

**Institutionalized Sufism and Non-Institutionalized Sufism:
A Reconsideration of the Groups of Sufi Saints of the Non-*Ṭarīqa* Type as Viewed
through the Historical Documents of Medieval Maghreb**

KISAICHI Masatoshi*

Perhaps the most important innovation in the 12th and 13th century Islamic world was the institutionalization of Sufism. During the years 1150 and 1250, especially with the crisis in Islam caused by the invasion of the Mongols and the fall of the Abbasid Empire, communities of mystics that were heretofore loosely organized groups of disciples following individual spiritual masters were transformed into corporate and increasingly hierarchical entities. The Qādirīya, Rifā'īya and Suhrawardīya that were born as a result of this later developed into international orders, that would influence the whole Muslim world.¹⁾

At around the same period Maghreb society was also facing a crisis of Islam. This was caused by several key factors such as the recapturing of Muslim Spain by the Castilian and Aragonese armies, the progress of Reconquista in the Cordova, Seville, and Valencia regions, and the invasion of the city of Salé in Morocco by the Castilians.²⁾ According to the travel journals of Muḥammad al-'Abdarī al-Tilimsānī who set out on a pilgrimage to Mecca in the year 688/1289, pilgrims and caravans had to pay protection money to Arab nomads who were running amok in the outskirts of Tlemcen, in order to be assured a safe passage. Furthermore, the Mediterranean was swarming with Christian pirates, causing the port of Bijaya to fall into disuse [al-'Abdarī 1968: 9, 11, 26-27, 64].

In the Rif region in northern Morocco there were already Sufis who had received the teachings of al-Rifā'ī. Despite this, groups such as al-Ṭā'ifa al-Rifā'īya or al-Ṭarīqa al-Rifā'īya did not emerge in the Moroccan region. On the other hand, local religious orders such as al-Ṭā'ifa al-Ṣanhājīya and al-Ṭā'ifa al-Mājiirīya had been formed in the Moroccan region. This raises several important issues for investigation. First, the coexistence of institutionalized and non-institutionalized Sufism and the comparison of the two models, second, the coexistence of international *ṭarīqa* model Sufism and local Sufism and the comparison of the two models, and finally what is most important, the actual process of the institutionalization of Sufi saints.

1. The extensive influence of Abū Madyan (d. 594/1198)

Rifā'ī Sufism had already exerted an influence in northern Morocco, but local Sufism was

* Sophia University

- 1) At present it is unclear as to what exactly it was that prompted these three orders to institutionalize. It is possible that this change is related to the institutionalization of *Futūwa*, but it probably did not have any direct link to the attempt by the Abbasid Caliph al-Nāṣir al-Dīn to control the *Futūwa* organizations through institutionalization. The reason for this was that after the death of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī and before al-Nāṣir assumed office, the disciples had already expanded their activities as far as Mecca and Syria. cf. [Cornell, V.J. 1998: 238, note. 113]. Surprisingly, it was only towards the end of the 15th century that Qādirīya thought entered the Moroccan region, when the descendants of 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī immigrated to Fez before the fall of Granada. cf. [al-Qādirī, Abū Bakr 1999: 327].
- 2) When the city of Salé was invaded by the Castilian army in 1260, over 3,000 women and children became captives. Cf. [Mohamed Kably 1986: 55-57].

always predominant before the end of the Marinid dynasty. This localism was characteristic of Sufism in the Maghreb until the end of the medieval period. Abū Madyan Shu‘ayb played a central role in this local Sufism.

Abū Madyan Shu‘ayb was born probably as a son of a *muwallad* (originally-Spanish converted Muslim) in Cantillana, a village near Seville in 509/1115-16. One day while working as a shepherd he became aware of learning, and went to Marrakech, a capital of the Murabits. There he was registered in a group of Andalusia soldiers and worked as a guard of Marrakech, and then went to Fes. In Fes he participated in the circle of ‘Alī b. Ḥirzihim and read the works by al-Ghazālī, al-Muḥāsibī, and al-Qushayrī. He was certainly taught Sufism by Ibn Ḥirzihim, but undoubtedly the man who most influenced him was Abū Ya‘zā, who was shaykh of a *Rābiṭa* in Fes at that time.

A greatly disputed issue concerning Abū Madyan’s biographical record is whether he actually went to Mecca for purposes of Hajj and became a disciple of ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī (d. 563/1166). There is nothing that can be found in the earliest sources (such as the biographies by al-Tādilī and Ibn Qunfudh) that appears to verify the meeting of the two. In fact, their acquaintance is only mentioned much later in a biographical dictionary called *al-Bustān* by Ibn Maryam (died shortly after 1602) [Ibn Maryam 1908: 110], a biographer from Tlemcen, and at present it is not only a widely accepted fact that Abū Madyan possibly never met ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī, but that his journey to the Mashriq was also unreal [Cornell, V.J. 1998: 152-153].

