Transnational Sufi Networks in India and Anatolia:
Naqshbandiyah-*Mujaddidiyah* Order

Cemil Kutlutürk[1]

Abstract

India and Turkey, noticeable for their strong historical background and geopolitical importance, have left their mark on the history of humanity via their outstanding wise men and a vibrant cultural and religious heritage. Even though political and military relations have occurred between these two regions, it should be stated that one of the most energetic interactions between them has taken place in the area of religion and culture, particularly at the core of Sufism. As in the example of the Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah tradition, some Sufi orders originally flourishing in India have entered into Anatolia through various channels and have taken deep roots there through the eminent Sufi leaders and their efficient endeavors such as training disciples, writing or translating celebrated sources and inaugurating lodges in different centers. Therefore, this paper tries to depict how the Sufi networks have built a transnational connection between the Indian subcontinent and Anatolia and examines the role of cultural perceptions, historical memories, and social fabrics on the evolution of Sufi thoughts, focusing on the sample of the Mujaddidiyah, sub-branch of Naqshbandiyah.

Keywords: Anatolia, India, Naqshbandiyah-*Mujaddidiyah*, Sufi network, Wahdat al-wujud, Wahdat al-shuhud, Vedanta.

---

[1] Assoc. Prof., Divinity Faculty. Ankara University. E-mail: ckutluturk@ankara.edu.tr

Öz

Hindistan ve Türkiye, güçlü tarihsel geçmişleri ve sahip oldukları jeopolitik konumları itibariyle dikkat çekmektedir. Her iki ülke de zengin dini ve kültürel mirası ve tanınmış simaları ve ilim adamları sayesinde insanlık tarihine önemli izler bırakmıştır. Tarihsel süreçte Hint alt kıtası ile Anadolu toprakları arasında siyasi ve askeri münasebetler yaşanmış olmakla birlikte iki bölge arasında en canlı ve öne çıkan etkileşimlerden birinin din ve kültür alanında gerçekleştiği belirtilmelidir. Bu bağlamda özellikle Sufizm dikkat çekmektedir. Nakşibendiyye-Müceddidiyye örneğinde olduğu gibi Hindistan menşeli gelişen kimi tasavvufi tarikatlar farklı yollardan Anadolu'ya ulaşmıştır. Bu tür tasavvufi oluşumlar, tanınmış Sufi önderlerin talebe yetiştirme, telif ve tercüme eser neşretme ve farklı merkezlerde tekkeler açma gibi çok yönlü ve etkili çabaları sayesinde Anadolu topraklarında gelişip kök salmıştır. Bu çalışmada tasavvufi ağın, Hint alt kıtası ile Anadolu toprakları arasında nasıl bir uluslararası bağ kurduğu meselesi, Nakşibendiyye'nin bir kolu olan Müceddidiyye örneğinden hareketle ele alınmaya çalışılmaktadır. Ayrıca Hint alt kıtasında ve Anadolu topraklarında gelişen Müceddidiyye hareketinin ana hatlarıyla mukayesesi yapılarak kültürel algıların, tarihi hafızaların ve sosyal dokuların Sufi düşüncelerin gelişimindeki rolü üzerinde durulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Anadolu, Hindistan, Nakşibendiyye-Müceddidiyye, tasavvufi etkileşim, vahdet-i vücûd, vahdet-i şühûd, vedanta.

Introduction

India was familiar to the Turks of Central Asia in the early times as this region was governed by numerous Turkish dynasties such as Ghaznavids, Delhi Turk Sultanates, and Baburis for about eight centuries (Palanpuri, 2007, p. 109; Abdurrahman, nd, p. 12; Kafesoğlu, 2001, p. 610; Palabıyık, 2012, p. 940). The relationship between Turkish dynasties found in the Indian subcontinent and the Ottoman Empire started approximately at the end of the fifteenth century after the conquest of Constantinople, through which the Ottomans achieved prominence in the eyes of South Indian Muslim rulers. The other significant case that brought about the political, commercial, and cultural relations between Anatolian and Indian Muslims was the conquest of Egypt and the Hejaz in 1517 by the Ottomans. Following that episode, relations flourished between both sides via ambassadors, letters, and gifts (Bayur 1987, pp. 404-407; Rashid, 1967, p. 537). While the political relations between two of the powerful military and political powers of the medieval era were broken by the fall of the Baburi dynasty at the end of the eighteenth century, the relations between the Indian subcontinent and Anatolia continued in some way as they both share a similar ethnic, cultural, and religious quality.

In the historical process, political and military relations have been observed between these two countries, however, it should be claimed that one of the most conspicuous interaction between the Indian subcontinent and Anatolia has occurred in the field of religion and culture. In this context, pilgrims who regularly visited the Arabian Peninsula and Sufis, who emerged on journeys to announce their mystical voices have played a vital role in establishing close relations between Anatolian and Indian Muslim geographies (Özcan, 1997, p. 15). They have had an excellent opportunity to promote and exchange their religious and mystical thoughts, which have grown up in their own culture and homeland.

In the context of the development of Indian-Turkish transnational cultural relations in the medieval and early modern period, the role of some Sufi orders, entering Anatolia after originally flourishing in India, is crucial since they have transferred their mystical thoughts and Sufi literature to Anatolia

through various channels and have taken deep root there utilizing the lodges opened in different centers during the Ottoman period. Among them, the Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah movement has a unique position since the historical data discloses that one of the most significant transnational Sufi networks on both sides has emanated out of this order. Therefore, an attempt is made in this paper to deal with the contribution of the Mujaddidiyah order towards exchanges of the mystical thoughts and principles between Indian and Anatolian Muslims.

