

JAWĀNMARDĪ IN THE WRITINGS OF ‘AYN AL-QUḌĀT*

Mohammed Rustom*

College of the Humanities, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada

Abstract. This article investigates the multi-dimensional presence of the important Persian Sufi concept of *jawānmardī* or chivalry in the writings of the famous 6th/12th century metaphysician, martyr, and mystic ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt Hamadānī (d. 525/1131). The piece begins by situating *jawānmardī* vis-à-vis its Arabic Sufi equivalent of *futuwwa*, both of which convey a wide range of spiritual perfections ranging from wisdom and detachment to justice and pure generosity. The specifically Persianate emphasis on *jawānmardī* as also and most importantly denoting the ideal type of lover of God then informs the remainder of our inquiry. It will consequently be shown how, in the writings of such an influential figure as ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt, *jawānmardī* is most prominently featured in three distinctive modes: as an aspirational ideal, as a realized concept, and as the key to unlock the mystery of one of the greatest of chevaliers, namely Iblīs.

Hundreds of thousands of spirits did God put into the clear,
But the one who cannot see this, how is he a chevalier?

(Rūmī 1925–1940, 2:893).¹

Keywords: ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt, Persian Sufism, Chivalry, Iblīs, Love, Sacrifice, Aspiration.

Corresponding Author: Mohammed Rustom, College of the Humanities, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, e-mail: MohammedRustom@cunet.carleton.ca

Received: 21 September 2022; **Accepted:** 2 December 2022; **Published:** 25 January 2023.

1. Introduction

Our epigraph from the *Mathnawī* of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī (d. 672/1273) draws on a stock Sufi image, that of the chevalier or *jawānmard*. This Persian term is identical to the Arabic *fatā*, which can be translated as “young man” or “chivalrous youth.” The latter derives from ones of its plurals, *fitya*, mentioned in Qur’an 18:13 (Nasr et al. 2015, 733–734) and which is also the basis of the key Arabic Sufi expression *futuwwa*. The Persian equivalent of *futuwwa* is *jawānmardī* (chivalry), the complex history of which has been thoroughly documented by Lloyd Ridgeon (2010 and 2011, 1–21) and its theoretical underpinnings extensively investigated by Cyrus Zargar (2017, chapter 8; see also Mahjub 1999).

Jawānmardī denotes such ethical perfections as pure generosity, the control of one’s sexual appetite, self-sacrifice, patience, and mercy. It also implies a kind of manliness (*muruwwa*) and spiritual bravery on the one hand (Zargar 2017, 221), and complete detached action on the other (Nasr 2007, 87–89). The prototype of the chevalier

* An earlier version of this paper appeared in *Journal of Islamic Ethics* 4, nos. 1–2 (2020): 25–37.

¹ Lit., “Hundreds of thousands of spirits did God manifest openly / But what kind of chivalry is it, if this one cannot see?” All translations from Sufi texts are my own, whereas those from the Qur’an are taken and occasionally modified from Nasr et al. 2015.

is of course ‘Alī, about whom the Prophet said, “There is no chivalrous youth other than ‘Alī” (Mahjub 1999, 554). ‘Alī is legendary for the manner in which his everyday interactions were punctuated by sagacity, moral uprightness, and a lack of self-interest (see Sajjadi 2011 and Shah-Kazemi 2006). His spiritual valor is on full display in the famous story, so beautifully retold in the *Mathnawī*, wherein his opponent in battle spits at him just as ‘Alī is about to kill him. With the possibility of personal animosity now introduced into the equation, ‘Alī withdraws and then explains to his puzzled enemy that he only acts for the sake of God, and not for his own sake (see Nasr 2007, 87–88).

This story also sheds light on the epigraph since it points up how the true *jawānmard* or chevalier always sees God behind the illusion of the myriad forms and even emotions which are constitutive of our earthly lives: ‘Alī could never act for himself precisely because all that he wishes to see, feel, and act for is God. In Persianate Sufism the chivalry of ‘Alī and others became a major referent in the 5th/11th century, particularly as seen in the teachings of the Sufi master Abū l-Ḥasan Kharāqānī (d. 425/1033) who placed a premium on the spiritual nature of *jawānmardī* (Ridgeon 2010: 46–51). Then, in the 6th/12th century, *jawānmardī* was increasingly defined vis-à-vis the doctrines and practices of the Persian school of passionate love (*madhhab-i ‘ishq*) (for which, see Lewisohn 2015, 152–173). It consequently came to denote, as William Chittick observes, “the ideal lover of God” (Chittick 2013, xxii).