In any case he settled down at Bijaya, a Mediterranean city of eastern Algeria, and established the *Rābiṭa al-zayyāt* [Ibn al-Qunfudh 1965: 37] to begin teaching Sufism. By this time he had already acquired extensive knowledge of the traditions of Sufi thought in the western Maghreb region. More specifically, under Ibn Ḥirzihim he learned orthodox Sufism through works such as al-Muḥāsibī, al-Qushayrī, and al-Ghazālī, from Ibn Ghālib he learned the juristic Sufism of al-Andalus which is based on the *uṣūl*, from Abu Ya‘zā he learned rural Sufism, and from Ibn Ḥirzihim and Abū ‘Abdullāh he learned Moroccan *malāmatīya* activism. According to historical documents, no one surpassed him in religious and intellectual influence. The sheer number of his followers and his great influence that persists even to this day testifies to Abū Madyan’s ability to remain on the point of tangency, between the popular saint-worship of the masses and the Sufism of the intellectuals. The extent of Abū Madyan’s influence on Sufi-saints in the region of Morocco is also vividly illustrated by the fact that of the 46 Sufi-saints in the Rif region described in the *al-Maqṣad* by al-Bādisī 15 were either his disciples or had been significantly influenced by his teachings. Although they did not establish organizations such as *ṭarīqa* and *ṭā’ifa*, the disciples often met with their shaykh at night and practiced collective liturgical exercises, and at the *Rābiṭa Ḥijāra al-Sūdān* Shaykh Abū Marwān organized a night meeting of the *samā’* and *dhikr* in which people (*fuqarā’* and *muḥibbūn*) wearing *khirqā* participated and danced (*shaṭḥ*) together, and one of them had the habit of smoking hashish [al-Bādisī 1982: 100-101].

2. Abū Madyan’s Sufi Populism and Activism

One important reason why Abū Madyan gained enormous popularity was the fact that he could

win over people from all walks of life, from academics to common people. His personality radiated a kind of populism similar to that of ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī, and this is cited as one of the reasons why the two are often viewed as having been associated, although this fact could perhaps be a mere legend.

When he preached in public (*majlis al-wa‘z*) people not only asked questions about Sufism but inquired about the Sharia and Islam in general, to which he responded using proverbs. He constructed the Rābiṭa al-zayyāt at Bijaya in order to teach, and his school produced more than a thousand saints (*awliyā’*)³⁾ and performers of miracles.

Abū Madyan said, “In the *samā’* (spiritual concert), people may shed tears (*bukā’*), cry (*nahīb*), wail (*ṣiyāh*) or weep (*shahīq*). *Samā’* is a personal experience, and when they [the people] are taking part they must lock the doors of their houses [Abū Madyan 1996: 81-3].” He encouraged free expression of emotions rather than rigidity.

The progress of his fame and his great influence raised the concern of political powers against him, and the Almohad Caliph Ya‘qūb al-Manṣūr decided to summon him to Marrakech, following the recommendation of the jurists among his inner circle. Complying with the summons Abū Madyan left Bijaya for Marrakech, but he died during the way and was buried in al-‘Ubbād near Tlemcen in 594/1198. There are certain political connotations in his works, and these raised the concern of the political powers. For example, in a handbook for his disciples he writes, “The Poor (*fuqarā’*) are the *salāṭīn* (sultans), *sādāt* (lords) and *umarā’* (princes) [Abū Madyan 1996: 162-3].” “These are the attributes of the true *faqīr*... They are the *ḥizb Allāh* (Party of God). Verily it is the *ḥizb Allāh* who have attained felicity (*muflīḥūna*) [Abū Madyan 1996: 90-91].”

Abū Madyan also emphasizes the spirit of *futūwa* (youth, chivalry) [Abū Madyan 1996: 124-5], but this spirit is accompanied by the obedience of disciples to their master, the avoidance of conflicts between disciples, justice, nobility of mind, constancy, a feeling of contentment with the gifts of God, and the rejection of unjust acts. He emphasized teachings together with actions. If these elements of spirit were combined with activism, they could turn into a highly political message. The followers of Abū Madyan did not confine themselves to meditation and asceticism alone, but lived by maintaining close links with the daily life of the people.

They were also taught to constantly place both themselves and others under scrutiny. It comes as no surprise that such actions and teachings caused the authorities to be on their guard against Abū Madyan.