1. Transnational Sufi Network in India and Anatolia

Indian Muslims prominently followed four major Sufi orders, namely; Chistiyah, Naqshbandiyah, Qadiriyah, and Suhrawardiyah, whose regular activities began after the Ghaznavid period (Titus, 1979, p. 117; Rizvi, 1983, pp. 55-70). The earliest of them was the Chistiyah, which was propounded by Moinuddin Chisti (d. 1236), who was one of the most prominent and celebrated Sufis in the Indian subcontinent. He came to India with the army of Shihabuddin Ghuri (d. 1206) at the end of the 12th century and selected Ajmer as his permanent abode. In the early 13th century, the Chistiyah order got a reliable power particularly in the northern parts of India thanks to the tremendous efforts of Sufi leaders such as Abdullah Kirmani, Baba Farid Shakar, Nizamuddin Auliya, and Nasiruddin Mahmud. They motivated their disciples in order to preach Islam and their spiritual principles in the rural areas of northeastern regions like Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Bengal, and Orissa (Haq, 1974, p. 177). The main factor behind their success was their capability to adapt themselves with the habits, customs, and languages of the local people (Author, 2016, p. 635).

The other crucial Sufi order popularized in India is the Suhrawardiyah. It was developed by Shihabudin Suhrawardi (d. 1234), who organized his disciples to launch their Sufi thoughts in India. In the process of introducing this order Bahauddin Zakariya Multani (d. 1262), Jalaluddin Tabrizi (d.1225), Hamiduddin Nagauri (d.1246), and Jalaluddin Surkh (d. 1291) were the most influential figures (Allami, 1907, v. 3, pp. 367-9). The third important Sufi order found in India is the Qadiriyah. It primarily emerged in India during the middle of the 14th century by the efforts of Abdulkarim bin Ibrahim Ali Jilani, the author of the famous work called *Al-Insan-i* Kamil (Haq, 1977, pp. 19-23). He was replaced by some eminent saint of this order like Mia Mir (d.1635), who was the spiritual guide of Dara Shikuh (d. 1659), the author of the noted spiritual work called *Majmual Bahrayn*, which is a comparative study between philosophical ideas of Vedanta and the mystical thoughts of Sufism (Yitik & Çınar, 2016, p. 529). The general picture demonstrates that the Qadiriyah order spread and achieved popularity in the different parts of the Indian subcontinent (Haq, 1977, p. 33).

The last significant Sufi order located in India is the Naqshbandiyah which forms the specific subject of this research paper. One of the earliest Sufis of this order to reach India is known as being Baqi Billah (d. 1604), who settled in Delhi, where he passed away after a few years (Subhan, 1938, p. 274). After him, this order was represented by the legendry Sufi leaders like Ahmad Faruqi Sirhindi (d. 1624), the chief disciple of Baqi Billah, and Shah Waliullah (d. 1762), a great scholar and mystic of this order and the celebrated author of *Hajjatullah il-Baligha* (Tosun 2005, pp. 70-79; Algar, 1991, p. 542).

Among the numerous Sufi forms of thought that stretched from India to Anatolia, the most striking and influential is the Mujaddidiyah movement, a sub-branch of the Naqshbandiyah founded by Ahmadi Sirhindi, who is usually known and familiar to the Turkish people as Imam Rabbani. Another essential point that draws attention in the context of cultural, religious, and intellectual interaction between India and the Ottoman is the Indian Lodge, mostly known as *Hindiler Tekkesi*. These lodges were largely attributed to the Naqshbandiyah *silsila* (chain) and served as a bridge between each country for propagating 'Indian' Sufi lifestyle and culture. Moreover, they were a focal point for Ottoman-Indian political and cultural relations (Tanman, 1998, p. 68).

1.1. Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah Tradition

The Naqshbandiyah order takes its name from Khwaja Bahauddin Naqshband Bukhari (d. 1389), a very prominent Sufi sheikh of the medieval period in Central Asia. At the end of the 16th century, Indian Sufi leader Ahmad Faruqi Sirhindi reiterated the importance of the shariah to counteract the spread of non-Islamic practices and beliefs stemming from Hindu culture and to reduce the impact of Akbar Shah's thought namely Din-i Ilahi, among the Muslim and Sufi circles of India. He opposed Emperor Akbar's attempts on introducing a new way of life which claimed to find a common platform that locates both Hindu and Muslim practices and beliefs. He preached that Muslims should follow their religion and non-Muslims their ways, as the Qurʾan mentioned. Furthermore, he tried to remove the influence of Vedanta, a prevailing religious thought of Hindus based on the unity of God (Raily, 2005, p. 184), among Muslim societies, especially in the minds of Muslim mystics. Ahmad Sirhindi, thereby, broke away from earlier mystic traditions and propounded his theory of the unity of the phenomenal world (Mektubat, no. 65; Reis, 2006, p. 230). For this effort, he was widely accepted as the religious reformer of the second millennium by his followers.

Due to the significance of Sirhindi's reforms to the Naqshbandiyah teachings, his spiritual descendants became known as a new order, the Mujaddidiyah. This new form of the Indian branch of the Naqshbandiyah rose to prominence in a short time throughout the Indian subcontinent and it spread eventually to the Caucasus, the Middle East, and Asia. After Sirhindi's death, his legacy and spiritual tradition was pursued by his sons like Muhammad Masum (d. 1668) and descendants such as Shaikh Mazhar Jan-i Janan (d. 1781), who was considered among the important figures in the Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah order in India after Sirhindi (Haq, 1977, p. 15).

