EARLY MYSTICS IN TURKISH LITERATURE

Mehmed Fuad Köprülü

Translated, edited and with an introduction
by Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

EARLY MYSTICS IN TURKISH LITERATURE

Early Mystics in Turkish Literature is a translation and edition of Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's (1890–1966) Turkish masterpiece *Turk edebiyatinda ilk mutasavviflar*, originally published in 1918 and republished numerous times. Focusing on two great medieval poets, Aḥmad Yasawī in Central Asia and Yūnus Emre in Anatolia, it examines the origin and early evolution of Turkish literature.

Using Arabic and Persian as well as Turkish sources, Köprülü describes the origin of Turkish literature and then attempts to show the continuity in its development between Central Asia and Anatolia. Furthermore, he studies these issues within the broader contexts of:

- Islam
- Sufism
- The genesis of Turkish culture in the Muslim world

The Turkish edition of this book was a major contribution to the study of Turkish literature, enjoying iconic status. The English edition updates and clarifies its detailed references, describes the influence of this book on subsequent scholarship, and includes a critique of the author's methods. *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature* is essential reading for scholars of Turkish literature and history, Islam, and Sufism.

This book has been translated into English by **Gary Leiser** and **Robert Dankoff**.

Gary Leiser is the Director of the Travis Air Museum at Travis AFB, California. He received a doctorate in Middle Eastern history from the University of Pennsylvania in 1976. He has been engaged in a long-term project of translating into English the major historical works of Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. Among those to have appeared are *Origins of the Ottoman Empire* and *Some Observations on the Influence of Byzantine Institutions on Ottoman Institutions*. His other works include the edition and translation, with Noury al-Khaledy, of al-Sulamī's thirteenth-century medical text *Questions and Answers for Physicians: A Medieval Arabic Study Manual*.

Robert Dankoff is Professor of Turkish and Islamic Studies at the University of Chicago. His publications include *Mahmūd al-Kāshgharī, Compendium of the Turkic Dialects (Dīwān Lughāt al-Turk)*, edited and translated with introduction and indices in collaboration with James Kelly; *Yūsuf Khāss Hājib, Wisdom of Royal Glory (Kutadgu Bilig): A Turko-Islamic Mirror for Princes*; *The Intimate Life of an Ottoman Statesman, Melek Ahmad Pasha (1588–1662)*; *Evliya Çelebi in Bitlis*; and *An Ottoman Mentality: The World of Evliya Çelebi*.

ROUTLEDGE SUFI SERIES

Series Editor: Ian Richard Netton
Professor of Arabic Studies
University of Leeds

The Routledge Sufi Series provides short introductions to a variety of facets of the subject, which are accessible both to the general reader and the student and scholar in the field. Each book will be either a synthesis of existing knowledge or a distinct contribution to, and extension of, knowledge of the particular topic. The two major underlying principles of the Series are sound scholarship and readability.

BEYOND FAITH AND INFIDELITY
The Sufi poetry and teaching of Mahmud Shabistari
Leonard Lewisham

AL-HALLAJ
Herbert W. Mason

RUZBIHAN BAQLI
Mysticism and the rhetoric of sainthood in Persian Sufism
Carl W. Ernst

ABDULLAH ANSARI OF HERAT
An early Sufi Master
A. G. Ravan Farhadi

THE CONCEPT OF SAINTHOOD IN EARLY ISLAMIC MYSTICISM
Bernd Radtke and John O'Kane

SUHRAWARDI AND THE SCHOOL OF ILLUMINATION
Mehdi Amin Razavi

PERSIAN SUFI POETRY
An introduction to the mystical use of classical Persian poems
J. T. P. de Bruijn

AZIZ NASAFI
Lloyd Ridgeon

SUFIS AND ANTI-SUFIS
The defence, rethinking and rejection of Sufism in the modern world
Elizabeth Sirriyeh

REVELATION, INTELLECTUAL INTUITION AND REASON IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF MULLA SADRA
An analysis of the al-hikmah al-'arshiyyah
Zailan Moris

DIVINE LOVE IN ISLAMIC MYSTICISM
The teachings of al-Ghâzalî and al-Dabbâgh
Binyamin Abrahamov

STRIVING FOR DIVINE UNION
Spiritual exercises for Suhrawardi Sufis
Qamar-ul Huda

A PSYCHOLOGY OF EARLY SUFI SAMÂ
Listening and altered states
Kenneth S. Avery

MUSLIM SAINTS OF SOUTH ASIA
The eleventh to fifteenth centuries
Anna Suvorova

SUFI VISIONARY OF OTTOMAN DAMASCUS
'Abd al-Ghani al-Nabulusi, 1641–1731
Elizabeth Sirriyeh

SUFI RITUAL
The parallel universe
Ian Richard Netton

EARLY MYSTICS IN TURKISH LITERATURE
Mehmed Fuad Köprülü
Translated, edited and with an introduction by Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff

EARLY MYSTICS IN TURKISH LITERATURE

Mehmed Fuad Köprülü

Translated, edited and with an introduction by Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff

Foreword by Devin DeWeese

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2006
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group

© 2006 Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2006.

"To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge's collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk."

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN10: 0-415-36686-0 (Print Edition)
ISBN13: 978-0-415-36686-1

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments vii
Foreword by Devin DeWeese viii
Translators' introduction xxviii
Abbreviations xxxvii
Preface to the third edition xxxviii
Preface to the second edition xlii
Preface to the first edition lii

PART I
Aḥmad Yasawī and his influence on Turkish literature **1**

1 Turkish literature before Aḥmad Yasawī 3
2 The legendary life of Aḥmad Yasawī 20
3 The historical life of Aḥmad Yasawī 57
4 The *khalīfas* and *ṭarīqa* of Aḥmad Yasawī 89
5 The work of Aḥmad Yasawī 127
6 Aḥmad Yasawī's literary influence 171

PART II
Yūnus Emre and his influence on Turkish literature **189**

7 Turkish literature in Anatolia before Yūnus Emre 191
8 The life of Yūnus Emre 268
9 The work of Yūnus Emre 302

10 Yūnus Emre's influence on Turkish literature and his imitators 362

Appendix 1: Chains of authority 385
Appendix 2: Some hymns of Yūnus Emre 388
Glossary 395
Bibliography 399
Index 430

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Presented here is a translation of Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's classic work *Türk edebiyatında ilk mutasavvıflar* or *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, which was first published in Ottoman Turkish in 1918. Subsequently revised and republished in the Latin alphabet of modern Turkish, it is a complex work of great range and depth relying on an array of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish sources and incorporating secondary works in several European languages. Indeed, in light of Köprülü's erudition, his son Orhon Köprülü, who edited the third edition, recommended that if a future edition were published a committee composed of scholars in various fields should be formed to bring it up to date. Translating this work into English and editing it have thus not only taken many years but also presented a number of challenges. We gratefully acknowledge the assistance, above all, of Devin DeWeese at Indiana University who wrote the foreword, provided most of the commentary on Köprülü's assessment of Aḥmad Yasawī, and helped to update many of the notes. In addition, Heshmat Moayyad and John Woods at the University of Chicago clarified a number of passages in Persian. We also wish to thank Beca Lafore for preparing the maps, Kathy Kruczek for preparing the charts, Nicholas Ruiz for preparing the musical scores, Jonathan Bloom for providing a photograph of Aḥmad Yasawī's shrine, Berrin Dirim for providing photographs of one of Yūnus Emre's reputed burial sites, and the Mongol papercut artist Norovsambuugiin Baatartsog for making the illustrations. The Turkish Ministry of Tourism granted permission to reprint a photograph of Aḥmad Yasawī's shrine from its edition of Naim-Bek Nurmuhammedoğlu's *Hoca Ahmed Yesevî Türbesi* (Ankara, 1991).

G. L. and R. D.

FOREWORD

Perhaps the greatest testament to the importance of Mehmed Fuad Köprülü's *Türk edebiyatında ilk mutasavvıflar* (*Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*) is the remarkable degree to which it has shaped, during the nearly 90 years since its publication, both popular and learned ideas about the historical links between religious and literary currents in Central Asia and their counterparts in Anatolia. Ironically, therein lies also the key to both the positive and negative aspects of the work's scholarly legacy: it led the way in exploring the impact, in Anatolian Turkish society, of Central Asian Turkic religious and literary developments, yet in so doing it helped to cement a tendency to view Central Asia through an Anatolian prism, rather than on its own terms and through its own sources. The fact that such a tendency was only exacerbated by the long isolation of Central Asia, and of the sources of its religious history, during most of the twentieth century can hardly be blamed on Köprülü's work, of course. In a sense, *Early Mystics* may be regarded as the first substantial statement of a "western" perspective on the continuities and discontinuities of Central Asian and Anatolian cultures, and this statement should have followed, or prompted, an equally substantial statement from an "eastern" perspective; the isolation of Central Asia during the Soviet era, however, and the impact of Soviet ideology – which stunted the academic study of religious life and straitjacketed the evaluation of "national" literature – ensured that there was no significant response to Köprülü's work from a Central Asian perspective. We are thus left with only one voice from what might have been, and should have been, an ongoing dialogue; and precisely because of the prominence of that one voice, and the expectation it fostered that Turkic civilization in Central Asia could be understood on Anatolian Turkish terms, a fundamental imbalance remains.

Having spent considerable time with Köprülü's *Early Mystics* while working on my own study of the Yasawī Ṣūfī tradition, I had some misgivings when I first learned that plans were under way to prepare an English translation of the book. I had decided early on that a fresh approach to the Yasawī tradition was long overdue, and that a new evaluation of that tradition would require starting from the ground up, with a substantially enlarged body of sources, new questions to ask of them, and a willingness to challenge everything that had become the

"accepted wisdom" about Aḥmad Yasawī and his legacy; revising or updating Köprülü was precisely *not* the way to proceed. I am still firmly convinced of this, and I hope that the results of my efforts will soon be available; but I also became convinced that Köprülü's work had attained an iconic status that made it essential to acknowledge and take stock of the assumptions, arguments, and conclusions advanced in the book, even if wholly in the context of rejecting or challenging them. Simply put, Köprülü's *Early Mystics* underlies, in some measure, nearly every treatment of the Yasawī Ṣūfī tradition in both scholarly and popular literature that has appeared during the past 85 years; while I believe it should no longer be regarded as authoritative, its influence is undeniable, and having it available in English translation might underscore the usefulness of a fresh evaluation of where, in my view, Köprülü had gone astray, and where his pioneering work was still of value. I also recognize that Köprülü himself, naturally, was not to blame for the often uncritical repetition of his views that came to dominate scholarship, especially in Turkey, on the Yasawī tradition, and that there would be merit in revisiting what, precisely, Köprülü said and what he did not say – not only from a historiographical standpoint, but from the standpoint of marshalling evidence and arguments for or against particular aspects of Köprülü's treatment – and in this way resuming that interrupted dialogue.

So, when Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff graciously asked me to contribute a foreword to the present English translation (and thereby gave me the opportunity to review the entire work without wading again through the 1918-era Turkish), I readily agreed. My conviction that many of Köprülü's views are in serious need of revision cannot lessen the impact of the book in its time, or the value of making it more widely accessible through a translation that is both remarkable for its clarity and an improvement, in many respects, over the original.

It should be noted at the outset that my comments are necessarily restricted to Köprülü's treatment of the Yasawī tradition, to which less than half of *Early Mystics* is devoted; I must leave it to others to assess the continued value of Köprülü's study of Yūnus Emre and his *oeuvre*, which comprises the bulk of the work, and serves as its real, central focus, for which discussion of the Yasawī tradition was preparatory. Yet Köprülü's work has in many respects held a more central place in the study of the Yasawī tradition than in the study of Yūnus Emre and other Anatolian Turkish poets and Ṣūfīs; scholarship on the latter has grown steadily since the appearance of *Early Mystics*, but scholarly attention to the legacy of Aḥmad Yasawī largely stagnated for nearly 70 years, with few new sources brought to light, and few new approaches adopted, beyond what Köprülü already employed. It is, moreover, in connection with the Yasawī tradition, and its presumed legacy in Anatolia, that the absence of a Central Asian perspective has been particularly unfortunate, and that imbalance of voices referred to above may in itself justify limiting my remarks to the Yasawī tradition.

The pioneering character of Köprülü's work was evident soon after its publication, in its warm reception by European scholars; the remarkable range of summaries and reviews in European languages attests to the interest and

admiration the work evoked. It had less impact, initially, in Turkey, as is discussed in the preface to the work's second edition, in Latin script (which appeared only in 1966, nearly half a century after the original publication), but its reputation and influence grew along with Köprülü's status as the pre-eminent scholar of Turkey's new republican era. Köprülü himself understood the work as an important model for the application of critical methods developed in European scholarship, and he stressed the value of the many primary sources first brought to light in *Early Mystics*; the methods adopted and the sources utilized remain among the most important and enduring contributions of the work (far more than specific arguments and conclusions), and Köprülü's achievement is all the more remarkable when we consider that he was only 28 years old when he completed it.

Ironically, some of the clearest reminders of the pioneering character of Köprülü's work are to be found among the most obsolete of his long footnotes. When he wrote, he could not draw upon an extensive scholarly literature on Ṣūfī mystical philosophy, or on the history of the Turks, or on Central Asian poetry; such issues had not been explored, in some cases, any more thoroughly than had the life and legacy of Aḥmad Yasawī, and while few would today cite much of the secondary literature he was compelled to consider on these and other subjects, much of which has been entirely superseded, we must acknowledge the breadth of his scholarship, as he addressed issues into which few had ventured before him, often supplementing his references to the relatively rare scholarly treatments of these topics with explorations in primary sources that up to his time had remained largely unexamined. The same need to prepare ground that then remained unworked no doubt reduced the time and space he could devote to the more specific subjects of his work; if we wish that Köprülü had delved more deeply into specific narratives or issues raised in the work, for example, we must remember that he felt constrained to deal with literary and religious developments and currents for which a few citations to standard treatments not yet created in 1918 would suffice today.

With due homage to the work and its impact, however, it will perhaps be useful to outline what were, in my view, the chief shortcomings in Köprülü's *Early Mystics*, and to indicate where and how the most substantial corrections or additions to Köprülü's presentation are to be made; doing so will not only suggest where scholarship has gone since his work appeared – or, more often, where it still needs to go – but also suggest the extent to which the flaws in the book were virtually inevitable given the state of scholarship at the time it was produced, rather than the result of scholarly deficiencies on Köprülü's part.

To begin with, there is little point in faulting Köprülü for the frequent nationalist tone in the work, and the emphasis upon asserting the intrinsically Turkish character of the cultural trends he sought to trace from Anatolia back to Central Asia; he was quite open about the "national" purpose of his endeavor, insisting that the "popular Ṣūfī literature" he believed was represented by both Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre was an important element of the distinctive "national character" of the Turks, whose noble cultural heritage had been too long

submerged, first by the dominance of Persian influence and later by European influence. While we may disagree with that stance, with the conscious insertion of such views into scholarly research, and with specific approaches or conclusions or judgments that seem to arise from these ideological foundations rather than from a sober assessment of the sources, Köprülü was straightforward about his agenda, and readers can easily ignore or suspend the obviously nationalist interpretations while still profiting from his analysis and the sources he adduced.

It is also to Köprülü's credit that he called, in his preface, for his work to be received as "a modest guide for future research"; this reminds us that he is hardly to be held accountable for what was perhaps the most unfortunate and pernicious aspect of his work's legacy, namely the slavish repetition of his views and the material he brought forward. No doubt Köprülü himself would have been dismayed at the elevation of his work as an unassailable scholarly icon, and at the tendency of later scholars to cite his "guide" as the final word on many subjects; at its worst, this tendency has led many writers to ignore, and thereby dishonor, Köprülü's own example of seeking and bringing to light new primary sources, and has even seemed to discourage the re-examination of sources already consulted by Köprülü, as if nothing more could be learned from them. Again, Köprülü can scarcely be criticized because the pioneering character of his work prompted the uncritical repetition of his views, and the wide-scale neglect, especially among Turkish scholars, of sources on the Yasawī tradition beyond those already cited by Köprülü; yet because so much of the subsequent discussion of Aḥmad Yasawī and of the Yasawī tradition is simply derivative and uninspired, it is inevitable that a critique of the prevailing views will be targeted at Köprülü's *Early Mystics*, the source, rather than at the more easily dismissible rehashings of his work.

By far the most important factor limiting the value of Köprülü's presentation of the Yasawī tradition (including the life and legacy of the tradition's eponym) was one largely beyond his control or remedy, namely his lack of access to the vast majority of essential sources produced in Central Asia among Yasawī Ṣūfī communities and their Naqshbandī and Kubrawī rivals. For his material on Yasawī history and the life of Aḥmad Yasawī, Köprülü's chief source was a manuscript, preserved in the library of Istanbul University, that contains, I believe, two works from the late sixteenth century by a Yasawī shaikh known as Ḥazīnī, a native of Ḥiṣār (west of Dushanbe in present-day Tajikistan) who established himself in Istanbul;[1] in addition, Köprülü made extensive use of the important Naqshbandī hagiographical compilation from the beginning of the sixteenth century, the *Rashaḥāt-i ʿain al-ḥayāt* (though only through an Ottoman translation from the end of the same century), as well as a few small treatises produced in Central Asian Naqshbandī circles, and he had access to the sixteenth-century poetic anthology of Khwāja Ḥasan "Nithārī" Bukhārī, the *Mudhakkir-i aḥbāb*, which includes interesting material on the Yasawī tradition. He was also able to consult a printed version of an important popular hagiography devoted to Ḥakīm Ata, a figure typically cast as one of Aḥmad Yasawī's chief disciples. Otherwise,

Köprülü relied on Bektashī narratives about Aḥmad Yasawī as well as on Ottoman accounts claiming Aḥmad Yasawī's spiritual ancestry of various Anatolian saints, and, of course, on the collection of poetry ascribed to Aḥmad Yasawī, the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*.

These sources retain their importance for the study of Yasawī history, but entire Yasawī lineages, and entire narrative cycles surrounding Aḥmad Yasawī, would remain unknown (as they were to Köprülü) without access to a host of other works. At the top of the list of sources whose absence from Köprülü's purview severely limited his treatment of the Yasawī tradition is undoubtedly the most important single source on Yasawī history, the *Lamaḥāt min nafaḥāt al-quds*, completed in 1035/1626 by an important Yasawī shaikh, Muḥammad al-ʿĀlim al-Ṣiddīqī al-ʿAlawī, known as ʿĀlim Shaikh of ʿAlīyābād; this work, though occasionally cited from manuscript or lithograph copies, and published in facsimile in 1986,[2] remains largely unexplored, but is of vital importance for the history of the Yasawī Ṣūfī communities of Mawarannahr (Transoxiana), and for traditions about Aḥmad Yasawī himself.[3]

Köprülü was also unaware of several sources produced before the sixteenth century, i.e. before the *Rashaḥāt*, whose account of the Yasawī *silsila* (genealogy of spiritual affiliation) shaped the presentation found in nearly every subsequent source produced outside Yasawī circles themselves. For instance, Köprülü wrote *Early Mystics* without consulting the important Chaghatay Turkic work of Mīr ʿAlī-Shīr Nawā'ī, the *Nasā'im al-maḥabba*, a translation, with additions (including precisely the valuable accounts of the Turkic shaikhs), of Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt al-uns*; Köprülü later learned of Nawā'ī's work and wrote a brief article outlining its information on saints of the Yasawī tradition,[4] but its material was not incorporated into, or even acknowledged in, later editions of *Early Mystics*. Köprülü was also unfamiliar with many other works, of hagiographical and doctrinal orientation, produced within various Ṣūfī communities of Central Asia during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which must be taken into consideration when outlining this early phase of Yasawī history; of special importance are works produced within Khwājagānī communities, precursors to the Naqshbandiyya, which shed crucial light on the extremely complicated question of the relationship between the Yasawī and Naqshbandī traditions.

Another extremely important early source on the Yasawī tradition is the Turkic work of Isḥāq Khwāja, the son of Ismāʿīl Ata, which survives in two redactions, one of which bears the title *Ḥadīqat al-ʿārifīn*. This work, from the middle of the fourteenth century, is not only an important (and still virtually unknown) example of Central Asian Turkic prose, but is a vitally important source on one prominent Ṣūfī community that traced its origins to Aḥmad Yasawī. Manuscripts of the two redactions are preserved in Tashkent and Kabul, and a fragment of the work, preserved in Uppsala, was mentioned by Köprülü in his later article on Aḥmad Yasawī in the Turkish edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.[5] The important Kabul manuscript was noted briefly by Zeki Velidi Togan,[6] but the Tashkent copies have not even been described in a published catalogue (I first

learned of them in 1984 while working in Tashkent, and published an article in 1990 citing one copy;[7] I have noted the work in two other articles on the Yasawī tradition,[8] and another copy has been cited in works by Ashirbek Muminov,[9] but a full discussion of the work will appear in my forthcoming study of the Yasawī tradition). The Ismāʿīl Atāʾī tradition reflected in the two redactions of this work is in fact reflected in a wide range of Central Asian hagiographical works produced from the fifteenth century to the nineteenth, but was completely unknown to Köprülü, and remains largely unknown in scholarship that has looked to Köprülü for the last word on the Yasawī tradition; its study offers many correctives to our understanding of Yasawī history, however, and I would argue that the work of Isḥāq Khwāja b. Ismāʿīl Ata should, and will, displace the problematical *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* as the most prominent Turkic-language legacy of the Yasawī tradition.

