49. Quoted in Paul Demiéville, "Langue et littérature chinoises," in *Annuaire du Collège de France* (Paris, 1962), p. 330.

50. Strictly speaking, *mondō* and *kōan* should be distinguished as two different genres, but for a first approximation, we can consider them together.

51. Notice the difference between the "progressive," linear dialogues of early Chan and the "disruptive" dialogues of "classical" Chan.

52. Concerning this notion, see François Lyotard and Jean-Loup Thébaud, *Just Gaming* (Minneapolis, 1985).

53. On this question, see Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*. See also "Performative Utterances," in Paul Edwards, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York, 1967), vol. 5-6, pp. 90–91; Jacques Derrida, "Signature, événement, contexte," in *Marges de la philosophie* (Paris, 1972), pp. 382–84; and Paul de Man, *Allegories of Reading* (New Haven, Conn., 1979), pp. 119–32. Notice, however, that, contrary to Austin's definition, Chan "speech-acts" are polysemic, irreducible to a single meaning, and do not imply a self-controlled intentionality.

54. See Bernard Faure, *La Vision immédiate* (Paris, 1987), pp. 30–54.

55. Jean-François Lyotard, *La Condition postmoderne* (Paris, 1979), p. 23.

56. In a round-table discussion on Chan, Nishitani Keiji stated, for example, that these encounters, "different from the dialogues that take place in schools or elsewhere, . . . were direct body attacks," while his interlocutor, Shibayama Zenkei, compared their protagonists to "two swordsmen fighting with real swords" (*Eastern Buddhist* 8 [1975]: 70).

57. Favret-Saada, *Les Mots, la mort, les sorts*, p. 261.

58. Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, 1981), p. 52.

59. Francis Rabelais, *The Histories of Gargantua and Pantagruel*, trans. J. M. Cohen (City, 1955), p. 234.

60. Rabelais, *Histories of Gargantua and Pantagruel*, pp. 235–36, 237, 238.

61. Thomas Merton, *Zen and the Birds of Appetite* (New York, 1968), p. 50.

8

Mystical Language and the Teaching Context in the Early Lexicons of Sufism

CARL W. ERNST

How does mystical language differ from other types of language? If one wishes to answer this question without relying on a priori definitions of mysticism, it would seem desirable to inquire how mystics have described their attitude toward language in general, and how they distinguish the characteristics of the special terminology and modes of discourse used in mystical writing. The literature of Islamic mysticism features a subgenre that is particularly appropriate for such an inquiry: lexicons of the technical terminology of the Sufis. The Sufi lexicons have the appearance of the standard academic dictionaries that proliferated in all the fields of Arab–Islamic scholarship, yet the Sufis distinguished themselves from other lexicographers by consistently referring their technical terms to a manifold range of mystical experiences. Most of the early Sufi lexicons, written between the tenth and thirteenth centuries C.E., are designed for novices in the Sufi path, and amount to maps of the internal topography of Sufism. The mystical language of the Sufi lexicons expresses a wide range of experiences, not propositions, and it presupposes the authority of the master–disciple relationship as the basis for the intended experiences of transcendence.

It is the special context of this teaching relationship that gives these Sufi lexicons importance for the concept of mystical language.

The construction of dictionaries was an activity that scholars of the Arab-Islamic world pursued diligently, to a degree rivaled perhaps only by the Chinese before modern times.[1] As an independent discipline, lexicography emerged slowly from the study of the Qur'ān, as an attempt to deepen the understanding of the sacred book.[2] Arabic philological scholarship proceeded along the lines of the science of *ḥadīth*, which studies the sayings and deeds of the Prophet Muhammad; transmitters of definitions, like *ḥadīth*-transmitters, had to pass scrutiny of their ethical and religious character to gain full acceptance. Dictionaries were arranged in a number of ways, sometimes by subject or by a variety of alphabetical orders.[3] A general dictionary such as the famous *Mafātiḥ al-'Ulūm* (*Keys of the Sciences*) of al-Khwārazmī (ca. 977) attempted to cover the terminology of both the traditional Islamic sciences and the intellectual sciences inherited from the Hellenistic world; this eclectic reference work was perfectly suited to the literary *adab*-culture of government secretaries in the late 'Abbasid period.[4] The vast multivolume Arabic dictionaries of Ibn Manẓūr (d. 1311) and al-Zabīdī (d. 1791) were models of literary scholarship, and used abundant specimens of pre-Islamic Arabic poetry as testimonies (*shawāhid*) to the usage of various words. While the study of the Arabic language thus enlarged its scope by absorbing secular literature, philology was never entirely separate from religious concerns; doctrinal considerations often precluded the conclusions that literary scholarship might have reached on its own, since the Qur'ān could never be considered on the level of ordinary writings.[5]

Sufi dictionaries first appeared as appendixes to the Arabic treatises on Sufism written in the tenth and eleventh centuries. Abū Naṣr al-Sarrāj (d. 988) included a chapter with definitions of 155 terms in his *Kitāb al-Luma' fī 't-taṣawwuf* (*Book of Glimmerings on Sufism*).[6] Substantially the same list of terms, with significant development of the definitions, appeared two centuries later in the Persian work of Rūzbihān Baqlī (d. 1209), the *Sharḥ-i Shaṭḥiyyāt* (*Commentary on Ecstatic Sayings*).[7] Briefer lexicons were included in the *Risālah* (*Epistle*) of Abū al-Qāsim al-Qushayrī (d. 1074) and the Persian *Kashf al-Maḥjūb* (*Revelation of the Veiled*) of 'Alī

al-Hujwīrī (d. 1072).[8] Of special interest are two dictionaries by the great Sufi master Muḥyī al-Dīn Ibn 'Arabī (d. 1240), one a separate treatise written in 1218 and the other a section in his encyclopedic *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah* (*Spiritual Conquests of Mecca*).[9] These texts are some of the most significant early Sufi lexical works.[10] Later works, such as the compendious Sufi dictionary of 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Kāshānī (discussed below), adopted a different focus and arrangement to reach a wider audience, but in the process they departed from the original orientation toward Sufi novices. In more recent times, the publication of broadly aimed dictionaries with significant amounts of Sufi terminology has continued, particularly in Persian.[11]

