture*

(Hyderabad: The Islamic Culture Board, July, 1958), Vol. XXXII, No. 3, pp.195-207.

³Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Muḥammad Bakhtiyār Khaljī (d. 1206 C.E) was born in present-day southern Afghanistan in the Khalaj/Khilj or Khiljī dynasty—a Turkic tribe that had migrated from Turkistan to Afghanistan and settled there a couple of centuries prior to his birth. Reaching India, he somehow gained favour of Malik Ḥusām al-Dīn—an influential Ghorid minister/officer under Muḥammad Ghorī (d. 1206 C.E)—and after displaying his valour, Bakhtiyār was granted a grand territory along the borders of Bihar. From here, he continuously launched military campaigns and advanced to conquer Bengal and Bihar and for this enterprise, he received strong patronage/support from the Ghorid regime. In the aftermath of his terrible defeat on his Tibet campaign, one of his Afghani commanders named, ‘Alī Mardān, assassinated him in 1206 C.E., at Devkot/Deokot, Bengal.

For details see, Abū ‘Uthmān Minhāj al-Dīn bin Sirāj al-Dīn (Minhāj-i SirājJuzjānī), *Ṭabaqāt-i Nāṣirī* (completed in 1260 C.E), Eng., tr., H.G. Raverty (New Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint, 1970—originally published in 1881 C.E), Vol. I, pp.548-73; Muḥammad Qāsim Farishtah, *Tārīkh-i Farishtah* (Persian), Ur., tr., ‘Abdul Ḥay Khwājah, (Lahore: Al-Mizān Nāshirān-oTājirān-iKutub, 2008), Vol. IV, pp.626-31; Khwājah Nizām al-Dīn Aḥmad (d. 1594 C.E), *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*, Eng., tr., Brajendranath De, (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1927) Vol.I, pp.49-54; Salīm, RS, *op.cit.*, pp.58ff; Abdul Karim, *Social History of the Muslims in Bengal* (Dacca—erstwhile East-Pakistan: The Asiatic Society of Pakistan, 1959), pp.17-39; A’jāz al-Ḥaq Quddūsī, *Tadhkirah-i Šūfiyā-i Bangāl* (Lahore: Markazī Urdu Board, 1965), pp.47-49; Charles Stewart, *The History of Bengal* (London: Black Parry and Co., 1813), pp.38ff; JadunathSarkar, ed., *The History of Bengal* (Dacca, Bangladesh: The University of Dacca, 1948), Vol. II, pp.1-9ff; A.B.M. Habibullah, *The Foundation of Muslim Rule in India* (Allahabad: Central Book Depot, 1976), pp.56-62; Mohammad Mojlum Khan, *The Muslim Heritage of Bengal* (United Kingdom: Kube Publishing Ltd., 2013), pp.13-19.

⁴Minhāj-i Sirāj, *Ṭabaqāt*, *op.cit.*, pp.529 (fn., 4), 548-95, 610, 664-67, 762-70; Diyā’ al-Dīn Baranī, *Tārīkh-i Fīrōz Shāhī*, ed., ‘Azīz al-Dīn Ḥusayn, (Aligarh: Sir Syed Academy, Aligarh Muslim University, 2017), pp.41, 61-80, 280f, 293,333f and Eng., tr., Ishtiyāq Ahmad Zilli (Delhi: Primus Books, 2015), pp.49-66, 74, 80, 86, 140f, 277f, 288, 359-66; (Also see mention of Bangla/Bengal in), ‘Abdul Qādir Badā’ūnī, *Muntakhab al-Tawārīkh* (Persian, compiled in 1595 C.E), ed., Aḥmad ‘Alī (Tehran: Anjuman-i Āthār-o Mafākhir-i Farhangī, 1960), Vol. I, Vol. II and Vol. III (1959 C.E); Khwājah Nizām al-Dīn Aḥmad (d. 1594 C.E), *Ṭabaqāt-i Akbarī*, Eng., tr., Brajendranath De, *op.cit.*, Vol. I (1927), Vol. II (1936) and Eng., tr., B. De and BaniPrashad, Vol. III (1939), pp.414-444; AbulFaḍl bin Mubārak ‘Allāmī (d. 1602 C.E), *Ā’in-i Akbarī*, Eng., tr., H.S. Jarret, (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal,1891), Vol. II, pp.115-44; Farishtah, *Tārīkh*, *op.cit.*, Vol. IV, pp.626-40; Salīm, RS, *op.cit.*; Karim, *Social History*, *op.cit.*, pp.17-39; Stewart, *The History of Bengal*, *op.cit.*; Sarkar, *op.cit.*; J.L. Mehta,

Advanced Study in the History of Medieval India (New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 2016), Vol.I, pp.81, 120, 216, 260f and (2017) Vol. II, pp. 167, 248f; H. Blochmann, "Contribution to the Geography and History of Bengal (Muhammadan period)", in *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1873), Vol. XLII, No(s). 1-4, pp.209ff.