After the death of Sirhindi, some great personalities have played a vital role in the emergence of the Mujaddidiyah order in Anatolian and Rumelian lands. One of them was Muhammad Murad al-Bukhari (d. 1720), known as the first Sufi who brought the Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah order to Anatolia (Şimşek, 2004, p. 19). He first went to India from Central Asia to get deep knowledge of Islamic sciences, including Sufism. Here, he met Muhammad Masum (d. 1668), he son and successor of Imam Rabbani, and became his faithful disciple. When Murad al-Bukhari completed his Sufi training, he traveled to the Hejaz and Anatolia to train devotees and spread his Sufi doctrines. He has lived for a long time in different parts of Anatolia such as Istanbul and Bursa, where he has resided for more than five years. He became a known figure among Sufi circles as he conveyed the principles and teachings of the Indian Mujaddidiyah Sufi tradition to Anatolia. When he was in Istanbul, he settled in a Sufi lodge in Eyup, where he passed away in 1720. After the funeral prayer performed in the Eyup Mosque, he was buried in the same lodge (Şimşek 2004, p. 119).

The scholars and public officials of the Ottoman Empire warmly welcomed Murad Bukhari. He had a major impact on the different strata of society, such as viziers, sheikhs, and madrasah scholars; besides that he had an influence on certain elites, such as Sheikhulislam Seyyid Feyzullah Efendi (d. 1703), Lalizade Abdulbaki (d. 1746) and Sheikhulislam Veliyyuddin Efendi (d. 1768). He left behind essential marks on the Anatolian Sufi network by influencing the prominent people in society and contributing precious works (Şimşek, 2006, p. 186).

He penned numerous literary works in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish such as *Jamiu Mufradati'l-Qurʾan* (in Arabic, Persian and Turkish), which is a holistic study of Quranic sciences rather than tafsir, *Silsiletudh Dhahab* (in Arabic), which deals with the Mujaddidiyah lineage and the author's views about the cult of the sect, and *Manakib* (in Turkish) (Şimşek, 2004, p. 125). Along with his own efforts and writings, the students educated by him such as Lalizade Abdulbaqi (d. 1746), Ebu Said Hadimi (d. 1762), Ahmad Trabzoni (d. 1777), and Turhalli Mustafa (d. 1782) have played a very significant role in the process of collecting them. These Ottoman Sufis, who were the followers of al-Bukhari, had settled in

various parts of the Ottoman states like Istanbul, Konya, and Tokat in order to make the Sufi thoughts of the Mujaddidiyah known to the wider audience. Through al-Bukhari's own works and the efforts fulfilled by his students, the literary tradition of this Sufi order gained a significant momentum in Bombay, Bursa, Istanbul, and Bosnia lines (Kara, 2017, p. 23). Consequently, Shaikh Murad al-Bukhari, a deputy of Muhammad Masum, took the order to Istanbul in the second half of the seventeenth century, where he was favorably received by the community leaders. At his death, the order had secured a permanent presence in the Ottoman lands.

Another significant figure in the cycle of transmitting Mujaddidiyah's thoughts from India to Anatolia was Yekdest Ahmad Bukhari (d. 1707), known as Joryani since he was born in the Joryan town of Bukhara. Originally from Joryan, he reached India and accepted the guidance of Shaikh Muhammad Masum. After he was ordained as a deputy by Shaikh Masum, Yekdest traveled to Mecca, where he guided many famous disciples who have played an active role in introducing the order to different parts of the Ottoman lands, particularly to Istanbul (Kufralı, 1949, p. 171). Thanks to his eminent and remarkable well-known disciples like Ahmad Kırımi (d. 1743), Mehmed Emin Tokadi (d. 1745), Muhammad Semarqandi (d. 1705), and Mustaqimzade Sulayman Sadeddin (d. 1788), he succeeded to transfer the mystical thoughts of Mujaddidiyah to which he devoted himself, to different parts of Anatolia (Şimşek, 2012, p. 392).

One of the most prominent shaikhs of the Yekdest *silsila* in Istanbul was Shaikh Mehmed Emin b. Ismail is mostly known as Bursali (d. 1813), who was born in Kirkuk (Kufralı 1949, p. 194). Following the passing away of his father, he went to Urfa and was educated in Hamevi Madrasah. Then he came to Istanbul, where he met Muhammed Agah Efendi and became his disciple. After a while, he finalized his spiritual training and received consent from him. Later he traveled to Bursa, where he built a library and a lodge to promote Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah's way of life (Kara, 2017, p. 25).

Among the Yekdest *silsila*, Mustaqimzade Sulayman Sadeddin occupied a special place since he was one of the most successful and efficient Sufis in the 18th century and the first person who accurately translated Ahmad *Sirhindi's Sufi* book *al-Maktubat* (*The Letters*), the handbook of the Mujaddidiyah order, into Ottoman-Turkish in 1860. After the original version of *al-Maktubat,* which has gained a great name and fame until today, this translation has been read and well accepted by Mujddidiyah among Sufi circles. He also translated the *al-Mektubat* of Muhammad Masum, the son of Imam Rabbani. These two translations were published together in 1860 in Istanbul. Even though these works proved less efficient than the endeavors of the strict adherents of the sect in the spread of the Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah order to the masses of India, Central Asia, and the Ottoman-Turkish world, their new editions and translations into various languages indicate that they have been read and influenced by Naqshbandiyah circles for centuries (Algar, 2004, p. 12).