European scholars have devoted relatively little attention to the Sufi lexicons, though two of the earliest works of nineteenth-century scholarship on Sufism highlighted this genre. Tholuck cited excerpts from Kāshānī's dictionary in 1828, and Aloys Sprenger published Kāshānī's complete text in 1845.[12] Ibn 'Arabī's separate lexicon, the *Iṣṭilāḥ al-Ṣūfiyyah*, was the first of his writings to be published in Europe, appearing in 1845 in an edition by Gustavus Flügel along with the general dictionary of Islamic subjects by Jurjānī (d. 1329).[13] These early efforts, however, did not inspire much further interest in the vocabulary and semantics of Sufism. Indeed, Sprenger called Sufi mysticism a "monomania" and a "disease" characteristic of civilizational decadence, though he conceded the importance of Sufism in poetry, "because the noblest feelings of man are morbidly exalted in this disease."[14] Reinhold Dozy, author of the *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, spoke contemptuously of the recondite language of Sufism, observing, "I think that I would lose my mind if I submerged myself in the study of certain types of these words, in the alembical terminology of the Sufis, for example. This is a task that I voluntarily leave to others."[15] The principal work on Sufism that might have been expected to deal with the Sufi lexicons was the epochal study by Louis Massignon, *Essai sur les origines due lexique technique de la mystique musulmane*. Massignon, despite his wide-ranging comments in this work, intended it to be specifically a study of the vocabulary of al-Hallāj, the Sufi martyr who exerted a consuming fascination over Massignon's studies. The early lexicons of Sufism, he ob-

served, could be profitably compared with the terms used by al-Hal-lāj, but Massignon also left this inquiry to others.[16] This essay is a brief survey of the early Sufi lexicons, with special reference to their explicit presentation of language as the expression of mystical experiences.

What was the purpose of a Sufi lexicon? As the authors of these texts explain, a lexicon is only necessary for a subject when a specialized technical vocabulary comes into existence, which only experts in that field properly understand. Unlike Khwārazmī's dictionary, however, the Sufi lexicons were not typically designed to assist outsiders to comprehend their vocabulary. On the contrary, the special terminology of Sufism was partially designed to conceal meanings from outsiders who were not qualified to understand them. The Sufi authors expound on this exclusive aspect of their terminology in the prefatory remarks to the lexicons. Qushayrī observes,

> Know, regarding the sciences, that every group among the schol-
> ars has words they employ on matters they share, by which they
> are distinguished from others, and they agree in this for the sake
> of their common goals: increasing understanding for those who
> discuss, or facilitating for the people of this art the comprehen-
> sion of their meanings without restriction. This group [i.e., the
> Sufis] employs words on matters they share, through which they
> intend to reveal their meanings to themselves, and to summarize
> and conceal from those who oppose them in their path [*tariqah*],
> so that the meanings of their words may be obscure to outsiders,
> out of jealousy toward them for their secrets. Thus they form a
> party against those who are unworthy. . . . By the commentary
> on these words we wish to facilitate the understanding of those
> among the wayfarers of these paths and the followers of their
> example [*sunnah*] who wish to comprehend their meanings.[17]

So the vocabulary of Sufism is designed both to facilitate understanding among Sufis and to frustrate it for outsiders. It should not be surprising that some Muslim scholars, such as the Hanbalī jurist Ibn al-Jawzī, therefore severely criticized Qushayrī's Sufi terminology as a reprehensible innovation.[18] Hujwīrī is equally firm in maintaining the two functions of the mystical vocabulary, though he underlines the utility of the Sufi terminology as being more for novices than adepts:

> Know (may God make you happy) that the people of every art
> and the masters of every activity have expressions with each other
> in the issuing of their secrets, and words the meaning of which
> none knows but themselves. The purpose of setting up expres-
> sions is twofold: one is better instruction and simplification of
> intricacies to approximate the understanding of the aspirant, and
> the other is concealing the secret from those who are not worthy
> of that knowledge. The proofs of that are clear, for the philolo-
> gists are distinguished by their own set expressions, such as "past
> tense," "future," "correct," [etc.; examples are given from jurists,
> *hadith* scholars, and theologians] . . . Now this group also has
> set words to conceal and display their speech, so that they may
> act accordingly in their path; they show what they wish and hide
> what they wish.[19]

The terms of Sufism, then, are explicitly intended both to conceal and to display, to show and to hide. It might be supposed that secretive "jealousy" of the Sufis (in Qushayrī's phrase) is not altogether different from the professional egotism that leads to jargon in every field. The Sufis have a different reasoning, however; their theory of meaning insists that the mystical language is esoteric in its essence, as we shall see.

It may not be easy to draw the line between novices who can benefit from having technical terms defined and outsiders who should be prevented from learning the Sufi vocabulary. The difference between Ibn 'Arabī's two lexicons illustrates this difficulty; the lexicon in the *Futūḥāt* occurs in the middle of an esoteric discussion of different types of divine knowledge, and it is aimed at the reader who has a deep acquaintance with Sufi teachings. This lexicon has the unusual feature, moreover, of chaining all the terms together so that the conclusion of each definition includes the next term, in this way introducing the next term's definition. This linkage of terms is certainly no accident; it suggests that they share an essential relationship beyond their purely lexical connotations.[20] The ingenious structuring of Ibn 'Arabī's lexicon is based on the simultaneously experiential and transcendental nature of the Sufi vocabulary, as discussed below. It is, in addition, expressed in a teaching formula ("If you say . . . then we say") characteristic of the Islamic religious sciences. Ibn 'Arabī's lexicon by these formal characteristics perfectly illustrates the intentionality of mystical

language in the teaching relationship. Ibn 'Arabī noticed the diffi-
culty of the Sufi vocabulary for "conventional scholars" when he
replied to the request of the unnamed friend who inspired the sepa-
rate lexicon:

> You asked us to explain the words that the Sufi mystics, God's
> people, circulate among themselves, when you saw many of the
> conventional scholars ask us about the meaning of our writings,
> and the writings of the people of our path, despite their lack of
> knowledge about the words which we have agreed upon, by which
> we understand one another. Just so is the custom of the people
> of every art among the sciences. So I answered you on that . . .[21]

It appears that Ibn 'Arabī's response to his friend's request is not
really destined for a conventional audience, but for the friend,
whom Ibn 'Arabī calls a trusted intimate. Nonetheless, the separate
lexicon is somewhat simpler than the excerpt in the *Futūhāt*,
though both contain substantially the same terms (in precisely the
reverse order), and it seems to be aimed more at the Sufi novice.[22]
The situation is different with Kāshānī, who in introducing his
lengthy dictionary (516 terms in 167 pages) states that he wrote it
for "the scholars of the traditional and intellectual sciences [who]
did not recognize" the technical terms of Sufism.[23] As James Morris
has pointed out, Kāshānī wrote on Sufism principally for mysti-
cally inclined intellectuals and scholars trained in the Avicennian
philosophical tradition.[24] By adopting a philosophical approach,
Kāshānī made his dictionary an intellectual commentary on Sufi
vocabulary for non-Sufis.