⁵ Baranī, *Tārīkh-i Fīrōz Shāhī* (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.61f and Eng., *op.cit.*, pp.49f. As per the surveys of Iqtidar Husain Siddiqui, the *Tabaqāt-i Nāṣirī* serves as the firsthand source of information pertaining to the accounts of the *Khiljī/Khaljī* rebellions in Bengal against the Sultanate of Delhi between 1229 and 1230 C.E. For details vide, I. H. Siddiqui, *Indo-Persian Historiography Up to the Thirteenth Century* (New Delhi: Primus Books, 2010), pp.93ff.

⁶ Vide references, fn., 3, *Supra*.

⁷ For details vide, Salīm, *RS*, *op.cit.*; Quddūsī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*, pp.39-61; Shaykh Muḥammad Ikrām, *Āb-i Kawthar*, (Delhi: Taj Company, 1999), pp. 297-329; T.W. Arnold, *The Preaching of Islam* (London: Constable and Company Ltd., 1913), pp.277-80; James Wise, "The Muhammadans of Eastern Bengal" in *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1903—compact volume containing issues, No. 1 of 1894, 1896 and Nos. 1 and 2 of 1898), Vol. LXIII, No. 1, pp.28-63; Refer to Chapter I of the current work for a general study on the factors behind the growth and spread of Islam/Muslims in the subcontinent.

⁸ Annemarie Schimmel, *Islam in the Indian Subcontinent* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1980), pp.47f.

⁹ Arnold, *op.cit.*, pp.277, 279.

¹⁰ Arnold, *op.cit.*, pp.279f; Wise, *op.cit.*; Arnold refers to, W.W. Hunter, "The Religions of India" in *The Times* (Newspaper), February, 25, 1888.

¹¹ For an account of Sufis of Bengal, vide: AbulFaḍl, *Ā'in-i Akbarī* (Persian), ed., H. Blochmann, (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1877), Vol. II, pp.216-24 and Eng., tr., H.S. Jarret, (Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1894), Vol. III, pp.364ff; Quddūsī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*; Ikrām, *op.cit.*, pp.297-329; S.A.A. Rizvi, *A History of Sufism in India* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1997), Vol.I, pp.199-202, 256-70; Muhammad EnamulHaq, *A History of Sufism in Bengal* (Dacca, Bangladesh: Asiatic Society of Bangladesh, 1975), pp.148-259; Md. GholamRasool, *Chishti-Nizami Sufi Order of Bengal* (Delhi: Idārah-i Adabiyat-i Delhi, 2009); Muhammad Ismail, *Development of Sufism in Bengal* (PhD thesis), (Aligarh: Department of Islamic Studies, AMU, Aligarh, 1989) and *Hagiology of Sufi Saints and the Spread of Islam in South Asia* (New Delhi: JnanadaPrakashan, 2010).

¹² The author of *SekaSubhodaya*, however, narrates a different story maintaining that Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn was actually from the kingdom of Aṭṭāva (most probably district Itawah/Etawah in present-day Uttar Pradesh) and had travelled extensively through Muslim lands before coming to Bengal. *SekaSubhodaya* (*The Blessed Arrival of the Shaykh*) is a Sanskrit work, revolving around the life and miraculous activities of Shaykh Tabrīzī, attributed to Halayudha Mishra, the chief

minister and chief Judge in the reign of Lakshmana Sena-r.1178-1206 C.E (Hindu ruler of Bengal, whose rule terminated with the arrival of Muslim commander, Bakhtiyār Khiljī). However, this work has been relegated as spurious, mythical and exaggerated fantasy with doubtful authorship by some modern-day authors/scholars (see for example, Karim, *Social History*, *op.cit.*, pp.12, 92f; GītānjaliDey, “The Imagery and the Representation of Shaikh JalaluddinTabrezi” in ‘*SekaSubhodaya*’ of Halayudha Mishra”, in *Proceedings of the Indian History Congress: 67th Session, Calicut University, 2006-2007*(Delhi: Indian History Congress, Department of History, Delhi University, 2007), p.403). Recently, some scholars like Richard Eaton, SukumarSen and Simon Digby have approached the work with a fresh examination, owing to which, it has gained a fractional credibility and has spurred the attention of researchers for further investigations concerning its significance and authenticity. This work, which is actually proposed to have been drafted around sixteenth century by many writers, has been translated and edited by Sukumar Sen. Provided the contrasting narratives (in comparison to the available Persian sources *Malfūzāt/Tadhkirahs*), questionable authorship and the legendary tales dispersed throughout the whole content, there remains a restricted room for considering this work as an authentic source of information in relation to the biography of Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī. Surprisingly, EnamulHaq in his, *A History of Sufism in Bengal*, with a paradoxical approach, constructs the whole biography and activities of Shaykh Tabrīzī on the statements of *SekaSubhodaya*, on one hand without referring to the generally recognized hagiological sources (*Tadhkirah/Malfūzāt* like *Fawā'id al-Fu'ād*, *Akhhār al-Akhyār*, *Siyar al-'Ārifīn*) and at the same time, considers the work with doubtful authorship and incredible data. See, EnamulHaq, *op.cit.*, pp.160-68; Karim, *Social History*, *op.cit.*, pp.93-95 and fn., 8 on p.93. For a detailed discussion on *SekaSubhodaya*, see, GītānjaliDey, “The Imagery...”, *op.cit.*; Vide also, Halayudha Mishra, *SekaSubhodaya* (Sanskrit), ed., and tr., SukumarSen (Kolkata: The Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1963) [as cited by Gītānjali, *op.cit.*, fn., 7, p.413]; Richard M. Eaton, *Rise of Islam*, *op.cit.*; EnamulHaq, *op.cit.*, p.160.