3. The institutionalization of the Sufi-saint society in the Maghreb during the 12th and 13th centuries.

As I have stated already, although there were Rifā‘ī Sufīs among the Sufi-saints of the Rif region, institutions such as *ṭarīqa* or *ṭā’ifa* did not emerge. However, the saints (*ṣulahā*, *fuqarā’*) frequently held *samā’* and *dhikr* in the *ribāṭs*, *rābiṭas* and *zāwiyas* which they attended wearing

3) [Ibn Maryam 1908: 108]. Additionally, in Ibn Qunfudh’s (d. ca. 1406), *Uns al-faqīr* (see below), an older historical account than the *al-Bustān*, the appearance of the Rābiṭa al-zayyāt (p.37) and 1,000 disciples of Abū Madyan (Shaykhs) are mentioned (p.102).

khirqas, and danced. Another case reveals the political role of the shaykh, where, leading their *aṣḥāb* (followers), certain shaykhs went on a jihad against the Christians in al-Andalus [Kisaichi 1990: 126]. It can be said that the activities that took place in establishments such as the *ribāṭs*, *rābiṭas*, and *zāwiyas* did not essentially differ from those of the Sufi order, even though they were not labeled as *Ṭarīqa* or *Ṭā'ifa*. A legist by name Ibn Qunfudh al-Qusanṭīnī (d. 810/1407-08) from Constantine in Algeria made a tour of western Morocco from 759/1357-58 to 776/1374-75, and on his return to Constantine he composed a hagiographical dictionary with travel memoirs entitled *Uns al-faqīr wa 'izz al-ḥaqīr*, at Constantine in 787/1385-86. According to his records, the organizations of Sufi-saints in rural villages were not something that belonged to any 'international' Sufi institution, but were structured around local tribes [Ibn Qunfudh 1965: 64-67]. He mentions six localized *ṭā'ifas* that had already been established in the rural tribal regions, namely, al-Ṭā'ifa al-Shu'aybiya, al-Ṭā'ifa al-Ṣanhājīya, al-Ṭā'ifa al-Mājirīya, al-Ṭā'ifa al-Ḥujjājīya, al-Ṭā'ifa al-Ḥāḥīya, al-Ṭā'ifa Al-Ghumāfiya. Among the descriptions of rural Sufism by Ibn Qunfudh, the following is worthy of note:

I (Ibn Qunfudh) attended a meeting of the *fuqarā'* held in the region of Dukkāla between Āsaḥī and Ṭīṭanfāṭr on the coast of the Atlantic ocean, together with the whole of these *ṭā'ifas* and many inhabitants of this region. This is a place named 'Ayn Bārīda belonging to the Dukkāla tribe. Here is level land...I found here 25 threshing places. The number of cattle for cultivation has reached 10,000 pairs on my arriving...This meeting was held on the month of *Rabī' al-Awwal* of the year of 769 (26/Oct.-24/Nov., 1367). Innumerable *fuḍalā'* (good men) attended this meeting. I met here virtuous men (*akhyār*) among them, 'ulamā' among them, and devout men (*ṣulaḥā'*) among them, but their numbers were so many that I was confused. An example shows how many their numbers were: one of the Dukkāla bought grapes from an orchard at 30 dinars, but this was not sufficient for the people...I found among them chronic sick people such as the lame and others, and saw them press together into the circle of *dhikr*. The sick begged and asked for recovery as if they wanted food. One of *fuḍalā'* took a hand of a sick, and his sickness was cured. A lame man was slapped with an edge of his clothes by one of the *fuḍalā'*, and he could walk. A boy at puberty participated in the *dhikr*. As his legs suffered from serious convulsions and his bones became very weak, he couldn't stand up. But when a man slapped his legs, his legs stretched and he was very pleased with the recovery of health while laughing [Ibn Qunfudh 1965: 71-72].

This report shows that many people including the sick and lame participated in this big meeting of *ṭā'ifas* together with Sufi saints (*fuḍalā'*, *akhyār*, *ṣulaḥā'*) and 'ulamā', performing religious acts (*dhikr*) and non-religious acts (curing the sick). Judging from this spectacle, it is very difficult to differentiate between the activity of the so-called *ṭarīqa* and non-*ṭarīqa* group.

Another important source is the *Al-Mustafād fī manāqib al-'ubbād bi-madīna Fās* by Al-Tamīmī (d.603-04/1206-08), a hagiographical dictionary that contains information about 115 Sufi

saints. The urban society of Sufi saints is vividly reflected in this document. From this we understand that they often acted in a collective fashion, and that these activities were not institutionalized as *ṭarīqa* or *ṭā'ifa*. However, there are certain aspects of their activities which we cannot ignore when considering the institutionalization of Sufi-saints.