What are the sources of the terms in the Sufi lexicons? The
studies of Massignon and, more recently, Paul Nwyia have shown
the fundamental importance of the Qur'ān in the formulation of
the Sufi vocabulary.[25] This point should not be overstressed, how-
ever. Massignon's establishment of the Qur'ānic and Islamic
sources of Sufi language served the purpose of refuting the early
Orientalist theories that sought extra-Islamic origins (Christian,
Greek, or Indian) for Sufism. The Sufis' reliance on the Qur'ān is
unquestionably the beginning point for understanding the language
of Sufism, but the controversies over novel and un-Qur'ānic terms
in Sufism are sufficient indication that the Sufis went outside
Qur'anic language to formulate their insights.[26] Massignon himself

pointed out three other sources of Sufi terminology: Arabic gram-
mar and the Islamic religious sciences, the early schools of Islamic
theology, and the vocabulary of the Hellenistic sciences.[27] Many of
the terms that occur in the early Sufi lexicons are not to be found
in the Qur'ān at all; since our concern here is not linguistic but
hermeneutic, for the moment it will suffice to make this general
observation. Academic inquiries about literary sources (*Quellen-
forschungen*) are in any case inclined to fasten on minutiae to the
neglect of authors' intentions. The Sufi authors are unanimous
in agreeing that the real source of their terminology is mystical
experience, a point that is examined more fully below. As far as
the definitions themselves are concerned, poetic testimonies and
quotations from authoritative Sufis appear frequently, particularly
in the works of Sarrāj and Qushayrī. Occasionally, verses from the
Qur'ān are cited as illustrations.[28] There is sometimes a wide varia-
tion in the definitions themselves, from one author to another;
each one seems to have felt a considerable freedom to add to or
subtract from the received definitions, in accordance with personal
experience or the authoritative pronouncement of a teacher.

The loose arrangement of terms in the Sufi lexicons suggests,
moreover, that small groupings of related but discrete mystical
experiences form the basic units of terms that are defined. Most of
the definitions are psychological, in terms of the soul's experience
of different aspects of God; this is true even of poetic phrases
and metaphysical terms usually given objectified and philosophical
meanings in non-Sufi contexts.[29] Overall, there is no discernable
order to the terms in these dictionaries, alphabetical or otherwise
(here, again, Kāshānī breaks the pattern of the early dictionaries
by adopting a standard alphabetical arrangement). The lexicons
instead group words into sets of two, three, or four, based on
similarity of derivation (from a single root), semantic clusters,
rhyme, grammatical form, semantic polarity, or parallel phraseol-
ogy.[30] Comparison of the sequence of terms in the different lexi-
cons shows a number of sections of terms that are repeated in
roughly the same order, but with some variation. It is possible that
a core list of Sufi mystical terms was widely used in oral teaching,
and later became the basis for the similarity of sequence in the
different texts; the similarities are not so great, though, as to sug-
gest literary dependence in every case.

All the Sufi authors agree that their special terms designate mystical experiences, variously designated by such names as "realities" (*ḥaqā'iq*), "meanings" (*maʿāni*), "states" (*aḥwāl*), "stations" (*maqāmāt*), and "unveiling" (*kashf*). Qushayrī, in his discussion of the esoteric nature of Sufi terminology, points out that mystical states are the result not of effort but divine grace: "Their [the Sufis'] realities are not collected by any sort of effort nor are gained by any kind of action; rather, they are meanings that God has promised to the hearts of a people, and by the realities of which he selects the consciences of a people."[31] Sufi esotericism, jealously guarding the secrets, is therefore designed to prevent wild misunderstandings on the part of people who have no access to the underlying experiences of encounter with God. Rūzbihān becomes rhapsodic in describing the mystical sources of Sufi language:

> Because there are certain words that are vessels for secrets and charged with lights, a subtle commentary will be spoken on that, God willing, so that the listener may recognize the understanding of the folk's expressions [*'ibārat*], and know their indication [*ishārah*]. Those words hold the cyphers [*rumūz*] of the treasures of subtleties of [divine] commands, the stopping-places of the secrets of [mystical] states, the annunciations of [divine] commands, the desires of gnosis, and the radiance of the lights of unveilings, which are disclosed to the beginners in love in the journeying of spirits and consciences, from the revelation of the manifestation of eternity, the eternal speech, the unique [divine] actions, and the realities of the manifestation of the [divine] attributes. Since with one taste of the drink of the spirits' fonts,[32] in the unique and marvellous subtleties of the hidden world, they become masters of their momentary state [*waqt*], they make an indication of that sweetness with these words.[33]

The rushing torrent of words does not immediately reveal a pattern of interpretation, but on closer examination the sources expressed by mystical terms can be discerned again; the "expressions," "indication," and "cyphers" derive from the divine commands, mystical states, gnosis, and unveilings. Rūzbihān also gives a theological content to these experiences, consisting of eternity, the speech of God, and the divine actions and attributes (all terms familiar to Islamic dialectical theology). He insists, further, that mystical terminology has a firm relationship with states that are fully known

to the adepts: "Every cypher is connected to a station, every indication is the description of a state, and every expression is the discovery of an unveiling. None knows save the master of stations and the adept of indications. I shall repeat these points and names from the marvel of their states, so that you may know how sweet and subtle is the elegance of their motions."[34] In most of the entries of his dictionary, Rūzbihān therefore begins with the definition of Sarrāj or another clear description, and then follows with a characterization of the experiential basis of the term, which he introduces with the phrase "Its reality is . . ." Kāshānī also agrees with the experiential grounding of Sufi terminology, though he puts it in a typically intellectualist and systematic way: "I have indicated that the principles mentioned in the book are from the stations of the folk, which ramify into a thousand stations. I have pointed out the quality of their ramification and that which distinguishes the quality of their ramifications according to their type."[35] Whether poetic like Rūzbihān or systematic like Kāshānī, the Sufis maintain that the essence of mystical terminology is the experience.