One of the later representatives who acted as a connecting bridge between the Indian subcontinent and the Ottomans in the context of the transferring of Sufi thought was the Abdulqadir Belhi (d. 1923), a Naqshbandiyah dervish, who came from Balkh city in Afghanistan and eventually reached Istanbul after passing by various Sufi centers such as Iran, Konya, and Bursa. He not only tried to raise to the position of the sheik of the lodge located in Eyup district in Istanbul but also conveyed his Sufi thoughts to the masses around him both with his effective sermons and various writings such as *Divan, Sunuhat-i Ilahiya wa Ilhamat-i Rabbaniya, Gulseni Esrar* and *Esraru't-Tavhid* (Kara, 2017, pp. 30-31).

In the context of the Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah Sufi network in India and Anatolia, the case of Khalidiyah order is significant as well. The Khalidiyah, which is a sub-order of the Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah order, spread from India to the Ottoman lands at the beginning of the 19th century at the hands of disciples of Shaikh Khalid Baghdadi (d. 1827) (Haksever, 2012, pp. 422-423). Shaikh Khalid was born in Qaradagh, a town in the district of Shahrizur in Iraq. After completing his education, he

started to teach in Sulaimaniyah, where he met with an Indian Muslim Sufi Shaikh called Mirza Rahimullah Azimabadi. As a result of Shaikh's influence and spiritual impact upon him, at the beginning of the 19th century, Shaikh Khalid decided to travel to India to seek advice from Shah Ghulam Ali (d. 1824), a Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah Shaikh in Delhi (Buehler, 2006, p. 65) mostly known in Arabic literature as Abdullah Dihlawi (Abu Manneh, 1982, pp. 2-5; Akot, 2014, p. 252). Abdullah Dihlawi attracted many disciples, most of whom came from different parts of the Muslim world like Sham, Iraq, Hijaz, Khurasan, and Anatolia (Buehler 2006, p. 77). Furthermore, an Indian Sufi known as Mahmud Jan, one of the caliphs of Abdullah Dihlawi, came to Istanbul carrying out various activities and gathering many adherents around him (Algar, 1997, p. 297). These kinds of historical events are very significant because they reveal that the Sufi interaction between India and Anatolia has not occurred only one-way but has taken place in both directions.

Shaikh Khalid spent about one year at Abdullah Dihlawi's Khanqah in Delhi. While Shaikh Khalid never went to Istanbul, some of his deputies like Muhammad Salih arrived at the Ottoman capital and thereby the Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah order got one more opportunity to deepen its roots into Istanbul. Through the activities of Khalid's disciples, this order gained many adherents in the Ottoman bureaucracy as well as some distinguished personalities such as Makkizada Mustafa Asim (d. 1846), Mehmed Refik Efendi (d. 1871), and Mustafa Izzet Efendi (d. 1801) (Algar, 1997, pp. 297-8).

1.2. Indian Lodge/Hindiler Tekkesi

Apart from the Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah wave, another vital trace of the religious and cultural exchange between Anatolia and the Indian subcontinent was the dervish lodges that were opened by Indian Sufis in different districts of the Ottoman lands. Among them, two lodges located in Istanbul, mostly known as *Hindiler Tekkesi*, are quite striking as they were established in order to accommodate travelers and dervishes arriving from the Indian subcontinent when they reached Anatolia (Zarcone, 1994, p. 74). The first one is in the Aksaray region, which was one of the oldest educational and cultural centers of the Naqshbandiyah in Istanbul, which was also named as *Horhor* because of the street on which it located. Although there is almost no information on the early period of this lodge, it is mentioned in some sources that it was founded by Sultan Mehmed the Conqueror following the wishes of the Hace Ishak Bukhari Hindi of the fifteenth century. After that, it was usually only referred to as the Indian Sufi Lodge, namely, *Hindiler Tekkesi* (Aybek, 1977, p. 96). During the reign of Sultan Mehmed's dispensation, this lodge was annexed to a mosque complex which was built to meet the need of explicit use as Naqshbandiyah structures, yet over the years, this mystical place also attracted Qadiriyah adherents also (Ayverdi, 1973, v.3, p. 418; Choudhury, 2016, p. 1902).

The second Indian Sufi lodge in Istanbul, mostly known as *Uskudar Hindi Tekkesi*, was founded by Sayyid Faydullah Hindi in 1738. A few historians argue that it could not be proven that both Sayyid Faydullah Hindi and the five sheikhs who succeeded him and used the Hindi title were of Indian origin. They were, according to them, probably Turkish sheikhs of Central Asian origin who came to Istanbul through India. However, the original names of these sheikhs make them more likely to be Sufis of Indian origin (Tanman, 1998, p. 68).

It is known that the Indian lodges were originally affiliated with the Naqshbandiyah order. Although these lodges were occasionally handed over to other Sufi traditions, at the end of the 18th century, they were retransferred to the Naqshbandiyah. These lodges basically served to Anatolian people and welcomed guests, merchants, and dervishes coming from the region of Bukhara, Afghanistan, and India. In these lodges the people have always taken care to be the ones who know the languages and traditional customs of the Indian subcontinent to be appointed as managers and caretakers (Brown, 1927, p. 371).

The Indian lodges had served as a site of temporary lodging, a hub of communal gathering, and a space for prayer for Central and South Asian Sufis during their visits to Istanbul. Despite its institutional namesakes being scattered throughout the Ottoman Empire, the Indian lodges were used as a haunting place by Indian pilgrims who traveled on the westward route to Istanbul, where they awaited the ships to take them to Hajj. These *tekke*s, therefore, served as dynamic reminders since non-Ottoman Sufis pilgrimage became a part of the Ottoman society. Influential presence of such visitors in large numbers could have helped to further improve the Indian nature of these lodges; however, it does not mean that these lodges do not host other Sufis who migrated from other regions of the eastern world (Choudhury, 2016, p. 1908).