¹³ The author of *Khazīnat al-Aṣfiyā'* astonishingly ascribes Shaykh Jalāl al-Dīn's affiliation with the *Chishtiyyah* fraternity and considers him as the disciple of Khwāja Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī. This proposition, which can also be viewed in the *Tadhkirah-i Awliyā'-i Pāk-o Hind* by Akhtar Dahlawī, has been probably narrated by these authors on the basis of the close association between Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī and Shaykh Tabrīzī. For details, vide, Ghulām Sarwar Lāhōrī, *Khazīnat al-Aṣfiyā'* (Persian), Ur., tr., Iqbal Aḥmad Fārūqī (Lahore: Maktabah-i Nabawiyyah, 2001), Vol. II, p.93; Mirzā Muḥammad Akhtar Dahlawī, *Tadhkirah-i Awliyā'-i Pāk-o Hind* (New Delhi: Dānish Publishing Company, 1991), p.71.

¹⁴ For a detailed account of ‘Attar, vide, Shahzādā Dārā Shikōh, *Safīnat al-Awliyā'* (Persian), (Agra: Maṭba'-i Madrasah-i Agra, 1853), p.306 and Ur., tr., by Muḥammad WārithKāmil, (Deoband, UP: Ṣābirī Book Depot. Deoband, n.d.),

pp.213; Farīd al-Dīn ‘Aṭṭār, *Tadhkirat al-Awliyā’*, Eng., tr., A.J. Arberry, *Muslim Saints and Mystics* (Ames, Iowa (US): Omphaloskepsis, 2000); Edward G. Browne, *A Literary History of Persia* (New Delhi: Goodword Books, 2011- originally published in 1902), Vol. II [of compact volume I and II], pp.507ff; Asghar Daadbeh and Mathew Melvin-Koushki, “ ‘Attar Nisaburi”, in eds., Wilfred Madelung and Farhad Daftary, *Encyclopaedia Islamica* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), Vol. III; H.Ritter, “Aṭṭār, Farīd al-Dīn, Muḥammad bin Ibrāhīm” in, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 1986), Vol. I, pp.752-55; B. Reinert, “Aṭṭār, Farīd al-Dīn”, in , *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, Vol. III, Part. I, (online edition), available at: <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/attar-farid-al-din-poet> (accessed on , 24th November, 2020).

¹⁵ For a Sufi like Shaykh Multānī, such kind of act/state was not less than a sin. Since, in the spiritual path (*Ṭarīqah*), among the duties of a disciple towards his *Shaykh*, is that a disciple should devote himself completely to only a single/main *Shaykh*/master (at one time) and should not be overwhelmed with the spiritual calibre and status of other masters (at least, in the meantime his *Shaykh* would be alive). Though, one can visit and seek blessings, advices and formulas (for performing different litanies) from other Sufi masters/experts, but not with the intention of seeking their supervision (and considering them as one’s *Murshid*/guide). However, in Sufi hagiographies, there are ample reports regarding the reception of vicegerency/*Khilāfah*/authorization of various *Shuyūkh*/masters in multiple Sufi orders (like that of Makhdūm Jahāniyān and others as mentioned in the previous sections), such Sufis are referred to as *Jāmi’ al-Salāsil*. The reason behind this phenomenon is that such Sufis actually are bestowed with authorization, *Ijāzah*/approval of reciting specific litanies etc., and prescribing them to others, as a blessing or gift (out of love and reverence), only after they would have tread the spiritual path under the supervision of an acclaimed Sufi *Shaykh*/expert. To receive *Khilāfah* or *Ijāzah* in multiple orders hardly affects the original linkage or affiliation of the Sufi. For a detailed account of the *Shaykh-Murīd*/Master-disciple relationship, Shihāb al-Dīn ‘Umar al-Suhrawardī, *‘Awārif al-Ma’ārif* (Arabic), Ur., tr., Shams Baraylwī (New Delhi: I’tiqād Publishing House, 1986), pp.559-70; Abū al-Qāsim al-Qushayrī, *Al-Risālah al-Qushayriyyah Fī al-‘Ilm al-Taṣawwuf* (Arabic), Eng., tr., Alexander D. Knysh (Reading, UK: Garnet Publishing Limited, 2007), pp.403ff; Vide also, Marshall G.S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974), Vol. II, pp.214ff.