Among the Persian Sufi authors of this time period, none devoted as much attention to *jawānmardī* as the profound mystic-philosopher ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt Hamadānī (d. 525/1131) (for his life and thought, see Rustom 2023). The concept of chivalry is like the lifeblood that animates the entire body of his writings. This is perhaps best evidenced with reference to three foci in particular: the manner in which ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt frames chivalry as an aspirational ideal for his students, alludes to and even demonstrates his own realized state of chivalry, and recounts a most perfect example of chivalry as embodied in Iblīs’s tragic life of love and loss.

2. Aspiration

As a Sufi master, legal judge, and scholar of scholastic theology ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt had a wide variety of students who would come knocking at this door. His many written responses to his inquirers’ questions have been preserved in the form of nearly 160 letters, which are collectively referred to as the *Nāma-hā* (see introduction in Rustom 2023). In many of these letters, our author turns his attention to his own spiritual disciples in particular, offering them a good deal of advice on how to live an inner life that is punctuated by the constant remembrance of God and the preparation for death (Rustom 2023, chapter 2). One of the hallmarks of chivalry is generosity, and for ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt the best display of it is by way of charity (*ṣadaqa*) (Rustom 2018, 65). One typical statement from his letters shall suffice:

Every day, set aside some of your own wealth, and give it away for the sake of God. Knowing that it is for the sake of God, set aside however much you wish (‘Ayn al-Quḏāt 1998, 1:114).

‘Ayn al-Quḏāt often addresses any given student as a *jawānmard*, using the exclamatory Persian expression *jawānmardā* or “O chevalier!”

O chevalier! The science of inheritance [*mīrāth*] is wayfaring [*sulūk*], not the inheritance from mother and father (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 1:225).

You say, “Can I perceive knowledge of God through the proof of the intellect?” O chevalier! The one who cannot know Him, how can he get there with the intellect? Nobody knows Him, and one does not reach the reality of faith until he sees all people as gathered in the Essence of God. What you know is not recognition [*ma’rifat*] of God. So have etiquette! (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 1:92–93).

Hypocrites are one thing, and lovers quite another! To which group do you belong? *Wavering between this [and that], being neither for one group nor for the other* [4:143]. O chevalier! If you fear the sultan more than you fear the Master, then you are still a hypocrite! (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 1:46–47).²

O chevalier! The Qur’an has been sent to people in as many as a thousand veils. If the majesty of the dot of the *bā’* of the *basmala* were to come upon the Throne or the heavens and the earth, they would be crushed and melted immediately. *Had We made this Qur’an descend upon a mountain, you would have seen it humbled, rent asunder by the fear of God* [59:21] also has this meaning (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1994, 173).

In calling his students chevaliers, ‘Ayn al-Qudāt is conforming to a practice common among some of the major Persian Sufi authors contemporaneous with him (see Chittick 2013, *passim*). These masters would refer to their audience as chevaliers in order to call their attention to realizing their potential as lovers of God, which, like *futuwwa*, would also entail their coming to embody “perfect virtue, wisdom, generosity, kindness, and compassion” (Chittick 2013, xxii).

In other contexts, ‘Ayn al-Qudāt uses a synonym for chevaliers, namely *mardān* or “men.”

If you come out of your self before death, you will see everything. But if not, then at its proper time—at the time of death—you will know: “*Now We have removed from you your cover; so today your sight is piercing!*” [50:22]. One must be of the quality of ‘Alī so that he can say, “Were the cover lifted, I would not increase in certainty.”³ Unveiling [*kashf*] comes about through sandal-service [*khidmat-i kafshī*]⁴ to the men, not through service at the court of the sultan! (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 2:388–389).

The men know with certainty that the most important and most obligatory of obligations is the recognition of God and His qualities. (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 2:254).