Due to its connections to the broader realms of early modern Islam, the Indian lodges also stands at a strategic crossroads. It functioned as a bridge between the Ottoman Empire and the Indian subcontinent in the context of Sufi life and religious culture, as well as being an important area for Ottoman-Indian political relations. For instance, at the beginning of the twentieth century, Ubeydullah es-Sindi (d. 1944), who fought for the liberation of India from British rule, lived in the Hindi lodge when he took refuge in the Ottoman Empire (Tanman 1998, p. 68). Regarding its political and diplomatic aspect, another prominent example is Imam Mehmed, whose physical body was buried in the sacred burial site of the Indian lodge. Imam Mehmed took part in a delegation sent by Tipu Sultan, the ruler of the Meysur State in India, to Abdulhamid I in 1787 to get military support from the Ottoman Empire in the struggle against a local rival, the British East India Company (Bayur, 1948, pp. 617-654; Qureshi, 1999, p. 69).

The tombstones in the cemetery found in these lodges also provide some significant data between each side regarding their socio-historical role. For instance, Muhammad Imam Sardar's gravestone in Horhor lodge states that he was known to his contemporaries at the Horhor lodge as a military envoy in the service of Tipu Sultan (d. 1799), whose name was known among the Sufis as Tipu Sultan Hindi. It is derived that Muhammad Imam was probably a frequent visitor to the Horhor lodge during his stay in the imperial city. According to its epitaph, the grave at Horhor was the final resting place of Muhammad Imam, who died in Istanbul in 1787. In this regard, the following information carved into the gravestone is remarkable:

> *hüve el-huld ve el-baki. merhum (ve) mağfur Mehmed Imam Serdar asker elçiyi Tipu Sultan Hindi. Ruhuna fatiha. Sene 1202 Hicri.* (He (Allah) is immortal and eternal. The late (and) absolved Muhammad Imam Sardar, who is the military ambassador of Tipu Sultan Hindi. Pray for his soul. The year 1202 of the Hijri) (Choudhury, 2016, p. 1914).

Indian Sufi lodges in the Ottoman provinces and different parts of Anatolia became destinations for non-Ottoman Muslims, in particular South Asians. Such kinds of Sufi structures encouraged and welcomed the political aspirations of Indian Muslims on the move between Kabul, Baghdad, Jerusalem, Istanbul, Mecca, and Medina. These *tekke*s received an influx of anticolonial Sufi leaders such as Ubaidullah Sindhi, who was an outstanding scholar from Sialkot. During his stay in the Indian lodge in Istanbul, he published some epistles with his friends, which included very striking analyzes about the following social-political status of the Indian continent (Choudhury, 2016, p. 1895). Indian lodges, hence, provided indications of changing Ottoman conceptions of cultural belonging.

Thanks to these lodges, the mobile and migrant Indian Sufis got a chance to propagate their mystical worldviews, particularly the basic principles of the Naqshbandiyah order among Ottoman people and found a favorable environment to get involved in the political, cultural, and religious life of the state (Gall, 2005, pp. 92-100). The historical data, on the other hand, reveal that they produced various outputs in different areas and benefited from local intellectual, legal, and fiscal opportunities to strengthen their values in a meaningful way (Kara, 2017, pp. 22–38). These fertile Sufis and their

versatile lodges, therefore, not only have built a transnational network between the Ottomans and the Indian subcontinent but also have established universal solidarity among the diverse ethnic-religious and linguistic populations in both regions.

2. Basic Differences between Anatolian and Indian Mujaddidiyah

The cultural perceptions, historical memories, and social structures of Anatolian and Indian Muslims differed from each other. Because of these factors, the Mujaddidiyah movement formed in these two regions took different variations depending on its geographical parameters through which it spread. When the Mujaddidiyah order expanded over an extensive network in Anatolian lands, apart from its original Indian version, it embraced some differences, especially in areas of the methodological principles and mystical experiences.

One of the main noticeable differences between the Anatolian and Indian Mujaddidiyah has emerged in the field of understanding of the existence and unity of God. Before the arrival of the Mujaddidiyah to the Anatolian territory, Ibn Arabi's (d. 1240) view on existence, formulated as the unity of being (wahdat al-wujud), which postulates that God and His creation are one (Kılıç, 20019, p. 115; Demirli, 2012, pp. 431-3), was influential among the Naqshbandiyah *silsila*. his situation was partially altered with the emergence of the Mujaddidiyah order in Anatolia. This is because, the order of Mujadidiyah of Indian origin has strictly defended the theory of monotheism of witness or oneness of appearance (wahdat al-shuhud), which holds that God and his creation are entirely separate (Ansari, 1986, p. 113). However, because of the historical background, no clear distinction has been arisen between the theories of *wahdat al-wujud* and *wahdat al-shuhud* among Anatolian Mujaddidiyahs, on the contrary to what emerged in India.

When the efforts of the Sufis, who guided Anatolian Mujaddidiyah order, are examined, it is seen that the doctrines of *wahdat al-wujud* and *wahdat al-shuhud* are tried to reconcile in some ways. Murad al-Bukhari, for instance, encouraged his son to read Ibn Arabi's celebrated work *al-Futuhatul Makkiyye* from Abdulgani en-Nablusi (d. 1731), one of the advocates of the theory of *wahdat al-wujud* (Şimşek, 2004, pp. 21-22; en-Nablusî, 2003, pp. 10-13).

