Tughluq, which shares architectural influences with the tomb of the shaykh known as Rukn-i ‘Alam (d. 735/1335) in Multan and Shaykh ‘Ala’ al-Din in Pākpatan. The Tughluq dynasty of direct or indirect descendants of Ghiyāth al-Dīn lasted for nearly a century, until the reign of Maḥmūd Shāh II (r. 796–7/1394–5 and 804–15/1401–12), but the dynasty was severely disrupted after the death of Fīrūz Shāh, especially after the invasion of Delhi in 801/1398 by Tāmūr Lang (Tamerlane), r. 771–807/1370–1405).

The main sources for the history of Ghiyāth al-Dīn Tughluq’s reign are the Tughluq-nāma of Amīr Khusraw, the Tārīkh-i Fīrūzsāhī of Ziya’ al-Dīn Barānī, and important references in the narratives of the famous Moroccan traveller Ibn Bāṭtūṭa. ‘Affī is said to have written a biography of Ghiyāth al-Dīn titled Maṇūqīb-i Sultān Tughluq (“The virtues of Sultan Tughluq”), but it is no longer extant.
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Ghulāt (extremist Shī‘īs)

The Ghulāt (vars. al-ghūliya, ghālūn; sing. ghālūn) are a branch of Shī‘ism known for radical theological beliefs. They are associated especially with several Shī‘ī sects from the first/seventh to the third/ninth centuries whose beliefs have come to be regarded as paradigmatic examples of this current of Shī‘ism.

The term Ghulāt has often been translated as “extremists,” but the word did not, when it gained currency in Arabic during first and second/seventh to the third/eighth centuries, contain the connotations of terrorism conveyed by this word in contemporary English. It comes from ghulūw, a word meaning roughly “to transgress a boundary” but which, in the context of early Shī‘ī sectarianism and theological literature, refers to an array of theological positions denounced as beyond the pale of proper belief. In English, therefore, the term ghulāt is perhaps best rendered
as “transgressive Shīfīs.” Although ghulūt originally carried exclusively pejorative connotations, branches of the Shī'a had, by the fourth/tenth century, co-opted the designation ghulūt and transformed the sense of ghuluww from a negative to a positive one. Thus, for example, the Nuṣayrī ‘Alawīs embraced the legacy of early ghulūt and extolled their community’s zeal for God (ghuluww ilā ilāh), zeal for the Lord (ghuluww ilā l-mawālī), and zeal for monotheism (ghuluww ilā l-tawḥīd) (Friedman, 207–8).

1. Early Accusations of Ghuluww

The beliefs categorised classically as ghuluww varied amongst heresiological treatments, but Imāmī Shīfī heresiographers and theologians listed the following most frequently: the return of Imāms and/or the righteous dead at the end of time (at-rāj’a, rāj’at al-amwāḥ); the occultation of the future eschatological saviour (al-ghayba); the continuation of divine revelation (waḥy) and inspiration (ilḥām) after the prophet Muḥammad’s death and/or a belief in the true Qur’ān’s corruption and suppression (tahbīf); the Imāms’ and/or their followers’ possession of a preternatural knowledge of the unseen (‘iṭm al-ghayba); the primacy of the esoteric interpretation of the Qur’ān (ta’wīl); the transmigration of souls (tanāsukh); the inheritance of the divine in humans (ḥuluḥ); and the delegation (tawfīq) of divine powers to the Imāms. “All of these ideas are present, in one form or another, in the early corpus of the sayings of the imams [of the Imāmī Shī’a]” (Amīr-Moezzi, Spirituality, 217); for this reason, the boundaries of ghuluww in Shīfī piety and theological thought have been constantly negotiated and contested throughout Shīfī religious and intellectual history (cf. Mazzaoui, 3–4, 63–73; Rizvi, 391–402). Beliefs that some Shīfī scholars and theologians rejected as ghuluww and contrary to the teachings of the Shīfī Imāms others endorsed and accepted as essential esoteric aspects of their faith rooted in the secret teachings of the Imāms.

Non-Shīfī scholars, usually Sunnīs, largely accepted these parameters of ghuluww in their own heresiographical and theological literature. Authors more hostile to the Shī’a, however, tended to expand the boundaries of ghuluww to include key tenets of Shīfī belief more generally, especially the rejection of the legitimacy of the caliphs preceding ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭalīb (r. 35–40/656–61) and the practice of cursing the Prophet’s Companions for abandoning and/or opposing ‘Alī (al-Qādī, Development, 310–2; van Ess, TG, 1:308–12).