The experiential nature of the Sufi vocabulary is particularly evident in the terms from grammatical categories. Even the terms for "word" and "name" have reference to mystical experience. To give some parallel examples: Sarrāj begins his definition of "name" (*ism*) prosaically, as "words put to give information about the named by a naming, to affirm the named; if the words fail, its meaning is not separated from the named."[36] In his view of language, meaning transcends the name. Rūzbihān partially translates and expands on this definition in a more overtly mystical way: "certain words by which they give information about the named. The name in reality is the attribute of the named. Know that the names [of God] manifest in the hearts of the faithful so that their certainty may increase."[37] In this definition, it becomes clear that in speaking of "name" and "the named," Sufis tend naturally to think of the names of God (the ninety-nine names derived from the Qur'ān) and how they experience God through those names, which are theologically the divine attributes. Since the names of God form a staple of Sufi meditation, it is scarcely surprising that the divine names are assumed to be the main referents for the term "name." For Ibn 'Arabī, names other than the names of God are not even included in the definition; he defines "name" as "that one

of the divine names that governs the state of the devotee during his momentary state."[38] Likewise, Ibn 'Arabī defines "word" (*harf*) as "that expression by which God addresses you."[39] In the Sufi lexicon, all words and names function in the relationship of intimacy between the human soul and God.

The semantic categories of mystical language have an obviously experiential dimension, but their meaning is so transcendent that it is sometimes very difficult to pin down. Rūzbihān likes to use the word "cypher" (*ramz*), a term that occurs once in the Qur'ān (3.41) to describe the signs by which the silent Zachariah communicated to his people. As Rūzbihān defines it, "cypher is the inner meaning [*ma'nā*] hidden beneath the external speech, which no one can grasp except those who are worthy of it. The cypher of the hidden realities pronounced by the tongue in the subtleties of knowledge is the secret in inverted letters."[40] The inner secret is so far beyond the outer speech that the letters of the word are described as "inverted" in comparison. An Arabic verse quoted by Sarrāj may have assumed silent Zachariah as the model of esoteric symbolism: "When they speak, may the goal of their cyphers incapacitate you, and when they are silent, how far you are from joining Him!"[41] Another favorite semantic category is "indication" (*ishārah*), which almost means "gesture" and implies a communication of so subtle a nature that it can scarcely be verbalized. As Sarrāj describes it, "The indication is that which is hidden from the speaker's revelation of it by verbal expression, because of the subtlety of its meaning. Abū 'Alī al-Rūdhbārī said, 'This knowledge of ours is an indication which, when it becomes an expression, is hidden.'"[42] Verbalization conceals reality; esotericism is inevitable. For Rūzbihān, "indication" is primarily the inner communication with God, and only derivatively is it the mystic's account of the experience to others:

> The reality of indication is the shining of the light of hidden subtle speech with God in the clothing of consciousness during the onslaught of finding God [*wujūd*] in the heart. The gnostic alludes to that from the mine of union with the tongue of reality for the people of the presence, so that he may thereby make an indication of that which is unveiled to him in the expansiveness of "the spirit of the spirit," which is present, witnessing, and speaking from God to God.[43]

The essence of mystical language is, again, the mystical experience, which the word attempts to convey; this is above all true of the controversial "ecstatic expressions" (*shaṭhiyyāt*) of Sufism, which burst all conventional bounds in their intensity.[44]

What are the implications of the Sufi lexicons for the general concept of mystical language? The "contextual" studies of mysticism in the 1978 and 1983 volumes edited by Steven Katz have stressed how mystical experiences are preconditioned by traditional concepts and metaphysical structures. Katz observes that "there is a clear causal connection between the religious and social structure one brings to experience and the nature of one's actual experience."[45] Without denying the importance of religious and social background as a background for mystical experience, I would not wish to reduce this complex phenomenon to pure immanence through psychologism; to state that mystical experience is a mediated, configured outcome of epistemological activity, as does Katz, might be interpreted as a one-sided relationship between language and experience, in which the built-in expectations of language have a "self-fulling prophetic aspect" for the experiential outcome.[46] Let us see how a broad contextual understanding of mystical language might apply to Sufism, and whether there are adequate reasons for resisting sociological and psychologistic reductionism. Sufis certainly use the theological and legal language of the Islamic tradition. Their special mystical teachings, too, constitute a tradition of consolidated wisdom and experience. Mystical teaching presupposes that there are certain goals that the teacher communicates to the student, toward which the student is guided; the student's attempts at understanding are corrected, shaped, and stimulated in the proper direction. Sufis were thus aware of the intentional function of language, above all as used in teaching, and this intentional function of mystical language is the basis of the Sufi lexicons. The terms used to indicate the master–disciple relationship put intentionality at the heart of this personal connection: the disciple is the *murid*, or seeker (aspirant), and the master is the *murād*, or object of search (that which is desired). Words are useful in the teaching to help shape the categories by which the student will approach experience, but since the Sufi terminology opens up unsuspected new possibilities of experience, the effect of absorbing them is broadening rather than narrowing. Yet the study of Sufi materials

is not intended to be a solitary activity. The teaching is an interpersonal process, not an abstract doctrine. If it is correct to assume that the Sufi lexicons are an outgrowth of oral teaching, that suggests even more strongly the importance of the personal teaching factor. In Sufism, as in the *hadith*-based religious sciences generally, the focus on the personal source of the teaching is an essential part of the disciple's ability to remember the teacher's words, to preserve them for himself and others.[47] The intentional language as used in the teaching relationship has two implications: first, it is language addressed to a specific audience for the sake of creating the conditions for the desired experience and understanding, not an independent body of philosophical propositions; and second, this language is a process implying the polar relationship of transcendence, in which the master and disciple occupy roles analogous to those of divinity and humanity.[48] Each of those implications needs to be addressed separately.