On the other hand, the initial Indian Mujaddidiyahs' perception of the doctrine of *wahdat al-shuhud* as an alternative to *wahdat al-wujud* has been directly related to the prevailing socio-cultural and religious-philosophical conditions of the Indian subcontinent. At the time of Ahmad Sirhindi, Islamic beliefs and practices were misinterpreted and misread by some Indian Muslims with the influence of local religious and philosophical traditions. Such an ambiance not only caused the weakening of the Islamic principles particularly among the Muslims whose theological background was not sufficient to comprehend such kinds of experiential states properly but also lead to the emergence of various eclectic and syncretic religious movements.

In this regard, the most critical development was the *Din-i Ilahi* movement initiated by Akbar Shah, the third ruler of the Baburi Dynasty. The historical sources state that Akbar and the royal court deviated from the actual path of Islam, particularly in the later period of his reign, because of the influence of some *ulama* around him such as Mullah Abdullah Sultanpuri, Maulana Abdul Nabi and two sons of Mullah Mubarak, Faizi and Abu Fazl, who betrayed Akbar in fulfilling their responsibility truly (Mektubat, no. 47). With the influence of such outstanding courtiers, Akbar allowed and encouraged such scholars, who were not only the adherents of the religion of Islam but followers of other religions like Hinduism, Jainism, and Christianity, to discuss their faiths in the court. In particular, a House of Worship (Ibadat Khana) was established with the guidance of Abul Fazl for such polemic discussions and this attempt ultimately led the foundation of the *Din-i Ilahi*, a combination of Hindu and Muslim beliefs (Badauni, 1898, v. 2, p. 219).

In these circumstances, Ahmad Sirhindi set upon himself the task of purifying the Islamic belief and awakening Muslim society. Apart from the cessation of the impact of the *Din-i Ilahi* movement, Ahmad Sirhindi's one of the basic targets was to get Islam rid of the accretions of Hindu pantheism (Rafique, 2005, p. 60). As it is known that at that time the Hindu philosophical teaching of Vedanta was also very common and influential among not only Hindu mystical thinkers but in some Sufi circles as well. The Vedanta philosophy is concerned with the self-realization by which one understands the ultimate nature of reality, called Brahman. The central concept of Vedanta is that Brahman is the ultimate cause of the universe and the Ultimate Reality. Individuality, on the other hand, is unreal and does not persist in the state of salvation. According to Shankara, what is called as the soul (atman) is not absolutely different from God (Brahman). The difference between the individual self and the supreme self is only evident because of the presence of limiting adjuncts, which are composed by names and forms and are produced by ignorance (avidya), hence; there is actually no difference (Raily, 2005, pp. 184-5). Eventually, the delusiveness of the individual self is apparently the central notion of the Vedanta that believes in subsuming every diverse phenomena and experience under an underlying unity. Therefore, *Vedanta* philosophy and the thought of *wahdat al-wujud* share some common views on the nature of ultimate power and the phenomenal world, while they have some departures as well (Sharvani & Sattar, 2016, p. 14).

These eclectic approaches brought about an even more misinterpretation of some Sufi thoughts that were not easy to be digested by ordinary Muslims. Ahmad Sirhindi, who observed that the Vedanta philosophy, as well as the doctrine of *wahdat al-wujud* influenced Indian Muslims in a negative manner, he decided to take some precautions. In his letters, he accentuates that mysticism without shariah misled and prompted people to misinterpret the basic ideas of Sufism (Mektubat, no. 100). The doctrines taught by him were an attempt to integrate reformist Sufi ideas into a Sunni framework. He always discoursed on his theory of *wahdat al-shuhud* more sharply for this purpose (Ansari, 1986, pp. 106-110). That is why the significance of the theory of *wahdat al-wujud* is more apparent and dominant among Indian Mujaddidiyahs rather than Anatolian Mujaddidiyahs.

The second striking difference between the Anatolian and Indian Mujaddidiyah tradition is the level of their relationship with other Sufi orders found in their spheres of influence. In India, the people who belong to the Mujaddidiyah order had not engaged with other Sufi traditions which were deeply influenced by local religious traditions, however, the situation in Anatolia had developed differently.

In Anatolian Sufi life, the relations between the various Sufi orders developed more intensely. A member of a cult joined the religious meeting of another cult, and was able to adopt the procedures and principles of different Sufi schools. For instance, some deputies of the Mujaddidiyah order in Anatolia were readers of the *Masnawi*, the noted collection of verses of Mawlana Jelaluddin Rumi (d. 1273). Even after they had become Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah shaikhs, they kept their spiritual relations with the Mawlawi order and continued to teach the *Masnawi*. Again, to give a few specific examples the names of Mehmed Emin Tokadi and Ahmad Trabzoni, who were the eminent representatives of the Anatolian Mujaddidiyah, might be cited. While the former participated in the Khalwati order, the latter was ratified as a member of both Mujaddidiyah and Mawlaviyah *silsila.* This situation caused to acceptance of some mystical practices belonging to other Sufi orders like audition (sama), whirling (devran), and dream interpreting (ruya) among Anatolian Mujaddidiyah, in particular after the death of Murad al-Bukhari (Şimşek, 2004, pp. 275, 336). Some Mujaddidiyah leaders even took art lessons from music masters and responded to those who opposed such practices by writing refutations such as *Makulat-ı Devriyye*, which was composed by Mustaqimzade (Şimşek, 2004, p. 358).

However, the approach of the Indian Mujaddidiyah sheikhs to the Sufi practices like whirling, singing, dancing, and dreaming has been different. For example, Ahmad Sirhindi points out that such procedures are not required to obtain proper knowledge of the essence of Islam. He wrote that "These

things are against our way. For this reason, Naqshbandiyahs do not follow them. When other Sufis do, we just respect them." (Mektubat, no. 273). Even al-Bukhari, who spent most of his life in India under the guidance of Ahmad Sirhindi, takes a stricter attitude towards dreams and inspiration since to him they only fetch up suspicion and do not produce certain knowledge (Şimşek, 2004, p. 337).