For example, Abū al-Rabī' Slaymān states, "I will only receive tribute from those whose faith I trust, whose earnings were gained through honest means, and who are considered specially virtuous among my *ikhwān*."⁴) Here, what type of people were these *ikhwān* that he mentions? It is also recorded, "Abū Sa'īd al-Ḥabashī spent a night with his group of *ikhwān* (*jamā'a min ikhwāni-hi*) in the Hermitage (*al-Rābiṭa al-kabīra*) in the mountains, and they went out late at night to practice *dhikr* on the mountain [al-Tamīmī 2002: 168]." Here the question arises as to whether or not the *ikhwān* were organized as an institution or not.

Another source states, "Abū Mūsā who has acquired *ṭarīqa* (*fi*) *al-taṣawwuf* (the way to Sufism) and *ma'rifa 'ilmi-hi* (intuitive knowledge) was among those who passed an ascetic, virtuous, devoted, serious and diligent life."⁵) However, it is also stated, "Abū 'Abdullāh al-Sijilmāsī devoted himself to *ṭarīq fi al-taṣawwuf* (way of the Sufism) and *jamā'a min al-murīdīn* (group of disciples) have come to Abū 'Abdullāh at night after the prayer of *'ishā'*."⁶) Here, the shaykh was presumably tutoring his disciples on the ways of Sufism, and thus in this instance, the relationship between Murīdūn and Shaykh Abū 'Abdullāh al-Sijilmāsī can arguably be seen as that of a Sufi order.

Similarly, in the case of the sermons (*majālis wa'zi-hi*) by 'Ammūr al-Baṭṭāt who had knowledge on the ways of Sufism (*ṭarīqa al-taṣawwuf*), would these assemblies fall into the category of what is generally understood as a Sufi order? [al-Tamīmī 2002: 117]

As remarkable as the above cases are, it is difficult to conclude whether the term *ṭarīqa* meant group organization.⁷) However, it does seem that the *ikhwān* and *murīdūn* lived with their *shaykhs* in ascetic communes, even if it was for limited periods. If the shaykh had knowledge of the ways of *ṭarīqa*, his disciples would surely have received instruction in it and practiced their asceticism accordingly. Moreover, their activities (*dhikr*, group worship, *wa'z*) were not too different from those of the order.

4. Abū Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ and al-Ṭā'ifa al-Mājiriya

The majority of Abu Madyan's disciples were content to pass down his teachings as faithfully as possible. However, a *shaykh* of the Maṣmūda Berbers, Abū Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Mājiri

4) [al-Tamīmī 2002: 167] In the accounts, the word *aṣḥāb* is also used frequently besides the term *ikhwān*. The issue of how *aṣḥāb* and *ikhwān* differed in meaning must also be investigated.

5) [al-Tamīmī 2002: 105] It is interesting to note that Rahal Boubrik states that the reason for the fact of Sufi thought developing into the *ṭarīqa* was the learning and diffusion of the *wird* rites by the Shadhilis. [Boubrik Rahal 1999: 49-52] The term *wird* here refers to the rites centered around and asking God's forgiveness (*istighfār*), the praise of a prophet Muḥammad, and the *shahāda*.

6) [al-Tamīmī 2002: 186] Here, 'way' is expressed by the word *ṭarīq*.

7) Jenkins makes an important point when he stated that for the *ṭarīqa* to change its meaning from 'way' or 'method' to Sufi order, it needed to make the transition from being a training method for professional (elite) Sufis to a training method for common (secular) Sufis by accepting members from the general public [Jenkins, R. G. 1978: 40-77].

(d.631/1234) implemented a particularly notable institutional development. His tomb in Āsafī is famous as a place of pilgrimage in the Dukkāla and Rajrāja regions, but its historical importance lies in the fact that he organized the al-Rakb al-Ṣāliḥī, a pilgrimage party to Mecca that was sent yearly. During his stay in Alexandria for about 20 years, he intended to organize the Sufi-led pilgrimage party to Mecca at his home, for the purpose of increasing Islamic knowledge within his tribe. After his coming back to the Morocco he constructed a *Ribāṭ* near Āsafī, a town of the Dukkāla tribe. Later, he organized the al-Ṭā'ifa al-Mājirīya, named after his tribe Banū Mājir. Historical sources state that the *al-ṭā'ifa* was an institutionalization of the way of Sufism (*ṭarīq al-taṣawwuf*), and from this we see that *ṭā'ifa* and *ṭarīqa* were recognized under the same conception [al-Mājirī 1992-93: t.2, p.14]. With regard to its doctrines, there is no detailed information except that there was a strong emphasis on *tawakkul* (trust in God), *tawba* (repentance) and *dhikr*; and that they were faithful to the teachings of Abū Madyan.