Although the designation ghulūt originated in anti- and intra-Shīfī polemics, it derived its polemical force from scripture. The Qur’ān admonished Christians and Jews, “Do not transgress the bounds of truth in your religion (lā taqhlī fi dinikum ghayra l-haqq) or follow after the caprices of a people already fallen into perdition” (Q. 5:77; cf. 4:171). Accordingly, the ghulūt were called “those who transgress the bounds (of truth)” because they fell prey to the errors of the wayward People of the Book mentioned in the Qur’ān and had thus introduced into Islam the errors of previous religious communities, whether Jews, Zoroastrians, or Christians.

The earliest accusations of ghuluww conformed to the broadly conceived understanding of the term as it occurs in the Qur’ān. Throughout the Umayyad period (41–132/661–750), polemists hurled accusations of ghuluww against religious
trends deemed deviant or dangerous and not merely the Shī‘a ones. Thus, when the young Umayyad prince ‘Abd al-Malik b. ‘Umar b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (d. c.100/719) wrote to the Khārijī leader Ibn Iḥāṣ, he warned him to eschew extremism in religion (al-ghulūwī fī l-dīn). Ibn Iḥāṣ retorted that, in the Qur’an, in his understanding, ghulūw means to speak anything other than the truth about God; this is a sin, Ibn Iḥāṣ averred, that the prince commits by aiding the Umayyad caliphs (Made-lang, Authenticity, para. 5). Likewise, the Khārijī leader Abū Bayḥāq (d. 94/713) denounced a rival Khārijī leader, Nāfī‘ b. al-Azraq (d. 65/685), for having “exceeded the bounds and fallen into disbelief (ghalā fa-kafara) after he broke off relations with non-Khārijī Muslims (al-Mubarrad, 3:291). A letter attributed to the caliph ‘Umar II b. ‘Abd al-‘Azīz (r. 99–101/717–720) also accused the Qadariyya—those who believe in the free will of humans—of having gone to extremes in their doctrines (ghalā’ fī l-qawl) because they deny God’s foreknowledge (van Ess, Anfänge, 118). The Umayyad caliph al-Walīd II b. Yazīd (r. 125–6/743–4) gave ghulūwī its broadest definition, declaring that “God will destroy any who stray and disobey, who are blind and who transgress (‘amyya wa-ghalā’) and who leave the paths of piety and the fear of God” (‘Abās, 314), implying that disobedience of the caliph was at the root of all ghulūwī.

Notwithstanding these early examples, the association of ghulūwī with the Shī‘a appeared early in Islamic history. Outsiders often regarded the devotion to ‘Alī and his progeny cultivated by Shī‘is of all sorts as the source of such beliefs and drew direct parallels to the Christians’ excessive devotion to Jesus: “Just as the Christians went to such extremes in their love for Jesus that they called him ‘the Son of God,’ ” wrote the Sunnī scholar Abū Ja‘far al-Tabarī (d. 310/923), “so have the ghāliyya gone to such extremes in their love for ‘Alī that some of them have said that he is their god or that he is a prophet sent to humankind, and others have uttered many farfetched doctrines” (Tahdhīb al-‘athār, 287–8). Similarly, the Mu‘tazī‘ī Ibn Abī l-Hadīlī (d. 655 or 656/1257 or 1258) averred that, whereas the Prophet’s Companions were far too intelligent to fall prey to such deviant beliefs, “many of those who followed ‘Alī descended from Christians and Jews, and since they had heard the belief of the indwelling (al-ḥulūl) of the divine in their prophets and leaders from their fathers and forbearers, they believed the same with regard to ‘Alī” (Sharḥ, 7:41).

2. The Shi‘ī ghulāt and their legacy

Much of our knowledge of the earliest ghulāt derives from heresiological sources written by Muslim theologians, Shī‘ī and otherwise, and must thus be distilled from polemics. Any historical account of these groups is thus inevitably unable to obviate entirely the shortcomings of heresiology, such as its overly schematic taxonomies of sects, historical anachronisms, distortions, and sometimes even outright fabrications.