Considering its continued obscurity, Köprülü can hardly be faulted for not knowing the work of Isḥāq Khwāja, and the *Lamaḥāt* too appears not to be represented in the rich manuscript collections of Istanbul; nevertheless, either one of these sources alone adds sufficient new material, and new perspectives, to render much of Köprülü's treatment of Yasawī history utterly obsolete.

While the body of sources produced within other (i.e. non-Ismāʿīl Atāʾī) Yasawī lineages of Central Asia is not large, these sources too are obviously important for an internal perspective on the Yasawī tradition; none of them, however, was known to Köprülü. The earliest such work, produced within the best-known Yasawī *silsila*, is a treatise in defense of the vocal *dhikr* (remembrance of God in a Ṣūfī séance), the *Taʿlīm al-dhākirīn*, completed in 947/1541, by a disciple of the pivotal Yasawī shaikh Khudāidād, and preserved in manuscript in St Petersburg and Bukhārā; the corpus of specifically Yasawī hagiographical literature from Central Asia includes, beyond the *Lamaḥāt*, the *Ḥujjat al-dhākirīn* of Mawlānā Muḥammad Sharīf of Bukhārā, completed in 1080/1669–70 (represented in manuscript collections of St Petersburg, Tashkent, and Istanbul), as well as the *Manāqib al-akhyār*, produced in 1036/1626 within a lineage descended spiritually as well as naturally from the Yasawī saint Sayyid Ata, and known from two manuscript copies, in London and Rampur.[10]

Yet another body of important "internal" Yasawī sources is the larger repertoire of works, in Persian and Turkic, by the same Ḥazīnī who wrote the Turkic *Jawāhir al-abrār* and the acephalous Persian work preserved in the manuscript from the library of Istanbul University that Köprülü used long ago; that manuscript has now been published[11] (the *Jawāhir* in transcription, the Persian work in facsimile), but Ḥazīnī's other works remain unpublished. They include the early *Jāmiʿ al-murshidīn* (in Persian, commissioned in Damascus by ʿAlī Chelebī Qïnalïzāde (d. 979/1572), finished in 972/1564–5, and preserved in a unique manuscript in Berlin); the *Ḥujjat al-abrār* (in Persian, completed in 996/1588, and preserved in a unique manuscript in Paris, which contains also other short works by Ḥazīnī of biographical interest but less important for Yasawī history); and the Turkic *Manbaʿ al-abḥār* (written in 995/1587, preserved in a single manuscript in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul).

Later non-Yasawī hagiographical works produced in Central Asia are also vital for tracing the Yasawiyya into the middle of the eighteenth century (when it essentially disappears from our sources as a distinct Ṣūfī community); chief among these are the *Thamarāt al-mashā'ikh* from late seventeenth-century Bukhārā; the *Ashjār al-khuld*, completed in 1139/1726 by a Kashmīrī author; the *Tadhkira-i Ṭāhir Īshān*, compiled by a Khwārazmian author from the mid-eighteenth century; and the untitled work of Mīr Musayyab Bukhārī, from the middle of the nineteenth century. Most of these works are preserved only in manuscripts held in collections of the former Soviet Union, and were thus long inaccessible to scholars from outside the USSR; they were also generally uninteresting to Soviet scholars, given Soviet attitudes to religious matters, and the resulting neglect of such sources, which continued into the 1980s, was clearly as much a factor in the slow pace of Yasawī studies as the dominance of Köprülü's presentation of the Yasawī tradition.

To these sources, finally, we may add the growing body of texts reflecting genealogical traditions linked to the family of Aḥmad Yasawī; these texts, preserved chiefly in private hands in Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, have only recently begun to be discovered and published, thanks largely to the efforts of local scholars (above all Ashirbek Muminov and Zikiriya Zhandarbekov).

Perhaps less consequential than the many primary sources unknown to Köprülü, but worth noting in any case, was his lack of access to important publications in Russian, in which the most substantial information on Central Asia, and on the Yasawī tradition there, available in the years preceding the completion of *Early Mystics* was published; Russian, naturally, was the language of scholarship in the state to which Aḥmad Yasawī's homeland belonged when Köprülü was preparing his work. Köprülü did occasionally have access to Russian scholarship through translations into French (as in the case of Bekchurin's important description of the Yasawī shrine complex) or German (as with some of Barthold's works), but he could not consult, for example, the extensive discussions of Yasawī's shrine and the practices related to it preserved in works of N. S. Lykoshin, and expressly lamented the inaccessibility of what was undoubtedly the most important product of the pre-Köprülü phase in the study of the Yasawī tradition, the article of the Russian Orientalist K. G. Zaleman, in which he published, together with the entire text of an important and popular Turkic hagiography on Aḥmad Yasawī's disciple Ḥakīm Ata, excerpts from several Persian hagiographies dealing with Yasawī saints.[12]

In addition to the essentially bibliographical shortcomings noted so far – which one might reasonably argue were more than offset, for its time and for the first serious, if tentative, examination of the Yasawī tradition, by the previously unstudied sources first introduced to scholarship in *Early Mystics* – there are other problems, of approach and method, that deserve to be noted.

(I) In utilizing the material he was able to consult, Köprülü sought to apply the critical methods of European historical scholarship; in this he largely succeeded (though occasionally his handling of the sources is less than transparent), but

inevitably, of course, the approaches and attitudes of 1918 seem dated today. This is especially true in the case of Köprülü's approach to the material he casts as legendary; it combines a positivist historian's clear demarcation of sources deemed "legendary" from those deemed "historical," on the one hand, with, at times, a surprisingly uncritical attitude to sources of both (essentially artificial) classes. For instance, he immediately denounces the miraculous as a sign of a merely "legendary" narrative and source, but accepts straightforwardly stories affirming a relationship between two shaikhs, or presenting a chain of transmission, or asserting a particular practice as normative; he seems not to have considered that the retrospective construction of *silsilas* and relationships, for polemical or even merely didactic purposes, might be as injurious to "historicity" as the polemical or didactic use of miracle stories, and time and time again he misses opportunities to explore genuinely important and revealing historical issues by asking more fruitful questions of the rich narrative material to which he alludes (more fruitful, that is, than "did it really happen?"). In the same vein, he often lets literary merit and reputation cloud his approach to source criticism, as when he trusts the illustrious Jāmī's accounts from the *Nafaḥāt al-uns* over accounts by less exalted (or anonymous) hagiographers, without recognizing that Jāmī himself adopted many of his accounts from precisely such hagiographical works (and often with evident disregard for fidelity to his source); likewise, one senses that Köprülü regarded "legends" recorded by Evliyā Chelebi or Muṣṭafā ʿĀlī as somehow more valuable than their counterparts recorded in the anonymous *velāyetnāmes* of Bektashī saints.

We are fortunate, to be sure, that Köprülü had sufficient respect even for "legendary" sources, as evidence of the popular apprehension of a saint's legacy, to recount the stories in his work (however much he abbreviated or "rationalized" the narratives); but by casting such narratives only as indications of a saint's popular appeal, Köprülü evidently felt freed from the need to analyze them seriously, and so failed to explore the actual structure and content of the narratives for clues to the issues that mattered to those who created and circulated the stories.

At times, moreover, Köprülü's handling of his sources is frustratingly vague and imprecise. His presentations of Aḥmad Yasawī's "legendary" life, for instance, and many other expositions of narrative accounts, typically skip from one source to another without specifying which he is following at a given time; by failing even to distinguish elements preserved in Bektashī tradition from those found in Ḥazīnī's work, Köprülü not only abdicated his own responsibility to contextualize each source and the material it adds to Aḥmad Yasawī's persona, but prevented even his reader from taking up that task. Instead, he lumped together various sources as "books of legends" and implied that their accounts are in agreement, or are fundamentally harmonizable: thereby he ignored, and obscured, the important historical evidence that may often be derived from the discrepancies and contradictions among sources. A similar tendency is evident in his argumentation on literary history; he frequently insists, for example, that the "influence"

of one poet on another is "obvious," and so never takes time to demonstrate it, or to explain the precise nature of the "influence" he has in mind.

(II) The Anatolian Turkish prism used by Köprülü for viewing Central Asia was noted at the outset of these remarks, but its consequences are worth fuller consideration. His lack of knowledge of the history of Central Asia, and especially of its religious history (above all in the period from the fifteenth century to the nineteenth) is understandable given the time when he wrote, but it left Central Asia essentially a blank screen upon which Köprülü felt free to project religious, cultural, and literary developments known to him from Anatolia; in this way he could insist that features of religious or cultural life among the Turks of Anatolia and the Ottoman realm that could not be traced to an essentialized "Islamic" source must go back, if not always to the pre-Islamic traditions of the Turkic nomads of the steppe (a source in fact invoked quite often), then at least to the synthesis of Turkic and Islamic traditions (equally essentialized, in both cases) that Köprülü imagined had taken place in Central Asia. It is immediately evident that such an approach is faulty, but the reconstruction of Islam's history in Central Asia on the basis of such projections from the Turkish experience in Anatolia has been far more common than the use of actual sources from Central Asia itself – certainly in Turkish scholarship, but also in European and American academic circles, where familiarity with the Ottoman world was, and remains, far more widespread than any direct acquaintance with Central Asia's Islamic heritage.

This approach continues to predominate among Turkish specialists, and colors our understanding not only of the Yasawī tradition, but of the entire religious history of Central Asia as well. It was adopted even by scholars who followed not the views presented by Köprülü in *Early Mystics* (where he emphasized the Yasawī tradition's place in the mainstream of Sunnī Ṣūfī movements), but those he championed later, namely the notion that the Yasawī tradition, like the Bektashiyya that supposedly sprang from it, was from its inception a "heterodox" movement shaped more by antinomian disregard for juridical norms, and by an eager receptivity to non-Islamic "influences," than by "normative" Islam. To some extent it is Köprülü's very use of such terms as "orthodox" and "heterodox" that is disturbing today, as students of Islamic religious history struggle to shake off the simple dichotomies such terms imply, but there is a more substantive issue involved here even if we grant him his terminology: Köprülü was paving the way for projecting a "tainted" Islam, either rife with "shamanic" holdovers from pre-Islamic Turkic religion or colored by excessive compromises with presumed "popular" religious tastes, as the wellspring of the Yasawī tradition, and, by extension, as the central religious profile of the Turks of Central Asia. Such a view is utterly indefensible from the standpoint of Central Asia's religious history, and of the Yasawī tradition's own sources, but it has nevertheless been remarkably persistent in some scholarly circles (no doubt because it harmonized well with certain approaches to Islam in twentieth-century Turkey).

(III) Through the sources he was able to use, his approach to those sources, and his lack of grounding in the Central Asian environment in which the Yasawī

tradition took shape, Köprülü in effect fixed in scholarly literature the key elements of what became the standard view of Aḥmad Yasawī's life and legacy. Each of these elements would require extensive evidence, and extensive argumentation, to challenge; it may nevertheless be worthwhile briefly to review the most important of them, and why they need revision, without here marshalling the evidence and arguments to be assembled elsewhere.

(1) Chronology. Köprülü appears never to have questioned the reliability of the date, 562/1166–7, given in some sources as that of Aḥmad Yasawī's death; at one point he credits "tradition" for this date, while elsewhere he claims that "all the different biographical dictionaries" are in agreement on this date. Of the sources Köprülü used, however, only the late (nineteenth-century) Indian hagiographical compendium of Ghulām Sarwar Lāhawrī, the *Khazinat al-asfiyā*, gives that date (neither the *Rashaḥāt* nor Ḥazīnī gives any date at all); the date does appear in earlier sources unknown to Köprülü (though in none of Yasawī provenance), but can be traced back no further than the second half of the sixteenth century (i.e. four centuries after the claimed date of the saint's death). Köprülü's lack of skepticism about this date, especially considering the source in which he must have found it, is remarkable; there has never been any good reason to assume that it is reliable, and substantial evidence bespeaks a somewhat later date for Aḥmad Yasawī's death. Nevertheless, Köprülü's affirmation of 1166–7 did much to entrench this date in subsequent literature ever more firmly, and still today, following Köprülü's example, scholars continue to make arguments about other issues – the political environment in which Aḥmad Yasawī lived, the reliability of specific traditions about his spiritual training, the linguistic and literary peculiarities of the poetry ascribed to him, the direction of literary or religious influence, etc. – as if this date were incontrovertibly established.

(2) Aḥmad Yasawī's family. In his discussion of the saint's immediate family, Köprülü not only glossed over important, and telling, discrepancies between Ḥazīnī's account and that of the *Rashaḥāt*, for instance, but failed to consider the impact of subsequent familial groupings on the presentations of Aḥmad Yasawī's family that came to be preserved in various sources. It is typical of Köprülü's treatment of the sources that Ḥazīnī's account of Aḥmad Yasawī's father, mother, and sister is accepted at face value, while the miracle tale for which these relationships merely set the stage is relegated to the purely "legendary" material; a fruitful interpretation of hagiographical narratives, however, must not only explore the historical circumstances reflected in accounts of the miraculous, but also envision the possibility that specific formulations of familial connections, or of genealogy, or of spiritual lineages, might distort historical reality every bit as much as (or more than) miracle stories.

(3) The role of Arslan Bābā. Köprülü accepted the story that Aḥmad Yasawī received his initial spiritual training from Arslan Bābā, and regarded the latter as a historical Ṣūfī teacher. While Köprülü did not explicitly support some of the more egregious transformations of Arslan Bābā – into a quasi-shamanic purveyor of pre-Islamic Turkic religious practices, or, more recently, into a representative

of a particular sectarian movement in Central Asia – his insistence that he was, in effect, a venerable teacher who trained Aḥmad Yasawī in his youth helped to set the tone of most subsequent treatments of Arslan Bābā. In fact the extant traditions about this figure most likely reflect very different religious currents, and it is quite unlikely that Arslan Bābā should be thought of as a historical Ṣūfī teacher.

(4) Aḥmad Yasawī's spiritual training and Ṣūfī *silsila*. Köprülü accepted the story, found in the *Rashaḥāt* (and other sources), that Aḥmad Yasawī's Ṣūfī master was Yūsuf Hamadānī, and that the latter was also the master of the spiritual ancestor of the Khwājagān and the Naqshbandiyya, ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī. This in itself is not surprising, since nearly every scholar who has had occasion to refer to Aḥmad Yasawī's place in Ṣūfī tradition has accepted the same story. What is disturbing, however, is that Köprülü ignored the clear assertion by Ḥazīnī that Aḥmad Yasawī belonged to a Suhrawardī lineage (a point underscored by other "internal" Yasawī sources as well). The likelihood that the *Rashaḥāt*'s account reflected a contrivance to show Ghujduwānī's superiority over Yasawī seems clear enough from the story itself, but even if Köprülü did not think to question this, he certainly should have acknowledged the possible significance of a quite different view of Aḥmad Yasawī's *silsila* affiliation, as found in the very "internal" Yasawī source whose importance Köprülü rightly recognized; that he did not was clearly connected with his acceptance of the death-date discussed above, and here we can begin to appreciate the web of interwoven assumptions and conjectures, which seem to support one another but in fact have no firm foundation, that fill Köprülü's treatment of the Yasawī tradition. In fact, Aḥmad Yasawī is portrayed as a pupil of at least two other shaikhs, besides Yūsuf Hamadānī, and the tradition surrounding his relationship with Yūsuf Hamadānī is in many respects the most problematical of these, for a host of chronological, historical, and textological reasons.

(5) Aḥmad Yasawī's life as a Ṣūfī teacher. As noted, Köprülü weaves together traditions from several sources to create a seemingly seamless biography for the saint; after returning to his hometown of Yasī/Turkistān and there training his disciples, the story goes, Aḥmad Yasawī withdrew from worldly attachments at the age of 63 and lived in his "retirement" cell (where he wrote much of his poetry) until his death at an advanced age. Köprülü treats this as a relatively straightforward account of the course of Aḥmad Yasawī's life, extracting it from a rich body of narratives circulated, in all likelihood, more to advance specific competitive or didactic agendas than to provide a simple biographical account; moreover, he presents it shorn of the miraculous elements he found so disturbing. For instance, what Köprülü interprets as the saint's "retirement" is actually presented in the sources as his enclosure in a subterranean cell, in which he continues to perform various miracles; Köprülü mentions the miracles as part of Aḥmad Yasawī's "legendary" life, assigns his "retirement" to his "historical" life, and invents the idea that he wrote his poetry in this historical retirement, without considering that the entire body of narratives might be explored not as a mixture

of purely legendary elements and elements rooted in historical fact, but as a multivalent complex of symbols and traditions combined for specific religious purposes that did not include the confirmation of external biographical details.

(6) The Yasawī order. Köprülü took it for granted that Aḥmad Yasawī consciously intended to create a Ṣūfī order, which was maintained in an unbroken line from the founder down to the latest affiliates Köprülü could find in sources available to him; thus he assumed that the principles and practices of the order outlined by Ḥazīnī existed largely unchanged from the time of Aḥmad Yasawī himself. In fact, the *silsila* of the Yasawī order known from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries is extremely problematical in its earliest phases, leaving the question of the order's continuity, and the possible retrospective formulation of the *silsila*, fraught with uncertainty. To be sure, Köprülü's treatment of the Yasawī order in Central Asia was perfunctory at best, comprising less than a single page in his text, and the full ramifications of the various lineages could have been understood only through the use of sources unavailable to him; but it is unclear why Köprülü did not explore more carefully the information available to him in Ḥazīnī's acephalous Persian work, and in the *Rashaḥāt*, about the Yasawī *silsila* in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

(7) The Yasawī presence in Anatolia. Köprülü laid the foundations for the most unfortunate aspect of what became the standard view of the Yasawī tradition, namely the view that Aḥmad Yasawī's real legacy, both in Ṣūfism and in poetry, lay not in Central Asia, but in the Betkashī tradition of the western Turkish cultural sphere, where it spread through the arrival, in the west, of "refugees" from the Mongol invasion. Köprülü was careful, in *Early Mystics*, to distance the historical Aḥmad Yasawī from the later Bektashī tradition (and, indeed, to distance Ḥajjī Bektash from that tradition); nevertheless, his emphasis upon Bektashī sources, and upon Anatolian traditions about saints incorporated into the Bektashī tradition, as the prime repository of Aḥmad Yasawī's memory and legacy – an emphasis that was itself an artifact of the inaccessibility of Central Asian sources – served to cement the assumption that the way to study the Yasawī tradition was to study the Bektashiyya, and more generally the currents of Anatolian Ṣūfism that were believed to have been shaped in Central Asia. Inevitably, this tendency was only intensified by Köprülü's much-heralded – but certainly, in my view, misguided – change of mind, when he concluded that Anatolian works of Bektashī, Ḥaidarī, and Bābā'ī provenance were more reliable sources on Aḥmad Yasawī and his legacy than were other works he implicitly dismissed as dominated by Naqshbandī influence. This view, though challenged in an important article,[13] continues to shape the predominant understanding of the Yasawī tradition in Turkish scholarship, and in much European and American scholarship as well (it is perhaps best represented today in the works of Ahmet Yaşar Ocak and Irène Mélikoff); it is at present a key obstacle, in my view, to improving our understanding of the Yasawī tradition.

(8) Aḥmad Yasawī's poetry. The centerpiece, finally, of Köprülü's treatment of the Yasawī tradition is, of course, the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*. It was through this

compilation that Köprülü sought not only details of Aḥmad Yasawī's life and spiritual training, but the substance and spirit of his religious message; the *Dīwān* was, for Köprülü, the encapsulation of Aḥmad Yasawī's central mission, namely the spread of Islam among the Turks (and its adaptation to Turkic tastes). The *Dīwān*, indeed, underlies the whole of *Early Mystics*, for the presumed influence of Aḥmad Yasawī's poetry on that of Yūnus Emre, which was in fact Köprülü's central concern, provided the rationale for the entire book.