¹⁶ Hāmid bin Faḍlullāh Jamālī, (Persian) *Siyar al-‘Arifīn*, (Delhi: Maṭba‘-i Riḍawī, 1893), pp.106, 164ff; Amīr Ḥasan ‘Alā’ Sijzī, *Fawā'id al-Fu'ād* (Persian): *Malfūzāt*/Discourses of Khwāja Niẓām al-Dīn (Lahore: Malik Sirāj al-Dīn and Sons Publishers, 1966), pp.17, 303f, 427 and Eng., tr., Ziya-ul-Hasan Faruqi (New Delhi: D. K. Print World, 1995), pp.135, 223, 336f, 444, fn., 40 on 131, [Hereafter, *FF*]; ‘Abd al- Ḥaq Muḥaddith Dahlawī, *Akḥbār al- Akhyār*, (Persian) (Tehran: Anjuman-i Āthār-o Mafākhir-i Farhangī, 1963), pp.83-86 and Ur., tr., Mawlānā Subḥān Maḥmūd and Muḥammad Faḍil, (Delhi: Adabī Dunyā, 1994),

pp.101-05 [Henceforth, AA]; Muḥammad Gawthī Shattārī, *Gulzār-i Abrār*, (Persian) ed., Muḥammad Zakī (Patna, India: Khudā Bakhsh Oriental Public Library, 1994), p.56; AbulFadl, *Ā'in* (Persian), *op.cit.*, Vol. II, p.216; Ikrām, *Āb-i Kawthar*, *op.cit.*, pp.297-303; 'Abd al-Raḥmān Chishtī, *Mir'āt al-Asrār* (Persian), Ur., tr., Wāḥid Bakhsh Siyāl, (Lahore: Diyā' al-Qur'ān Publications, 1993), Vol. II, pp.162-67; Ghulām Sarwar, *Khazīnat*, *op.cit.*, Vol. II, pp.93ff; Salīm, *RS*, *op.cit.*, fn., 3 on p.45 and fn., 1 on p.97; Quddūsī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*, pp.113-32; Karim, *Social History*, *op.cit.*, pp.91-96; Enamul Haq, *op.cit.*, pp.160ff; Rizvi, *op.cit.*, pp.199f; Akhtar Dahlawī, *op.cit.*, pp.71-73; Nūr Aḥmad Khān Farīdī, *Tadhkirah-i Bahā' al-Dīn Zakariyyā Multānī* (Lahore: 'Ulama' Academy, 1980), pp.179-86; Sk. Abdul Latif, "Shaikh Jalal-ud-Din Tabrizi and His Contribution to the Spread of Sufi Influence in Bengal during the Thirteenth Century" in , Anup Taneja, ed., *Sufi Cults and the Evolution of the Medieval Indian Culture* (New Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research, 2003), pp.168-70; Arnold, *op.cit.*, p.280; Mohammad Ishaq Khan, *Biographical Dictionary of Sufism in South Asia* (New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors, 2009), pp.151f.

¹⁷ See, K.A. Nizami, "Iltutmish the Mystic", in, *Islamic Culture* (Hyderabad,: the Islamic Culture Board, April, 1946), Vol. XX, No(s). 1-4, pp.165-80; Jamālī, *op.cit.*, p.165; Nizami, "Early Indo-Muslim Mystics and their Attitude towards the State", in, *Islamic Culture* (July, 1949), Vol. XXIII, No., 3, pp.168f.

¹⁸ Narrations from *Fawā'id al-Fu'ād*, *Siyar al-Awliyā'* and *Siyar al-'Ārifīn*, amply attest of the close association among Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī, Bahā' al-Dīn Zakariyyā Multānī and Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī. The reports (of these sources) suggest of frequent meetings/visitation among them especially between Shaykh Tabrīzī and Khwāja Quṭb al-Dīn during the former's sojourn at Multan and Delhi. Obviously, there would have been exchange of knowledge, thoughts, ideas and experiences among them. Jamālī reports that once Shaykh Tabrīzī visited Khwāja Quṭb al-Dīn, who had organized a gathering of *Samā'* and it appears that Shaykh Tabrīzī had also listened to the *Samā'* along with the Khwāja. The existence of cordiality among the Sufi members belonging to different fraternities/orders, as in this and other cases already discussed previously, draws one's attention towards a significant corollary that despite their variance in ideologies/thoughts pertaining to some issues (like attitude towards wealth, mundane life, State and politics and *Samā'*) and ways/means of practising (self-purification) *Taṣawwuf*, the Sufis would foster friendly and respectful relations with each other. This also implies that apparently variegated, the Sufi orders are fundamentally same and lead to a common and single goal, i.e., reaching to the level of eternal felicity or attaining the pleasure of Allah through self-purification. Vide, for meetings between the duo, Sijzī, *FF* (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.185, 255f and Eng., tr., *op.cit.*, pp.234,297; Jamālī, *op.cit.*, p.166; Shattārī, *op.cit.*, p.56; Mīr Khuwrd, *Siyar al-Awliyā'* (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.50-52, and Ur., tr., *op.cit.*, pp.60-62; Muḥaddith Dahlawī, AA, (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.85f and Ur., tr., *op.cit.*, p.104.