According to the heresiographers, the first ghulīh sect was the Saba‘īyya, who were named after their purported founder, a Jewish convert to Islam from Ṣan‘ā‘ named Ibn Saba‘ (also known as ‘Abdallāh b. Wahb al-Saba‘ī al-Hamdānī and Ibn al-Sawdā‘), who became a follower of ‘Alī perhaps as early as the caliphate of ‘Uthmān b. ‘Affān (r. 23–35/644–56). Early sources emphasize consistently that Ibn Saba‘ was a ghulīh because he cursed ‘Alī’s enemies.
amongst the Prophet’s Companions and believed that ‘Aṭf had received from the Prophet a sacred bequest (waṣiyya) designating him as heir (Sayf b. ‘Umar, 136; al-Nawbakht, 19–20; al-Tāṣt, 133). The sources, however, made other, mutually contradictory, claims about Ibn Saba’. While some claimed that ‘Aṭf burned Ibn Saba’ alive when he declared ‘Aṭf to be God (al-Tāṣt, 131–4), others claimed that he was a minor commander in ‘Aṭf’s army until ‘Aṭf’s assassination in 40/66 and that he refused to believe reports of ‘Aṭf’s death. Ibn Saba’ professed, rather, that ‘Aṭf would not die until he filled the earth with justice as it is now filled with injustice (Ibn Abī l-Dunyā, 83–4, 87–8). Although some accounts reconciled these two assertions by claiming that ‘Aṭf spared Ibn Saba’ and exiled him to al-Madā’in, in central Iraq, recent research has suggested that the earliest and probably most authentic of these stories is the narrative of his denial of ‘Aṭf’s death and his declaration of ‘Aṭf’s messianic return (Anthony, Caliph, 165–80). Although Ibn Saba’ himself was a shadowy figure obscured by later black legends, the name of the sect that bears his name, the Saba’iyya, appeared with surprising regularity in Umayyad-era orations, epistles, and poetry as a term of abuse directed against pro-‘Alid factions in Kufa (Anthony, Caliph, 241–311).

Ghulāt appeared for the first time as a discrete group called by that name during the Kufan revolt of al-Mukhtār al-Thaqaff, which took place in 66–7/685–6, during the Second Civil War (60–72/685–91). Al-Mukhtār began his revolt with the aim of exacting vengeance upon those responsible for the slaughter of the Prophet’s grandson, al-Ḥusayn b. ‘Aṭf, at Karbalā’ in 61/680, but al-Mukhtār quickly embraced more grandiose and controversial ideas. He claimed to prosecute the revolt in Kufa on behalf of al-Ḥusayn’s half-brother, Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafiyā (d. c.99/717), whom the counter-caliph ’Abdallāh b. al-Zubayr (d. 72/691) imprisoned in Mecca for refusing to offer public support to his attempts to topple the Umayyad caliphs (Anthony, Meccan prison). Al-Mukhtār purportedly proclaimed that Ibn al-Ḥanafiyā would rise to defeat the tyrannical Umayyad caliphs as the Mahdī (the End-times redeemer) and thus fill the earth with justice as it is presently filled with injustice. The expressed aims of his revolt were to revive ‘Aṭf’s defunct Kufan theocracy based on “God’s scripture, the Prophet’s conduct (ṣumma), the pursuit of vengeance for the blood of the Prophet’s family, the waging of jihād against the violators of God’s law, and the protection of the weak” (al-Tabart, al-Ta’rīkh, 2:633; al-Balādhurt, ed. al-Dūrṭ and ‘Uqla, 4/2:165).

The historian Abū Mikhnaf (d. 157/774) reported stories of certain Kufan women named Hind bt. al-Mutakallifā al-Nā‘iziyā (var. al-Nā‘itiyā) and Laylā bt. Qumāma al-Muzaniyyā (also al-Nā‘iziyā) in whose homes “would gather every ghulāt from the Shī‘a to converse” throughout al-Mukhtār’s revolt. The belletrist al-Jahlīz (d. 255/868–9) mentioned also a third woman in their ranks, named al-Ṣadafī lit., she who turns her face away; al-Bayān, 1:365). Those attending the gatherings in Hind’s and Laylā’s homes became notorious for claiming to prophesy the future in ecstatic utterances, as did the pre-Islamic Arabian soothsayers (kubbān); this inspired a cadre of al-Mukhtār’s acolytes to expose their activities to Ibn al-Ḥanafiyā, who wrote a spirited denunciation of the “transgressive beliefs (ghulaww)” of these two women.
leadership amongst the earliest *ghulāt* in Kufa is in stark contrast to the demonisation of women in later *ghulāt* literature (Tendler Krieger, 60–1).