Köprülü's understanding of the *Dīwān* is problematical in many respects. His assumption of a "missionary" purpose for a book of Ṣūfī poetry has been influential, but is unconvincing, and in all likelihood obscures the actual audience for which the *Dīwān* was compiled. Similarly, his emphasis on a religious mission defined in purely "national" terms is as anachronistic as his attitude to the *Dīwān's* presumed audience is condescending. We are repeatedly reminded that the Turks whom Aḥmad Yasawī was seeking to reach through the *Dīwān* were simple and unsophisticated, and needed a dumbed-down version of Islam and Ṣūfism – which, luckily, Aḥmad Yasawī was perfectly suited to provide, since he was, as Köprülü uncharitably characterizes him, not only a poor poet with a "very simple" imagination, but also a poor representative of what is best in Ṣūfism. Indeed, Köprülü seems less intent upon a serious study of the *Dīwān*, which, he declares, lacks any "significant aesthetic value," than upon holding it up, at a distance, as the presumed inspiration for – yet, ironically, as but a pale foreshadowing of – the vibrant poetry of Yūnus Emre. Such a conclusion is borne out if we compare his treatment of the verse he ascribes to Aḥmad Yasawī with his treatment of Yūnus's poetry; the latter is quoted at length and subjected to considerable stylistic and semantic analysis, but Köprülü never fully engages with the *Dīwān* as a whole or even with a single poem contained in it (his citations from the *Dīwān* are quite sparse, in fact, and are rarely analyzed in any depth). Köprülü's dismissal of the aesthetic quality of the poetry ascribed to Aḥmad Yasawī is naturally at odds with the contemporary rediscovery, or reassertion, of the presumed role of the Yasawī tradition as a bridge between Turkey and Central Asia, and it underscores a somewhat discordant parochialism (shaped, perhaps, more by Köprülü's views on Islam and Ṣūfism than by any conscious deprecation of Central Asian culture); yet as Köprülü contrasts what he sees as the rigid pieties and choked asceticism of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* with the sort of freewheeling and "broadminded" Ṣūfī poetry he obviously prefers, as exemplified by Yūnus Emre's verse, we may rightly suspect that the "national" mission he set for himself was indeed restricted to the western Turks, and did not include the Turks of Central Asia, whose love for the dry and artless poetry ascribed to Aḥmad Yasawī is implicitly belittled in Köprülü's presentation.[14]

Alongside all these problems in his treatment of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, however, Köprülü failed to come to terms with a much more basic question: is the *Dīwān* indeed the work of Aḥmad Yasawī? My own study of the Yasawī tradition has convinced me that it cannot be regarded as such in any meaningful sense; more decisive, in my view, than the issues many others have pointed out – the clearly

compilative character of the *Dīwān*, the late date of surviving manuscripts, the anachronistic references to Yasawī's shrine, the inclusion in it of verse by many poets, and the wholly Chaghatay character of its language – is the simple fact that, until the nineteenth century, none of the many sources through which the history of the Yasawī tradition can be reconstructed ever affirms that Aḥmad Yasawī was regarded as the author of an extensive body of mystical verse, or of aphoristic sayings, much less of a collection of poetry called the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* (by contrast, many sources affirm, quite early and consistently, that Ḥakīm Ata, who is typically cast as Aḥmad Yasawī's disciple and whose very appellation links him, etymologically, with the utterance of *ḥikmats*, was widely known for his aphoristic sayings and mystical verse, and we can trace in the sources a number of aphorisms ascribed first to Ḥakīm Ata, or to the *mashā'ikh-i turk* in general, for which credit is later transferred to Aḥmad Yasawī).

Köprülü seems to have at least been aware of the irony to which he in fact never explicitly calls attention, namely that Aḥmad Yasawī the poet, and his *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, go strangely unmentioned in the many Turkic literary works from Central Asia that one might expect to have paid homage to the earliest Turkic Ṣūfī poet. His response to this silence is in effect an appeal to class warfare. In an extreme version of the two-tiered view of "high" and "low" culture, Köprülü insists that Aḥmad Yasawī's verse reflected folk tastes, and that the court poets (and their anthologists) held those tastes in contempt and so failed to mention the poets, or repeat the poetry, that appealed to them.[15] Such a claim is nonsense in many regards, but perhaps it will suffice to recall the silence of Mīr ʿAlī Shīr Nawā'ī – a creature of the court, but much enamored of the richness of Turkic as employed among all classes – about any poetic legacy of Aḥmad Yasawī; as his *Majālis al-nafā'is* shows, Nawā'ī was more than happy to name a poet and cite his verse while belittling his metric skill. Similarly, though Köprülü did not know the work when he wrote *Early Mystics*, Nawā'ī's *Nasā'im al-maḥabba* – like the *Rashaḥāt*, which Köprülü did know – stresses Ḥakīm Ata's renown for aphoristic sayings, but mentions neither verse nor sayings in connection with Aḥmad Yasawī.

Köprülü, to be sure, went further than any of his predecessors in "distancing" Aḥmad Yasawī from the *Dīwān*, acknowledging that not all of the poems in it, or even all the poems in it ascribed to "Aḥmad," could be the work of Aḥmad Yasawī; he expressly rejected the naive tendency to accept the extant *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* as a simple collection of Aḥmad Yasawī's poetic production. Yet he never seems to have questioned whether Aḥmad Yasawī in fact wrote any poetry at all; on the contrary, Köprülü assumed not only that he did, but that poems added to the *Dīwān* by later poets were inevitably modeled on Aḥmad Yasawī's verse, in form and content. Herein lies, I believe, the most breathtaking leap, and the most serious problem, in Köprülü's treatment of the *Dīwān* – which, again, colors his entire discussion of that work's presumed influence on Yūnus Emre and Turkic poetry in general: even if we suspend our skepticism and accept that Aḥmad Yasawī must have written poetry of some sort, we might still protest that

Köprülü never indicates how, precisely, we may judge which poems were Aḥmad Yasawī's and which reflected the work, or adjustment, of later poets;[16] Köprülü's answer, in essence, is to insist that we need not trouble ourselves to make such a judgment, for even if we cannot identify a single poem that has survived unchanged as the work of Aḥmad Yasawī, we can be sure that the verse in extant versions of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* genuinely reflects the "spirit" and "literary personality" of Aḥmad Yasawī.

In this way Köprülü formulated a mechanism for, in effect, saving the connection between Aḥmad Yasawī and the extant *Dīwān*: starting from the assumption that Aḥmad Yasawī wrote poetry (an assumption he never examines or questions), he declares that even if we do not have direct access to that poetry, we can know what it was like on the basis of other poets' contributions, since, Köprülü is sure, those other poets modeled their verse on Aḥmad Yasawī's. The reasoning is circular, of course: Aḥmad Yasawī wrote poetry, his poetry influenced his followers' poetry, their poetry appears and may even predominate in the *Dīwān*, and so even if we cannot point to a single poem from the *Dīwān* as demonstrably the work of Aḥmad Yasawī (as in fact Köprülü never does), we can be certain that the verse in the *Dīwān* closely reflects the missing verse of Aḥmad Yasawī.

It is, of course, doubly ironic that Köprülü takes the trouble to pursue this dubious argument, with the aim of linking the *Dīwān* to Aḥmad Yasawī, only to disparage the *Dīwān* as aesthetically deficient, and Aḥmad Yasawī as an inferior poet. But by maintaining that the *Dīwān* reflects the "literary personality" of Aḥmad Yasawī, Köprülü felt justified, we may presume, in a wide range of assertions about the place of the *Dīwān* in Turkic literary and cultural history. Thus, for instance, Köprülü writes with unblinking certainty that when (not if) an early copy of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* is discovered, it will reveal linguistic features characteristic of the eleventh-century *Kutadgu Bilig*; but until such an early copy is brought to light, Köprülü insists that we can still discuss the linguistic features it must have reflected on the basis of the period and environment in which Aḥmad Yasawī lived, and of our certainty that he wrote the "original" poetry that inspired later additions to the *Dīwān*.

In the final analysis, it is not Köprülü's argument by itself that is particularly lamentable; had it provoked the debate that he himself no doubt would have welcomed, it would not have had the stultifying effects on Yasawī studies that it in fact did have. However, the conclusions based on this argument were repeated again and again, with reference to the by-then-iconic Köprülü, in countless surveys of Turkish history, literature, and religion, in Turkish as well as in European and American scholarship, and with only rare exceptions, the question of the authorship of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was never seriously addressed. Indeed, on the contrary, the *Dīwān* became ever more inextricably linked with the name of Aḥmad Yasawī, and the assumption that he wrote poetry – and that, however we choose to finesse the issue, the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* is that poetry – became his central claim to fame, eclipsing not only the actual history of the Central Asian Ṣūfī lineages, familial groups, and shrine constituencies that took

their inspiration from Aḥmad Yasawī (in most cases without ever paying attention to the poetry he was supposed to have written), but even the rich body of narrative evocations of Aḥmad Yasawī's saintly persona preserved in literary hagiographies and oral tradition from Central Asia.

As a final indication of the importance of *Early Mystics*, and of the unfortunate state of Yasawī studies resulting from the long reluctance to engage Köprülü's work critically from a Central Asian perspective, we may note briefly how thin scholarly production on the Yasawī tradition has been since the work's appearance. Between 1918 and the late 1940s, little of note was added to international scholarship on the Yasawī tradition except for two articles, both by Soviet scholars, focused on the shrine of Aḥmad Yasawī.[17] Both studies included information on oral tradition connected with the shrine, and on the organizational aspects of the activities associated with it; they are of particular importance for reflecting the period before the intense assault against Islamic institutions begun by the Soviet government in the later 1920s.

Two important articles from the late 1940s and early 1950s, one from the Soviet Union and one from Turkey, mark the next significant scholarly contributions on the Yasawī tradition. The first, a study of the language of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* by A. K. Borovkov,[18] formulated major elements of the case for rejecting Aḥmad Yasawī's authorship of the extant *Dīwān*, and made at least limited use of several important Central Asian sources (the *Lamaḥāt* and the *Thamarāt al-mashā'ikh*) on the Yasawī tradition; unfortunately, this article was largely ignored in Turkey and elsewhere, though its arguments were summarized in H. F. Hofman's survey of Chaghatay literature, from 1969.[19] The other seminal article from this era, by Zeki Velidi Togan,[20] discussed several previously unknown sources, including the *Ḥujjat al-dhākirīn* and another source, seemingly of great interest, that has unfortunately been lost; Togan's work, like Borovkov's, pointed to important new directions for research on the Yasawī tradition, but there appears to have been virtually no serious response to the promise of either contribution.

For nearly 40 years after this period, the Yasawī tradition suffered a particularly severe drought in substantive scholarly attention. In the Soviet Union, not unexpectedly, Aḥmad Yasawī came to be decried, along with other Ṣūfīs, as an obscurantist deceiver of the masses, and the most substantial publication devoted to him was an antireligious tract entitled "The Shadow of the Middle Ages."[21] Some attention was occasionally given to literary aspects of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, and Aḥmad Yasawī's shrine was studied as an archeological and architectural site, but there was virtually no serious attention to the history and legacy of the Yasawī tradition until the end of the Soviet era. In Europe and America, study of the Yasawī tradition largely fell through the cracks of academic divisions that also harmed the broader study of Central Asia as a whole. Although the hagiographical legacy of the Yasawī order is overwhelmingly in Persian, Iranists largely ignored what was repeatedly (if wrongly) cast as a purely "Turkic" tradition; meanwhile, students of Turkic language, history, or religion remained largely unfamiliar (in part due to their reliance upon Köprülü) with the larger body of

sources relevant to Yasawī history, and limited their interest in the Yasawī tradition to the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*. Specialists in Ṣūfī studies, meanwhile, began to turn their attention to the Yasawī tradition in the 1970s, but almost entirely in connection with its presumed links to the Naqshbandiyya.

In Turkey, the Yasawī tradition continued to be noted as an important element of a Turkish religious and literary heritage, but writers were mostly content to parrot the conclusions of Köprülü, and there was little original work done, even on the sources already identified by Köprülü. The manuscript containing works of Ḥazīnī that was used and cited so extensively by Köprülü, for instance, remained largely unstudied by scholars in Turkey, from the time Köprülü wrote down to the 1990s. It was not until 1983 that a substantial selection of poems from the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was published, edited by Kemal Eraslan[22] (whose 1979 publication of a transcribed edition of Nawā'ī's *Nasā'im al-maḥabba* was noted earlier); like Köprülü, Eraslan effectively dodged the issue of the *Dīwān*'s authorship, and like Köprülü's work, Eraslan's selections from the *Dīwān* seemed almost to discourage original work on the poetry ascribed to Aḥmad Yasawī, as scholar after scholar chose to cite these selections for a wide range of conclusions (about the *Dīwān*'s language, style, philosophical and religious foundations, etc.), instead of exploring fuller printed versions, or actual manuscript copies, of the *Dīwān* (this tendency continued even after the publication of fuller versions of the *Dīwān* in the 1990s). European and American Turkologists, it may be added, seem largely to have concurred with Turkish scholars on the virtual identification of Yasawī studies with the study of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, and in any case cannot be said to have contributed significantly to the study of any aspect of the Yasawī tradition.

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union and the expansion of contacts with scholars, and scholarly resources, in Central Asia, attention to the Yasawī tradition has grown dramatically in terms of sheer bibliographical weight, but less so in terms of new approaches or the use of new sources. Several new versions of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* have been published in the former Soviet Union, with transcriptions based on modern Uzbek, Qazaq, Türkmen, and Tatar, and two Latin-script transcriptions have appeared in Turkey (the Türkmen publication, issued in Moscow, and one of the Turkish versions are based on actual manuscript copies, while the others are based on earlier printed versions of the *Dīwān*); the fundamental issues surrounding the *Dīwān*'s origins and development, however, remain essentially ignored. As for other aspects of the Yasawī tradition, the most important developments inevitably involve an increased attention to previously unavailable Central Asian sources. Scholars in Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan – above all Ashirbek Muminov and Zikiriya Zhandarbekov – have begun uncovering valuable genealogical texts dealing with an important and still unappreciated aspect of the Yasawī tradition, as noted above; at the same time, some increased attention to the study of Yasawī hagiographical literature from Central Asia is evident in works of Bakhtiyar Babadzhanov in Uzbekistan, Florian Schwarz in Germany, and Thierry Zarcone in France. My own publications on

various aspects of the Yasawī tradition likewise reflect the study of Central Asian materials, and stem from ongoing work aimed at a thorough re-examination of the history of Yasawī Ṣūfī communities.

In Köprülü's native country, lastly, the disconnect between quantity and quality in recent Yasawī studies is regrettably quite stark; the flood of publications on Aḥmad Yasawī that has appeared in Turkey since the early 1990s (partly in connection with the declaration of 1993 as the "Year of Aḥmad Yasawī," on the misguided assumption that his birth could be dated to 1093) is full of largely unoriginal and repetitive works that rarely go beyond Köprülü's approaches and conclusions of long ago. A bright spot in this regard is the promising work of Necdet Tosun, who has recently published two important sources relevant for Yasawī studies.[23] In his introduction to one of these, especially, Tosun reveals – alongside a persistence in several assumptions about the Yasawī tradition that will take some time to abandon – a far greater acquaintance with the broader body of sources from Central Asia than is evident in any other product of Turkish scholarship on Aḥmad Yasawī. His approach, rather than the uninspired repetition of ideas that were fresh some nine decades ago, is what I firmly believe Köprülü would be pleased to see today.

Devin DeWeese
Bloomington, Indiana

NOTES

1 Köprülü, and others following him, have referred to this manuscript as containing a single work, the *Jawāhir al-abrār*, in which the author changes from Turkic to Persian in the midst of the text; in fact the change of language coincides with a clear break in the text between two folios, and it seems clear that several sheets containing the end of the *Jawāhir* and the beginning of a second work have been lost.

2 Muḥammad ʿĀlim Ṣiddīqī, *Lamaḥāt min nafaḥāt al-quds* (Islamabad, 1406/1986).

3 See my preliminary discussion of this work in "The Yasavī Order and Persian Hagiography in Seventeenth-Century Central Asia: ʿĀlim Shaykh of ʿAlīyābād and his *Lamaḥāt min nafaḥāt al-quds*," in *The Heritage of Sufism*, vol. III: *Late Classical Persianate Sufism (1501–1759), The Safavid and Mughal Period*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn and David Morgan (Oxford, 1999), pp. 389–414.

4 "Orta-Asya Türk dervişliği hakkında bazı notlar," *TM*, 14 (1964), pp. 259–62.

5 "Ahmed Yesevi" in *İA*, I, p. 212. citing Zetterstéen's catalogue of the Uppsala collection, whence the manuscript was mentioned also in H. F. Hofman's *Turkish Literature: A Bio-bibliographical Survey*: Secton III (Chaghatai), Part 1 (Authors); 6 vols in 2 (Utrecht, 1969), III, pp. 316–18.

6 A. Zeki Velidî Togan, *Oğuz destanı: Reşideddin Oğuznâmesi, tercüme ve tahlili*, 2nd edn (Istanbul, 1982), pp. 81, 104, 125; and Togan, *Umumî Türk tarihine giriş*, I, 3rd edn (Istanbul, 1981), p. 497.

7 "Yasavian Legends on the Islamization of Turkistan," in *Aspects of Altaic Civilization III* (Proceedings of the Thirtieth Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference, Indiana University, Bloomington, June 19–25, 1987), ed. Denis Sinor (Bloomington: Indiana University, Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, 1990), pp. 1–19.

8 "Yasavī Šayḫs in the Timurid Era: Notes on the Social and Political Role of Communal Sufi Affiliations in the 14th and 15th Centuries," in *La civiltà timuride come fenomeno internazionale*, ed. Michele Bernardini [= *Oriente Moderno* (Rome), N.S., 15 (76), No. 2 (1996)], pp. 173–88 [pp. 175ff]; and "The *Mashā'ikh-i Turk* and the *Khojagān*: Rethinking the Links between the Yasavī and Naqshbandī Sufi Traditions," *Journal of Islamic Studies* (Oxford), 7/2 (July, 1996), pp. 180–207 [p. 187].

9 Aširbek K. Muminov, "Veneration of Holy Sites of the Mid-Sïrdar'ya Valley: Continuity and Transformation," *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*, ed. Michael Kemper, Anke von Kügelgen, and Dmitriy Yermakov (Berlin, 1996; Islamkundliche Untersuchungen, Bd 200), pp. 355–67 [p. 364]; Aširbek K. Muminov, "Die Qožas: Arabische Genealogien in Kasachstan," *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*, vol. 2: *Inter-regional and Inter-ethnic Relations*, ed. Anke von Kügelgen, Michael Kemper, and Allen J. Frank (Berlin, 1998; Islamkundliche Untersuchungen, Bd 216), pp. 193–209 [pp. 207–8].

10 See my "A Neglected Source on Central Asian History: The 17th-century Yasavī Hagiography *Manāqib al-akhyār*," in *Essays on Uzbek History, Culture, and Language*, ed. Denis Sinor and Bakhtiyar A. Nazarov (Bloomington, IN: Research Institute for Inner Asian Studies, 1993; Uralic and Altaic Series, vol. 156), pp. 38–50.

11 Ḥazīnī, *Cevâhiru'l-ebrâr min emvâc-ı bihâr (Yesevî Menâkıbnamesi)*, ed. Cihan Okuyucu (Kayseri, 1995).

12 K. G. Zaleman, "Legenda pro Khakim-Ata," *Izvestiia Akademii nauk* (St Petersburg), 9/2 (1898), pp. 105–50.

13 Ahmet T. Karamustafa, "Early Sufism in Eastern Anatolia," *Classical Persian Sufism: From Its Origins to Rumi*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn (London/New York, 1993), pp. 175–98.

14 Copies of Latin-script editions of *Early Mystics* were eagerly and gratefully received by Uzbek intellectuals during two of my visits in the mid-1980s; the work had then the triple cachet of being inaccessible and forbidden, of dealing with a figure who was both beloved as poet and typically disparaged by Soviet propaganda, and of highlighting a Turkic consciousness that transcended national boundaries. The sense of deflation, upon discovering the eminent Turkish scholar's dismissal of Aḥmad Yasawī's poetic gifts, was quite palpable.

15 In fact, however, Köprülü's hostility to the Persian influence in court poetry, and his preference for the "simple Turkish" of the "folk poets," reflected a dichotomy that was central in his time, but is increasingly recognized as overdrawn today; and in any case, it was not a meaningful dichotomy in Central Asia (especially for poets, and their audiences, who had not yet learned the importance, so much a part of Köprülü's age, of extracting the Persian and Arabic elements from their lexicons). In this regard it is worth recalling the appraisal, half a century before Köprülü wrote, of Vambéry, who said that the Persian and Arabic element was sufficiently strong in the poems of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* to cause the "uninstructed nomads" difficulty in understanding them (A. Vambéry, "Muhammadanism (in Central Asia)," *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings (1908–26; rpt New York, 1961), vol. 8, pp. 885–8 [p. 887]).

16 Köprülü often implies that use of the syllabic meter is a marker of the early and more primitive stage of Turkic poetry supposedly represented by Aḥmad Yasawī's verse (even though Köprülü himself notes some confusion over whether certain poems reflect syllabic meter or poorly executed *ʿarūḍ* meters). It is interesting, in this regard, that the earliest version we have of a poem ascribed directly to Aḥmad Yasawī and found, still, in extant versions of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* appears in one of Ḥazīnī's works from the latter sixteenth century; yet Köprülü himself acknowledged that this poem reflected the principles of the *ʿarūḍ* system supposedly introduced only after the time of Aḥmad Yasawī. Köprülü would no doubt argue that this poem had been modernized

and its meter adjusted; indeed, much else has been adjusted, inasmuch as extant versions of the poem differ substantially in structure and wording, and in Ḥazīnī's work it appears in distinctly Ottoman orthography, rather than in the Chaghatay form we would expect it to have if indeed written down in Central Asia. But when our earliest known recording of a poem ascribed to Aḥmad Yasawī reflects the *ʿarūḍ* system, the rationale for using that system's presence or absence as evidence of the "originality" of specific poems is obviously dissolved.

17 M. E. Masson, *Mavzolei Khodzha Akhmeda Iasevi* ([Tashkent, 1930], 23 pp.; this work has now been republished in *Goroda Turkestana: Sbornik nauchnykh statei*, ed. K. M. Baipakov [Almaty, 1999], pp. 9–29); W. Gordlevsky, "Choğa Aḥmed Jasevi" [in German], in *Festschrift Georg Jacob*, ed. Theodor Menzel (Leipzig, 1932), pp. 57–67 (in Russian, with some additional material, in V. A. Gordlevskii, *Izbrannye sochineniia*, II [Moscow, 1962], pp. 361–8).

18 A. K. Borovkov, "Ocherki po istorii uzbekskogo iazyka (opredelenie iazyka khikmatov Akhmada Iasevi)," *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie*, 5 (1948), pp. 229–50; Borovkov unfairly dismissed Köprülü's entire work as uncritical (p. 229) and ignored it altogether.