The members were obliged to wear uniforms such as the *muraqqa'a* (clothes with patches) and *shāshīya* (cap), and to take a *'aṣā* (stick), *rakwa* (a sack), and a *tasbīḥ* (a big rosary with 1,000 beads) [al-Mājirī 1992-93: t.2, p.173].

Such symbols of institutionalization raised the suspicion of the Almohad authorities, but despite this many followed the instructions of Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ in working to form Sufi-led pilgrimage bands to Mecca. In organizing the yearly pilgrimage caravans, the *shaykh* took advantage of the network of Abū Madyan's disciples and associates throughout the Maghreb region. Participants in the pilgrimage were gathered from the followers, and they became *fuqarā'*. As the number of followers increased, the *shaykh* dispatched members chosen for their competence to the cities of central Maghreb and Ifrīqiya, where they would gather even more members, and also performed tasks such as taking care of the accommodation and food for the pilgrim bands. In addition, sponsorship was offered to those who had limited funds for the pilgrimage in the form of donations collected in the Ribāṭ Āsafī.

With regard to al-Ṭā'ifa al-Mājirīya, its area of activity expanded outside the Maghreb region. Their main object here was to promote the idea of pilgrimage among the tribal people, and in fact active members of the order were people of the Dukkāla tribe (more specifically the Manū Mājir tribe). In that respect this institution too did not transcend the boundaries of its tribal/ethnic framework and its status as a local organization.

5. The Trimingham Theory reconsidered

The research undertaken by J.S. Trimingham⁸⁾ has gained wide acceptance by scholars as a comprehensive explanation regarding the process of organization and institutionalization of Sufism. However, it must be said that even though his analyses are based on the limited sources from the Maghreb region available to us, there are problems with certain generalizations within his framework that I will discuss below.

8) [Trimingham 1971] Trimingham's developmental stage theory has been summarized well in [Kobayashi 1973: 62-85]

First of all, the activities of the Sufi-saints can be divided into 4 categories. Since the 8th century AD many Sufi-saints were leading an ascetic Sufi way of life independently, and in some extreme cases they were living in complete seclusion. Others developed master-disciple relationships on a personal basis. In principle the sainthood of a Sufi saint finishes in his lifetime, and his doctrine and spiritual method were neither institutionalized nor succeeded to by his children and disciples. Their activities mainly took place in their homes, in religious establishments (*ribāṭs*, mosques). In mountains and deserts however, there were some who lived a roving life.

In the 11th and 12th centuries we see leading Sufi-saints and their disciples forming religious groups (*jamā'a*) as well as assemblies (*majlis*), where they practiced *dhikr* and *samā'*. However, again there was no passing on of the sainthood by the *shaykhs*, and their groups and assemblies were not institutionalized.

During the 12th to 14th century, a group of Sufi orders was born in Iraq, a region that was facing serious political, social, and ideological crises. They were three orders named Qādirīya, Rifā'īya and Suhrawardīya. These organizations were collectively called *ṭarīqa* and their activities and doctrines were institutionalized. Sainthood was passed on through lineage within the orders while expansion transcending tribal, ethnic, and regional boundaries took place, resulting in the development of an international religious institution that has survived to this day.

However, the organizations that were labeled *ṭarīqa* were not functional collective units until at least around the 14th century. In other words, although the *ṭarīqa* widened its network across a vast area and across tribal and ethnic boundaries, their base of operations was in the *ribāṭs* and *zāwiyas* that were part of the local infrastructure. Therefore, the bona fide activities and organizations consequently grew detached from each other. As this separation occurred, there was an increasing need for the organizations to acquire qualities that were appealing, that attracted and retained followers. This was how the position of the *shaykh* became hereditary.⁹⁾

At around the same time, the Sufi-saints in the Maghreb area began to gather around the *ribāṭs*, *rābiṭas* and *zāwiyas* and formed organizations in reaction to the socio-political crisis in Islamic society, that was brought about by the progressing Reconquista and the rising activities of the nomads. However, the institutionalization in this case was built on local and tribal bases, which meant membership in the organization coincided with the area of activity. In some cases, the sainthood of the *shaykh* was passed on by lineage, but this was not a crucial element of the organization's structure. Additionally, although the institutionalization of doctrines and rituals occurred, the organizations themselves were impermanent and in many cases became extinct after a certain period of time. Such organizations in the Maghreb were most commonly known as *tā'ifa*, until the term was recently replaced by *ṭarīqa*.