¹⁹ Jamālī, *op.cit.*, p.165.

²⁰ The term *Shaykh al-Islam*, as per Brill's, *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, "was an honorific title in use in the Islamic world up to the early 20th century, applied essentially to religious dignitaries." Vide, *Shaykh al-Islam* in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, (Leiden: Brill, 1997), Vol. IX, pp.399ff; Nizami, *Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in India During the Thirteenth Century* (Delhi: Idārah-i Adabiyat-i Delhi, 1974), pp.159ff [henceforth, *SARP*].

²¹ Jamālī, *op.cit.*, pp.165-69; Muḥaddith Dahlawī, AA, (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.83f and Ur., tr., *op.cit.*, p.102; Sijzī, *FF* (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.245f and Eng., *op.cit.*, pp.287f; Shaṭṭārī, *op.cit.*, p.56; Chishtī, *op.cit.*, pp.164-67; AbulFaḍl, *Ā'in* (Persian), *op.cit.*, Vol. II, p.216; Ikrām, *op.cit.*, pp.298f; Ghulām Sarwar, *Khazīnat*, *op.cit.*, Vol. II, pp.94-98; Nizami, *Salāṭīn-i Dihlī Kay Madhhabī Rujhānāt* (Delhi: Nadwat al-Muṣannifin, 1958), p.121. [Henceforth, *Salāṭīn*]; Nizami, *SARP*, *op.cit.*, p.162-64 and "The Suhrawardi Silsilah and its Influence on Medieval Indian Politics", in, *Medieval India Quarterly* (Aligarh: Department of History, AMU, July-Oct., 1957), Vol. III, p.123 [Henceforth referred to as, *SSMP*]; Karim, *Social History*, *op.cit.*, p.92; Farīdī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*, pp.179-86; Rizvi, *op.cit.*, Vol. I, p.201; Khan, *Biographical Dictionary*, *op.cit.*, pp.151f; Quddūsī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*, pp.120-23; Enamul Haq, *op.cit.*, pp.162-64; Abdul Latif, "Shaikh Jalal-ud-Din Tabrizi", *op.cit.*, pp.170-74.

²² The account, goes in the hagiographies, like this that one day in Spring season, Shaykh Tabrīzī had offered *Fajr*/dawn prayers and was resting on his cot as usual, while his slave, a good-looking Turkic boy, was massaging his feet. Meanwhile, Najm al-Dīn performed with the *Fajr* prayers along with the Sultan on the roof of the palace, where from they could easily watch Shaykh Tabrīzī. He tried to charge the Shaykh with false allegations of not having observed the prayers (which the Shaykh had performed already) and instead taking pleasure in the company of the slave. However, the Shaykh was spiritually illuminated (as per the records and probably the salve would have informed him) about the bad intentions and he, at once lifted the quilt from his face and pointed to Najm al-Dīn saying, "had you come earlier, you would have seen me embracing him." Following this castigating remark, the Sultan, who might have understood Najm al-Dīn's purport of charging the Shaykh with false allegations, cautioned him in intervening in the affairs of the Shaykh. Vide, Jamālī, *op.cit.*, pp.166f; Rizvi, *op.cit.*, Vol. I, p.200.

²³ Literally *Maḥḍar* (trial) in Arabic is derived from *Ha-Ḍa-Ra* (to be present in a gathering or listen to or attend trial in a court) refers to "administrative record, report, memorandum, record of trials or "to be present somewhere (in a trial, meeting, gathering)" or court hearing and technically, it had been in vogue during the medieval (Muslim) administration in India referring to organize a gathering/assembly/panel of distinguished experts and intellectuals including scholars, Sufi experts, jurists, academics, in front of the ruler/Sultan/*Pādshāh* (in the imperial court) to discuss any important issue or consider/hear the charges levied against a person and pass on a final decree. See, the term, *Sidjill* in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, *op.cit.*, Vol. IX, pp.538ff; Waḥīdal-Zamān Kīrānwī

(compiler), *Al-Qāmūs al-Jadīd: Arabic-Urdu Dictionary* (Deoband, UP: Kutub Khānah-i Husayniyyah, 2011), p.184; Ḥabīb Khān (comp.), *Lugāt-i Kishwarī: Persian-Urdu Dictionary* (Lucknow: Nawal Kishore Book Depot, 1972), p.673; Maqbūl Baygh Badakhshānī (comp.), *Fīrōz al-Lugāt: Persian-Urdu Dictionary* (New Delhi: M.R. Publications, 2010), p.997; J.G. Hava (comp.), *Arabic-English Dictionary* (New Delhi: Goodword Books, 2008), p.129; ‘Abdul Ḥafīz (comp.), *Miṣbāḥ al-Lugāt: Arabic-Urdu Dictionary* (Delhi: Maktabah-i Burhān, n.d), p.160; Ḍiyā’ al-Dīn Baranī, *Tārīkh-i Fīrōz Shāhī*, Eng., tr., Ishtiyāq Ahmad Zilli (Delhi: Primus Books, 2015), p.130; Muhammad Salim, “Shaykh Bahā’ al-Dīn Zakariyya of Multan”, in, *Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society* (Karachi: Pakistan Historical Society, Jan-1969), Vol. XVII, Part.I, p.8.