The intentionality of mystical language in Sufism as a teaching points at certain experiential sources, but this is an enterprise that is distinct from instruction in abstract philosophical positions. Sufism needs to be understood in this kind of "contextual" fashion, for the master-disciple relationship decisively shapes the interpretive tradition. The views of W. T. Stace on mysticism, which have been so trenchantly criticized in the previous volumes of this series, would not in fact advance our understanding of Sufism appreciably.[49] The abstract monism of Stace, it has been rightly observed, destroys the meaning of the traditional religious language of mysticism, regarding it as mere camouflage retained to satisfy the orthodox and provide conventional means of communication. Such an approach would have been familiar to the Sufis, being reminiscent of the views of the Arab-Islamic philosophers like Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna, d. 1037), who regarded religion as an imitation of philosophy through the imagination. Although there was some overlap in the aims, epistemologies, and terminology of philosophy and Sufism, the intellectualism of the Aristotelian philosophers was fundamentally in contrast with the Sufis' insistence on attaining a state beyond reason.[50] Thus when the Andalusian philosopher Ibn Rushd (Averroes, d. 1198) asked Ibn ʿArabī if the truths known to the philosophers and the Sufis were the same, the answer was "yes . . . and no."[51] The vital element of personal verification by experi-

ence (*tahaqquq*) has for some philosophers given way to abstraction. Even so, let us remember that consistency for its own sake was not a goal of philosophy either, to the degree that it also was a teaching tradition. The Jewish philosopher Maimonides spoke for the Arab-Islamic intellectual tradition as well when he pointed to the need to adapt knowledge to the capacities of particular audiences as one of the principal causes of authorial inconsistency.[52] This principle of esotericism in philosophical teaching is entirely parallel to that of Hujwīrī for Sufi teaching, which is "better instruction and simplification of intricacies to approximately the understanding of the aspirant."[53] Abstract propositions, whether those of Stace about "mysticism" or those of rationalist philosophers in general, are not the subject of Sufi teaching. The priority of teaching over reason received a comparable stress in Shiʿism. The Ismaʿili theorist Ḥasan-i Sabbāḥ underlined the essential importance of the imam's teaching authority by pointing out that reason alone cannot be a guide; if one refutes another's position by reason, one is acting as a teacher.[54] Even the doctrines of Islamic theology are not the subject of Sufi teaching, though it is impossible to separate the language of Sufism from its theological environment. Therefore, to reduce Sufi teaching to the terms of its theology or "ontological structure" can be another form of de-contextualizing.[55]

The intentionality of mystical language in Sufism assumes the master-disciple relationship, as mentioned earlier, and within this language each term implies transcendence as both structure and experience. The role of the guide (whether master, Prophet, or God) is to act as a check on individual self-will and to open up the soul to what the Sufis call the "realities," "stations," and "names." The technical terminology of Sufism, properly understood, has the same function. An example is Rūzbihān's definition of a "visitation" (*wārid*): "The source of 'visitation' is the unveiling of the gnostic's object [*murād*], which enters spontaneously [*bi-qaṣd*], increasing his longing."[56] The intentionality of the "visitation" as the unveiling of the "object" coincides with the intentionality of focusing on the master; as we have seen, both the unveiling and the master are the "object" (*murād*). As Sarrāj defines the term, "the *murād* is the gnostic in whom there remains no seeking [*irāda*], who has attained the goals, and who has expressed the states, sta-

tions, aims, and seekings, for he is the sought object [*murād*] by which is sought that which is sought."[57] The one who has attained the goals, and who can express them, is not to be distinguished from them. The expression of the goals in the form of teaching indicates the transcendent experience to the student through a term or concept, just as the teaching personally mediates the attained experience. And just as transcendence is built into the teaching relationship, the Sufi sources agree that the language of Sufism has been articulated to express experiences that are transcendental. Although known and intended as object, the experience comes unasked, without reference to the aspirant's volition and beyond one's conscious control. It is for this reason that the Sufi authors define even semantic categories like "word" and "name" in terms of an experience of divine–human interaction. At the risk of repetition, let me stress that the Sufi vocabulary does not objectify the transcendent as a separate "object," but constitutes it as transcendent in consciousness. The transcendent is indicated by the various experiential modes that the Sufi tradition has defined.

If the experiential and transcendental orientation just outlined fairly corresponds to the self-understanding of the Sufis, can we generalize from this case to speak about mystical language more generally? If we call the Sufi tradition mystical, then mysticism is not a particular doctrine or even a particular experience, and the term should not be used in an objectified way; it can, however, be useful as a term to describe the tendency to return to the experiential sources of philosophical and theological symbols. The very origin of the concept of experience in Western thought attests to a tension with rationalism, whether religious, philosophical, or scientific; it is experience that enlarges the field of thought.[58] In religion, it was primarily the Protestant reformers who invoked religious experience against the authority and doctrine of the Catholic church, and this nondoctrinal usage continued down to William James's use of the term in his classic study.[59] In the scientific field, along with Baconianism, alchemy was another source of our concept of experience in its struggle against Aristotelian orthodoxy; alchemy, of course, had religious implications as well. Here I would like to invoke an image from a seventeenth-century alchemical text, which allegorically depicts Experience as the Queen of Heaven, before whom Philosophy bows down and worships. The poem concludes,

> There with arose Phylosophy as one filled with grace,
> Whose looks did shew that she had byne in some Heavenly place;
> For oft she wipt her Eyes,
> And oft she bowd her knees.
> And oft she kist the Steps with dread,
> Whereon Experience did tread;
> And oft she cast her Head on high
> And oft full low she cast her Eye
> Experience for to espy.[60]

So, with apologies to Philo, I would like to suggest that we think of philosophy (and by extension language) as the handmaiden of experience. This is not to suggest that language and prior conceptual formation have no role in mystical experience; their role is very real and significant, but it remains secondary to the experience itself.

It cannot be denied that mystical language is inextricably connected to religious and social contexts. Yet to assert that these religious and social contexts have a dominant causal relationship to mystical experience and its interpretation is, in my view, unjustified, and it contradicts the very structure of mystical language as discussed above. If mysticism always has a religious and social aspect, then perhaps religion and society always have a mystical aspect. Here Ibn 'Arabī might fundamentally agree with Nagarjuna, that there is no *nirvāna* without *samsara*; transcendence and immanence are relational poles, not hypostatic entities.[61] Eric Voegelin, in his illuminating studies of the experiential sources of Western civilization, has convincingly argued that the interpretive symbol, the experience of reality, and consciousness itself are inseparable aspects of a participatory whole: "A vision is not a dogma but an event in metaleptic reality. . . . There is no 'object' of the vision other than the vision as received; and there is no 'subject' of the vision other than the response in a man's soul to divine presence."[62] Voegelin has also given an incisive analysis of the deformations that occur when philosophical propositions and theological doctrines are separated from the experiences to which they were originally tied.[63] The vocabulary of Sufism is one kind of source that can help us avoid this error; if we are right in generalizing about this mystical tendency, then mystical vocabularies in other religious traditions will have a similar experiential thrust.