‘Ayn al-Qudāt of course does not understand these “men” as males per se, and at any rate he expresses great admiration for the spiritual accomplishments of some of the major

² For ‘Ayn al-Qudāt’s critique of worldly leaders, see Rustom 2018 and Safi 2006, 182ff.

³ This saying is less commonly ascribed to other early Sufi figures. See, for example, Sarrāj 1914, 70.

⁴ For ‘Ayn al-Qudāt’s teachings on sandal-service, see Rustom 2023, chapter 2.

female Sufi figures who came before him (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1962a, 25).⁵ When speaking of the men, he wants to contrast them with those whom he calls *nā-mardān*, that is, non-men or wimps. These wimps are best characterized as being bound by their habitual attachment⁶ to this world and their own sense of selfhood:

You have been content with false habit! The path of men who tear the idols of habit to pieces is one thing, and the path of effeminate, wimps, and false claimants who take the idols of habit as their objects of worship is quite another! (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 1:225).

The wimps are wimps precisely because they do not have the spiritual virility to pursue the life of single-minded devotion to and love for the divine. They are bound by the idols of their own habits and serve these idols rather than God. Since they are unfit to walk the path of love, they receive another designation of blame which again stands in stark contrast to chivalry, namely faint-heartedness (*bad-dilī*): “O friend! You are a self-lover, but trading cannot be done with faint-heartedness!” (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 1:123).

3. Realization

While ‘Ayn al-Qudāt wishes to alert his audience to the ideals of chivalry, he also provides them with many hands-on examples of what a chevalier is supposed to know, do, and say. How does he do this? By citing himself as a case in point:

Alas! Whoever wants to hear of the divine mysteries without an intermediary, say, “Hear it from ‘Ayn al-Qudāt” (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1994, 300).

O chevalier! That which I know, you will never know! (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 3:279).

O chevalier! 80,000 worlds have been created, and the lowest of all of the worlds is the world of bodies. These other worlds are not bodies at all. By the majesty and worth of the Beginningless, I have had a vision many times about how bodies should be in existence. People have come from another path, and you are knocking at another door! (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 1:88).

O dear friend! On the path to God, I have seen it all.... Without doubt, you do not know because you have not arrived. I know, because I have arrived. (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 2:25).

In other instances, we can read between the lines and see chivalry on full display in ‘Ayn al-Qudāt’s life and writings. We know, for example, that when he was unjustly charged and then sentenced to death for external causes that were purely political in nature (see Safi 2006, chapter 6), he welcomed his fate with open arms (Rustom 2018, 55–56 and 67–68). As has been shown elsewhere (Rustom 2018), the subterfuge involved in

⁵ Fine examples of realized Sufi women in classical and contemporary Sufism can be found in Geoffroy 2020, chapters 7–9 and Sargut 2018.

⁶ For ‘Ayn al-Qudāt’s critique of habit (*‘ādāt*), see Rustom 2023, chapters 6 and 10.

bringing ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt to his death explains only one dimension of a much more complex set of circumstances and causes related to his demise.

The other cause was a directly vertical one, which ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt himself identified with what is known as the divine jealousy (*ghayrat*). This jealousy does not allow for the disclosure of the secret of God’s lordship (*sirr-i rubūbiyya*) except that the one revealing it pay for it with his life (see Rustom 2018). The sage of Hamadan was perfectly aware of the consequences of his revealing the secret of God’s lordship, which he discusses at great length in his writings, particularly in his magnum opus the *Tamhīdāt* (“Paving the Path”) (see Rustom 2023, chapter 10). Like a true chevalier, ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt must speak about the true nature of God’s oneness and the reality of faith (*īmān*) and unbelief (*kufr*), regardless of the consequences:

Alas! What boldness I have to speak these words which cannot be contained in this world or that world! But I shall speak, come what may! (‘Ayn al-Quḍāt 1994, 209).

Although on account of this discussion my blood will be spilt, I have no care and I shall speak, come what may! (‘Ayn al-Quḍāt 1994, 266).

You think that being killed on the path of God comes as an affliction or is an affliction? No, in our path being killed is life! What do you say? Does one not love to give his life?! (‘Ayn al-Quḍāt 1994, 235).