Al-Mukhtār’s Kufa fell in Ramadān 67/ April 687 to Muṣ‘ab b. al-Zubayr (d. 72/691), but a cohort of the revolt’s leaders fled north to the city of Nisibis, where a remnant held out against the Zubayrids and then the Umayyads, to whom the city fell shortly after the Umayyads’ recapture of Kufa in 72/691–2 (Anthony, Kaysāniyya, 184–5). This remnant became known under many names: the Saba’iyya, the Khashabiyā (because of the non-Arab clients, *mawālī*, wielding wooden weapons who filled their ranks; Crone, Wooden weapons), and, most famously, the Kaysāniyya. The origin of the name “Kaysāniyya” is unknown (Anthony, Kaysāniyya, 183), but it is clear that the Kaysāniyya was a mother sect that gave birth not only to the Ḥashimid movement, which gave rise in turn to the ‘Abbasid caliphate in 132/750 (*Ta’rīkh al-khalīfān*, 245b; cf. al-Qaḍī, Kaysāniyya, 203–67; Yücesoy, 21–24; Haider, 79–84) and to various other sectarian Shī‘a revolts reviled as *ghulāt*. Indeed, many *ghulāt* came to play a prominent role in early Shī‘a movements that mobilised revolts against the Umayyad caliphate in Iraq and the Iranian Plateau and to exercise their influence on the early ‘Abbasid caliphate through sects such as the Rāwandīyya and the Ḥarbīyya. Eventually, however, the influence of these sects waned outside the urban centres of their Iraqi heartland, being purged from or eventually absorbed by the Khurramiyya and their nativist, Zoroastrian rebellions throughout the Iranian hinterland (Crone, *Nativist prophets*, 82–95).

A series of revolts conducted in late-Umayyad and early-‘Abbasid Kufa by...
offshoots of the Kaysānīyya came to be regarded as paradigmatic sects of the ghulāt. The orbit of the early ghulāt’s influence often extended far beyond Kufa, their epicentre, but the city nonetheless gained a reputation for providing a volatile pool of credulous recruits for Prophetic pretenders who drew upon the ‘Alid sentiments of its populace. Most of these early groups ran afoul of the authorities of Iraq and faced execution, often by cruel means, for laying claim to Prophetic knowledge, foretelling the apocalypse, and leading small uprisings. Mocking sardonically the touted virtues of Kufa at the court of the ‘Abbāsid caliph Abū l-‘Abbās al-Saffāḥ (r. 132–6/750–54), the Basran patriot Abū Bakr al-Hudhali (d. 167/783–4) once gibed, “Never have I seen a land so full of crucified prophets as Kufa!” (Ibn Bakkār, 156–7).

Accounts of these early revolts frequently contradict one another. According to Ibn ‘Ayyāsh al-Mantūf al-Hamdānī (d. 158/775), the earliest of these revolts was by a straw vendor named Bayān b. Sam‘ān, whom the governor of Kufa ‘Umar b. Hubayra al-Faḍlār (r. 102–5/720–23) crucified for claiming to be a prophet and declaring fornication and wine-drinking licit (al-Tawḥīdī, al-Imtā‘, 3:176). Al-Jaḥiz claimed that Bayān also spread to his followers in al-Madā’in protheses of imminent apocalyptic battles (malāḥim) (al-Jaḥiz, al-Barṣān, 354–6). Other accounts named Khālid al-Qāṣrī, the subsequent governor of Kufa (r. 105–20/723–38), as the authority who crucified Bayān (ps.-Nāshī‘, 40–1; cf. Anthony, Crucifixion, 31–3).