²⁴Jamālī, *op.cit.*, pp.165-69; Muḥaddith Dahlawī, AA, (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.83f and Ur., tr., *op.cit.*, p.102; Sijzī, FF (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.245f and Eng., tr., *op.cit.*, pp.287f; Shaṭṭārī, *op.cit.*, p.56; Chishtī, *op.cit.*, pp.164-67; AbulFaḍl, *Ā’in*(Persian), *op.cit.*, Vol. II, p.216; Ghulām Sarwar, *Khazīnat*, *op.cit.*, Vol. II, pp.94-98; Ikram, *Āb-i Kawthar*, *op.cit.*, pp.298f; Nizami, *Salāṭīn*, *op.cit.*, pp.121-23 and SARP, *op.cit.*, pp.162-64 and SSMP, *op.cit.*, p.123; Karim, *Social History*, *op.cit.*, p.92; Farīdī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*, pp.179-86; Rizvi, *op.cit.*, Vol. I, p.201; Khan, *Biographical Dictionary*, *op.cit.*, pp.151f; Quddūsī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*, pp.120-23; EnamulHaq, *op.cit.*, pp.162-64.

The translator of Chishtī’s, *Mir’āt al-Asrār* has mistakenly and baselessly proposed that the person appointed as the new *Shaykh al-Islam* was a servant/disciple of Shaykh Multānī. See, Chishtī, *op.cit.*, p.166.

²⁵Sayyid Muḥammad Mubārak Kirmānī or Mīr Khuwrd (Khawāja Nizām al-Dīn’s noted disciple) *Siyar al-Awliyā’* (Persian), (Delhi: Maṭba-i Muḥib, 1885), p.54, and Ur., tr., ‘Abdul Laṭīf, (New Delhi: Kutub Khāna Ṣiddīqiyyah, 1999), p.64.

²⁶Here it should be maintained that Najm al-Dīn’s resentment for Quṭb al-Dīn Bakhtiyār Kākī, as is vivid from his complaint regarding his (Kākī’s) popularity with Ajmerī recorded in *Siyar al-Awliyā’*, could not lead him (Najm al-Dīn) to concoct any mischievous plot against Bakhtiyār Kākī, as he devised against Shaykh Tabrīzī. The most plausible reason for this was the reserved and indifferent attitude of the *Chishtiyyah* Sufis towards the rulers/*Salāṭīn* and their non-involvement in State/political affairs. Hence, for Najm al-Dīn, there were least chances of any influence or direct interference of Bakhtiyār Kākī that would undermine his (Ṣughrā’s) position in the imperial court. On contrary, Shaykh Tabrīzī belonged to the *Suhrawardiyyah* fraternity that endorses of nurturing cordial relations with the rulers. Thus, his association with the Sultan would have naturally been perceived by Najm al-Din Ṣughra as a situation that would jeopardize his authority and status in the empire. Vide, Mīr Khuwrd, *Siyar al-Awliyā’* (Persian), *op.cit.*, p.54, and Ur., tr., *op.cit.*, p.64; Nizami, “Early Indo-Muslim Mystics and their Attitude Towards the State” in, *Islamic Culture* (Hyderabad: The Islamic Culture Board, Oct., 1948), Vol. XXII, No., 4, pp.395-97 [No(s). 1-4, compact volume] and (Jan., and April, 1949), Vol. XXIII, No., 1 and 2, pp.13-21.

²⁷ Sijzī, *FF* (Persian), *op.cit.*, p.196 and Eng., tr., *op.cit.*, p.242; See also, Muḥaddith Dahlawī, *AA*, (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.83f and Ur., tr., *op.cit.*, p.102.

²⁸ The event attesting the influence of Shaykh Tabrīzī over the Qāḍī has been narrated in the *Fawā'id al-Fu'ād* as: Once, Qāḍī Kamāl al-Dīn is reported to have had an argument with the Shaykh on the observation of *Namāz/Ṣalāh*/prayers, following the Shaykh's remarks (conveyed to a servant) that "whether the Qāḍī knew the way to offer *Ṣalāh*" after he found him engaged in prayers. The Shaykh replied that there is difference (of spiritual state) between the jurists/scholars/‘*Ulamā*’ and the Sufis in their performance of *Namāz/Ṣalāh*, as the former perform their prayers facing the (direction) *Ka'bah* while the latter would not pray unless they witness the Empyrean/Throne of God (‘*Arsh*’). Though, the *Qāḍī* appears to have not been convinced with Shaykh Tabrīzī's assertion, but after witnessing Shaykh Tabrīzī praying before the Divine Throne in a vision/dream, he was completely swayed over with the Shaykh's spiritual stature. See for a detailed account, Sijzī, *FF* (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.401-03 and Eng., tr., *op.cit.*, pp.422f; Jamālī, *op.cit.*, pp.169-71; Ḥamīd Qalandar (compiler), *Khayr al-Majālīs: Malfūzāt-i Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd Chirāg-i Dilhī*, ed., K.A. Nizami, (Aligarh: Department of History, Aligarh Muslim University, 1960), pp.211f [Henceforth, *KM*]; Chishtī, *op.cit.*, pp.166f; Rizvi, *op.cit.*, Vol.I, p.201.