‘Ayn al-Quḍāt naturally never refers to himself as a chevalier. Only three persons are given that honor in his writings. The first of them is none other than the great Sufi martyr al-Ḥallāj (d. 309/922), whose famous ecstatic utterance “I am the Real!” (see Sells 1996, 277) is itself proof of his chivalry:

O chevalier! In the grasp of the recognizer [*‘arīf*], the seven heavens and the earth are paltry. If he should say “I am the Real!,” excuse him! (‘Ayn al-Quḍāt 1998, 1:113).

When a madman says that a drop in the ocean is to be called the ocean itself, it is just like when that chevalier said, “I am the Real!” He too should be excused! (‘Ayn al-Quḍāt 1994, 340).

4. Iblīs

The other two chevaliers in ‘Ayn Al-Quḍāt’s writings are the Prophet Muḥammad and Iblīs. This is a point that our author cites as originating from al-Ḥallāj’s *Kitāb al-Ṭawāsīn* (partially translated in Sells 1996, 272–280), and which he discusses on two separate occasions. The most detailed of them is as follows:

Al-Ḥallāj said, “Chivalry [*futuwwa*] is not fitting, except for Aḥmad and Iblīs.”⁷ Alas! What do you hear? He said, “Chivalry is appropriate for two persons: Aḥmad and Iblīs.” “Chevalier” and “arrived man” pertain to these

⁷ Cf. Sells 1996, 273. For Aḥmad as one of the Prophet’s honorific names, see Nasr et al. 2015, 1366.

two. The others are nothing but children on the path! (‘Ayn al-Quḏāt 1994, 223).

In his writings the sage of Hamadan devotes much of his attention to the person and reality of the Prophet (see Rustom 2017). When it comes to his chivalry, ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt explicates it in all but name with reference to many aspects of his worldview, particularly his metaphysics of light, cosmology, epistemology, aesthetic theory, and doctrine of divine Self-love (see Rustom 2023, *passim*).

The chivalry of Iblīs is much less obvious, which is one of the reasons why ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt develops his Satanology from so many different angles. Before moving in that direction, some comments are in order concerning the Sufī defence of Iblīs. It is based in the first instance on a reading of such Qur’anic verses as 2:34 (*et passim*), wherein God asks the angels to prostrate to Adam. Iblīs, who at this point in the Qur’anic narrative is not yet “Satan” and who in Qur’an 18:50 is referred to as being among the Jinn, refuses to comply. Iblīs is then shunned from the divine Presence and becomes an enemy of God (see Lory 2018).

Needless to say, Sufis such as al-Ḥallāj and ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt’s own Sufī master Aḥmad Ghazālī (d. 520/1126) saw Iblīs’ refusal to bow to anyone other than God as an expression of the highest form of monotheism and love for God. ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt also enters into this conversation and develops the *tawḥīd-i Iblīs* (“monotheism of Iblīs”) motif in greater detail, and with more ingenuity and creativity, than any other author in the Islamic tradition. For example, he brings the figure of Iblīs to bear on his philosophical and theological views, demonstrating how Iblīs’ person and function are inextricably related to his theodicy and doctrine of human agency (Rustom 2020). But when it comes to the question of Iblīs’ chivalry, ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt maintains that it can best be seen in light of his tragic story, which is one of perfection, love, and even comfort for those who are familiar with its details:

O chevalier! If *unto Moses God spoke directly* [4:164] is perfection, then Iblīs is of this perfection! (‘Ayn al-Quḏāt 1998, 1:96).

O chevalier! That place where Iblīs is, you do not have a way to it. So how can you get to this country? (‘Ayn al-Quḏāt 1998, 1:97).

There is only one of my friends who can listen to a part of his tale. So who would dare tell it, and who would dare hear it?! (‘Ayn al-Quḏāt 1998, 2:417).

If someone in existence knew to listen to the story of Iblīs, especially its mysteries, his story would be extremely dear to him (‘Ayn al-Quḏāt 1998, 2:416).