Another ghulī heresiarch, al-Mughṭra b. Sa‘īd, was reputedly a magician well known to the court of Khālid al-Qāṣrī (al-Ṭabarṣ, Taʾrīkh, 2:1619–20; Ibn Abī l-Hadīd, 8:96) and had been a wayward student of the Kufan scholar al-Shaʿībī (d. c. 103–110/721–28; al-Fasawī, 2: 581–82). Al-Mughṭra claimed to work miracles, to possess knowledge of the unseen, and to have ascended to Heaven and beheld God (Abū Tammām, Ar. 69, Eng. 69–71). He revolted in Kufa alongside his followers, the Wuṣṭāfī (lit., the serving boys), but Khālid defeated al-Mughṭra and crucified him on a bridge in Wāṣṭ in 119/737 (al-Ṭabarṣ, al-Taʾrīkh, 2:1621; al-Baladhurī, ed. Madelung, 2:497; Ibn Qutayba, 2:148). Other accounts, however, claimed that Bayān and al-Mughṭra revolted as co-conspirators against Khālid al-Qāṣrī, while declaring the Ḥāshimid rebel Muḥammad al-Nāfs al-Zākiyya (d. 145/762) to be the Mahḍī (al-Ṭabarṣ, al-Taʾrīkh, 2:1620; al-Baladhurī, ed. Madelung, 2:496–97; cf. Marsham, 109–11, 122–25, and Elad, 54–7).

Most notorious of all was the heresiarch Abū Manṣūr al-ʾIjlī, who made similar grandiose claims of prophecy and claimed to have seen God in a heavenly ascent (Abū Maʿṣīr, 279–80; cf. Ansārī, Abū Manṣūr-i ʾIjlī, 288) but who gained real infamy after he established a cabal based in the house of Abū Qutna al-Khaṃmāq (the strangler) amongst the Kinda tribe in Kufa. His followers waged a clandestine jihad (jihād khaḍf) and assassinated their opponents by strangulation. Abū Manṣūr and his followers evaded Khālid al-Qāṣrī’s attempts to capture them, but the governor’s successor, Yūsuf b. ʿUmar al-Thaqāfī (r. 120–2/738–40), finally hunted down and arrested their leadership, crucifying Abū Manṣūr and his followers. His movement did not, however, disappear but continued under the leadership of Abū Manṣūr’s son al-Ḥusayn, who amassed a considerable following and wealth until he too
was seized and executed by the 'Abbāsid caliph al-Mahdī (r. 158–69/775–85; Sa‘d al-Ash‘arī, 47; Abū Tammām, Ar. 107–9, Eng. 101–2; Ibn Qutayba, 2:147; al-Jāḥiẓ, al-Ḥayawān, 6:389–90).

Early chroniclers depicted these movements primarily as millenarian rebellions, but the Shi‘i heresiologists who described their views most extensively attributed to them a spectrum of esoteric beliefs, including secret and preternatural knowledge that imbued them with miraculous powers, the indwelling of God’s Spirit, and heavenly ascents to behold God (Amir-Moezzi, Spirituality, 169–91, 213–7). The discourse of such knowledge and experience was often embedded in complex cosmogonic doctrines (Amir-Moezzi, Spirituality, 133–67; Crone, Nativist prophets, 208–15). For Imāmī heresiographers, and for those relying on them, these early ghulāt and their successors were nevertheless always depicted as disciples, albeit ostracised and overzealous, of the notables of the Prophet’s clan of Quraysh, the Bānū Hashim—whether prominent descendants of ‘Alī, such as Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīya (d. 81/700–701), Muḥammad al-Baqī‘ (d. 117/735), Muḥammad al-Nafṣ al-Zakīyya, and Ja‘far al-Sādiq (d. 148/765), or even the early ‘Abbāsid caliphs. When a figure whom a particular ghulāt sect revered as the Mahdī died before fulfilling his messianic destiny, these sectarians often persisted in their beliefs, asserting that the death of their Mahdī was an illusion and that he would remain in hiding until the time of his re-emergence.