The mystical language of Sufism as found in the Sufi lexicons is

an expression of experiences of transcendence formulated according to the inner structure of the master–disciple relationship. In this sense, there is no point in arguing that mystical experience is unmediated or "pure" experience. To the contrary, the teaching tradition is a powerful mediation that enables the individual to have symbolic access to experiences that might otherwise never be imagined. Yet the fundamentally transcendental orientation of the symbols and terms of mystical teaching is liberating rather than limiting. The model suggested by the Sufi lexicons condenses mystical experiences in terms designed to reveal the experiential possibilities to those who are prepared for them. At the same time, these terms tend to shut out those who are not participants in the teaching process. Outsiders will naturally tend to analyze mystical terms by their externals, but mystical language retains the ability to indicate the transcendent by its own reverberation in the soul.

Notes

1. John A. Haywood, *Arabic Lexicography: Its History, and Its Place in the General History of Lexicography*, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1965), p. 1; Fuat Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifftums*, vol. 8: *Lexikographie* (Leiden, 1982), p. 15, citing A. Fischer.

2. Frithiof Rundgren, "La Lexicographie arabe," in Pelio Fronzaroli, ed., *Studies on Semitic Lexicography*, Quaderni de Semitistica, no. 2 (Florence, 1973), pp. 145–59.

3. For details of dictionary arrangements, see Haywood, *Arabic Lexicography*, and Sezgin, *Geschichte des arabischen Schrifftums*, pp. 7–16.

4. Abu Abdallah Mohammed ibn Ahmed ibn Jusof al-Katib al-Khowarezmi, *Liber Mafatih al-Olum*, ed. G. Van Vloten (Leiden, 1895; reprint, Leiden, 1968), pp. 3–4. For a list of translations of the different sections of this dictionary, see A. I. Sabra, "al-Khwārazmī, Abū 'Abd Allāh," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, new ed.

5. Lother Kopf, "Religious Influences on Medieval Arabic Philology," in Kopf, *Studies in Arabic and Hebrew Lexicography*, ed. M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, with the assistance of S. Assif (Jerusalem, 1976), pp. 19–45.

6. Abú Naṣr 'Abdallah B. 'Alí al-Sarrāj al-Ṭúsí, *Kitāb al-Luma' fī 't-taṣawwuf*, ed. Reynold Alleyne Nicholson, E. J. W. Gibb Memorial series, vol. 22 (London, 1914; reprint, London, 1963), pp. 333–75, listed on pp. 86–99 of the English summary; I count separately terms that Nicholson left grouped together to arrive at his total of 143 terms.

7. Ruzbehan Baqli Shirazi, *Commentaire sur les paradoxes des Soufis (Sharh-e Shathîyât)*, ed. Henry Corbin, Bibliothéque Iranienne, no. 12 (Tehran, 1966), pp. 545–80, 613–32, giving 159 terms, plus a brief glossary of 47 additional terms on pp. 632–35. The *Sharḥ-i Shaṭhiyyāt* was Rūzbihān's own Persian translation of his earlier Arabic work *Manṭiq al-Asrār*; in the dictionary section, the Persian text drops most of the specimens of Arabic Sufi poetry (originally given by Sarrāj' and adds elaborations from Rūzbihān's own experience.

8. Abū al-Qāsim 'Abd al-Karīm al-Qushayrī, *al-Risālah al-Qushayriyyah*, ed. 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Maḥmūd and Maḥmūd ibn al-Sharīf, 2 vols. (Cairo, 1972–74), pp. 200–74, with forty-nine terms in the dictionary proper, followed by fifty-one chapters on various states; Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn 'Uthmān al-Jullābī al-Hujwīrī al-Ghaznawī al-Lāhawrī, *Kashf al-Maḥjūb*, ed. 'Alī Qawīm (Islamabad, 1398/1978), pp. 320–37, with ninety-two terms in four sections; cf. the English translation by Reynold A. Nicholson, *The Kashf al-Mahjúb, The Oldest Persian Treatise on Sufiism*, E. J. W. Gibb Memorial series, vol. 17 (London, 1936; reprint, London, 1976), pp. 367–92.

9. Muhyī al-Dīn Abī 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn al-'Arabī, *Kitāb Iṣṭilāḥ al-Ṣūfiyyah*, in *Rasā'il* (Hyderabad, 1367/1948), with 198 terms; Ibn 'Arabī, *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah* (Beirut, n.d.), vol. 2, pp. 127–34. I am indebted to Professor William Chittick for calling the latter text to my attention.

10. Other early Sufi writings, such as Anṣārī's *Manāzil al-Sā'irin* and Abū Ṭālib al-Makkī's *Qūt al-Qulūb*, are relevant to the development of mystical language in Sufism, but cannot be considered here for reasons of space.

11. Much material from Kāshānī's lexicon appears in that of Jurjānī, and Kāshānī's work received a commentary by Shams al-Dīn Ghaffārī (d. 1430) as well as an abridgement by the Shi'i scholar Ḥaydar Āmulī (d. 1385). See Ḥājjī Khalīfah, *Kashf al-Ẓunūn*, ed. Gustavus Flügel, *Lexicon Bibliographicum et Encyclopædicum a Mustafa ben Abdallah Katib Jelebi Dicto et Nomine Haji Khalfa Celebrato Compositum* (London, 1845). The lengthy Arabic dictionary of the Indian scholar Muḥammad al-T'hānawī (ca. 1745), *Kashshāf Iṣṭilāḥāt al-Funūn*, Bibliotheca Indica, no. 17 (Calcutta, 1853–62; reprint, Beirut, 1966), added to the main entries a number of mystical definitions in Persian. Su'ād al-Ḥakīm's *al-Mu'jam al-Ṣūfi: at-Ḥikmah fi Ḥudūd al-Kalimah* (Beirut, 1981) is a comprehensive guide to Ibn 'Arabī's terminology. Ja'far Sajjādī's Persian dictionary of technical terms, *Farhang-i Muṣṭalaḥāt-i 'Urafā wa Mutaṣawwifah* (Tehran, 1339/1960), includes many excerpts from Sufi sources. Dr. Javad Nurbakhsh, the Ni'matullahi Sufi leader, is currently publishing a multivolume *Farhang-i Nurbakhsh* on Sufi terminology in Persian. The Pakistani

Chishti leader Dhawqi Shah also compiled an excellent Urdu lexicon of Sufism, *Sirr-i Dilbarān* (Karachi, 1405/1985), with many quotations from Arabic and Persian authorities.