19 H. F. Hofman, *Turkish Literature*, vol. VI, pp. 110–28 (on Aḥmad Yasawī; Hofman's study also includes useful discussions of other figures from the Yasawī tradition).

20 Zeki Velidi Togan, "Yesevîliğe dair bazı yeni malûmat," in Osman Turan *et al.* (eds) *60 Doğum yılı münâsebetiyle Fuad Köprülü armağanı (Mélanges Fuad Köprülü)* (Istanbul, 1953), pp. 523–9.

21 Iu. G. Petrash, *Ten'srednevekov'ia* (Alma-Ata, 1981).

22 Ahmed-i Yesevî, *Dîvân-ı Hikmet'ten seçmeler*, ed. Kemal Eraslan (Ankara, 1983).

23 Necdet Tosun, "Yesevîliğin İlk Dönemine âid bir Risâle: Mir'âtü'l-kulûb," *İLAM Araştırma Dergisi*, 2/2 (Temmuz-Aralık, 1997), pp. 41–85; idem, "Ahmed Yesevî'nin Menâkıbı," *İLAM Araştırma Dergisi*, 3/1 (Ocak-Hazıran, 1998), pp. 73–81.

TRANSLATORS' INTRODUCTION

In an article entitled "Attempts at Self-interpretation in Contemporary Islam" published in 1955, Gustave von Grunebaum, one of the leading twentieth-century scholars of the Middle East, quotes his equally renowned colleague H. A. R. Gibb as stating regretfully in 1942: "I have not yet seen a single book written by an Arab of any branch in any Western language that has made it possible for the Western student to understand the roots of Arab culture. More than that, I have not seen any book written in Arabic for Arabs themselves which has clearly analyzed what Arabic culture means to the Arabs." Von Grunebaum then goes on to say: "This statement could be extended to include the non-Arab Muslim and his failure to interpret his culture to both himself and the West. It holds good today as it did when it was written, and it is likely to hold good for some time to come."[1]

Gibb's assertion was, perhaps, debatable, but von Grunebaum's was mistaken, for in 1918 Köprülü had published *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, which, among other things, was meant to help establish the modern Turkish national identity.[2]

Mehmed Fuad Köprülü

Our author was born in Istanbul in 1890. Through his father İsmail Faiz Bey, he was related to the sister of the famous Ottoman Grand Vizier Köprülü Mehmed Pasha (d. 1661). She was also the wife of Kıbleli Mustafa Pasha, a vizier of Mehmed IV. His father was a civil servant and his mother was the daughter of a religious scholar from İslimiye, present-day Sliven in Bulgaria.

Köprülü attended the Ayasofya junior high school (*rüşdiyye*) and then Mercan high school (*idâdî*) in Istanbul. Between 1907 and 1910, he attended the School of Law at Dârülfünûn, which later became Istanbul University, but he did not complete the course of study. Indeed, while in law school, he became interested in Turkish literature, which soon became his passion and contributed to his decision to abandon law. In 1909 he joined the literary society Fecr-i Âtî, which was strongly influenced by French literature, and wrote poetry for the illustrated weekly *Servet-i Fünûn*. He also wrote about contemporary literary issues and,

taking a conservative position, was critical of the national literature and language movement. He later changed his position, however, under the influence of Turkish nationalism. Between 1910 and 1913, he taught Turkish and Turkish literature at various high schools in Istanbul. He was the first to organize a program in literature at Istanbul Lisesi and Galatasaray Lisesi. Meanwhile, he joined various political associations, such as Türk Derneği (The Turkish Association), Türk Yurdu Cemiyeti (The Turkish Homeland Society) and Türk Ocağı (The Turkish Hearth). Coming under the influence of Ziya Gökalp (1875 or 1876–1924), the Turkish nationalist ideologist of the Ottoman Empire and exponent of the Turkism movement, he identified himself with the Turkish national literature movement. Parallel to Gökalp's establishment of the bases of Turkish nationalism, Köprülü carried out scholarly research on the origins of Turkish literature, or what he called Turkish national literature. He thus went back to the earliest periods of Turkish history and examined the history and literature of various Turkish societies. Contemporary political and social conditions in the Ottoman Empire, the teachings of Gökalp, and the policies of the Committee of Union and Progress all influenced him in this regard. In 1913 with Gökalp's help, he became instructor – at the age of 23 and almost completely self-taught – of the history of Turkish literature in Dârülfünûn. Intensifying his research, he published in the same year his ideas about how Turkish literature should be studied using European methods in an article entitled "Türk edebiyatı tarihinde usûl" (Method in the history of Turkish literature).

With several friends, Köprülü tried to found the Türkiyat Cemiyeti (Society for Turkish Studies). He had Gökalp's support, but the grand vizier, Sait Halim Pasha, was opposed to the name, which was changed to Âsâr-i İslamiyye ve Milliyye Tetkik Encümeni (The Society for the Study of the Islamic and National Culture). This society was launched in 1915. Its publication was *Millî Tetebbüler Mecmuası* (*The Journal of National Research*). For the first issue, Köprülü contributed "Türk edebiyatında âşık tarzının menşe' ve tekâmülü hakkında bir tecrübe" (An essay on the origin and development of Turkish minstrel poetry). Indeed, he began to publish on a wide variety of historical, literary, and intellectual subjects in many journals and newspapers. His first major work, *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*, which proved to be his masterpiece, appeared in 1918, when he was only 28, and earned him an international reputation. In 1920–1, he published the first edition of *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (*The History of Turkish Literature*), which further established him as a leading authority in Turkish studies. In 1922, he published "Anadolu'da islâmiyet" (Islam in Anatolia) and in 1923 *Türkiye tarihi* (*The History of Turkey*). Also in 1923, he became dean of the Faculty of Literature at Istanbul University. In the same year Gökalp published *Türkçülüğün esasları* (*The bases of Turkism*) and stated that Köprülü was very learned and a great scholar in the field of Turkish studies and that he would shed light on Turkism. In 1924, Köprülü served for eight months as under-secretary in the Ministry of Education on the insistence of its minister, Vasıf Çınar. In the same year, he became director of the Türkiyat Enstitüsü (Institute of Turkish Studies), which

was established by a decree of the Council of Ministers. In 1925, he began to publish *Türkiyat Mecmuası* (*The Journal of Turkish Studies*), its scholarly journal.

As Köprülü's fame spread abroad, he attended a number of international congresses as Turkey's representative: Paris, 1923; Leningrad, 1925; Baku, 1926; Oxford, 1928; London, 1929; and Tehran 1934. In 1925 he was made a corresponding member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences on the recommendation of W. Barthold, I. Krachkowsky, and S. Oldenburg. He received honorary degrees from the University of Heidelberg, 1927; the University of Athens, 1937; and the Sorbonne, 1939.

In 1927 Köprülü was elected president of Türk Tarih Encümeni (The Turkish Historical Society). The following year, he published, among other things, several studies on the pre-Ottoman Turkish principalities in Anatolia. In 1931 he founded the short-lived *Türk Hukuk ve İktisat Tarihi Mecmuası* (*Journal of Turkish Legal and Economic History*), in which appeared his long article "Bizans müesseselerinin osmanlı müesseselerine te'siri hakkında bâzı mülâhazalar" (Observations on the influence of Byzantine institutions on Ottoman institutions). In 1935 he published *Les origins de l'Empire Ottoman*, which was a series of lectures given at the Sorbonne the previous year. In 1937 he became ordinarius professor at Istanbul University, where he served from time to time as a dean.

In 1935 Köprülü began his political life. While still a university professor, he was elected representative from Kars in eastern Turkey. Shortly thereafter he moved to Ankara, where he taught medieval history in the Faculty of Language, History and Geography at Ankara University (1935–41). After 1941 he devoted much of his scholarly energy to the *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, the expanded Turkish version of the first edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, but still contributed to various journals, notably his "Anadolu Selçukluları tarihinin yerli kaynakları" (Local sources for the history of the Seljuks of Anatolia) and "Osmanlı imparatorluğu'nun etnik menşei meseleleri" (Problems of the ethnic origin of the Ottoman Empire), both of which appeared in *Belleten* in 1943. In the same year he retired from his professorship and entered politics full time. He was one of the founders of the Democratic Party in 1945. The following year he was elected deputy from Istanbul. When the Democratic Party came to power in 1950, he became Minister of Foreign Affairs. With the exception of a brief period in 1955, he held this position until May 1956 and played an important role in Turkey's accession to NATO. After a falling out with party officials, he resigned from the Democratic Party in 1957. Several months after the coup against Prime Minister Adnan Menderes on 27 May 1960, he was arrested and held on Yassıada for four months. Upon his release in 1961, he briefly re-entered politics and then withdrew completely.

Meanwhile Köprülü's scholarly work continued to be recognized abroad. In 1947 he was elected a member of the American Oriental Society. In 1959 he was made an honorary member of the American Historical Society. Between September 1958 and July 1959, he was a visiting professor at Harvard. In 1964 he was made a corresponding member of the School of Oriental and African

Studies at the University of London. Indeed, he never really ceased pursuing his scholarly interests. Toward the end of his life, he worked with F. A. Tansel on updating some of his earlier publications, including the one presented here. On 15 April 1965 he was involved in a traffic accident in Ankara and on 28 June 1966 died from complications arising from that accident. He was buried in the Köprülü burial plot opposite the tomb of Sultan Mahmud in Istanbul.

Taking Turkish literature beyond the boundaries of the Ottoman state, Köprülü approached it as a whole, from the heroic era to the present. In the process, using modern scholarly methods, he shed light on the main features of Turkish literature. He introduced many poets and writers, such as Shayyād Ḥamza, Aḥmad Faqīh, and Khwāja Dehhāni, to the scholarly world. His books and articles touched on many subjects: the history of Turkish literature, literary criticism, Oriental studies, the history of Turkish civilization and culture, language, religion, art, music, political history, and ethnology. As with literature, he believed history should be approached as a whole. He worked to make the old concept of history in Turkey, which was military and political history, more inclusive, incorporating religious, legal, economic, and social history as well. He generally saw literary history as part of the history of civilization, and believed that by studying all the literary products that revealed the intellectual evolution of a nation over the centuries one could shed light on its spiritual life. Thus, because literary works were created by artists under the moral and material influence of the society in which they lived, literary history included not only a work itself but also the life of the artist and the society to which he belonged. Altogether, Köprülü established the basis for the modern study of Turkish literature and showed Turks how to do this themselves. He was a master at synthesizing great amounts of information and published some 1500 books, articles, essays, and other writings.[3]

Early Mystics in Turkish Literature

The appearance of Köprülü's *Early Mystics* in 1918 caused a sensation among knowledgeable European scholars. They had never seen anything like it. For the first time, a native Middle Eastern scholar had applied modern Western methods of research and analysis to sources that were, up to then, unknown or poorly known in both Europe and the Middle East in order to study a number of fundamental aspects of the origin of his own culture. As a consequence, he published a major work in his own language that shed light on many little known or obscure subjects. At the same time, by describing the sources for his work, he opened new areas of research.

What exactly did Köprülü do in this book? Briefly put, he described, by marshalling a vast array of Arabic, Persian, and Turkish sources, the virtually unknown subject of the origin of Turkish literature and the role of mystics or Ṣūfīs in the development and spread of this literature in the area stretching from Central Asia, the original homeland of the Turks, across Iran to Asia Minor or

Anatolia. In the process, he showed how this literature helped to create a national identity for the Turks, and thus played a seminal role for Turkish culture in the Muslim world. This last point was very important. Köprülü had a national objective in mind when he wrote this book. It appeared at the time of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and at the beginning of the Turkish nationalist struggle for independence, which soon resulted in the emergence of the modern Republic of Turkey. Köprülü sought to give the Turks, for the first time, a proper historical identity through their literature, one that was not lost or obscured in Ottoman or traditional Islamic history. In short, he wanted to present to the Turks their true history as far back as the literary sources would allow. With *Early Mystics*, Köprülü became the founder of the modern study of Turkish literature and history in Turkey. Indeed, this work had an important effect on Turkish studies internationally.

Köprülü divides *Early Mystics* into two distinct parts. He devotes the first to Aḥmad Yasawī, whom he identifies as the first great Turkish popular Ṣūfī poet. According to Köprülü, Aḥmad Yasawī was born in Sairām (Isfījāb), in modern Kazakhstan, in the latter part of the eleventh century and died in 1166–7. In the course of his life, he established a new genre in Turkish literature, namely mystical folk poetry, and founded a Ṣūfī brotherhood or *ṭarīqa* that spread his teachings. This brotherhood, the Yasawiyya, was the first to flourish among the Turks, and eventually gave rise, again according to Köprülü, to one of the most powerful *ṭarīqa*s in the Muslim world, the Naqshbandiyya. After Aḥmad Yasawī's death, his tomb in Yasī, which was greatly embellished by Tīmūr (Tamerlane), became an important place of pilgrimage for the Turks of Central Asia and the Volga region.

Köprülü begins by describing the various cultural influences on the Turks in Central Asia and what was known of Turkish literature before the appearance of Aḥmad Yasawī. He focuses on the spread of Ṣūfī mysticism among the Turks – how it was adapted to traditional beliefs and its role in the conversion of the Turks to Islam. Then he presents an account of the legendary life of Aḥmad Yasawī as reflected in popular traditions and later Ṣūfī religious biographies. Köprülü follows the spread of the legends about Aḥmad Yasawī throughout Turkistan (modern Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Kyrgyzstan), along the Volga, and eventually to Anatolia and the Balkans – spreading to the latter two regions mainly as a result of the Mongol invasion and then being incorporated into the Bektashī tradition. All this is evidence, asserts Köprülü, of the very strong impression that Aḥmad Yasawī made on Turkish literary and religious life. Our author then concentrates on Aḥmad Yasawī's literary imitators and spiritual successors to show how they compounded and magnified his influence among the Turks.

Köprülü next describes Aḥmad Yasawī's literary works, i.e. his collection of religious poems known as *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*. He discusses its linguistic and literary features, comparing it to earlier Turkish works, such as the *Kutadgu Bilig*, as well as to contemporary works. Köprülü emphasizes in particular how Aḥmad Yasawī

addressed the common people in their own language. He also takes careful account of the Ṣūfī element in the *Dīwān*, which was critical in making it a new genre of Turkish literature.

After this, Köprülü attempts to describe what was known of the actual historical life of Aḥmad Yasawī: his childhood, religious training, travels, and family. Then he discusses his historical spiritual successors. This naturally leads to a detailed account of the rules and religious practices of the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*, which in turn allows Köprülü to present a synthetic view of the origin and nature of Turkish mysticism in Central Asia. He then shows how Aḥmad Yasawī's influence, spread by the Yasawiyya, prevailed for centuries among the Turks.

Köprülü devotes the second part of his book to Yūnus Emre, the greatest of all Turkish Ṣūfī poets, whose work has influenced Turkish literature up to modern times. Yūnus Emre lived in the second half of the thirteenth century in Central Anatolia. Like Aḥmad Yasawī, who had a strong influence on him, this poet spoke to the people in a language they could understand, but, according to Köprülü, he was a much greater artist. His sublime poetry, which expounds the most difficult metaphysical problems in plain and unembellished language, not only furthered the development of Turkish mystical folk literature but also helped to spread Ṣūfism among the Turks in Anatolia.

Köprülü begins by describing Turkish literature in Anatolia before Yūnus Emre, the development of the Ṣūfī movement in that region, and such notable mystics as Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. Then he focuses on the rise of Turkish in Anatolia as the national language of the Turks and on the appearance of folk literature, including such works as the *Dede Korkut* and *Oghuznāme*. Next Köprülü discusses the life of Yūnus Emre. He starts with the view of Yūnus in the Bektashī tradition and then examines the historical person, assessing among other things his supposed illiteracy and his fame, which was already considerable by the fourteenth century. Then Köprülü provides a detailed account of his collected poetry, comparing its linguistic and literary features to earlier works, including those of Aḥmad Yasawī, and contemporary products. Altogether, he shows how Yūnus Emre created a new style of Turkish literature that had a profound effect on later poets. Köprülü stresses Yūnus Emre the moralist and supreme artist who was able to grasp and eloquently explain Ṣūfī principles and profound metaphysical questions in simple language. For Köprülü, the plain yet eloquent language in the style of Yūnus Emre represents the epitome of Turkish literary taste. Thus Yūnus Emre embodied the Turkish "national" genius. Finally, Köprülü describes Yūnus Emre's continuous influence on the development of Turkish literature, his many spiritual successors and literary imitators, his key role in the development of the poetry of the Turkish Ṣūfī lodges, especially those of the Bektashīs, and the creation of *'āshuq* literature (that of wandering minstrels after the fifteenth century).

Köprülü firmly believed that one had to study Turkish literature, from Central Asia to Anatolia, as a whole, and that without understanding pre-Islamic Turkish literature, it was impossible to describe that of the post-Islamic periods. And

without knowing how Turkish literature developed in Central Asia and Anatolia up to the formation of the Ottoman state, it was impossible to comprehend the development of Ottoman literature. With *Early Mystics*, Köprülü attempted to lay the foundation for the modern study of Turkish literature, from its very beginning, within such a framework. He was remarkably successful in this attempt. Indeed, despite some serious flaws, which have been highlighted in the Foreword and the commentary in the notes, his book became a milestone in the modern study of Turkish literature and cultural history. It also stimulated many subsequent works, such as those of Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı on Yūnus Emre. Today much of the background information in *Early Mystics*, such as that on the Turks, Islamization, and Sufism, is, of course, dated, but its assessments of Aḥmad Yasawī and, especially, Yūnus Emre are still central to modern research; although recently, as mentioned in the Foreward and the commentary in the notes, Köprülü's analyses of Aḥmad Yasawī and his work have been seriously challenged. Nevertheless, for almost a century, this work has remained a standard of modern Middle Eastern studies. It is still the starting point for research on the cultural genesis of the Turks. Furthermore, this book is also of great importance for the study of the evolution of Islam in general and Ṣūfism in particular, and of the interrelationship and differences between Turkish literature and Arabic literature, and especially between Turkish literature and Persian literature. It lies at the heart, therefore, of the most fundamental areas of research in Central Asian, Middle Eastern, and Islamic studies. Its significance to specialists and general readers goes well beyond the scope of Turkish studies.

Translators' note

As mentioned, *Early Mystics* was originally published in Istanbul in Ottoman Turkish in 1918. A second edition, revised by Köprülü and transcribed into the Latin alphabet, appeared in 1966. A third edition prepared by his son Orhon Köprülü, who simplified the language a bit, corrected a few things, and made some additions to the notes, was published in 1976. Since then, this third edition has been reprinted a number of times. The translation presented here is based on this edition, although we frequently compared it with the first edition, especially to clarify problems arising from changes in alphabet.

We have attempted to translate this work into colloquial English. This means in particular that we have tried to eliminate the redundancies and wordiness in Köprülü's style, although some vestiges of these characteristics may remain. In a few cases, we have broken long paragraphs into shorter paragraphs; and we have rearranged the order of a few notes required by the differences in English and Turkish syntax.

Furthermore, the translation that follows differs in several other respects from the way in which the original text was presented. At the very beginning, in the table of contents, Köprülü included the subheadings from all chapters. We have eliminated them as unnecessary. In the narrative and notes – apparently believing

that his readers were equally multilingual and well read – Köprülü frequently included passages in medieval Arabic, Persian, or Turkish without translating them and with little or no comment. We have translated all such passages into English with the exception of some chronograms in Chapter 4, some first lines from *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* in Chapter 5 that are cited for identification purposes, and the poem cited in Chapter 9, notes 3 and 6, in order to illustrate textual and linguistic matters.

In addition, and just as annoying, Köprülü was inconsistent in his method of citing sources, sometimes even giving different names to the same source. In other instances, he was so brief or vague as to leave even a specialist reader in doubt. He also had a tendency to merge his sources and to make sweeping generalizations without proof. It is difficult to determine if these are signs of haste or simply carelessness. In any case, we have recast all of Köprülü's footnotes according to modern English usage, giving a full reference to a work when first cited, and author and short title thereafter. The full reference can, of course, also be found in the Bibliography.

We have checked many of the original sources that Köprülü cites and have made a number of corrections. Furthermore, we should point out in particular that the use of quotations from Aḥmad Yasawī's *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* in "Westernized" form are not meant to imply that this work was in Ottoman rather than Chaghatay. This is the way in which they appear in the Latinized editions of the *Early Mystics*. We should also state that for Evliyā Chelebi's *Seyāḥatnāme*, Köprülü used the Istanbul edition of 1314–18/1896–1900, which is unreliable for scholarly purposes. We have cited instead the original Bağdat Köşkü manuscripts. Köprülü frequently mentions the Kirghiz, following Russian usage of the time, but with rare exceptions he really means the Qazaqs. Where appropriate we have changed this designation to the latter. Lastly, we have added a minimum number of new references in an attempt to bring *Early Mystics* up to date. This minimalist approach will not satisfy all readers, but given the breadth and complexity of this work, it would be impossible to introduce all the subsequent work on the subjects raised by Köprülü that have appeared in many languages over the past century.

As will be seen in the prefaces, Köprülü included in the first edition a "select," rather than a complete, bibliography. In the second and third editions, it was merged it with the index. We have provided a separate and complete bibliography of all works cited and a separate index. In the bibliography we have also translated the titles of all Russian and modern Turkish works. Except for the correction of minor oversights, we have placed all changes and additions to, or clarifications of, the narrative and notes in braces { }. We have also added a glossary, two maps, and several photographs.