Scholars have justifiably questioned whether these heresiological accounts, with their love of taxonomy and misbegotten genealogies, anachronistically projected controversial beliefs of their own times back onto the earliest Ghulāt (Bayhom-Daou, ʿShīʿite Ghulāt). While this line of argumentation has many merits, several common themes—such as messianism, millenarian activism, continuous prophecy, and ecstatic and esotericist religiosity—are attested long before the heresiologists’ writings. An early letter attributed to al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīya (d. after 94/713), the son of the man the Kaysāniyya revered as their Mahdī, contains our earliest testimony to and denunciation of the beliefs of the most uncompromising remnants of al-Mukhtār’s revolt. His testimony is important because—in contrast to his brother Abū Hashim, who seemed to have embraced the Kaysāniyya (al-Fasawi, 2:2:737, 742; Aḥbār al-ʿAbbās, 174, 180–1)—al-Ḥasan first joined and then abandoned the remnants of the Kaysāniyya who survived al-Mukhtār’s revolt (Anthony, Meccan prison, 20–3). Al-Ḥasan accuses the Shī‘a of Kufa, whom he calls Saba‘iyya, of numerous misdeeds: spreading lies against the Umayyads and fomenting religious strife, entertaining the opinions of the ignorant and low-born while foisting their religion upon the Prophet’s family, claiming access to suppressed parts of the Qurʾān, following the prophecies of soothsayers (kuḥḥān), and expecting an apocalyptic political reversal (dawla) to transpire simultaneously with the resurrection of the dead (van Ess, Das Kitāb al-Irāq, 24, §6). This list of beliefs, albeit laconic, leaves the impression of a Kufan religious milieu that brewed millenarian political aspirations with beliefs in the continuity of prophecy and ecstatic religiosity according, at least partially, with the lurid descriptions of the early ghulāt found in later heresiological works (cf. Halm, Gnosis, 43–96).
Much like the Ḥashimiyya movement that led to the ‘Abbasid revolution in 132/750, the ghulāt fused chiliastic hopes and political activism into an idiom that appealed strongly to groups alienated from the Islamic-conquest elite, culling much of its leadership and strength from the disaffected and disenfranchised, especially the early non-Arab converts and freedmen from Iraq and the Iranian plateau. The ghulāt were likewise considerably transformed by the political success of the ‘Abbasid revolution.

The last significant revolt of the ghulāt in Kufa occurred during the caliphate of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765), the eponym of the Khaṭṭābiyya. While the causes of this revolt remain obscure, Abū l-Khaṭṭāb had gained a reputation as a prominent and trusted disciple of the sixth Imām, Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq (d. 148/765), before the uprising. Jaʿfar seems, however, to have begun to distance himself from Abū l-Khaṭṭāb as early as 135/752–3, after hearing that he was extolling Jaʿfar as divine and “espousing ghulaww.” Jaʿfar’s public denunciations certainly became widely known by the time of Abū l-Kaṭṭāb’s execution, in 138/755–6 (al-Kulayn, 2:148, 5:150; cf. Ausari, Abū l-Khaṭṭāb, 432–3), yet the authorities’ repression of Abū l-Khaṭṭāb’s circles occurred even earlier. According to Abū l-Ḥasan al-Ashʿarī (d. 324/936), followers of Abū l-Khaṭṭāb had already run afoul of the Umayyads during the Iraqi governorship of Yazīd b. ʿUmar b. Hubayra (d. 129–32/741–9), when a figure named ʿUmayr b. al-Bayān al-ʿIṣrī erected on the outskirts of Kufa a tent dedicated to the worship of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq (Maqāliyya, 12–3). When Abū l-Khaṭṭāb and seventy of his close companions rebelled against the ‘Abbāsid prince Ṣaʿd b. Mūsā (d. 167/783–4) in Kufa, the prince annihilated them, crucifying them and burning their corpses after their defeat (al-Baladhuri, ed. al-Durra, 3:255–6; Saʿd al-Asḥārī, 81–2). After Abū l-Khaṭṭāb’s execution, the successors of the Khaṭṭābiyya embraced the strategic political quietism adopted by the Shīʿī followers of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, thus eschewing the urgency of millenarian activism and opting for initiatic secrecy and esoteric religiosity. Imāmī theological literature came to refer to these ‘Abbāsid-era ghulāt as muṣawwida, because they regarded the Imāms—and at times even their closest disciples—as holding a delegation (tafsīd) of God’s power on earth and, hence, as the locus of God’s manifestation in this world, the conduit of the divine light to his disciples and possessors of preternatural and salvific knowledge of all things, seen and unseen (Amir-Moezzi, Ḥaṭṭābiyya, 127–8; cf. Modarressi, Crisis, 21–9).