Because Iblīs refused to bow to anyone other than God, his love for his Beloved was pure and uncontaminated. In a different context, ‘Ayn al-Quḏāt explains what this type of love is with reference to the attraction of iron to a magnet:

If the iron is pure, the magnet will entirely attract the iron towards itself, with nothing to divert the iron’s pursuit of the magnet. But if the iron is mixed with some gold, silver, or the like, this will compromise its attraction towards the

magnet. Likewise, whenever the iron is not contaminated by something else, its fully actualized pursuit after the magnet will ensue. It is then that finding—namely the iron’s arrival at the magnet—will necessarily occur (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1962b, 33).

Iblīs’ love was like pure iron, which meant that it could not but become attracted to the Magnet. This type of utter attraction toward and pure love for the divine is indeed the very stuff of *jawānmardī*.

Another aspect of Iblīs’ chivalry is his complete lack of concern for the consequences of his love. He loves God, regardless of what that will entail. If it means that people will hate him forever, so be it. And if it means that he will have to suffer for his love⁸ even at the hands of his Beloved, so be it:

Iblīs chose separation from the Beloved over prostration to someone else. How excellent was his perfection of love! *The gaze swerved not, nor did it transgress* [53:17] (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 1:96).

How fine was his aspiration! He said, “I am ready for endless pain, so give me the eternal mercilessness that is my due!” (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 2:187).

“Do as You wish. Whatever You do, I am contented with that. If others flee from Your curse, Your curse for me is an embroidered robe, and a crown upon my head” (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 2:187).

‘Ayn al-Qudāt has much to say about how Iblīs’ attendant separation from God’s Presence is in fact a distinctive honor conferred upon him. In the first instance, he relates Iblīs to God’s jealousy when he admiringly refers to him as a “victim of the Empire’s jealousy” (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 2:416). He also tells us that some of his own teachers used to refer to Iblīs with such titles of distinction as the “Master of masters” and “Leader of the abandoned ones” (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 1:97).

Iblīs’ abandonment was a necessary consequence of his being implicated in a much more intricate cosmic plan (see Rustom 2020). He could not but be abandoned, since without his being characterized as a dark, distant, and misguiding force, the opposite of these, namely light, proximity, and guidance would not obtain. Iblīs is therefore a perfect chevalier who displays nothing less than the greatest type of self-sacrifice. He gives up his own self-interest and the usual human longing to be with God in place of abandonment from the Presence of God, and this purely for the sake of others.

According to the reality of the matter, he took the path of proximity in distance (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 1:315).

Until Iblīs was cursed, God’s beauty was never displayed to His lovers. Until a bad eye was cast, one could not arrive at perfection itself (‘Ayn al-Qudāt 1998, 1:415).

⁸ For ‘Ayn al-Qudāt’s teachings on the intimate relationship between love and suffering, see Rustom 2022.

5. Conclusion

Before bringing this article to a close, it would be good to take stock of our findings. We had the opportunity to situate the Persianate understandings of *jawānmardī* or chivalry amid the constellation of meanings in the universe of its Arabic Sufi equivalent, that of *futuwwa*. Both terms naturally share the same points of reference and senses of meaning. At the same time, *jawānmardī* also came to refer to the ideal lover of God from the 6th/12th century onward, largely due to the influence of the Persian school of passionate love.

Of all of the members of this school, none has approached the notion of chivalry in as multi-dimensional a manner as has ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt. He urges his students to become chevaliers and also shows them that chivalry is not simply an ideal. Rather, it is an attainable reality, and one which he inhabits. For those who wish to come to realize chivalry as ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt has, he calls their attention to the story of Iblīs, whose tale of love and self-sacrifice gives them a perfect window into what a life of chivalry entails and is all about.

True *jawānmardī* or chivalry can and should be learned from the greats of the past, be they the Prophet, ‘Alī, al-Ḥallāj, ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt, or Iblīs. Their lives and teachings point the way to chivalry’s true qualities, the most important of which is the love of God for God’s sake alone. And as ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt also reminds us, chivalry is ultimately to be realized inside one’s self. In a time like ours where the cult of the self has such an unprecedented following, the sage of Hamadan’s teachings on chivalry are all the more compelling. To this effect, he encourages his readers to ask themselves three simple questions, the answers to which will tell them whether or not they are real chevaliers: “Now, look inside yourself—is love for this world predominant, or love for Paradise, or love for God?” (‘Ayn al-Quḍāt 1998, 1:65).