²⁹ *Jītal* refers to the copper coin used during the Delhi Sultanate alongside the silver coin, *Tanka*. The value of these coins depended upon the value of the metal in them. See, for *Jītal*, Minhāj-i Sirāj, *Ṭabaqāt*, *op.cit.*, Vol. I, pp. fn., 2 on p.584 and fn., 6 on p.603; Sijzī, Eng., tr., *op.cit.*, p.465.

³⁰ The conversion of this curd-seller (afterwards, ‘Alī Mawlā) has been narrated in *Fawā'id al-Fu'ād* in light of a miraculous act of Shaykh Tabrīzī, as per which, when the vendor saw the Shaykh, he was captivated by his graceful and radiant face and at once said to himself that “in the Dīn/religion of [Prophet] Muhammad [ﷺ] there are [still] people like him [Shaykh Tabrīzī] and embraced Islam at the hands of Jalāl al-Dīn Tabrīzī, who named him as ‘Alī’”

۔ ”...بر فورایان آورد۔ شیخ اور اعلیٰ نام کر دبا شد! مردمان ہم گفت، در دین محمد ﷺ اسن چنین ...

See, Sijzī, *FF* (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.227f and Eng., tr., *op.cit.*, pp.25, 272f; Ḥamīd Qalandar, *KM*, *op.cit.*, pp.191f; Jamālī, *op.cit.*, pp.170f; Rizvi, *op.cit.*, Vol. I, p.201; Muḥaddith Dahlawī, *AA*, (Persian), *op.cit.*, p.85 and Ur., tr., *op.cit.*, p.103; Ghulām Sarwar, *Khazīnat*, *op.cit.*, Vol. II, pp.99f; Quddūsī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*, pp.128-31; Akhtar Dahlawī, *op.cit.*, pp.71-73.

Khawāja Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā’, as per *Fawā'id al-Fu'ād*, recollects that one of his teachers, Mawlāna ‘Alā al-Dīn Uṣūlī (a reputed scholar), was bestowed with a *Khirqah* in his younger age by Shaykh Tabrīzī in Badā’ūn. With the blessings (*Barakah*) of this *Khirqah*, the Mawlāna became exemplary in knowledge and character. See, Sijzī, *FF* (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.278-80 and Eng., tr., *op.cit.*, pp.315-17; Quddūsī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*, pp.130f.

³¹ See for LakshmanSena's defeat by Khiljī, Minhāj-i Sirāj, *Ṭabaqāt*, *op.cit.*, pp.548ff, fn., 7, 9, on p.558 and fn., 1, 4 on p.559.

³² See, Jamālī, *op.cit.*, pp.165-69; Muḥaddith Dahlawī, AA, (Persian), *op.cit.*, pp.83f and Ur., tr., *op.cit.*, p.102; Quddūsī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*, pp.131-33; Karim, *Social History*, *op.cit.*, pp.93-95; EnamulHaq, *op.cit.*, pp.164f; Nizami, *Salāṭīn*, *op.cit.*, p.121; Rizvi, *op.cit.*, Vol. I, pp.200-02.

A‘jāz al-Ḥaq Quddūsī in his *Tadhkirah-i Šūfiyā-i Bengāl* on one hand accepts the general view of the hagiographers regarding the arrival of the Shaykh in Delhi i.e., not before 1210 C.E., yet, paradoxically, considers the Shaykh to have visited Bengal during LakshmanSena’s rule (by or before, 1203 C.E). See, Quddūsī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*, pp.132f.

³³ Jamālī, *op.cit.*, p.171; Shattārī, *op.cit.*, p.56; ; Ghulām Sarwar, *Khazīnat*, *op.cit.*, Vol. II, p.100; Gītānjali, *op.cit.*, pp.410ff; Rizvi, *op.cit.*, Vol. I, pp.201f; EnamulHaq, *op.cit.*, p.166; Quddūsī, *Tadhkirah*, *op.cit.*, p.133; Chishtī, *op.cit.*, p.167; M. ‘Ābid ‘Alī Khan, *Memoirs of Gaur and Pandua*, ed., H.E. Stapleton, (Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Book Depot., 1931), p.99.

³⁴ Shattārī, *op.cit.*, p.56; Chishtī, *op.cit.*, p.167; Ikrām, *op.cit.*, pp.299f; EnamulHaq, *op.cit.*, pp.166f; ‘Ābid ‘Alī Khan, *Memoirs*, *op.cit.*, pp.97-106; Akhtar Dahlawī, *op.cit.*, pp.72f; Abdul Latif, “Shaikh Jalal-ud-Din Tabrizi”, *op.cit.*, pp.174-76.