Because *Early Mystics* covers both a vast period and a vast cultural area, and employs so much Arabic and Persian technical terminology, not to mention, of course, Turkish, and because the same words frequently appear in all of these languages but often with different pronunciations, there is no satisfactory system of transliteration of this terminology into English that would reflect these

differences and not cause confusion for the lay reader when moving back and forth among these languages. As a general rule, therefore, we have "Arabized" technical terms where possible and followed the system of transliteration used in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, with the exceptions of q for ḳ and j for d̲j̲, until the modern period, for which we have "transitioned" to modern Turkish orthography for Turkish names and words. Thus ö and ü are the same as in German, c = j, ç = ch, ğ is not pronounced but lengthens the preceding vowel, ş = sh, and ı = gh in Edinburgh. It should also be mentioned that in modern Turkish a circumflex is used to indicate long vowels, but it is often left out. Thus a word may appear with this accent in the title of one work but appear without it in another. Inconsistencies were thus inevitable, especially because we have also used the conventional English spellings for certain words, but should not bother the specialist or lay reader.

Finally, we should mention that this is the first attempt to translate *Early Mystics* into another language.[4] Theodor Menzel published a very detailed summary of the narrative part of this work as "Köprülüzade Mehmed Fuad's Werk über die ersten Mystiker in der turkischen Literatur," in *Körösi Csoma Archivum*, 2 (1926–32), 281–310, 345–57, 406–22, but the narrative constitutes only one-third of the work. The remainder consists of the notes.

NOTES

1 In *Islam: Essays in the Nature and Growth of a Cultural Tradition*, Memoire 81 of *The American Anthropologist*, p. 185.

2 Von Grunebaum's oversight is curious. He knew Köprülü and contributed to his *Festschrift* in 1953, by which time, as we shall see below, Köprülü had published a stream of fundamental articles and monographs in Turkish that laid the basis for the modern study of Turkish civilization in its broadest sense. Moreover, a detailed German summary of the narrative part of *Early Mystics* had been published in 1932, on which see below.

3 This sketch of Köprülü's life comes from Gary Leiser's introduction to his translation of "Bizans müesseselerinin osmanlı müesseselerine tesiri hakkında bazı mülahazalar," as *Some Observations on the Influence of Byzantine Institutions on Ottoman Institutions* (Ankara, 1999), and from "Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad," in *Türk Dili ve Edebiyat Ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul, 1982–98). For additional works on his life see the prefaces, n. 1. The best study of Köprülü is George Park, "The Life and Writings of Mehmet Fuad Köprülü," dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1975.

4 The translators have previously published a slightly modified version of Chapter 10 in *Mésogeios*, 17–18 (2002).

ABBREVIATIONS

EI[1]	*Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st edn (Leiden, 1913–42)
EI[2]	*Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1960–2004)
EIr	*Encyclopaedia Iranica* (London, 1985–)
İA	*İslâm Ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul, 1940–88)
JA	*Journal Asiatique*
MTM	*Millî Tetebbûlar Mecmuası*
RHR	*Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*
TM	*Türkiyat Mecmuası*
TOEM	*Tarîh-i 'Osmânî Encümeni Mecmuası*
YM	*Yeni Mecmua*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft*
ZKV	*Zapiski Kollegii Vostokovedov*
ZVO	*Zapiski Vostochnago Otdyeleniya Imperatorskago Russkago Arkheologischeskago Obshchestva*

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

The third edition of Ordinarius Professor M. F. Köprülü's book entitled *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature* is being published by the Office of the Chief of Religious Affairs, which also published the second edition in 1966. This new edition has a history of four or five years. At first the Ministry of National Education considered publishing it in the series *One Thousand Basic Works*, but when this series was ended the Cultural Secretariat of the Office of the Prime Minister decided to issue this book among its publications. Upon this decision, I was asked to prepare this new edition. The Secretariat and I came to a mutual understanding on certain conditions and toward the end of 1973 the work was ready to be given to the press. At that point, the Office of the Chief of Religious Affairs made persistent entreaties to both me and the Cultural Secretariat of the Office of the Prime Minister as a result of which all parties mutually agreed that the third edition would also be published by the Office of the Chief of Religious Affairs.

My late father had prepared the second edition of *Early Mystics*, but because of his untimely death resulting from a traffic accident, the final proof reading was done by Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, who also wrote the preface to that edition. In her preface, which I have included verbatim in this new edition, Tansel accurately describes the conditions under which *Early Mystics* was written in 1918, the great interest the book aroused at that time in Europe, the special characteristics of the work that Köprülü did in various fields,[1] and how the second edition came about. Consequently, there is no need for me to say anything more in these respects.

I will simply try to describe here the principles that I followed while preparing the third edition of *Early Mystics*. I have basically adopted the editorial method that Tansel used in the second edition, but I have taken a bit further her simplification of the language and carried the process as far as one could with a work of this sophistication. For example, in place of the term *müsteşrik* {Orientalist}, which would be difficult for today's youth to understand, I preferred the word *şarkiyatcı*, the meaning of which could at least be inferred by deduction. Instead of the term *muakkip* {imitator}, I found it appropriate to say *takipçi*. And I used *doğu* {east} and *batı* {west} rather than *şark* and *garp*. If he were alive today, my

father would have readily adopted virtually all the changes that I made in the language of the third edition.

Another way in which this edition differs from the second is that I have extended Tansel's effort to write the names of foreign books and articles in their original form. The names of a number of foreign books and articles were, in fact, left in their Turkish form in the second edition. With certain exceptions, I have tried to give all of these titles in the language in which they were written. In order to distinguish the Leiden edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* from the Istanbul edition (i.e. the *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*), I have written the former as *Encyclopédie de l'Islam* {in the translation, we refer to the English version throughout}.

While preparing the second edition, my late father added to the original notes only a few of his publications that appeared after 1919. For the third edition, I have made additions to many of these notes.[2] Thus, this new edition of *Early Mystics* represents, to a certain extent, an improvement over previous versions. In the additions that I made to the notes, I followed two main principles. First, I concentrated on the works of Köprülü that appeared after the first edition of *Early Mystics* and I added to the relevant notes the results of those works to which, if he were alive, he too would most naturally have referred. Second, as far as I could, I have added, where necessary, references to the works of other writers that are relevant to the original notes of the book.

It will be understood from my brief comments here that the most noteworthy features of the third edition are the additions that I have made to the notes. In order to distinguish them from the original notes, I have placed them within brackets [ ] {which have been retained in the translation}.

As a result of the research that Köprülü carried out after completing the first edition of *Early Mystics*, he changed his mind about certain ideas that he had previously advanced. One change was the view he later held about Aḥmad Yasawī and his *ṭarīqa* {Ṣūfī brotherhood, mystical path}. As Köprülü himself expressly stated, "I originally described both the Ṣūfī personality of Aḥmad Yasawī and the nature of the Yasawī *ṭarīqa* exactly as the Naqshbandī sources portray them. However, the accounts of the Bābā'ī, Ḥaidarī, and Bektashī traditions concerning Aḥmad Yasawī are closer to historical reality."[3] Despite Köprülü's change of view, it was not incorporated in the second edition of *Early Mystics*. In this new edition, though, I have used the occasion to clarify this matter.

In his later writings, Köprülü also advanced views that differed from those in the first edition on certain secondary problems, but there was no reflection of them in the second edition. He wrote in the first edition, for example, that the pen name of Mehmed Giray IV was ʿĀrif, but in an article that appeared in 1928, he stated that it was not ʿĀrif but Kāmil.[4] This minor error was left in the second edition, but in the present version I have corrected it in the relevant note.

In the first edition of *Early Mystics*, the name of a certain work is given as *Hibat al-ḥaqā'iq*. Although well known by this name at that time, it has now been

shown that this title was the result of a misreading. Reşid Rahmeti Arat later carried out research in which he established that the name was *ʿAtabat al-ḥaqāʾiq* and this reading has been universally accepted. Nevertheless, in the second edition the title of this famous book is still given as *Hibat al-ḥaqāʾiq*. In the third edition, I have given the correct name in both the text and the notes. Throughout the work, I have also found it appropriate to write certain personal names the way Köprülü later accepted them. For instance, in an article that he published many years ago, he went to great length to explain that the name "Kutulmuş," as it appeared in the second edition, must be read as "Kutalmış,"[5] and many of our other historians have agreed with him. In this new edition, I have therefore used Kutalmış as the form of this name.

I should like to state immediately here that the additions that I have made to some of the notes in the third edition of *Early Mystics* are just a beginning. I hope and wish that for a future fourth edition a commission of specialists on various subjects will be formed who will be able to make additions to a great many more notes. I am sure that my father's spirit would rejoice at such a project.

Another difference between the second and third editions of *Early Mystics* is the method of transcription. In the new edition, proper names have been written as they are pronounced. In ending this brief description of the third edition, I should mention that I was in Istanbul while the book was published in Ankara and thus pages were sometimes sent to the press without being proof read and this led to a number of unavoidable printing errors. Those mistakes that cannot be deduced from the context have been listed with their corrections at the end of the book {not included, of course, in this edition}.

Istanbul, January 20, 1976
Dr Orhan F. Köprülü

NOTES

1 The following works, listed chronologically, should be added to the bibliography {of the works} of Köprülü given by Tansel in her preface to the 2nd edn (see below n. 2 to Preface to 2nd edn): S. N. Özerdim, "Bibliyografya – F. Köprülü'nün yazılarına ek ve bâzı düzeltmeler," *Belleten*, 30 (1966), 661–5; F. A. Tansel, "Memleketimizin acı kaybı Prof. Dr Fuad Köprülü," *Belleten*, 30 (1966), 633–5; Tansel, "Prof. Dr Fuad Köprülünün yazıları için basılmış bibliyografyalar," *Türk Kültürü*, 6 (1968), 543–56; Orhan F. Köprülü, "Prof. Fuad Köprülü için yazılmış bibliyografyalar ve bunlara bâzı ilâveler," *Türk Kültürü*, 8 (1970), 616–20; Köprülü, "Fuad Köprülü bibliyografyasına yeni ilâveler," *Türk Kültürü*, 10 (1972), 1242–5; Köprülü, "Köprülü bibliyografyası'nda yeni gelişmeler," *Türk Kültürü*, 14 (1975), 52–5. {See also Köprülü, *Fuad Köprülü* (Ankara, 1987).}

2 We can list here articles like "Çagatay edebiyatı," "Âzerî edebiyatı" {rather, "Âzerî," which includes a long subsection entitled "Âzerî edebiyatının tekamülü}, and "Bektaş" in *İA*; "Abdal" in *Türk halk edebiyatı ansiklopedisi* {Istanbul, 1935}; and "Mısır'da bektaşîlik" in *TM* {6 (1936–40), 13–31}. {Orhon Köprülü's additions to the notes were relatively few.}

3 *İA*, s.v. "Ahmed Yesevî," I, 212a. For more on this matter, see n. 52 which I added to pp. 116–17 of the 3rd edn {i.e. n. 70 of Chapter 4 of the present translation}.
4 {"XVII. asır saz şairlerinden Kâmil kırım hanı IV. Mehmet Giray,"} *Hayat Mecmuası*, 1928, no. 134; {reprinted in Orhon Köprülü ed. *Köprülü'den seçmeler* (Istanbul, 1972), pp. 93–8}.
5 "Türk onomastique'i hakkında," *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, 1 (1950), 227–30.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The Office of the Chief of Religious Affairs has decided to publish a second edition of Professor Dr Fuad Köprülü's book entitled *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature*. The author of the work has greeted this decision with pleasure. Not only has it long been out of print – and when rarely found in second-hand bookshops the price is high, 150 or sometimes even as much as 700 liras {$1 = 14 liras} – but it is also the publication to which he devoted the most work and therefore the one to which he gives the most value.

Köprülü began his publishing career when only eighteen years old with a poem entitled "Şeyh Gâlibe."[1] Between 1908 and 1918 – before the appearance of *Early Mystics* – he published a number of poems as well as articles on language, history, literature, literary history, and other fields. Although some twenty of these articles were translations from French, they are noteworthy for shedding light on his artistic talent and his intellectual development and inclinations.[2] The preparatory phase of the studies that, in the event, formed a nucleus for the scholarly work that he would later produce occurred in particular between the years 1913 and 1918. In 1913, at the age of twenty-three, Köprülü was chosen for the position of Professor of the History of Turkish Literature at Istanbul's Dârülfünûn {later Istanbul University}. In the same year, he published an article entitled "Türk edebiyatı tarihinde usûl" {*Bilgi Mecmuası*, 1 (1329/1913), 3–52; reprinted in his *Edebiyat araştırmaları* (Ankara, 1986), pp. 3–47} in which he not only critically examined and explained the scholarly methods on which the Western world relied, but also established, based on his personal experience, the scholarly methods that were appropriate to the national structure of Turkish literary history. The ability to use these scholarly methods to their full extent, and the knowledge that he acquired from his personal studies of our popular poets, are conspicuous in, among others, his articles "Ahmed Yesevî ve Çağatay ve Osmanlı edebiyatları üzerinde te'sirleri," which was published in *Bilgi Mecmuası*, 1 (1330/1914), 611–45, "Türk edebiyatı'nın menşe'i" and "Türk edebiyatı'nda âşık tarzının menşe' ve tekâmülü {hakkında bir tecrübe}," both of which appeared in *MTM* in 2 (1331/1915), 5–78, and 1 (1331/1915), 5–46, respectively,[3] whose director he became in the same year. All this prepared him to establish the study of popular Ṣūfī literature on a sound foundation and made it possible for him to write *Early Mystics*.

Composed, therefore, after such a preparatory phase, *Early Mystics* attracted the attention of European scholars to Köprülü, the founder of the science of Turcology in our country, and his work. Professor Cl. Huart, a member of the Institut Français, wrote the first review of this book. He begins his critical article by saying "There is certainly something that has changed in Turkey. Less than two years ago, a large volume was published that is unlike anything that we have previously known. Not only does it reveal to us new events or fill gaps in our insufficient knowledge {of the history of Turkish literature}, but it is also presented in an impressive manner. We discover here, with amazement bordering on admiration, the application of the strictest principles of historical and literary criticism as they are taught in the universities of Western Europe. Although written in Ottoman Turkish, one could say that it was thought in French. Indeed, alongside technical expressions taken largely from Arabic, which is the scholarly language for the Muslim East as Greek is for us, one encounters others that are simply calques on French terms."[4] Describing Köprülü in his article as "a writer known for his patriotism,"[5] Huart then presents his analysis of the book. He points out that it focused on a field of early Turkish literature that had been very little studied since the conquest of Istanbul. He mentions other documents that confirm the information provided in this work and, thanks to it, shows how erroneous {our knowledge} has been of certain matters and would have to be corrected. Commenting on the richness of the published and unpublished sources in various languages that Köprülü used, Huart expresses a desire for the immediate publication of the unpublished works that he mentioned and, at the end of his article, reaches the following conclusions: "Not only the history of Asia Minor from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries, but also that of the ideas in circulation throughout the immense domain of the Muslim world during this and earlier periods are still so little understood, even by Orientalists, that any serious work that contributes to our knowledge can only be welcomed. Consequently, we are happy to greet the publication of a volume, like the one Köprülü-Zâde Mehmed Fuad has written, which by its nature focuses attention on the problems that need resolving and that one can be optimistic about resolving, thanks to the new sources that he presents, which until recently have been inaccessible to research."[6] In another review of this work, Huart states his opinion that "its author has adopted the principles of European science; he knows French and probably also German; he knows our methods of criticism and applies them; he translates into Turkish our scholarly terminology whenever the language is appropriate and, if not, introduces it with Latin letters directly into his text. His work will open a new era."[7]

After Huart, J. H. Mordtmann published a critical review of *Early Mystics*. In his analysis of the book, the heart of his article, he cites a few documents that escaped the notice of our author and are related to {certain} details. Mordtmann describes the characteristics of Köprülü's method and how his book was written from a new point of view, saying, "Among the exponents of the humanities in the new Turkey, the author merits the rank of *mücte hid* {an independent scholar

of great erudition and diligence}. He approaches, with broad perspectives, various and great problems. He commands the relevant Western and Eastern literatures on an astonishing scale and establishes himself as a master in specialized research. He has the skill to present the subject matter in an easily comprehensible style that does not weary the reader. With special gratitude, we must acknowledge that he, by means of accurate citations and detailed references, has met the demands placed on such works in the West. Notes of various length, which accompany the entire text, complete the presentation in the manner in which European philology has been practiced for centuries. In contrast to his predecessors in the East and West – the Ottoman *tezkirecis* {biographers}, Hammer, Gibb, and others – he considers Ottoman literature as the result of the general literary development of the Turkish peoples during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries."[8] Mordtmann also describes the very rich contents of this work and then adds that "because of its size, which would surely make a full translation prohibitive, certain parts should at least be made accessible to European colleagues."[9]

Let me state that, unfortunately, when *Early Mystics* appeared not a single review of it was published in our country. One reason for this is that the book constituted as much a turning point in our scholarly research in Turcology as it did in the scholarly life of the author, and consequently our scholars had not yet attained a level of competence that would allow them to evaluate it. In the Western scholarly world, however, following Huart and Mordtmann, J. Németh, Professor of Turcology at the University of Budapest, evaluated this work. The latter states, "In this work, Köprülü-Zâde Mehmed Fuad, Professor of the history of Turkish literature at the University of Constantinople, has, on the one hand, provided a synthesis of knowledge on the origin and early development of Turkish mystical poetry and, on the other, presented all the basic and a great many secondary problems of early Turkish literature related to his subject, which he has studied in a detailed and most critical manner. In both parts of the work, he has succeeded to a degree that one would hardly expect given the present state of research. European education, extensive study of Turkish literature, mastery of philology, ability to express oneself clearly, rich resources (the libraries and manuscript collections of Constantinople), and the results of earlier research have all contributed to the creation of this distinguished book. Köprülü-Zâde has produced a guide to this difficult field. It presents many problems in a clear light and will facilitate to a significant degree future research." In the same review of *Early Mystics*, which he considered to be the harbinger of a bright future for research in Turkey on the history of Turkish literature, Professor Németh acknowledges Köprülü's authority and ends by saying, "Altogether, thanks to Köprülü-Zâde and his school in Constantinople who have made accessible to us the bases of their research (texts and other sources) in a philologically reliable manner, we hope that the history of Turkish literature will thus finally occupy its proper place as a worthy discipline in the ranks of the historical studies of other literatures. No one is more competent to lead this

work, on the basis of his abilities and because of his position, than Professor Köprülü-Zâde."[10]

In 1925, Th. Menzel published an article entitled "Die ältesten türkischen Mystiker," based on *Early Mystics*.[11] And in the same year, Köprülü was elected a member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Before his election, professors W. Barthold, S. Oldenburg, and I. Krachkovsky prepared a report in which they described the value and originality of his scholarly books and articles published up to 1925 and gave perhaps the most prominent place to the ideas in *Early Mystics*.[12] In this report, they cite the opinion of the late Martin Hartmann, who had usually been a severe critic of Turkish scholarly works, about the articles on popular literature that Köprülü had first published in *MTM* and used as a basis for writing *Early Mystics*. In Hartmann's view, Köprülü's works were in complete conformity with the European scientific method and contained profound scholarly thought. Other characteristics of his works were his success in showing everywhere in excellent fashion the relationships between the history of literature and social life, and in providing new theories to shed light on historical events. Turning to the new ideas presented in *Early Mystics*, the report notes that the work was well received by French, German, and Hungarian reviewers. It goes on to state that the work was very important for revealing the close relationships between the Ṣūfī *ṭarīqa* of the Central Asian Turk Aḥmad Yasawī and the Bektashī *ṭarīqa* of Asia Minor. And according to the French reviewer Huart, Köprülü's study would require a major revision in the ideas of European scholars about the Bektashīs – as portrayed in both Georg Jacob's famous book {*Die Bektaschijje in ihrem Verhältnis zu verwandten Erscheinungen* (Munich, 1909)} and R. Tschudi's article in the *EI*[1] on this subject {s.v. "Bektāsh"}. The report then goes on to analyze *Early Mystics*.

I believe that the material that I have presented to this point has revealed the importance of *Early Mystics* with respect to its repercussions in France, Germany, Hungary, and Russia.[13]

*

When our author wrote *Early Mystics*, he was twenty-eight years old. He had not yet established his rich library, which today is connected by a corridor to the top floor of his house in the Akbıyık section of Istanbul and which is also reached by a stairway from the garden.[14] At that time, his library was in the large room on the second floor of this house opposite the stairs. Köprülü has stated that he wrote *Early Mystics* in this room in a year and a half and then spent more than another year revising it. In this work, which focused on subjects and problems that had been virtually unexplored up to that time, the author, following the most rigorous scholarly methods, demonstrated the ability to synthesize and present in Turkish the rich material that he had obtained not only from published sources in Oriental and Western languages but also from manuscripts in the libraries of Istanbul and Europe and his own unique manuscripts and

those of his friends. *Early Mystics* constituted, in fact, a beginning, a turning point, for his subsequent scholarly research.