The attitudes of the Indian Mujaddidiyah sheikhs towards these kinds of Sufi practices should be read similarly, taking into account the socio-cultural conditions in which they lived. At the time of the growth of the Mujaddidiyah movement, rituals like a whirling, dancing, and singing were widespread common spiritual and ritualistic performances among Indian society. The certain religious practices and motifs peculiar to local Hindu denominations, particularly the Bhakti[2], have somehow spread to some Sufi traditions (Digby, 2007, pp. 238-245). For example, the writings of the Sufi leaders who adhered to Chistiyah reveal that they did not oppose the adaptation of the Bhakti cult to the Hindu saints and used their terms and linguistic styles for Islamic devotional songs. This might have been for a tactical purpose to familiarize the local people towards Islam and get acquainted with Sufi teachings but it also ensured that bilateral interactions have been taking place (Candayan, no. 5). The deputies of the Mujaddidiyah order in India who grew up in this atmosphere, hence, tried to uproot heresy and to purify Sufi practices from non-Islamic influence. Their attitude towards mystical illuminations and the concept of *wahdat al-wujud,* therefore, was more prudent, and their relationship with other Sufi orders was more deliberative.

Conclusion

Turkey and India are commonly perceived as unfamiliar countries to each other because of the geographical distance and socio-cultural differences. However, historical data reveal that there have been far more religious, cultural, commercial, political, and diplomatic bilateral relations between these two deep-rooted civilizations through the efforts of rulers, scholars, merchants, mystics, pilgrims, travelers, and voyagers. In this regard, the Sufis of both countries established unshakable bridges between these two regions crossing long distances, which created an international cultural network in the south and west of Asia. Regarding with mystical mobility, the role of the Naqshbandiyah order cannot be ignored, as it provided a strong transnational Sufi network among Indian and Anatolian Muslims.

Naqshbandiyah sheikhs, who were trained in India, established Indian lodges, mostly known as *Hindiler Tekkesi*, in different parts of the Ottoman Empire in order to introduce their Sufi way to native people and to gather individuals who share their mystical thoughts and principles. This happened suddenly after that the Naqshbandiyah-Mujaddidiyah *silsila*, an Indian origin sub-branch of the Naqshbandiyah, reached Anatolian land through eminent deputies of Ahmad Sirhindi. Even though the nature of the Anatolian and Indian Mujaddidiyah order was approximately similar to each other, their interaction with other Sufi orders and approaches to the concepts of *wahdat al-wujud* and *wahdetshudud* exhibited some differences rooted in the socio-cultural surroundings in which they flourished. Consequently, the experience of Mujaddidiyah order has enabled the establishment of transnational Sufi networks in India and Anatolia, which not only allowed both cultures to recognize each other more closely but filled an essential gap in the context of political, social, and cultural relations between the Ottomans and the Indians.

---

[2] Bhakti means attachment or devotion to divine. The term Bhakti refers to one of several alternate spiritual ways to salvation in Hindu dharma (Pandeya, 1991, pp. 3-4).

References

Abdurrahman, S. (nd). Madhyakalin Bharat ke Musalaman Şasakon ki Dharmika Udarata, Raza Laibreri, Rampur.

Abu Manneh, B. (1982). "The Naqshbandiyya-Mujaddidiyya in the Ottoman Lands in the Early 19th Century", Die Welt des Islams, 22, 1-36.

Akot, B. (2014). Seyid Sibğatullah Arvasi (ö. 1287/1870) ve Bazı Tasavvufi Kavramlara Yaklaşımı", EKEV Akademi Dergisi, 18(58), 251-263.

Algar, H. (1991). Bâkî-Billâh", Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, vol. 4, (pp. 542-543). Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Algar, H. (1997). "Halidiyye", Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, vol. 15, (pp. 295-296). Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Algar, H. (2004). "Mektuat", Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, vol. 29, (pp. 11-12). Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Allâmi, A. F. (1907). Akbar Nama (I-III), trans. H. Beveridge. Calcutta: Asiatic Society.

Ansari, M. (1986). Sufism and Shariah. London: The Islamic Foundation.

Aybek, Z. H. (1977). "Hindîler Tekkesi", Hayat Tarih Mecmuası, 12(7), 96.

Ayverdi, E. H. (1973). Osmanlı Mi'mârîsinde Fâtih Devri, 855–886 (1451–1481), vol. 3, İstanbul: Baha Matbaası.

Badauni, A. Q. (1884). Muntakhabut Tawarikh, vol. 1, trans. W. H. Lowe, Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.

Bayur, Y. H. (1948). "Maysor Sultanı Tipu ile Osmanlı Pâdişahlarından I. Abdülhamid ve III. Selim Arasındaki Mektuplaşma," Belleten, 12(47), 617–54.

Bayur, Y. H. (1987). Hindistan Tarihi (I–III). Ankara: TTK Basımevi.

Brown, J. P. (1927). The Dervishes or Oriental Spiritualism. London.

Buehler, A. (2006). "Mawlana Khalid and Shah Ghulam Ali", Journal of the History of Sufism, 5, 65-79.

Choudhury, R. (2016). "The Hajj and the Hindi: The Ascent of the Indian Sufi Lodge in the Ottoman Empire," Modern Asian Studies, 50(6), 1888–1931.

Demirli, E. (2012). "Vahdet-i Vücûd", Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, vol. 42, (pp. 431-435). Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Digby, S. (2007). "Sufi and Bhakti Compositions and Linguistic Indignization", In Hamid Husain (ed.), Sufism and Bhakti Movement Eternal Relevance, (pp.238-262). New Delhi: Manak Publications.

en-Nablusî, A. b. İ. (2003). Gerçek Varlık: Vahdet-i Vücûd'un Müdafaası, trans. Ekrem Demirli. İstanbul: İz Yayıncılık.