³⁵ ‘Ābid ‘Alī Khan, *Memoirs*, *op.cit.*, pp.99ff; Ikrām, *op.cit.*, pp.299ff; EnamulHaq, *op.cit.*, p.165; Karim, *Social History*, *op.cit.*, p.94.

³⁶ *Chilla Khāna* refers to a small chamber/cell for a Sufi to remain in seclusion for at least forty-days and perform spiritual exercises.

³⁷ See for details, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdullah ibn Baṭṭūṭah, *Al-Riḥlah*, Eng., tr., Mahdi Husain (Gujarat: Oriental Institute, 1976), pp.238-40 (vide, fn., 1-6 on p.238 and also, compare the dates of birth/death of Ibn Baṭṭūṭah (d. 1369 C.E) with Shāh Jalāl (d. 1346 C.E) and Shaykh Tabrīzī (d. c. 1225 or 1244 C.E); ‘Ābid ‘Alī Khan, *Memoirs*, *op.cit.*, pp.99ff; Ikrām, *op.cit.*, pp.301-03; Rizvi, *op.cit.*, Vol. I, p.202; EnamulHaq, *op.cit.*, pp.166f; Karim, *Social History*, *op.cit.*, pp.94 and fn., 5 on p.96; H. Beveridge, “The Khurshīd-i Jahān Numā of Sayyid Ilāhī Bakhsh al-Ḥusainī Angrēzābādī”, in *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1896), Vol. LXIV, No(s), 1-4 (1895), pp.230f.

³⁸ See, Jamālī, *op.cit.*, p.171; AbulFaḍl, *Ā’in* (Persian), *op.cit.*, Vol. II, p.216; Ghulām Sarwar, *Khazīnat*, *op.cit.*, Vol. II, p.101; Ikrām, *op.cit.*, pp.300-03; Akhtar Dahlawī, *op.cit.*, p.73 [as per Akhtar, he died in 622 AH/624-25 C.E]; Rizvi, *op.cit.*, p.202 [Rizvi is completely silent in this matter]; EnamulHaq, *op.cit.*, pp.166-68 [EnamulHaq discusses this issue at length]; Karim, *Social History*, *op.cit.*, p.96.

Jamālī and AbulFaḍl take his place of death as “the Bandar/port of DevMahal” identified with Maldives Islands, see, Karim, *Social History*, *op.cit.*, fn., 2 and 3 on p.96; H. Beveridge, “The Khurshīd Jahān Numā ... ” in, *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, *op.cit.*, pp.230f; H. Blochmann, “Contribution to the Geography and History of Bengal (Muhammadan period)”, in *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal [J.A.S.B]* (Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1873), Vol. XLII, No(s), 1-4, p.260.

³⁹ Sayyid Ashraf Jahāngīr Simnānī, *Maktūbāt* (Persian), compiler, ‘Abd al-Razzāq Nūr al-‘Ayn, Ur., tr., Muḥammad Mumtāz Ashrafī (Karachi: Dār al-‘Ulūm Ashrafiyyah, 2000), Vol. II, *Maktūb*/letter no., 45 sent towards Sultan Ibrāhīm Sharqī, pp.45f; Rizvi, *op.cit.*, Vol. I, p.260.

Estimating the number of his disciples would not be an easy task owing to the unavailability of the relevant sources/historical records. For a modern-day researcher it would be almost an impossible endeavour to provide even a cursory overview of his disciples (in Bengal) let alone a detailed account of their biographies/activities in Bengal. In *Fawā'id al-Fu'ād*, it is related that Shaykh Tabrīzī used to be reluctant in initiating people as his disciples and would allow only the capable persons to enter the fold of apprenticeship. See, Sijzī, *FF*, (Persian), *op.cit.*, p.55.

⁴⁰ Khwāja Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā' attests of having seen this letter, which had been drafted in Arabic. See, Sijzī, *FF* (Persian), *op.cit.*, p.172 and Eng., tr., *op.cit.*, p.223.

⁴¹ For a detailed discussion on the difference between the pioneering *Chishtiyyah* and *Suhrawardiyyah* Sufis with regards their attitude towards wealth, grants/endowments from the State, relation with the rulers, meddling in the political affairs etc., See, Nizami, “Early Indo-Muslim Mystics”, *op.cit.*, Vol. XXII, No. 4, (Oct, 1948) pp.387-98; Vol. XXIII, Nos. 1 and 2, (Jan and April, 1949) pp.13-21; Vol. XIII, No. 3 (July, 1949), pp.162-70; Vol. XIII, No. 4 (Oct., 1949), pp.309-12 and Vol. XXIV, No. 1, (Jan, 1950), pp.51-60; Nizami, *State and Culture in Medieval India* (New Delhi: Adam Publishers and Distributors, 1985), pp.179-202.