Professor Köprülü always had a national objective in his research and it was for this reason that he divided *Early Mystics* into two parts: "Aḥmad Yasawī and His Influence {on Turkish Literature}" and "Yūnus Emre and His Influence {on Turkish Literature}." In this way, he wanted to prove that "the Turkish literature of Anatolia had not developed separately and independently from the literature of the Turks in other regions, that it was a continuation of the past {i.e. earlier Turkish literature}, and that, consequently, one could only write a history of Turkish literature by studying it as a whole" (p. 3 of the first edition). Let me immediately state that while the life, work, and influence of Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre – the first of whom lived in Turkistan in the sixth/twelfth century and the second of whom, who continued his tradition, lived in Anatolia – are studied in *Early Mystics*, the book also sheds light on their milieus and on their ethnic, religious, linguistic, literary, and political characteristics. Indeed, although Ṣūfī literature from the sixth/twelfth century to recent times constitutes the core of the book, the material presented on the influence of these two great Turkish mystics and their imitators includes information on the history and social, linguistic, and literary life of the period in general. Another valuable feature is that, as in subsequent studies, the author is not content with simply providing information on these various topics, but also draws attention to scholarly problems that have not been investigated and need to be studied. For all these reasons – its comprehensive coverage of the subject, the rich information that it contains, and its masterful composition based on the most rigorous methodology – *Early Mystics* is a milestone of scholarship.

*

It is appropriate to give a brief account of how the second edition of *Early Mystics* was prepared and to describe the differences between it and the first edition.

Köprülü worked continuously between September and December of 1963 to prepare the second edition of this book. While I read the text that was typed with the new letters {Latin alphabet}, Köprülü would follow along in the original work. On some subjects – for example, the linguistic characteristics of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* (pp. 107–24 of the second edition) – he would say, "What difficulties I encountered while writing this! At that time there was nothing written on this subject." Furthermore, he placed marks at the required places for the additions that he was planning to make at the end of the book. In fact, he had already put such marks in his personal copy and had even entered some notes. He said, for instance, that he had made a lot of notes on Luqmān-i Paranda. Because of the essentially plain language of the book, we changed certain Persian phrases and foreign words that are no longer used today {in Turkish}. The revisions and additions that Köprülü was going to make were to be placed at the end of the book, so nothing was added to the main body of the work except

some limited bibliographic information. {Fortunately,} almost all the books in foreign languages that Köprülü had used were in his library in Istanbul. Nevertheless, writing the names of these books and their authors, all of which had been in the Arabic alphabet in the first edition, in their original form proved to be an enormous task. After four months of continuous work, the text was ready for the press. At the beginning of 1964, it was delivered to the Office of the Chief of Religious Affairs.

The following are the major differences between the first and second editions of *Early Mystics*:

1 As the author stated in the preface {to the first edition} of his book, he was not able to see certain studies despite making every effort to do so. After indicating that some of them were important, he said, "If I come across any of these sources while my book is in press, I will not hesitate to include them at the last minute in the Corrections and Additions section." It is clear from this that he planned to work on the book even after it was given to the press. Indeed, in the Corrections and Additions section that he attached to the end of the book, he explained, "The number of printing errors in my book was very low and, on the whole, so obvious to the reader as to be of no significance. However, more than a year passed between the time the book went to the press and the time it appeared from the press. During this period, I continued my research and noticed some mistakes in both the typescript and published text as well as a few rather important omissions. It was possible, of course, to leave them to the second edition of the book, but there was considerable doubt about when there might be a second edition. Consequently, I was compelled to add this short section containing major errors and omissions in order for the first edition of my book to have as few deficiencies as possible when presented for criticism. Nevertheless, in a study of this nature, which covers a broad and completely unknown subject for the first time, there is no doubt that many errors and deficiencies will remain. I hope to make up for them by benefiting from the criticism to which my work will be subject." After this, thirty-five entries are given (pp. 395–400). In the second edition, these corrections and additions have been inserted in their proper place in the text and notes, and therefore have been deleted from the end of the book.

2 The author also continued his research while the section called "Corrections and Additions" was being set in type. As he states, "After the 'Corrections and Additions' section was printed, I came across some information on the famous cauldron in the *türbe* {mausoleum} of Aḥmad Yasawī and I could not avoid inserting it here." He then attached one more page under the heading "Appendix" (p. 401). In the second edition, this section has been removed and placed where it belongs in the book.

3 In the first edition, under the heading "Bibliography," which was arranged alphabetically, Köprülü explained, "While writing my book, I provided sufficient information on every page concerning the various sources to which I referred. There were, however, some works, mainly manuscripts, about which no

information was given {in the text}. I therefore found it appropriate to give a brief description of them here. The works next to which there is an asterisk are manuscripts. In my bibliographic entries, I did not consider it important whether works were in manuscript or published, or written in different languages. I listed them alphabetically according to the name of the author. Works whose authors are unknown were entered alphabetically according to their titles." Then comes the bibliographic data (pp. 403–16). In the second edition, the author thought it better to place the information given on a work in the bibliography within brackets next to its title in the general index. This information comes immediately after the numbers referring to the pages on which the work is mentioned in the book. In this way, the information that had been given in the bibliography, which we have deleted, can be more extensively and easily used.

4 In the first edition, the bibliography was followed by the table of contents (pp. 417–24). The author had taken great pains to arrange this section in order of subject rather than by heading; and for the second edition he has placed it verbatim at the beginning of the book under the heading "Contents." The page numbers for the table of contents have, naturally, been changed to correspond to the new edition.

5 In the first edition, under the heading "General Index," which contained the proper names in the text in alphabetical order, Köprülü stated, "The names of authors, whose works can be found directly under their names in the Corrections and Additions {i.e. bibliography} section are not included in this list. As I said in the preface, I had originally decided to have two separate lists, one for personal names and one for place names, but I later came to prefer the present arrangement." Thus the General Index contained historical names, with the exception of the names of authors, and geographical names (pp. 425–46). This index also contained a limited number of technical terms. *Alpler devri*, for example, is included but *alp-erenler* is not. Following the author's suggestion, this General Index was removed and replaced at the end of the second edition with one that contains everything that had been in the General Index plus the names of all works and authors that were in the text or had been in the Corrections and Additions and Appendix sections as well as all expressions and technical terms concerning history, literature, language, religion, mysticism, etc.

In both editions, the arrangement of the remaining parts is the same. Two diagrams, entitled "The Yasawiyya Chain of Authority" and "The Zangī Ata Chain of Authority," and the musical scores for twelve of the hymns of Yūnus Emre are placed at the end of the book and separated from the text. In the first edition, the illustrations "Turkistan: The City of Yasī" and "The Tomb of Aḥmad Yasawī in Turkistan" were published as a supplement to the text {i.e. separately}.

*

The proofs of the book were first corrected by the Office of the Chief of Religious Affairs. Around the middle of September 1965, Professor Köprülü began to

work on correcting them a second time. As I read and corrected the proofs, he followed along in the first edition of his book. On Friday, October 15, he had worked more than three hours in this fashion at Türk Tarih Kurumu {the Turkish Historical Society, in Ankara}. On that day, we had reached the end of the section on the rules {*ādāb*, etiquette, protocol} of the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*, which began on page 80, in our corrections. In this section the duties of *murīds* {novices, disciples} to their *murshid* {spiritual guide} were discussed. Once while correcting this section, Köprülü assumed a joking manner as he spoke of unpleasant matters and said, "Do you see? The paths of discipleship are difficult." And he added, "You shall complete what I have left half finished." On Monday we were going to continue the corrections, but that evening while walking home from the Turkish Historical Society, he suffered that regrettable traffic accident. I visited him many times in the hospital and, although he said that I should continue the job of making the corrections and that, in any case, he would soon be on his feet and then be able to work again, he was never able to get beyond the subject of the rules of the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*. To be sure, *Early Mystics* was a solid work with respect to the fundamental material on which it was based and very little criticism of any kind was directed toward it that would cause any change in this material. Nevertheless, Köprülü had continued his research {on this subject} during the almost fifty years that had passed since the book was published; and he said that he had thought about providing an appendix at the end of the book for the notes that he had taken from this research because they would enrich the present material. What a pity that this was not possible!

In 1964, while we were organizing his library in his home in Ankara, Professor Köprülü took *Early Mystics* from a shelf and, opening it to the first page, said, "Do you see? I wrote the death dates of my relatives here. This is the date of my father's death . . ." Because of its religio-mystical subject, this book had a spiritual value for him. This famous work, which attracted the attention of Western Turcologists to our country, was truly a turning point in his scholarly life. Exerting an enormous effort, he had written it at the age of twenty-eight, an age that was young for one to be called a true scholar. On April 27, 1966, he signed off on the proofs for the text of the second edition. This was the last work on which he was able to sign off for publication. Around the middle of the following May, he was able to see the first volume of his *Edebiyat araştırmaları*, which was published by the Turkish Historical Society,[15] but he was not able to see the second edition of *Early Mystics*, which he had wished so much to be completed.

Our esteemed and great teacher! The second edition of *Early Mystics* is now finished and has been published by the Office of the Chief of Religious Affairs, which is responsible for administering the religious affairs of our country. May your soul rejoice! May God's mercy be upon you! Rest in the light!

Ankara, July 9, 1966
Fevziye Abdullah Tansel

NOTES

1 *Mehâsin Mecmuası*, Sept. 1324/1908, no. 1.
2 Although they are incomplete in certain respects, see the following bibliographies of the author's publications: Şerif Hulûsî {Sayman}, *Ord. Prof. Dr Fuad Köprülü'nün yazıları için bir bibliyografya (1913–1934)* (Istanbul, 1934), 19 pp.; Hulûsî, *Ord. Prof. Dr Fuad Köprülü'nün yazıları için bir bibliografya (1912–1940)*, 2nd edn (Istanbul, 1940), 24 pp.; S. N. Özerdim, "F. Köprülü'nün yazıları, 1908–1950," in *Türk Dili ve Tarihi hakkında Araştırmalar – 1*, published by Türk Tarih Kurumu and Türk Dil Kurumu on the occasion of Köprülü's sixtieth birthday and edited by Hasan Eren and Tibor Halasi-Kun (Ankara, 1950), pp. 159–248; and "Fuad Köprülü'nün ilmî neşriyatı," in Turan *et al.* (eds) *60 Doğum yılı münâsebetiyle Fuad Köprülü armağanı*, pp. xxvii–l.
3 Both these and a number of Köprülü's other scholarly articles can be found in a recently published collection of his works, *Edebiyat araştırmaları* (Ankara, 1966 {reprinted Ankara, 1986}). {These two articles are on pp. 49–130 and 195–238 respectively.}
4 {"Les Anciens derviches turcs,"} *Journal des Savants*, new series, 20 (1922), 5. For a Turkish trans. by Râgıp Hulûsî, see *TM*, 1 (1925), 267–80.
5 {Huart citing L. Bouvat in "La Presse Ottomane" in} *Revue du Monde Musulman*, 38 (1920), 242.
6 "Les Anciens derviches turcs," p. 18.
7 *JA*, {202} (1923), {147}. In this article, Huart mentions the founding of the Historical Society {Tarih Encümeni} in Istanbul and the beginning of research on new documents, and then draws our attention to a very important point, namely that this work, which was written when the Ottoman Empire was on the verge of collapse, was prepared with a national objective in mind, that of investigating the problem of the origins of this powerful state. Let me point out an error that has appeared in certain {Turkish} works with respect to Huart's reviews mentioned here and the one in n. 5: the passages cited from both of Huart's reviews have been presented as being from only the one in *JA* with no reference to *Journal des Savants* (see, e.g., the brochure issued on the occasion of Köprülü's fortieth birthday, p. 4: N. S. Banarlı, *Resimli Türk edebiyatı tarihi* {Istanbul, 1948}, p. 362).
8 *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, {26} (1923), {122–3}. For a Turkish translation by Mübârek Galib, see *TM*, 1 (1925), 281–7.
9 *Ibid.*, p. 129.
10 *Körösi Csoma-Archivum*, {1} (1924), {330–2}. For a Turkish translation of this article by Köprülü-Zâde Ahmed Cemal, see *TM*, 1 (1925), {in the review section} 288–9. In addition to the information given by Németh here on Köprülü's book, he also states that among the manuscript collections of the Hungarian Academy there is a recent MS belonging to Aḥmad Yasawī of which Köprülü was unaware. According to the catalogue, it consists of 81 folios of 17 double lines and was written in 1124/1712.
11 *ZDMG*, which is Germany's oldest journal of Oriental studies, new series, 4 (1925), 269–89.
12 Köprülü was elected to membership in the session of the aforesaid academy held on November 5, 1925 and was informed of his election by a letter dated November 20, 1925. Later he was also sent a diploma of membership. (For more information and the text of the report, see *TM*, 2 [1926], 555–9.) In 1948, Köprülü was expelled as a corresponding member because of his nationalism and the communist bias of certain members of this academy. This action stemmed from a letter – which was first published in the communist newspaper in Tbilisi {in Georgia} and then in the major Soviet newspapers, and broadcast on Soviet radio – signed by two members of the Georgian Academy. Supposedly based on historical facts, it demanded that a large section of Turkish territory be given to Soviet Georgia. Subsequently, in a series of

articles, Köprülü attacked this letter, which was having repercussions in the world press. (See "Gürcü âlimlerine cevap – I. Tarih, yalancı şâhit olamaz"; "II. Tarih değil, efsâne"; "III. Efsâne değil, tarih," which appeared, respectively, in the newspaper *Vatan*, December 17, 19, 20, 1946; see also Köprülü, *On the Way to Democracy*, trans. Tibor Halasi-Kun [London, 1964], pp. 79–90.) Köprülü used to say that he considered it an honor to be expelled.

13 Alî Emirî Efendi, in his response to Alî Rızâ Bey's letter criticizing {Sahabeddin Süleyman and Köprülü's} *Yeni Osmanlı tarih-i edebiyatı* {Istanbul, 1916}, referred to *Early Mystics*, asked if the Ministry of Education had published this work out of love of ignorance, and said that it was meaningless to write a book about Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre, whose death dates were unknown and whose *dīwāns* {collections of poems} were no longer extant, and to give a place to legends. This article, which descends to the level of personalities, is virtually devoid of constructive criticism {"Cevap,"} (*Tarih ve Edebiyat Mecmuası*, year 3, no. 25, March 31, 1336/1918, pp. 635ff).

14 {Köprülü's library is now in the possession of the Yapı Kredi Sermet Çifter Araştırma Kütüphanesi in Beyoğlu, Istanbul.}

15 See above n. 3.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

In order to understand the {Turkish} national spirit and taste in Muslim Turkish literature, the period most worthy of study is that of the great mystics {Ṣūfīs} who spoke to the masses using the popular language and meter and whose works have endured for centuries. One must distinguish this popular {*khalq*} Ṣūfī literature, which was clearly related to the pre-Islamic folk {*qawmī*} literature, from the abundant and artful compositions that Turkish poets – who translated, and skillfully and enthusiastically imitated, the Ṣūfī works of the Persians – wrote in the *ʿarūḍ* meter[1] and most often in pompous language. Because these two currents continued parallel to each other for centuries, they naturally influenced each other. Nevertheless, despite such mutual influence and the many Persian elements that were incorporated, it is possible, indeed essential, to study the popular Ṣūfī literature – if one can use this expression – as a separate phenomenon.[2]

Because we {Turks} forgot our distinctive national character in the middle ages under Persian influence and, since the Tanzimat {the Ottoman reform movement between 1839 and 1878}, under European influence, popular Ṣūfī literature, like everything related to, or derived from, the people, has been neglected, even regarded with contempt. Unlike the artists who wrote pompous works in imitation of the Persians, the popular mystics, who tried to impart, with simple and sincere hymns, the sacred fire that burned in the depth of their souls, were forgotten. Earlier generations, even if they did not allow these hymns any aesthetic value, at least attributed to them a sacred quality. In recent times, because this view also has disappeared, no one even remembers who wrote them. Among the trifling things that have been written on our literary history since the Tanzimat, and that do not have any scholarly value, not a single line mentioning the existence of the popular mystics can be found. However, this Ṣūfī literature of the common people, which is closely related to early popular literature and is very valuable in revealing the national spirit, has a long history.

The Turks embraced Islam within a short time and of their own free will, unlike many others who were converted by the sword. And these Muslim Turks did not refrain from making religious propaganda among their brothers who had not yet entered the Islamic fold or, if they had, did not properly conform to its beliefs and principles. These then were the spiritual conditions under which

early Turkish literature spread in Islamic form. A number of Turkish dervishes, animated by the desire to spread the new religion and its *ṭarīqas*, moved among the nomadic Turks and tried to propagate this new religious ideal in a language they could understand and in an aesthetic form they would appreciate. This is the reason why the popular literature, which had prevailed among the Turks for centuries, served as a model for the mystical literature whose foundation was being laid. This mystical literature, which produced works that were rather dry and simple in the earliest stages that we can discern – probably because it pursued a propagandistic goal – was increasingly refined over the centuries to the extent that it acquired a special quality that revealed the Turkish national genius. In fact, works were created that could compare with the most sublime Persian mystical compositions. This popular Ṣūfī literature, which is so characteristically Turkish that nothing like it is found among the Arabs and Persians, is therefore worthy of special and careful study.

Up to now, the few general works and monographs that have been written in the East and West on our literary history have been largely devoid of scientific value. Consequently, the problem of the general development of Turkish literature is still an unsolved mystery for the scholarly world. I must say that, unfortunately, no one – from Joseph von Hammer(-Purgstall) to E. J. W. Gibb, or from our old official biographers to the few rare scholars of today – has realized that it is necessary to study as a whole the literary development, over at least thirteen or fourteen centuries, of the entire Turkish nation from Inner Asia to the shores of the Mediterranean. In the hands of researchers who consider the various branches of the Turks to be separate nations with no connection to each other, who do not understand the bonds and relationships among them, and who see no need to study the general history of the Turks in a comprehensive fashion, this important part of world history will remain a mystery forever. Fortunately, the historical research that has modestly begun in our country in the past six or seven years has revealed the error of this point of view, to which Orientalists have been bound up to now, as well as the path that must be followed in order to study the past and bring it to life.[3] We will see in the future what important results this approach will have in the study of all branches of Turkish history.

When a group of events are connected and have influenced each other, it will always produce mistaken results to take into account some of them while ignoring the rest, or to try to understand any series of events by completely neglecting their origin. Without understanding pre-Islamic Turkish literature, it is impossible to explain that of the Islamic periods. Without knowing how Turkish literature developed in Central Asia and Asia Minor up to the formation of the Ottoman state, it is impossible to comprehend the development of Ottoman literature. Indeed, it is a mistake to ignore any of the literatures that have appeared in each period in the different geographical areas where the Turks have lived, and the relationships among these literatures. It is meaningless to try to understand, for example, the period of Aḥmad Pasha {Bursalı, d. 902/1496–7} without knowing {Mīr ʿAlī Shīr} Nawā'ī {d. 906/1501}. In like manner, in order to grasp

scientifically the development of Turkish literature, it is also necessary to understand the special developments of popular literature and *ʿāshuq* {minstrel} literature in every period and region and the influences and reactions upon each other of the classes of literatures addressed to all these different levels of taste.[4]

Once these requirements are clear – i.e. once these new points of view are accepted – the first task is to write monographs on the different periods of our literary history, on the literatures in the various Turkish dialects and on various important figures, in other words, to conduct meticulous and systematic analyses on literary phenomena, undertaken with a synthetic goal in mind. Indeed, history today is not a mass of endless and unconnected data, but a product of synthesis and composition. For historians who accept the notion that social factors determine the course of events, history is neither a work of art nor simply an exercise in erudition. Consequently, in order for a historian not to be left bewildered when faced with a mass of important events, he must rely on a set of hypotheses derived from the systematic study of these events, i.e. he must combine, classify, and compare the data that he collects and then establish certain frameworks in his mind in order to be able to reach any conclusions from them. This approach – which is also what we call *intuition* – is possible as a result of a historian's familiarity with, and affinity for, his subject over many years and is completely scientific. It has no connection with preconceived ideas, because these hypotheses and frameworks arise out of lengthy and systematic study of the events themselves, i.e. from meticulous and profound analyses. Given that even mathematicians and specialists in the natural sciences have accepted the necessity and importance of hypotheses in their work, it is impossible for any scholar not to perceive the need for them in a more complex field like the social sciences. Taking all these observations into account, it is easily conceded that for a true historian, who has complete command of his subject, erudition is not a goal, but it is a requisite condition. Simple syntheses that are not based on extensive and rigorous analyses, no matter how bright their apparent scientific luster, are doomed to collapse in the face of serious criticism.

After this brief explanation of my views on literary history, I would like to say a few words about the nature of this modest monograph that I have presented for criticism. Some four or five years ago, I published a rather long study on Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, the herald of popular Ṣūfī literature among the Eastern Turks and their greatest representative, and another on Yūnus Emre, who is considered the earliest and greatest popular Ṣūfī poet of the Western Turks.[5] The major thesis of those studies was that popular Ṣūfī literature among the Western Turks was influenced by Aḥmad Yasawī. In the study on Aḥmad Yasawī in particular, I tried to support this hypothesis with the help of historical documents, in addition to literary and linguistic comparisons, and I presented considerable material relating to his fame, his disciples, his miracles, etc. among the Western Turks. In this way, I wished to demonstrate that the Turkish literature of Anatolia had not developed separately and independently from the literature of the Turks in other regions, that it was a continuation of the past {i.e. earlier

Turkish literature}, and that, consequently, one could only write a history of Turkish literature by studying it as a whole. During this time, I was not even aware that Mr E. J. W. Gibb had discovered some common points between Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre. Nevertheless, I set out to prove a much broader claim than his and put forward the bold hypothesis that the popular Ṣūfī literary movement among the Western Turks originated from the Eastern Turks and especially Aḥmad Yasawī.