Gall, D. L. (2005). A Culture of Sufism: Naqshbandis in the Ottoman World, 1450–1700. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Haq, S. M. (1974). "Rise and Expansion of the Chishtis in the Subcontinent", Journal of the Pakistan Historical Society, 22(3), 157-181.

Haq, S. M. (1977). "Rise of the Naqshbandi and Qadiri silsilahs in the Subcontinent, with special reference to their efforts to restore the supremacy of the Shariah." Journal of Pakistan Historical Society, 25(1), 1-33.

Haksever A. C. (2012). "Osmanlı'nın Modernleşme Sürecinde Hâlidîler ve Diğer Müceddidîler", In Erdal Baykan (ed.), Uluslararası Mevlana Halid-i Bağdadi Sempozyumu Bildirileri, (pp. 419-435). Ankara.

Hines, N. A. (2009). Maulana Daud's Candayan. Delhi: Manohar.

İmam-ı Rabbani, Ahmed-i Faruki Serhendi. (2014). Mektubat Tercemesi, trans. Hüseyin Hilmi Işık. İstanbul: Hakîkat Kitâbevi.

Kafesoğlu, İ. (2001). "Ondördüncü Yüzyıldan Sonra Orta Asya'da Kurulmuş Türk Devletleri", Türk Dünyası El Kitabı. Ankara.

Kara, M. (2017). "Hindistan'da Oluşan Tasavvuf Kültürünün Bursa'ya/Osmanlı Dünyasına Aksedişi (Müceddidiye Örneği)." Yeni Türkiye Dergisi -İslam Dünyası Özel Sayısı-II, 96, 22–44.

Kılıç, M. E. (2019). İbn'ül-Arabi. Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı Yayınları.

Kufralı, K. (1949). "Nakşibendiliğin Kuruluşu ve Yayılışı" (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi, Türkiyat Enstitüsü.

Murray, T. T. (1979). Indian Islam: A Religious History of Islam in India. Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers.

Özcan, A. (1997). Pan-İslamizm: Osmanlı Devleti Hindistan Müslümanları ve İngiltere (1877–1924). Istanbul: İsam Yayınları.

Palabıyık, H. (2012). "Hindistan'ın İslâmlaşmasında Orta Asya İslâm'ının Tesiri", In Muhammed Savaş Kafkasyalı (ed.), Orta Asya'da İslam (I-III), (pp. 925-974). Ankara.

Palanpuri, M. (2007). Muhtaser Tarih-i Hind. New Delhi: Farid Book Depot.

Pandeya, A. G. (1991). Bhakti Darşanavimarşah. Varanasi.

Qureshi, I. H. (1999). "Tipu Sultan's Embassy to Constantinople', In Irfan Habib (ed.), Confronting Colonialism: Resistance and Modernization under Haidar Ali and Tipu Sultan, (pp. 69-78). New Delhi: Tulika.

Rafique, M. (2005). "Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi's Critique of Mysticism", In Abdul Ali & Zafarul Islam (eds.), Contribution of Shaikh Ahmad Sirhindi to Islamic Thought, (pp. 56-69). Aligarh: Institute of Islamic Studies.

Raily, P. (2005). "Vaidika Parampara evam Sankara Vedanta ke Sandarbha mein Atma ki Avdharana," (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis). Punjab: Panjab University.

Rashid, A. (1967) "Ottoman Mughal Relations during the Seventeenth Century." Türk Tarih Kongresi, (pp. 533–545). Ankara.

Reis Bedriye. (2006). "XVI-XVII. Yüzyıllarda Hindistan'da Din-i İlahi Tartışmaları ve İmam-ı Rabbani", TASAVVUF: İlmî ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi, 7(16), 211-234.

Rizvi, S. A. (1983). A History of Sufism in India, vol. 2, From Sixteenth Century to Modern Century. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Sharvani, Z. A. Kh., & Sattar, S. A. (2016). "Visishtādvaita and Wahdatul-Wujūd: Points of comparison and departure", Tattva- Journal of Philosophy, 8(1), 1-18.

Şimşek, H. İ. (2006). "Murad Buhârî", Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, vol. 31, (pp. 185-187). Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Şimşek, H. İ. (2012). Mehmed Emin Tokadî'nin Hayatı Eserleri ve Tasavvufî Şahsiyeti, Tokat Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitabı, yay haz. Ali Açıkel, 389-402

Şimşek, H. İ. (2014). Osmanlı'da Müceddidilik XII/XVIII. Yüzyıl. Erkam Matbaası.

Subhan, J. A. (1938). Sufism its Saints and Shrines. Lucknow.

Tanman, M. B. (1998). "Hindîler Tekkesi," Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslâm Ansiklopedisi, vol. 18, (pp.67-68). Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı.

Tosun, N. (2005). İmâm-ı Rabbânî Ahmed Sirhindî: Hayatı, Eserleri, Tasavvufî Görüşleri. İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları.

Yitik, A. İ., & Çınar, A. (2016). "Dârâ Şükûh ve Eseri Mecma'-i Bahreyn Üzerine", In A. Hikmet Eroğlu (ed.), Prof. Dr. A. Küçük'e Armağan, (pp. 529-568). Ankara: Berikan Yayınları.

Zarcone, T. (1994). "Hindîler Tekkesi," Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi, vol. 4, (p. 74). Istanbul: Kültür Bakanlığı ve Tarih Vakfı.