References

- ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt. (1962a). *Shakwā al-gharīb*. In part III of *Muṣannafāt-i ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt*, edited by ‘Afif ‘Usayrān. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Dānishgāh-i Tih-rān.
- ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt. (1962b). *Zubdat al-ḥaqā’iq*. In part I of *Muṣannafāt-i ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt*, edited by ‘Afif ‘Usayrān. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Dānishgāh-i Tih-rān.
- ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt. (1994). *Tamhīdāt*, edited by ‘Afif ‘Usayrān. Tehran: Manūchih-rī.
- ‘Ayn al-Quḍāt. (1998). *Nāma-hā*, edited by ‘Alī Naqī Munzawī and ‘Afif ‘Usayrān. Tehran: Asāṭir.
- Chittick, W. (2013). *Divine Love: Islamic Literature and the Path to God*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Geoffroy, É. (2020). *Allah au féminin*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Lewisohn, L. (2015). “Sufism’s Religion of Love, From Rābi‘a to Ibn ‘Arabī.” In Lloyd Ridgeon (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Sufism*, 150–180. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lory, P. (2018). *La dignité de l’homme face aux anges, aux animaux et aux djinns*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Mahjub, M.J. (1999). “Chivalry and Early Persian Sufism.” In Leonard Lewisohn (ed.), *The Heritage of Sufism, Volume 1: Classical Persian Sufism from its Origins to Rumi (700–1300)*, 549–581. Oxford: Oneworld.
- Nasr, S.H. (2007). *The Garden of Truth*. New York: HarperOne.
- Nasr, S.H., Dagli, C.K., Dakake, M.M., Lombard, J.e., & Rustom, M. (2015). *The Study Quran: A New Translation and Commentary*. New York: HarperOne.
- Ridgeon, L. (2010). *Morals and Mysticism in Persian Sufism*. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Ridgeon, L. (2011). *Javanmardi: A Sufi Code of Honour*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Rūmī. (1925–1940). *The Mathnawī of Jalāl'uddīn Rūmī*, edited and translated by R. A. Nicholson. London: Luzac.
- Rustom, M. (2017). “Everything Muhammad: The Image of the Prophet in the Writings of ‘Ayn al-Qudāt.” *Sacred Web* 39: 33–40.
- Rustom, M. (2018). “‘Ayn al-Qudāt between Divine Jealousy and Political Intrigue.” *Journal of Sufi Studies* 7 (1–2): 47–73.
- Rustom, M. (2020). “Devil’s Advocate: ‘Ayn al-Qudāt’s Defence of Iblis in Context.” *Studia Islamica* 115 (1): 65–100.
- Rustom, M. (2023). *Inrushes of the Heart: The Sufi Philosophy of ‘Ayn al-Qudāt*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Rustom, M. (2022). “*Theo-Fānī*: ‘Ayn al-Qudāt and the Fire of Love.” In Bilal Orfali, Atif Khalil, and Mohammed Rustom (eds.), *Mysticism and Ethics in Islam*, 129–138. Beirut: American University of Beirut Press.
- Safī, O. (2006). *The Politics of Knowledge in Premodern Islam: Negotiating Ideology and Religious Inquiry*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Sajjadi, S. (2011). *Futuwwa*, translated by Rahim Gholami. In In Wilferd Madelung and Farhad Daftary (eds.), *Encyclopaedia Islamica*, vol. 3, s.v. ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. Leiden: Brill.
- Sargut, C. (2018). *Beauty and Light: Mystical Discourses by a Contemporary Female Sufi Master*, translated by Cangüzel Zülfcār; edited by Tehseen Thaver. Louisville: Fons Vitae.
- al-Sarrāj, Abū Naṣr. (1914). *Kitāb al-Luma‘*, edited by R. A. Nicholson. Leiden: Brill.
- Sells, M. (1996). *Early Islamic Mysticism*. Mahwah: Paulist Press.
- Shah-Kazemi, R. (2006). *Justice and Remembrance: Introducing the Spirituality of Imam ‘Alī*. London: I. B. Tauris in association with The Institute of Ismaili Studies.
- Zargar, C. (2017). *The Polished Mirror: Storytelling and the Pursuit of Virtue in Islamic Philosophy and Sufism*. London: Oneworld.