As a result of continuous work over the past four or five years, and as the fruit of investigating Turkish literature as a whole, I have arrived at some clear and specific ideas regarding the literary development of the Turkish nation. I have also engaged in detailed studies on the pre-Islamic literature of the Turks, the scholarly study of which up to now had been regarded as impossible. All of this has made it possible to defend much more forcefully and definitively the hypothesis that I made five years ago. For a historian, nothing more gratifying can be imagined than to be able to support a hypothesis made years earlier with new documents that were discovered later. While studying the different periods and branches of Turkish literature, I obtained a number of documents on Aḥmad Yasawī, Yūnus Emre, and popular Ṣūfī literature among the Turks. Thus I felt obliged to combine and synthesize these materials and to write this monograph on an aspect of Turkish literature that displays most clearly its national spirit and taste.

I have published this book under the title *Early Mystics in Turkish Literature* mainly because I have included extensive material on the life and works of these two great personalities in addition to showing, in general, how popular Ṣūfī literature began among the Turks and the various causes and influences under which it developed. The work is thus divided into two parts. In the first, I describe broadly Turkish literature up to Aḥmad Yasawī and the spread of Islam and Ṣūfism among the Turks. Then I provide more detailed information on the legendary and historical life of Aḥmad Yasawī, on the rules of his *ṭarīqa*, on his spiritual successors {*khalīfas*}, on his works and influence. Because this part constitutes in itself a monograph on Aḥmad Yasawī, all issues connected with him – even a number of secondary topics that at first glance might seem extraneous – are dealt with in full detail. Those who believe that such minute details are appropriate for any monograph will excuse the author. On matters not directly concerned with Aḥmad Yasawī, such as his *khalīfas* and his poetic imitators, naturally I have not maintained the same degree of detail but have treated them in a more general manner. Nevertheless, this first part clearly shows the general outline of popular Ṣūfī literature among the Eastern Turks and its historical development.

As for the second part, which describes the origin and development of this type of literature among the Western Turks, it constitutes a monograph on Yūnus Emre and, following the format of the first part, gives a fully detailed account of all issues connected with him, even if not touching directly on literary history. An extensive description is given of Yūnus Emre's legendary life, his

historical life, his poetry and its different characteristics, and his influence. Then a brief general account is given of his principal followers, their lives and works. But as with the first part, this second part also clearly explains the origin and development of popular Ṣūfī literature among the Western Turks. Although all sources and documents are given individually in the footnotes, I have found it necessary to add a bibliography at the end of the book to facilitate the work of researchers and especially university students. Furthermore, I give short descriptions there of manuscripts, some of which are completely unknown to the scholarly world, as well as information that I regard as necessary and useful on many {published} sources or studies in different languages. Finally, I have added two indexes {subsequently changed to one in the first edition of *Early Mystics*}, in alphabetical order, of personal names and place names, which should be of further assistance to those working in various fields of history.

A quick perusal of the bibliography will indicate how much attention to detail I have given in my book, even regarding secondary and tertiary issues, and how many and varied sources I have consulted. Indeed, I can state that my book presents a canvas of many important historical problems that are still unknown to the scholarly world but are worthy of study, and that it provides the primary sources for studying them. If my book can serve in this fashion as a modest guide for future research, this would be the greatest satisfaction that I could receive from my work. I must attribute the deficiencies in my book especially to the fact that there are very few works on the Eastern Turks in the libraries of Istanbul and that it was also almost impossible to find there works published in Europe. For example, Zeki Velidi {i.e. Ahmed Zeki Velidi Togan} stated in his *Türk-Tatar tarihi* {Kazan, 1912} that the Russian Orientalists S. E. Malov, N. F. Katanov, and S. M. Matveev had made studies on Aḥmad Yasawī and his *khalīfas*, but despite all my efforts, I was not able to see them. Furthermore, I was unfortunately unable to examine K. G. Zaleman's article on Ḥakīm Ata and N. I. Veselovskii's work on the *türbe* and mosque of Aḥmad Yasawī, both of which are mentioned by P. M. Melioransky in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* {*EI*[1], s.v. "Aḥmed Yesewī"}. Since Melioransky is silent about the Russian sources mentioned by Zeki Bey, this could be an indication that they are not of great importance. Whatever the case, to see and review these sources would not have been without advantage. If I come across any of these sources while my book is in press, I will not hesitate to include them at the last minute in the Corrections and Additions section. I can claim, nevertheless, with strong conviction that any deficiencies arising from not having seen the aforesaid sources could not have a great effect on the work as a whole. If this small product of five or six years work sheds light on, and explains in broad outline, a problem that has remained unknown up to now, namely the problem of the origin and development of popular Ṣūfī literature among the Turks, I hope readers will excuse any errors and deficiencies in the details.

Fuad Köprülü
Istanbul, July 28, 1918

NOTES

1 {On this topic, see *İA*, s.v. "Arûz," the sections on Persian and Turkish literature (M. F. Köprülü); and *EIr*, s.v. "ʿarūż" (L. P. Elwell-Sutton).}

2 Here the word *khalq* is used as the equivalent of French *populaire*. It would be wrong to conclude, as some have done, that this term is used pejoratively. The works created by this literature, which should not be confused with the products of folklore, were greeted enthusiastically not only by the common people, but also by the scholarly and refined circles of the upper classes. See the narrative of this book. {Köprülü's distinction between "popular" and "folk" literature is not always clear. He often uses *khalq* to mean both.}

3 This view was described and defended in detail for the first time in my article "Türk edebiyatı tarihinde usûl," *Bilgi Mecmuası*, 1 (1329/1913), 3–52. This same view was also clearly expressed in the introduction to my book *Türk edebiyatı tarihine medhal* {no such book was published, but the first part appeared as the article "Türk edebiyatının menşe'i" – see the bibliography}, but in another fashion.

4 For an understanding of my thoughts on this matter in broad measure, see the introduction to my article "Türk edebiyatında âşık tarzı'nın menşe' ve tekâmülü hakkında bir tecrübe," *MTM*, 1 (1331/1915), pp. 35–46. {Reprinted in his *Edebiyat araştırmaları*.}

5 "Ahmed Yesevî ve Çağatay ve Osmanlı edebiyatları üzerinde te'sirleri," *Bilgi Mecmuası*, {vol. 1}, 1330/1914, 611–45; and "Yūnus Emre," *Türk Yurdu*, 4 {1329/1913}, 612–21, and "Yūnus Emre, âsârı," 5 {1329/1913}, 922–30.

Part I

AḤMAD YASAWĪ AND HIS INFLUENCE ON TURKISH LITERATURE

1

TURKISH LITERATURE BEFORE AḤMAD YASAWĪ

A Pre-Islamic literature

The literature produced by the Turks before their adoption of Islam consisted – with the exception of some insignificant translations made under Chinese, Indian, and Iranian influence – of popular poetry sung to the accompaniment of the *saz* {a Turkish stringed instrument, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Saz" (J. Cler)}. In all the social institutions of the Turks at that time, there was, moreover, a primitive genuineness that revealed the spirit and personality of the people in language, religion, ethics, customs, and legal practices. Although the civilizations of China, India, and Iran had begun to have an influence on the Turks in some fields, this {cultural} penetration was very piecemeal and superficial. Because it never spread from the center to the periphery, i.e. from the enlightened elite to the mass of the people, it was not able to have a real effect on society. Thus, the works that constituted the Turkish literature of that time were also, in conformity with the other elements of society, far from foreign influence and genuinely reflected all the attributes of the people. Everyone, from the ruler to the most insignificant person, sensed himself in the {popular} poetry. Poets in that period were uniformly simple men with *kopuz* {ancestor of the *saz*} in hand. Wandering from encampment to encampment, they would appear at public or private gatherings and sing the exploits of the old heroes and recite the national epics, or fashion new {folk} songs {s. *türkü*} about recent events. At the same time, they might also perform magic or do fortune telling with their *kopuzes*. And the poets were certainly present at national hunting rites, called *sıgır* {properly, *sagır*, "royal battue"}, at public banquets or *şölen*, and at mourning ceremonies called *yoğ*.

All of this poetry was recited in the syllabic meter {*hece vezni*}, which was natural for Turkish. This metrical system had several varieties depending on the number of syllables, because Turkish syllables, while they are all precise and unvarying in length, naturally divide into groups with distinct pauses or caesuras. The oldest were the simplest, i.e. the ones with the smallest number of syllables. All of the poems of that period, whatever the subject, had a precise form. In these early forms of Turkish poetry, two main features are conspicuous. The first is the paucity and specificity of the forms. The reason for this is that the literary

personality in those primitive times could not develop freely, but every poet had to respect the existing forms with a kind of religious devotion. Second, in strophes of poetry, which were usually composed of four verses {i.e. quatrains}, only the first three verses rhyme with each other while the fourth rhymes with {the fourth line of} all the strophes. It seems clear that this type of poetry was written to be sung and that the fourth verse always naturally maintained the same rhyme, operating like the refrain of a folk song. In the works of this early period, when music and poetry had not yet been separated, the rules of rhyme were also very simple and basic, so much so that, in the modern sense, it would be more correct to speak of assonance rather than rhyme. For them, it was sufficient for the last syllables of the verses to have a slight similarity, in order to create a rhyme, and this similarity was usually brought about by the inflection of verbs, thus assuring the poets an ample ease of composition. In short, although the literary products of this early period were of limited scope, simple, and basic, they sprang from the spirit of an entire people and expressed their joys and sorrows. This elementary, but lively and heartfelt literature, which spread with vigor and majesty across the steppes of Asia, was rich enough to show the rough and warlike and, at the same time, refined and profound spirit of the Turk in its naked glory.[1]

B The Turks and Islam

In the sixth century CE, the Turks known as the Göktürks established a large empire in Central Asia, stretching from Siberia to Lake Baikal, and began, on the one hand, to threaten seriously China and, on the other, the Sāsānid rulers. They even held discussions with the Byzantine Empire {about an alliance} against {the Sāsānid ruler} Khusraw Anūshirwān. Problems of succession, however, resulted in the division of this empire into two parts, known as the Western and the Eastern Turks, in 581. In the eighth century, it almost seemed that the Eastern Turks, or T'u-Chüe, would be able to re-establish the former Turkish unity, but at that time Arab armies propagating a new religion entered Transoxiana under the command of Amīr Qutaiba {b. Muslim}. Both the Western and Eastern Göktürks resisted the Muslim invasion for a long time. The new religion gradually advanced, however, sometimes by blood and iron and sometimes by peaceful means, and expanded its area {of dominance} toward the east.

In order to invade Soghdia and Farghānā, the Muslim armies that were marshalled in Khurāsān followed the old military road that passed through Marw and Balkh south of the Amu Darya {Oxus} River. Despite the great disorders that the Turkish world then faced, it occasionally struck fairly successful blows against the conquerors. In 712, a Turkish army entered Soghdia and rendered great assistance to the local population, who had risen in revolt after Qutaiba's return to Marw, and left the Arabs in possession of only the city of Samarqand. Nevertheless, the following year, the Arabs again carried out successful conquests in the region. After the death of Emperor Mo-ch'o {716,

the ruler of the Eastern Turks}, the Western Turks again separated from the Eastern Turks. But Su-lu, a leader of the Türgesh, who had formed a strong government and had taken possession of the old provinces of the Western Göktürks between Talas {Ṭarāz} and Tokmak, did not want to give up Transoxiana easily. Consequently, for most of his life, he did not leave the Arabs in Soghdia in peace. Although the conquests of Qutaiba had advanced rather far to the north of the Amu Darya, the Turks, who had previously penetrated deeply into Iran, were able to hold out and entered the region of Gurgān via the corridor between the Amu Darya and the Caspian Sea.

During the period of the Arab Umayyad caliphate, the situation in Transoxiana remained in doubt for a long time. If the plan of Caliph ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz {d. 101/720} to build caravansaries and hospitals throughout his domain and establish a just administration, while not taking *kharāj* {land tax on non-Muslims} from converts, had been properly applied, Transoxiana would have been very quickly Islamized. The tyrannical and selfish policy of the Umayyads prevented this, however, and war against the Turks continued for a long time. During this interval, the Chinese unjustly killed the ruler of Shāsh {Tashkent}, who had surrendered to them. His son took refuge with the Muslims and sought their help. Although the Chinese dispatched a powerful army with the support of the Ikhshīd of Farghānā, the army that Abū Muslim sent under the command of Ziyād b. Ṣāliḥ completely defeated it – because of the uprising of the Qarluqs.[2] This battle (133/751) then sealed the fate of Transoxiana, which, henceforth, would definitely be Islamized and enter the orbit of Islamic civilization. And, indeed, so it was.

During the ʿAbbāsid caliphate, the Turks were not able to carry out a major operation in Transoxiana, only some minor actions. As in the Umayyad period, there were no formidable masses of Turks to resist the Arabs. After the defeat of the Chinese and the collapse of the Türgesh state, two groups of Turks appeared. The Qarluqs conquered the entire province of Yedi-Su {Semirechy} and the region east of the Syr Darya {Jaxartes} and in 766 took the capital {Sūyāb/Ordukent} of the Türgesh. Meanwhile, the Oghuz took the area west of the Syr Darya. These were the remnants of the Western Turks who had scattered after the death of Su-lu. It was these Oghuz who participated in the events of the ninth century, and they should not be confused with the Toquz Oghuz {i.e. Uighurs} of Eastern Turkistan. Although they were unable to conduct large-scale operations, they occasionally pillaged the countryside, became involved in uprisings in Transoxiana and came to the aid of local rulers or Arabs who had rebelled. Large walls were built around cities like Bukhārā and Shāsh as protection from their depredations.

Transoxiana became completely Muslim in the Sāmānid period. Most of the people of that region were probably already Muslim by the reign of Caliph al-Muʿtaṣim {d. 247/861} and even carried out military expeditions {*ghazā*} against the unbelievers in the desert. As the people of Shāsh had done previously, the inhabitants of Isfījāb, north of the Syr Darya, also converted to Islam a short

time after Nūḥ b. Asad, the uncle of the first Sāmānid ruler Ismāʿīl b. Aḥmad, captured that city in 838. Furthermore, Caliph al-Maʾmūn, as a result of various campaigns, brought members of important local families to the capital of the caliphate {Baghdad} and induced them to convert by bestowing upon them major gifts and other rewards. This sensible policy of Islamization was followed even more vigorously during the reign of al-Muʿtaṣim when Turks from the areas of Soghd, Farghānā, Ushrūsana, and Shāsh were taken directly into the caliph's imperial guard. Al-Muʿtaṣim built the city of Samarra for his Turkish bodyguard troops. After al-Muʿtaṣim's reign, not only did the number and influence of the Turks in Iraq gradually increase, but this situation also contributed to the rapid Islamization of Turkistan.[3] In 350 AH {961} nomads of 200,000 tents – Qarluqs, Oghuz, and the remnants of the Western Turks – who lived, without recognizing Muslim rule, in territories on the Muslim side of the fortified frontier between Shāsh and Fārāb accepted Islam. This religion also began to be firmly established in the fourth/tenth century in the areas of Kāshghar and Balāsāghūn. During the fifth/eleventh century, at any rate, virtually the entire Turkish world did become Islamized and fell under the influence of Islamic civilization.[4]

C The Ṣūfī movement

As early as the second/eighth century, Islam had begun to differ significantly from its original form. In fact, when various nations {s. *millet*} who had lived with their own cultures and traditions for centuries in different parts of the world entered the sphere of Islam, they inevitably introduced a great many changes even on the most fundamental points. An old and rich civilization like that of Iran was thus able to defend at least its moral independence against the irresistible force from the desert. Subsequently, because of its rapid spread, Islam also came face to face with civilizations and religions other than Iran. The influence of Indian civilization (even if indirect), Judaism, Christianity (which had completely dominated Syria), intellectual movements that resulted from the translation of the works of the ancient Greek philosophers – these and many other factors affected the development of Islam. Consequently, throughout the Islamic realm there were a great many religious doctrines {s. *madhhab*} and sects {s. *maslak*} that clashed sharply with each other.[5] The old Sāsānid dominion, which was already on the verge of collapse because of steadily increasing Turkish attacks,[6] initially submitted to the Arab sword; but then the Iranian spirit {*İrânîlik*}, by considering the descendants of Ḥusain {the grandson of the Prophet} to be the inheritors and successors of the Sāsānids, struck terrible blows against the Arab nation and the Islamic religion under the screen of "defending the rights of *ahl al-bait*" {the family of the Prophet}. By insinuating Zoroastrian beliefs in a Muslim guise, the Iranian spirit asserted itself, demonstrating that an ancient civilization could not easily be destroyed.[7] In the fifth/eleventh and sixth/twelfth centuries, various religious doctrines and practices held sway throughout the

Muslim world and the personal and political ambitions of the rulers gave great scope to their development.[8]

One of the most striking things in many places in the Islamic world at that time was the spread of mysticism {Ṣūfism} and the multitude of mystics {Ṣūfīs}. Ṣūfism hardly existed in the first centuries of Islam. It took shape under the influence of Iranian, Indian, and Greek ideas, and to some degree Christianity – albeit taking most elements from Islam – and soon spread throughout the Muslim world.[9] Beginning with Abū Hāshim al-Kūfī {d. 161/777–8}, who first took the name Ṣūfī and founded the first *zāwiya* {Ṣūfī lodge} in Syria, many great Ṣūfīs – including Sufyān al-Thawrī (d. 161/778); Dhū 'l-Nūn al-Miṣrī (d. 246/861), who grew up in Egypt, which had been the home of the early Christian hermits; Abū Yazīd al-Bistāmī (d. 261/874–5 or 264/877–8) from Khurāsān; {al-Ḥusain b. Manṣūr} al-Ḥallāj (d. 309/922), about whom all sorts of ideas were advanced; and al-Junaid al-Baghdādī {d. 298/910} – succeeded in spreading their doctrines despite all forms of opposition and imputations. In his famous treatise {*al-Risāla al-Qushairiyya*}, Abū 'l-Qāsim 'Abd al-Karīm al-Qushairī (d. 465/1072) tried to demonstrate that the Ṣūfī way of life was compatible with Sunnī doctrine. Somewhat later, al-Ghazālī (450–505/1058–1111) succeeded, in many of his works, in convincing the Sunnī establishment that this was the case. Afterwards, al-Suhrawardī al-Maqtūl {d. 587/1191}, the author of *Ḥikmat al-ishrāq*, Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī {d. 632/1234}, the author of *'Awārif al-ma'ārif*, 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī (d. 561/1166), and a great many other Ṣūfīs who fill the books of *ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya* {Ṣūfī biographical dictionaries} gained tremendous spiritual authority among thousands of disciples, as well as the general public, as they expounded their doctrine.[10] Many famous religious scholars {*'ulamā'*} attached themselves to the great shaikhs, and many rulers and commanders {s. *amīr*} encouraged this movement – or, rather, were caught up in it – by sponsoring the construction of *zāwiyas* and *tekkes* {also Ṣūfī lodges}. Thus, shaikhs and dervishes were trained throughout the Muslim world and new social groups were, in effect, brought into being. Moreover, after the death of every great shaikh, he acquired a miraculous aura in the popular imagination. Such flights of fancy fill not only the *manāqib* works {works of the legendary deeds of Ṣūfī saints}, which are replete with superstitions of no historical value, but also those sources that are most valuable for the history of Ṣūfism.[11]

D Ṣūfism in Turkistan

Khurāsān, which nourished the ancient traditions of Iran in its bosom, was a primary, perhaps *the* primary, center of the Ṣūfī movement after the rise of Islam. Consequently, after the Islamization of Transoxiana, it was quite natural for this movement to enter Turkistan by the routes that Islam had previously followed. And this is exactly what happened. In the third/ninth century, Ṣūfīs were abundant in Herat, Nīshāpūr, and Marw, while in the fourth/tenth century shaikhs began to appear in Bukhārā[12] and also in Farghānā.[13] Indeed, the Turks

in Farghānā gave their shaikhs the name *bāb*, or *bābā*. Ṣūfīs also appeared among the Turks who traveled, in whatever capacity, to and from Khurāsān. Muḥammad Maʿshūq Ṭūsī, whom the famous Ṣūfī Abū Saʿīd Ibn Abī ʿl-Khair {d. 440/1049} greatly esteemed, and Amīr ʿAlī ʿAbū were pure Turks.[14] In the event, influenced by various factors of this sort, the Ṣūfī movement slowly gained strength among the Turks as it spread from the great Muslim centers like Bukhārā and Samarqand to the hinterlands, and as dervishes, armed with an ecstatic religious love, introduced new beliefs among the nomadic Turks.[15]

The spread of Ṣūfism, which claimed roots going back to the Prophet via Abū Bakr {the first caliph} or ʿAlī {the son-in-law of the Prophet and the fourth caliph}; the de facto official recognition that it received from the political powers through the construction of *tekkes*; and the high regard that a great many notables, statesmen, and even sultans paid to the shaikhs – all these factors gave the shaikhs enormous moral influence. Both the Qarakhānids, who were so observant of {Islamic} religious norms {s. *ḥukm*} that they would not drink wine, and the early Seljuks, who defended Islam with enthusiasm and passion, showed great respect and reverence to religious scholars and shaikhs alike.[16] On the other hand, because the Turkish rulers were so devoted to Islamic beliefs,[17] they had accepted Ḥanafism with great vigor and conviction. This tendency, which essentially arose from the social conscience of the Turkish nation, on the one hand hindered the spread of heretical Shīʿī and Muʿtazilī doctrines within Islam and, on the other, also as a natural result of this, created a profound and sincere harmony between legal religious norms and the Ṣūfī ideas that developed in Turkish circles.[18]

In my view, by the time Aḥmad Yasawī came on the scene, the Turkish world had already been accustomed to Ṣūfī ideas for a rather long time – probably since the fourth/tenth century – and {word of} the legends and miracles of the Ṣūfīs had spread not only in the cities but also, to some extent, among the nomadic Turks. As for the dervishes, who recited hymns and poetry, who did many good works for the people in order to please God, and who showed the people the ways to happiness and paradise, the Turks enthusiastically accepted them and believed what they said, likening them to the *ozans* {troubadour poet-singers} whom they had endowed with religious sanctity since ancient times. In this manner, a number of the dervishes, who were called *ata* {father} or *bāb* {spiritual leader}, took the place of the old *ozans*. Well known among the people were tales of such Ṣūfīs as Arslan Bābā, who was depicted as a companion of the Prophet; Korkut Ata,[19] the famous patron saint of the *ozans* who, according to legend, went from Turkistan to Arabia in order to learn about Islam and, after meeting with Abū Bakr, accepted the new faith; and Choban Ata.[20] It seems certain, then, that, at the time of Aḥmad Yasawī, there were dervishes trying to spread Muslim beliefs and traditions among the nomadic Turks, who lived along the banks of the Syr Darya and in the steppes, by addressing the people in a language they could understand – simple Turkish. One must assume that Aḥmad Yasawī was a greater and more powerful personality than the dervishes who

preceded him. Still, if the earlier generations had not prepared the way for him, his success could not have been as great.