After conducting the most systematic investigation of the institutionalization of Sufi-saints, J.S. Trimingham presented the following general model for the developmental stages of Sufism: (1) the *khānaqāh* stage (early Islamic period to the 11th century), (2) the *ṭarīqa* stage (12th to 14th

9) It is possible to understand what Yajima called "the strengthening of the magnetism of shaykhs." Yoichi Yajima, "The issue of heredity in Tariqa", in *Sufism and Saint Veneration in Islam*, [Yajima 2005: 201].

centuries), and (3) the *tā'ifa* stage (15th century onwards).

The problem here is that the activity patterns of Sufi-saints can be divided into the 4 patterns presented in the table below, and that from the 13th century onwards all 4 of these patterns can be observed in every region in every period. If we are to focus our attention on the social function of Sufi-saints in the Maghreb region, we see that the group model in pattern (2), and the local orders in pattern (3) have played the most important role. If this indeed is the case we would gain a more accurate understanding of the reality of Sufi-saint society by viewing their expansion as a diversification of their activities, rather than as a series of developmental stages.

For Form of organization	Name of organization	Characteristics of organization	Place of activities
(4) internationalized order	<i>ṭarīqa</i>	permanent lineage is an indispensable element, trans-ethnic, trans-tribal and shows trans-regional proliferation, institutionalization of doctrines and rituals	dissociation of places of activities (<i>ribāt</i> , <i>zāwiya</i> , <i>khānqāh</i>) and the organization, <i>ribāt</i> and <i>zāwiya</i> are the real centers of the activities
(3) local order	<i>tā'ifa</i> , <i>zāwiya</i>	Lineage can be seen in some cases but is not indispensable, ethnic and tribal relationships, institutionalization of doctrines and rituals	coincidence of places of activities (<i>ribāt</i> , <i>zāwiya</i>) with the organization(<i>tā'ifa</i>)
(2) group of Sufi saints	<i>jamā'a</i> , <i>majlis</i>	Non-lineage, non-continuity of sainthood, limited period of existence, non-institutionalization of doctrines and rituals	coincidence of places of activities (<i>ribāt</i> , <i>zāwiya</i> , mosque, house) with the organization
(1) independent or solitary	seclusion or personal relationship	Non-lineage, non-continuity of sainthood, limited period of existence, non-institutionalization of doctrines and rituals	private houses, mountains, desert, vagabondage, religious houses(mosque and <i>ribāt</i>)

6. Administration and maintenance of order within Sufi organizations

There are problems with Trimingham's theory of developmental stages, yet there is no doubt that there was a strengthening in administrative control within the Sufi orders from the 15th century onwards, especially in areas that came under French colonization after the 19th century. In conclusion, we must consider how the administration and maintenance of order was carried out as an organization.

By forming comradely or master-disciple relationships with each other, the Sufi-saints were able to build a network that transcended the boundaries of blood such as family and tribes, as well as narrow territorial ties. These personal relationships between Sufi-saints were brought about by many causes and motives. For example, a disciple might have wanted to receive instruction in Sufism as well as other academic matters or share confidences with the master, in particular to confess his sins and repent in the master's presence. Other motives include the need to share thoughts on both physical and spiritual aspects of life, the desire to have a companion during meals, and the obligation to provide travelling colleagues with accommodation and food.

From the perspective of order within the organization, the direct master-disciple relationships played a particularly significant role. In Sufi-saint society, the master could exact absolute obedience from his disciple. Disciples sought to become like their masters, and to achieve this object it was necessary for them to obey, respect, and love their masters. Naturally, the condition for being a master was the possession of the type of knowledge, character, and faith that would serve as an

example for followers, but in the master-disciple relationship there was greater emphasis on the disciple's obedience.

For example, a Moroccan mystic by the name of al-Tujībī (d. 1342) wrote a book on the rules of conduct between a master and disciple, in which he stated, "When the master is riding an animal (such as a donkey), the disciple must hold the reins and walk with the animal. When engaging in conversation one must not speak before the master, and in front of the master one must remain silent. When receiving goods the master will receive them first, and when sitting the master should use the cushion. When offering prayers, the disciple must lay out the rug for the master." [al-Tujībī: B.G. (Rabat) d-1795, 80]

A source of al-Qādirī also declares, "When walking together, the disciple must never walk ahead of his master. He must walk behind the master. That is the proper courtesy." [al-Qādirī 1977: 175]

When an order is formed it becomes necessary to differentiate between members and non-members. An order is ambivalent in nature. It tries to maintain a balance between openness so as to increase the number of members,¹⁰ and a certain level of reclusiveness so as to strengthen the solidarity between existing members.