Unlike earlier ghulāt, the muṣawwida maintained intimate ties with the Imāms of the Imāmī Shiʿa, and many, such as Mufaḍḍal b. ʿUmar al-Juḥi (d. before 179/795; cf. Modarressi, Tradition, 333–7) played an indispensable role in managing the financial affairs of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq and his successors (Asatryan, Bankers). The muṣawwida also left behind much pseudepigraphal literature and many esoteric writings attributed to important early representatives of this faction—works that mostly survive thanks to the Nuṣayrī Ḵawwāṣ who preserved them alongside the writings attributed to their founding figures, such as Mūḥammad b. Sinān al-Zahīrī (d. 220/835) and Mūḥammad b. Nuṣayr al-Numayrī (d. after 254/868). This corpus, now available in an eleven-volume collection, Silsilat al-turāth al-ulawī (“The Alawite heritage series”; Diyar
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\textquote{Aql, Lebanon 2006–13}, contains our earliest examples of literature written by ghulât (Asatryan, Early Shi'i cosmology, 3–4). This series adds to ghulât works that have been better studied, such as the famous Kitâb al-haft wa-l-azîla (“The book of the heptad and shadows”) attributed to Mufâdâl b. ’Umar (d. before 183/799) (Halm, Buch der Schatten; Asatryan, Early Shi’i cosmology; Asatryan, Shi’ite underground literature) and the Umm al-kitâb (“Primordial book”), which survives only in a Persian translation (Anthony, Legend) and large parts of which are attributed to Ja’far al-Sadiq’s disciple Jâbir al-Ju’ff (d. 128/745–6), a figure notorious for espousing ghulât. Among the works rich for the history of ghulât as a resource potentially as rich for the history of ghulât as the Nag Hammadi corpus is the so-called gnostic sects of early Christianity.
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The origins of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey (GNAT; Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi, TBMM), often mistranslated as the Turkish Grand National Assembly, may be found in the assemblies of the first and second constitutional periods (1876–1918). During the war of independence (1919–22), Entente troops occupied Istanbul in March 1920, and the sultan dissolved parliament on 2 April 1920, which prompted the nationalists in Anatolia to form a new parliament in Ankara. After elections were held, the new parliament—which consisted of deputies elected from the provinces and a group of members of the Meclis-i Mebusan (Chamber of Deputies)—was opened on 23 April 1920, and for the first time, its president, Şerif Bey (1845–1929), used the phrase “Grand National Assembly” instead of Meclis-i Mebusan. On 8 February 1921, the cabinet passed a decree on “the composition of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey” and thereby proclaimed the new parliament under this name.

The Assembly, acting as the constituent assembly, enjoyed both legislative and executive powers. Mustafa Kemal Paşa (d. 1938) was elected speaker during the second sitting. The Assembly’s objective was to rescue the country, the caliphate, and the sultan from the foreign powers.

An early election was held in April 1923, and the newly formed government resigned due to a disagreement with the Assembly. Mustafa Kemal Paşa took advantage of this crisis and proposed the proclamation of a republican form of government to parliament. The majority in parliament supported his proposal, and, on 29 October 1923, the Republic of Turkey was proclaimed, with Mustafa Kemal Paşa elected as its first president.

Initially, the parliamentary system was meant to be multi-party. Mustafa Kemal’s Halk Firkası (Peoples’ Party) already existed, and dissidents in the Assembly formed the Progressive Republican Party (Terakkiperver Cumhuriyet Fırkası), on 18 November 1924. However, because it opposed the kind of regime the Kemalists were trying to establish, the new party was officially dissolved on 5 June 1925. Another party, the Free Republican Party (Serbest Cumhuriyet Fırkası), was formed by Fethi Okyar (d. 1943), Kemal Paşa’s confidant, on 12 August 1930. Fethi dissolved his party on 17 November 1930, after it attracted reactionaries opposed to the regime.

Between 1930 and 1945, the Republican People’s Party (Cumhuriyet Halk Partisi, CHP) governed Turkey singly, without any opposition. After World War Two, parties were formed again, and the Democrat Party (Demokrat Partisi, DP) emerged from the elections of 1946 as the opposition in parliament. In the parliamentary elections of May 1950, the DP won 415 seats and became the governing party, while the CHP went into opposition.

The military coup of 27 May 1960 and the constitution of 1961 altered Turkey’s