12. Tholuck, *Die Speculative Trinitätslehre des Späteren Orients* (1828), pp. 7, 11, 18, 26, 73, cited in D. B. MacDonald, "'Abd al-Razzāk al-Kāshānī," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, vol. 1, pp. 88–89; 'Abd al-Razzāq Kāshānī, *'Abdu-r-Razzāq's Dictionary of the Technical Terms of the Sufies*, ed. Aloys Sprenger (Calcutta, 1845).

13. 'Ali Ben Mohammed Dschordschani, *Definitiones*, ed. Gustavus Flügel (Leipzig, 1845). Two translations of Ibn 'Arabī's lexicon exist: A. Regnier, "La Terminologie mystique des Ibn 'Arabī," *La Museon* 48 (1935): 145–62; Rabia Terri Harris, "Sufi Terminology: Ibn 'Arabī's *Al-Iṣṭilāḥāt al-Ṣūfiyyah*," *Journal of the Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi Society* 3 (1984): 27–54.

14. Kāshānī, *'Abdu-r-Razzāq's Dictionary*, pp. v–vi.

15. Quoted in Louis Massignon, *Essai sur les origines du lexique technique de la mystique musulmane*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1968), p. 12.

16. Massignon, *Essai sur les origines du lexique technique*, pp. 19–20; the index of Hallajian terms is on pp. 19–36.

17. Qushayrī, *al-Risālah al-Qushayriyyah*, p. 200.

18. Abū al-Faraj 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Alī ibn al-Jawzī, *Talbis Iblis*, ed. Khayr al-Dīn 'Alī (Beirut, n.d. [1970]), p. 185.

19. Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-Mahjūb*, p. 320.

20. Each definition concludes with a term (X), followed by the phrase "And if you say, 'What is X?' then we say, 'X is . . .'" Ibn 'Arabī traces this "strange method" (*ṭariqah gharibah*) of chaining to the early Sufi Ibrāhīm ibn Adham (ca. 765) (*Futūḥāt*, vol. 2, p. 134).

21. Ibn 'Arabī, *Iṣṭilāḥ*, p. 1.

22. The lexicon in the *Rasā'il* contains mostly briefer versions of the definitions in the *Futūḥāt* lexicon, and it lacks the additional parts of the definitions that chain the terms one to another in the *Futūḥāt*. Thus in the *Rasā'il*, Ibn 'Arabī avoids, on the surface, the complex problem of the interrelationship of the technical terms of Sufism.

23. Kāshānī, *'Abdu-r-Razzāq's Dictionary*, p. 3; he states particularly that he wrote his lexicon to assist the comprehension of his commentaries on Ansārī's *Manāzil al-Sā'irin*, Ibn 'Arabī's *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*, and the Qur'ān.

24. James Winston Morris, "Ibn 'Arabī and His Interpreters, Part II (Conclusion): Influences and Interpretations," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 107 (1987): 101–06. Many of the later Sufi dictionaries share more or less in Kāshānī's systematic tendencies.

25. Massignon cites twenty-four terms taken directly from the Qur'ān and an equal number derived from the roots occurring in the Qur'ān (*Essai*

sur les origines du lexique technique, pp. 45–47). Paul Nwyia, in *Exégèse coranique et langage mystique, nouvel essai sur le lexique technique des mystiques musulmans* (Beirut, 1970), has analyzed a series of early Sufi texts that illustrate the development of mystical exegesis of the Qur'ān in Sufism.

26. On the problem of non-Qur'ānic language in the heresy trials of Sufis, see in addition to the critical remarks of Ibn al-Jawzī, Carl W. Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy in Sufism* (Albany, N.Y., 1985), pp. 97–98, 112.

27. Massignon, *Essai sur les origines du lexique technique*, pp. 49–52.

28. I count fourteen Qur'ānic citations of terms in Sarrāj's dictionary (*ḥaqq, mushāhadah, shuhūd, qabḍ, basṭ, ru'yah, 'aqd, mahw, ṭamas, bādi, bahr, iṣṭinā', iṣṭifā'*, and *talbis*); and in the *Sharḥ-i Shaṭhiyyāt* Rūzbihān cites only ten terms in Qur'ānic contexts (*maqām, qabḍ, basṭ, faṣl, hamm, athar, bādi, iṣṭinā', iṣṭifā'*, and *rūḥ*).

29. The difference between Sufi definitions and philosophical definitions may be quickly verified by comparing terms such as *ḥāl, ḥaqiqah, fanā', faṣl, ishtibāh*, and *rūḥ* in the Sufi lexicons and in Aristotelian usage. See Soheil M. Afnan, *A Philosophical Lexicon in Persian and Arabic* (Beirut, 1968), s.vv.

30. Examples of lexical order taken from Sarrāj: root (*ḥaqq, ḥuqūq, tahqiq, tahaqquq, haqiqah*); semantic clusters (*ḥāl, maqām, makān*); rhyme (*kawn, bawn*); form (*lawā'iḥ, lawāmi'*); polarity (*qabḍ—basṭ, sahw—sukr*); parallel phraseology (*anā bi-lā anā, nahnu bi-lā nahnu*).

31. Qushayrī, *al-Risālah al-Qushayriyyah*, p. 200.

32. The phrase "spirits' fonts" (*mashārib al-arwāḥ*) recalls the title of Rūzbihān's treatise "The Spirits' Font," or *Mashrab al-Arwāḥ, wa huwa Mashhūr bi-Hazār u Yak Maqām*, ed. Naẓif Muḥarram Khwājah (Istanbul, 1973), a work that describes the 1,001 stations (*maqāmāt*) of the spiritual path from the creation of the universe to its end. Although the term *mashrab* has become conventionalized to mean "sect," for Rūzbihān it still holds something of the root meaning of "source of water" (or font); as his book on 1,001 stations shows, the sources he has in mind are spiritual experiences.

