

































































30. I thank Annemarie Mol for pointing my attention to the problems of equivocation and translation of Sufi bodies (email, 7 September 2017).
31. Arthur Saniotis articulated the demands on the Sufi students in terms of the aspiration and cultivation of a certain “existential mastery in the form of disciplining the body . . . , the need for controlling the *nafs*, the seat of carnality” (2012, 79).
32. *Whitewashing* can be understood as the racialized “expropriation of cultural identity [that] cripples and deforms” (Hall 1989, 71). It constructs whiteness as universal and normative, expressing itself through racial erasures in a white supremacist society (Gabriel 1998). Whitewashing manifests in how popular Euroamerican media erase crucial contextual details when representing non-white and non-Western figures, exemplified by the casting of white actors to play a BIPOC character (Zhang 2017). I have discussed the political dangers of a related phenomenon (cultural appropriation) elsewhere in this book (Introduction, chapters 2, 4, and 6). However, restricting Rumi to a nationalist heritage, such as exclusively Iranian, Afghan, or Turkish, can be problematic. Considering Rumi as both Sufi and Muslim, who belongs to the transnational heritage of several nation-states beyond contemporary borders, complicates a singular identity. The contemporary appreciation of Rumi and other historical Sufi figures is emblematic of a global heritage accessible to Muslims and non-Muslims, whether they identify as Sufis or not, but not at the cost of whitewashing non-Western non-white Sufis like Rumi (Arjana 2020) and the cultural appropriation of an inherently Islamic tradition like Sufism.