Orders of the *ṭarīqa* type began to appear in the Moroccan region in the 15th century. Al-'Ayyāshī (died 1679) who is famous for his journal concerning his pilgrimage to Mecca, mentions several orders that existed in the Maghreb region in his book *al-Rihla al-'Ayyāshīya*.¹¹

Among them, the al-Ṭarīqa al-Jazūlīya founded by al-Jazūlī (d. 1465) was the most influential, and a relatively large number of historical records related to its organization have survived. According to records¹² left behind by al-Fāsī (d. 1698), when al-Jazūlī institutionalized the order through rebuilding the ribāṭ of Abū Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, he had 12,665 followers [al-Fāsī 1313/1896: 3-4].

The hierarchical structure of the members is as follows [al-Fāsī 1313/1896: 32]. It starts with the *shaykh* at the top, and he is followed by top officials made up of his close affiliates, the *shaykh*'s successor, the *shaykh*'s affiliates, the successor's affiliates, the affiliates of the *shaykh*'s siblings, the affiliates of the *shaykh*'s second successor, the affiliates of the *shaykh*'s paternal uncle, the descendents of the *shaykh*'s paternal uncle, the descendents of the *shaykh*'s second successor, the descendents of the second successor's siblings, the children of the descendents of the second successor's siblings, and finally all the other members of the order.

As described above, the organization of the order consisted of a pyramidal hierarchical structure, with a handful of cadres and relatives who were most familiar with the *shaykh*'s teachings placed at the top. One can see that the hierarchy was founded on blood ties and master-disciple

10) According to the research of Kawamoto, in the case of the Naqshbandī order of central Asia, lay people were given membership at assemblies called *ṣuḥba*. This practice contributed greatly to the expansion of the order and was common among many other orders [Kawamoto 1983: 93-125].

11) Names such as Naqshbandīya, Qādirīya, al-Suhrawardīya and Kubrawīya are mentioned in [al-'Ayyāshī 1977: 205-206].

12) The Organization was referred to as al-Ṭā'ifa al-Jazūlīya [al-Fāsī 1313/1896: 2; 1994: 18].

relationships that demanded absolute obedience.

A special rite was made for the purpose of reinforcing the sense of solidarity among the order's members. As mentioned earlier, the Shaykh Abū Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ obliged the members of the Mājirīyūn to defer to the following codes of conduct [al-Mājirī 1992-93: 173]:

- *Members must shave their heads
- *Wear tattered clothing
- *Carry a walking stick and begging sack
- *Wear a felt hat
- *Wear a large necklace that had 1,000 beads

Jazūlī felt a strong sense of affinity towards Abū Muḥammad and his teachings, and so he imposed these codes of conduct and dress in their entirety on the members of the al-Jazūlīya order. Features such as tonsure, tattered clothing, and a begging sack, can also be seen in the Qalandarīya order that spread in Iran and central Asia in the 13th century.

The tattered clothing, staff, beads and begging sack not only served their primary practical purposes, but also helped strengthen the sense of camaraderie between members of the organization by facilitating mutual recognition through a uniformed appearance. The order placed great emphasis on solidarity and put in a great deal of effort into instilling a sense of belonging in its members. For example, it is stated in its doctrines, "Between members, no secrets must exist and, no wealth must be given to a single individual." The activities of these men of the order with their uniform attire and accessories, led to the winning over of many new members.

On the other hand, such consolidation of rites and reinforcement of disciplinary rules were not unlike the administrative control of a bureaucratic government. The orders of the Maghreb region from the 19th century onwards came to be controlled by a bureaucratic system under French colonial rule, and this was due to the need for internal maintenance of the organization and to establish membership.¹³⁾

Bibliography

- al-‘Abdarī Abū ‘Abdullāh Muḥammad (d. fl. 688/1289). 1968. *Riḥla al-‘Abdarī*. Rabat: Jāmi‘a Muḥammad al-Khāmis.
- Abū Madyan. 1996. "Bidāyat al-murīd," in V.J. Cornell comp. & trans, *The Way of Abu Madyan*, Cambridge: The Islamic texts Society, pp. 81-83.
- 1996. "Qaṣīda rā’īya," in V.J. Cornell comp. & trans, *The Way of Abu Madyan*, Cambridge: The Islamic texts Society, pp. 162-163.
- 1996. "Uns al-wahīd wa nuzhat al-murīd" in V.J. Cornell comp. & trans, *The Way of Abu Madyan*. Cambridge: The Islamic texts Society, pp. 124-125.