33. Rūzbihān, *Sharḥ-i Shaṭhiyyāt*, pp. 544–45.

34. Rūzbihān, *Sharḥ-i Shaṭhiyyāt*, p. 545.

35. Kāshānī, *'Abdu-r-Razzāq's Dictionary*, p. 3.

36. Sarrāj, *Kitāb al-Luma' fi 't-taṣawwuf*, p. 350.

37. Rūzbihān, *Sharḥ-i Shaṭhiyyāt*, p. 570.

38. Ibn 'Arabī, *Rasā'il*, p. 12. The topic of the different types of gnosis of the divine names introduces Ibn 'Arabī's lexicon in the *Futūḥāt*.

39. Ibn 'Arabī, *Futūḥāt*, vol. 2, p. 130.

40. Rūzbihān, *Sharḥ-i Shaṭhiyyāt*, p. 561.

41. Sarrāj, *Kitāb al-Luma' fi 't-taṣawwuf*, p. 338, quoting Qannād.

42. Sarrāj, *Kitāb al-Luma' fī 't-taṣawwuf*, p. 337.

43. Rūzbihān, *Sharḥ-i Shaṭḥiyyāt*, p. 560.

44. On *shaṭḥiyyāt*, see Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy*, esp. chap. 1.

45. Steven T. Katz, "Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism," in Steven T. Katz, ed., *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis* (New York, 1978), p. 40.

46. Katz, "Language, Epistemology, and Mysticism," p. 59. [Katz is also aware of this trap and seeks to avoid it (see pp. 64-65)-Ed.]

47. See Carl W. Ernst, "The Textual Formation of Oral Teachings in the Early Chishtī Sufism," in Jeffrey Timm, ed., *Texts and Contexts: Traditional Hermeneutics in South Asia* (Albany, N.Y., 1991), pp. 271-97.

48. The Sufi master is not technically divinized, but there is a parallelism between the role of the master and that of God, reflected in the progression of mystical experience implicit in the formula, "annihilation in the master" (*fanā' fī al-shaykh*), "annihilation in the Prophet" (*fanā' fī al-rasūl*), "annihilation in God" (*fanā' fī allāh*).

49. For these criticisms, see Katz, *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis*, index, s.n. "Stace, W. T."

50. This is the position of 'Ayn al-Quḍāt al-Hamadānī. See Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy*, p. 112.

51. Henry Corbin, *Creative Imagination in the Sufism of Ibn 'Arabī*, trans. Ralph Manheim, Bollingen Series, no. 91 (Princeton, N.J., 1969), pp. 41-42. The issue of the relationship between Islamic philosophy and Sufism is highly complex, and can only be touched on here; readers should refer to the studies of Corbin, S. H. Nasr, Fazlur Rahman, James Morris, and Parviz Morewedge (among others) for further details.

52. Moses Maimonides, Introduction of *Guide for the Perplexed*, trans. Schlomo Pines, in *A Maimonides Reader*, ed. Isadore Twersky (New York, 1972), pp. 244-45.

53. Hujwīrī, *Kashf al-Maḥjūb*, p. 320. On esotericism as a principle of knowledge in the Islamic world, see Marshall G. S. Hodgson, *The Venture of Islam, Conscience and History in World Civilization*, vol. 2: *The Expansion of Islam in the Middle Periods* (Chicago, 1974), pp. 195-200, and Carl W. Ernst, "Esoteric and Mystical Aspects of Religious Knowledge in Sufism," *Journal of Religious Studies* 12 (1984): 93-100.

54. Ḥasan-i Sabbāḥ, "Four Chapters," cited in Marshall Hodgson, *The Order of Assassins* (New York, 1978), pp. 325-28.

55. For a discussion of the "ontological schemata which shape the configuration of the [mystical] quest and its goal," see Steven T. Katz, "The 'Conservative' Character of Mystical Experience," in Steven T. Katz, ed., *Mysticism and Religious Traditions* (New York, 1983), esp. pp. 32-43.

A critique of doctrinal reductionism is found in Sallie B. King, "Two Epistemological Models for the Interpretation of Mysticism," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 61 (1988): 257-79. [Katz has replied to King in "On Mysticism," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 56 (1989): 751-57-Ed.]

56. Rūzbihān, *Sharḥ-i Shaṭḥiyyāt*, p. 549. Likewise, the Sufi Najm al-Dīn Kubrā (d. 1220), when asked by the philosopher Fakhr al-Dīn Rāzī (d. 1209) how the Sufis know God, replied, "By certain visitations [*wāridāt*] that occur in the heart, and which the soul is incapable of falsifying" (Ibrāhīm Shaṭṭārī, *Āʾinah-i Ḥaqāʾiq-numā, Sharḥ-i Jām-i Jahān-numā* [Hyderabad, 1313/1895-6], pp. 7-8).

57. Sarrāj, *Kitāb al-Luma' fī 't-taṣawwuf*, p. 342. Ibn 'Arabī defines the *murād* as "an expression for the one who is ravished of his seeking while his affairs remain in readiness; he has passed all the customs and the stations without effort" (*Rasāʾil*, p. 2).

58. André Lalande, *Vocabulaire technique et critique de la philosophie*, 5th ed. (Paris, 1947), s.v. "experience," pp. 309-11.

59. H. Pinard, "La Théorie de l'expérience religieuse. Son évolution, de Luther à W. James," *Revue d'histoire ecclesiastique* 17 (1921): 63-83, 306-48, 547-74.

60. "Experience and Philosophy," quoted in Elias Ashmole, *Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum* (London, 1652; reprint, Hildesheim, 1968), p. 341.

61. Frederick J. Streng, "Language and Mystical Awareness," in Katz, *Mysticism and Philosophical Analysis*, pp. 141-69.

62. Eric Voegelin, *Order and History*, vol. 4: *The Ecumenic Age* (Baton Rouge, La., 1974), p. 243, discussing "The Pauline Vision of the Resurrected"; see also Voegelin, *Anamnesis*, trans. Gerhart Niemeyer (Notre Dame, Ind., 1978), esp. pt. 3.

63. Voegelin, *Ecumenic Age*, pp. 1-57.