13) The names of Algerian orders and the numbers of their members are documented in [Depont & Coppolani 1897: 215].

- al-‘Ayyāshī, Abū Sālim ‘Abd Allāh (d. 1679). 1977. *al-Riḥla al-‘Ayyāshīya (Mā’ al-mawā’id)*. Rabat: Maktaba al-Ṭālib.
- al-Bādisī ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq (d. fl. 722/1322). 1982. *al-Maqṣad al-sharīf wa al-manza‘ al-laṭīf fī al-ta’rīf bi-ṣūlahā’ al-Rīf*. Rabat.
- Boubrik Rahal. 1999. *Saints et société en Islam: la confrérie ouest-saharienne Fādiliyya*. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
- Cornell, V.J. 1998. *Realm of the Saint: Power and Authority in Moroccan Sufism*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Depont Octave et Coppolani Xavier. 1897. *Les confréries religieuses musulmanes*. Alger: Ja. Maisonneuve & P. Geuthner.
- al-Fāsī, Muḥammad al-Mahdī (d. 1109/1698). 1313/1896. *Kitāb al-mumtī‘ al-asmā‘ fī dhikr al-Jazūlī wa al-Tabbā‘ wa mā lahumā min al-atbā‘*. Fes, (lithograph).
- 1994. *Kitāb al-mumtī‘ al-asmā‘ fī dhikr al-Jazūlī wa al-Tabbā‘ wa mā lahumā min al-atbā‘*. Casablanca: al-Najāh al-jadīda.
- Ibn Maryam al-Tilimsānī (d. fl. 1011/1602). 1326/1908. *al-Bustān fī dhikr al-awliyā’ wa al-‘ulamā’ bi-Tilimsān*. Alger.
- Ibn al-Qunfudh al-Qusanṭīnī (d. ca. 810/1407-08). 1965. *Uns al-faqīr wa ‘izz al-ḥaqīr*. Rabat: faculté des lettres et des sciences sociales.
- Jenkins, R. G. 1978. “The Evolution of Religious Brotherhoods in North and Northwest Africa 1523-1900,” in Willis J.R. ed., *Studies in West African Islamic-History*, London: Frank Cass, pp. 40-77.
- Kawamoto Masatomo. 1983. “The Methods of Discipline in the Naqshbandi Order,” *The Tōyōshi-Kenkyū*, 42(2), pp. 93-125.
- Kisaichi Masatoshi. 1990. “The Society of Sufi-saints in 13th century Rif Region and their Ribāṭs, Rābiṭas and Zāwiyas,” Collected Papers for the 35th Anniversary of the Establishment of the Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan, Tokyo: Tōsui Shobō Publishing.
- Kobayashi Seiichi. 1973. “The Formation of the Sufi Orders in Egypt,” *The Tōyōshi-Kenkyū*, 32(2), pp. 62-85.
- al-Mājirī, Abu al-Abbas Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm (d. fol. 696/1297) (great grandson of the saint Abū Muḥammad). 1992-93. *al-Minhāj al-wāḍiḥ fī taḥqīq karāmāt Abī Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ* (a dissertation of Sa‘īdī ‘Abd al-Salām). Rabat: Université Muḥammad V, faculté des lettres, t.2.
- Mohamed Kably. 1986. *Société, pouvoir et religion au Maroc à la fin du Moyen-Age*. Paris: Maisonneuve & Larose.
- al-Qādirī, Abū Bakr. 1999. *al-Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al- Jīlānī*. Casablanca: Maṭba‘a al-najāh al-jadīda.
- al-Qādirī, Muḥammad b. al-Ṭayyib al-Ḥasan (d. 1187/1773). 1977. *Nashr al-mathānī li-Ahl qarn al-ḥādī ‘ashar wa thānī*. Rabat: Dār al-Maghrib lil-ta’līf wa al-tarjama wa al-nashr.
- al-Tamīmī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad (d. 603-04/1206-08). 2002. *al-Mustafād fī manāqib al-‘ubbād bi-madīna Fās*. Tétouan.

Trimingham, J.S. 1971. *The Sufi Orders in Islam*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

al-Tujībī, Sa‘īd b. Aḥmad b. Ibrāhīm (d. 750/1342). *al-Ināla al-‘ilmīya wa al-risāla al-‘ilmīya fī al-ṭarīqa al-mutarjarridīn min al-ṣūfīya*. B.G. (Rabat) d-1795: 80.

Yajima Yoichi. 2005. “The issue of heredity in Tariqa,” in *Sufism and Saint Veneration in Islam* (Islamic Area Studies, 7), University of Tokyo Press, p. 201.