E The influence of Iran

Because of their geographical location, the Turks were in continuous contact with China and Iran from very ancient times. The early Chinese chronicles, which are reliable and comprehensive, show the relationship of the Turks with China fairly clearly. The early relationship of the Turks with Iran, however, only enters the light of history – leaving aside the legends in the *Shāhnāme* – at the time of the last Sāsānid rulers. After the Turks had lived under the influence of these two civilizations for centuries, Iran, which had accepted Islam, gradually brought them into its sphere of influence.[21] Even during the development of the Uighur civilization, which was the {Turkish civilization} most strongly influenced by China, the attraction of the Turks to Iranian civilization, which had proven its worth in art, language, and thought, was virtually unavoidable, especially after it was invigorated with a new religion.[22]

Even before it drew the Turks into its sphere of influence, Iranian civilization had had, in fact, a major effect on Islam. With respect to the concept of government and the organization of the state, the ʿAbbāsids were attached not to the traditions of the *khulafāʾ al-rāshidūn* {the first four caliphs} but to the mentality of the Sāsānid rulers.[23] After Khurāsān and Transoxiana passed into the hands of native Iranian – and subsequently highly Iranized Turkish – dynasties with only nominal allegiance to the ʿAbbāsids, the former Iranian spirit, which the Islamic onslaught was not able to destroy despite its ruthlessness, again revealed itself. In the fourth/tenth century, Persian language and literature began to grow and develop in an Islamic form. This Perso-Islamic literature was influenced, to a large extent, by the literature of the conquerors. Not only were a great many words brought into the language via the new religion, but new verse forms, a new metrical system, and new stylistic norms were also adopted in great measure from the Arabs. Indeed, almost nothing remained of the old Iranian syllabic metrical system, the old verse forms, or the old ideas about literature. Still, the Iranians, as heirs of an ancient civilization, were able to express their own personality in their literature despite this enormous Arab influence. They adopted from the *ʿarūḍ* meters only those that suited their taste. They created or, perhaps, revived the *rubāʿī* form {of verse}.[24] They also introduced novelties in the *qaṣīda* form {of verse}, which can be considered an old and well known product of Arabic literature, and in the *ghazal* {lyric "love song"}.[25] Above all, by reanimating {their own} ancient mythology, they launched an "epic cycle" that was completely foreign to Arabic literature.[26] These developments were on such a scale that the fifth/eleventh century witnessed the formation of a new Persian literature in all its glory.

The Turks adopted a great many elements of Islam not directly from the Arabs, but via the Iranians. Islamic civilization came to the Turks by way of

Transoxiana from Khurāsān, the cultural center of Iran. Indeed, some of the great cities of Transoxiana were spiritually far more Iranian than Turkish. Also, the Iranians were no strangers to the Turks, for they had known each other well before the appearance of Islam. For all these reasons, it was the Iranians who guided the Turks into the sphere of Islamic civilization. This fact, naturally, was to have a profound influence on the development of Turkish literature over the centuries.

To be sure, we do not know precisely how and to what extent Persian literature at first influenced Turkish literature, but the earliest Turkish work recognized by the scholarly world as a product of the post-Islamic period, the *Kutadgu Bilig* written in Kāshghar in 462/1069–70 at the time of the Bughrā Khāns {Qarakhānids}, clearly exhibits Persian influence in many respects. This is not the place to give a fully detailed description of this old Turkish composition,[27] but the Persian influence on it is striking, especially in language, meter, and form.

Linguistically, the *Kutadgu Bilig* is full of Persian and Arabic words. If one takes into consideration the longstanding relations of the Turks with the Iranians, the many concepts that the new religion introduced, and the new words that were used to express them, then the number of foreign words does not appear to be excessive. As for the question of meter, this composition – despite the mistaken claims of certain European scholars – was not written in the syllabic meter but was modeled directly after the meter of the *Shāhnāme* and, as in all Persian works of this type, the preferred form was that of *mathnawī* {rhymed couplets}. The verse is very defective, because the Turkish of that time could not, of course, suddenly accord with the *ʿarūḍ* metrical system, which was alien to its structure. This is one of the main reasons why some people considered it to have been written in the syllabic meter. With regard to subject matter, ideas, and metaphors, one encounters the influence, at the same time, of both {Turkish} popular literature and Chinese literature. But in the meter, especially, the strong influence of Persian literature is immediately apparent. Indeed, this influence was so strong that within a short time it eventually was able to drive out all others.

Like all Muslim works, the *Kutadgu Bilig* begins with a prose preface that includes the *taḥmīd* {*al-ḥamdu li-'llāh*, praise be to God} and *taṣliya* {*ṣallā ʿllāhu ʿalayhi wa sallam*, God bless him (the Prophet) and grant him salvation}. In the prologue to this work, the author Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib finds the human aptitudes to consist of "justice, ability, comprehension, and contentment."[28] He then animates each one in the form of a person and presents lengthy debates among them. With regard to its subject, this book is a variation on the Persians' *siyāsatnāme* {advice for rulers} genre. One of these four aptitudes, Ögdülmish son of Qut {rather, he is the son of Ay-toġdi who represents "Fortune" (= Qut)}, describes to the ruler, one by one, all the officials and classes who constituted Turkish society in Kāshghar at that time and explains the qualifications they should have and how the ruler should treat them. The book is full of such questions as "How

should one be a *tapucu*, i.e. a civil servant?" "How should one be a *subaşı* or military commander?" "How should one treat the people?" "What should one do for farmers, merchants, doctors, and sorcerers?" "How should one behave toward women?" "What qualities should be sought in a good wife?" "How should the dynasty show respect to the mission of the Prophet?" There is also a *kaside* in praise of Bughrā Khān, following the example of Persian *mathnawī* writers. Nevertheless, as regards the subject of the work – i.e. portraying the various human aptitudes through personification – as well as the simplicity and specificity of its figures of speech and metaphors, nothing like it can be found in Persian literature. For these aspects, Chinese influence on the one hand and vestiges of {Turkish} popular literature on the other are much more significant. Even the ode in praise of Bughrā Khān is closer to the products of early {Turkish} popular literature than to Persian examples.[29]

This work, which was written in Kāshghar in 462/1069–70, should by no means be considered an isolated literary product. Indeed, there are references in the preface that clearly reveal this point. If one considers that the Turks already had {various} scripts before Islam and that they had books composed in these scripts, then it becomes immediately obvious that Muslim works would be written in Kāshghar, which was an old center of Turkish civilization, soon after that city accepted Islam, and that one would not have to wait centuries before this occurred. When the Turks adopted Islam, they were not a barbarian people who were strangers to writing, books, and education.[30] Thus, we can assert that by the fifth/eleventh century at least, Turko-Islamic works had begun to be written in Turkistan and that they were subject to Perso-Islamic influence. If Iranian influence had made an impact so quickly and vigorously in an eastern region like Kāshghar, which was a center of the old Uighur civilization and had been under continuous and strong Chinese influence, then naturally this influence must have been felt on a much wider scale in regions further to the west and closer to the cities of Khurāsān. But unfortunately, ruinous invasions, wars, and a thousand other things over the centuries have destroyed the products of those early periods and virtually nothing remains in our possession. Let me state clearly here, however, that such Turkish works that imitated Persian forms and were written under the influence of Persian literature in Muslim centers were not widespread among the masses. They were only circulated among the learned who received a Muslim education in the *madrasas* {these colleges of Islamic law began to spread in the fifth/eleventh century}.

F Popular literature

We know that the Turks possessed a rich popular literature in the fourth/tenth and fifth/eleventh centuries, and we also have some valuable examples of it. These works allow us to explain how, and with what kinds of compositions, the Turks were able to express their literary impulse in the time before Aḥmad Yasawī. While the *Kutadgu Bilig* and similar works were read and studied by men

educated in the *madrasas* of the cities of Turkistan, which had become strong centers of Islam, the needs of the popular masses were met, as they had been for centuries, by the simple products of the popular poets.[31] Because popular literature, for various reasons, underwent hardly any perceptable change over the centuries, it preserved its basic pre-Islamic features into the Islamic period.

Some of the surviving works from that period can be regarded as codes of ethics of a didactic nature. The evil of stinginess and envy, the obligation to gain a reputation for generosity among one's people, the qualities of the hero, the greatness of God, and the need to respect and obey one's parents and elders are among the items dealt with in these pieces in a simple and straightforward manner. The most valuable of these works, however, are the lamentations-elegies {s. *sagu-mersiye*}. These elegies were sung during mourning ceremonies or in general assemblies – regarded in pre-Islamic times as only a religious practice but afterwards as more of an aesthetic one – to the accompaniment of the *kopuz* and were usually rather long. They describe the merits of the deceased, the various stages of his combats, how he attacked the enemy, where the battles occurred, and how grieved all the people were – indeed, all of nature was – because the hero died. The metaphors are simple and primitive but sincere and colorful. Sometimes summer and winter are personified and, as in the *Kutadgu Bilig*, engage in a debate. We find in them a rapturous feeling, not only toward nature but toward all manifestations of life. Saying that when summer comes the snows will melt, the nightingales will sing, and happy couples will make love, the reciter of the elegy dwells on the joy of life. When he sees a beautiful slave girl, he likens her face to the moon and her neck to the juniper tree. Like all lovers, he speaks of the beauty of his beloved, her cruelty, and her bewitching eyes and he weeps profusely. The beauty of the countryside and the plains, the frosty nights, the wild steppes, the misty hills, the ducks, geese, and small water fowl are all described in these elegies with a lively affection.[32]

These elegies are expressed in quatrains, each verse having seven or eight syllables. Sometimes the verses of the first quatrain all rhyme {aaaa}, sometimes all but the third rhyme {aaba}. As for the following quatrains, the first three verses rhyme while the fourth returns to the rhyme of the initial quatrain {ccca, ddda, etc.}, thus forming a larger unit, whose rationale I explained above (section A {i.e. that this type of poetry was written to be sung and the fourth verse maintained the rhyme, like the refrain of a folk song}). The other poems, of a didactic nature, are occasionally in the form of quatrains with five, six, or seven syllables per verse, but more often consist of couplets of 10, 12, 14, or 15 syllables per verse {Köprülü is mistaken here. This should be 11 or 12}.

Aside from poems, there existed among the people legends or sagas, such as the *Oghuz menkabesi* {Legend of the Oghuz},[33] that had survived from very early times. Although they belonged fundamentally to the pre-Islamic period, a number of these legends acquired an Islamic form and circulated in that fashion thanks to the efforts of the dervish poets who made religious propaganda in the Islamic period.

This, then, was the level of literary development of the Turkish people when Aḥmad Yasawī appeared on the scene in the fifth/eleventh and sixth/twelfth centuries.

NOTES

1 For detailed information with full documentation on the music, literature, and literary life of the Turks before Islam, see the first part of my article "Türk edebiyatı tarihine medhal" {only the first part of this study ever appeared, as "Türk edebiyatının menşe'i," *MTM*, 2 (1331/1915), 5–78, reprinted in his *Edebiyat araştırmaları*, pp. 49–130}. There is also brief and general information on this subject in my book *Küçük Türk edebiyatı tarihi* {apparently part one of his *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (Istanbul, 1920–1), cf. his *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (1926; reprinted Istanbul, 1981), Chapters 1–4}.

2 For the information in Chinese sources on this war, see E. Chavannes's book *Documents sur les Tou-kioue (Turcs) Occidentaux* (St Petersburg, 1903), pp. 297–8.

3 {As will be seen, Köprülü sometimes uses Turkistan to mean the historical region of the middle (and sometimes lower) Syr Darya valley and sometimes to mean the Russian holdings in Central Asia in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.}

4 Al-Ṭabarī {*Ta'rīkh*, i.e. *Ta'rīkh al-rusul wa 'l-mulūk* (Leiden, 1879–1901), Eng. trans. under the general editorship of Ehsan Yarshater as *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (Albany, NY, 1985–)}; Ibn al-Athīr {*al-Kāmil fī 'l-ta'rīkh*, Thornberg edn (Cairo, 1303/1885–6)}; al-Balādhurī, *Futūḥ al-buldān* {(Leiden, 1866), Eng. trans. Philip Hitti and F. C. Murgotten as *The Origins of the Islamic State* (New York, 1914–24)}; W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion* (London, 1928); Jurjī Zaydān, *Medeniyyet-i islâmiyye tarihi*, {Turkish} trans. {of the Arabic original (Istanbul, 1328–30/1910–12)}; Necib Âsım and Mehmed Ârif, *Osmanlı tarihi* {Istanbul, 1335/1916–17}; Chavannes, *Documents*. {On the Göktürks, see Wolfgang Scharlipp, *Die frühen Türken im Zentralasien* (Darmstadt, 1992) and Ahmet Taşağıl, *Gök-Türkler* (Ankara, 1995).}

5 Bernard Carra de Vaux, *Gazali* (Paris, 1902) {reprinted Amsterdam, 1974}, Chapters 7, 8.

6 Chavannes, *Documents*, p. 302. The major role that the Turks played in this important event in world history has not been considered at all by specialists in Islamic history.

7 In order to understand the influence of the Iranian national spirit on Islam, see R. Dozy's *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme* {(Leiden, 1879), Köprülü apparently used the Turkish trans. by Abdullah Cevdet (Cairo, 1908)}; and {vol. 2}, Chapter 34, "Le Mahdi," in Cl. Huart's *Histoire des arabes* (Paris, 1912–13). E. Blochet provides strong evidence that Iranian culture had already exerted an influence on the Arabs before Islam, "Études sur l'histoire religieuse de l'Iran" {part 2, "L'ascension au ciel du prophète Mohammed," *RHR*, 40 (1899)}, p. 20. Jurjī Zaydān, like all other Arab historians, is of the opinion that 'Abbāsid rule was nothing but Iranian oppression (*Medeniyyet-i islâmiyye*, vol. 1, p. 84). A great many Iranian poets from Firdawsī {d. 411/1020} to Khāqānī {d. 595/1199} were Zoroastrians {*zerdüşti*} in spirit. Indeed, Shaikh Abū 'l-Qāsim Jurjānī did not want to perform Firdawsī's funeral prayer because he had filled his *Shāhnāme* {Book of Kings} with eulogies for all the Zoroastrians {*mecûsîler*}, Dawlat-Shāh, *Tadhkirat al-shu'arā'*, {ed. E. G. Browne (London, 1901)}, p. 58.

8 On this subject, see al-Shahrastānī, *Milal wa 'l-nihal* {Turkish trans. Nūh b. Muṣṭafā (d. 1070/1660), published in Cairo, 1263/1847 and then Istanbul, 1279/1862; French trans. D. Gimaret *et al.*, as *Livre des religions et des sectes* (Louvain, 1986–93)}.

9 Carra de Vaux, *Gazali*, {Chapter 7,} "La mystique avant Gazali," pp. 175–200. The ideas advanced on the origin of Ṣūfism are still very divergent. Carra de Vaux, who is a devout Catholic and a fine Orientalist {d. 1953}, presents Christianity as the prime

source, but he is partisan in this regard. In his article "Perse" (Iran) in *La Grande Encyclopédie* {Paris, 1886–1902} and in the section on Ṣūfism (pp. 268–77) in his {*Histoire de la*} *littérature arab* {(Paris, 1902), English trans. *A History of Arabic Literature* (London, 1903; (reprinted Beirut, 1966)}, Huart says the question has not yet been resolved whether this movement came from India, from Christian monks, or directly from Iran, but he gives primacy of place to Iranian influence. In his article "Soufisme" in *La Grande Encyclopédie*, Georges Salmon gives the opinion that this movement arose under the influence of the Alexandrian school, i.e. Neoplatonism, but that pantheism, which later spread among the Ṣūfīs, arrived from India via Iran. Carra de Vaux, however, while discussing the Ṣūfī poets of Iran, explains at great length that most of them were not pantheistic and that there is absolutely no connection between the {concept of} *fanā'* {annihilation, passing away from self and its replacement by a pure consciousness of God} in Ṣūfism and nirvana in India (*Gazali*, p. 287) {see *EIr*, s.v. "Baqā' wa Fanā'" (G. Böwering)}.

There are also those, like Blochet, who claim that Christianity had no influence whatsoever on Islam, and those who think that the principles of Ṣūfism were wholly derived from the Koran and *Ḥadīth* {Prophetic tradition}. Thus we can see how far we are from solving this problem. Huart, unable to give a definite answer based on historical documents, makes very vague and general assertions, such as "The Ṣūfī movement represents the victory of the Arian spirit over the Semitic mentality." This is utter nonsense. The views of Dozy, A. I. Silvestre de Sacy, E. Trumpp, and F. A. D. Tholuck {*Sufismus* (Berlin, 1821)} on this subject cannot even be considered as significant as those given above because they belong to earlier periods of Orientalism. There is certainly a great need in the scholarly world for a general history of Ṣūfism that would show the influence of various sources on the different Ṣūfīs in their proper proportions. Unfortunately it appears to be difficult to meet this need. {Since Köprülü wrote, an enormous amount of scholarly work has been done on Ṣūfism; see, e.g., *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Taṣawwuf" (L. Massignon [B. Radtke *et al.*]).}

10 The first biographies of Ṣūfīs were written in Arabic. In his introduction to {R. A. Nicholson's edition of Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār's} *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'* {London, 1905–7}, Mīrzā Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb al-Qazwīnī mentions, p. ج, as the earliest works of this kind ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad b. al-Ḥusain al-Sulamī's (d. 412/1021) *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya*, Abū Nuʿaim Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Iṣfahānī's (d. 430/1038) *Ḥilyat al-awliyā'*, Ibn Khamīs al-Kaʿbī {al-Mawṣilī al-Shāfiʿī's} (d. 552/1157–8) {*Manāqib al-abrār min*} *maḥāsin al-akhyār*, and Jamāl al-Dīn Abū ʿl-Faraj al-Baghdādī al-Ḥanbalī's {i.e. Ibn al-Jawzī} (d. 597/1200–1) *Ṣafwat* {or *Ṣifat*} *al-ṣafwa*. The first two of these works are in our libraries {al-Sulamī ed. J. Pedersen (Leiden, 1960); al-Iṣfahānī ed. (Cairo, 1932–8); Ibn al-Jawzī ed. (Cairo, 1411/1991)}. Furthermore, al-Sulamī adapted his work from that of his master Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. ʿAbd Allāh {al-Bajalī} al-Rāzī {known as Ibn Shādhān, d. 376/986}, {Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt* {*al-uns*}, {ed. (Calcutta, 1859)}, {Turkish} trans. {Lāmiʿī}, {Istanbul, 1289/1872–3} p. 274. The earliest biographical dictionary of the {Ṣūfī} saints written in Persian was the *Kashf al-maḥjūb li-arbāb al-qulūb* of Abū ʿl-Ḥasan ʿAlī b. ʿUthmān al-Ghaznawī al-Jallābī {al-Hujwīrī} (d. 465/1072 or 469/1076), a very poor edition of which was published in Lahore. There are some manuscript copies in the Istanbul libraries. Before the Great War {the First World War}, the Russian Orientalist V. A. Zhukovskii was preoccupied with preparing a new critical edition of it ({Huart, a review of Nicholson's *The Kashf al-maḥjūb, The Oldest Persian Treatise on Ṣūfis*,} *JA*, 11th series, 3 {1914}, p. 187) {ed. Zhukovskii (Leningrad, 1926)}. Nicholson has translated this work into English {Leiden and London, 1911}. In addition to this work, Shaikh al-Islām Abū Ismāʿīl ʿAbd Allāh b. Muḥammad al-Anṣārī al-Harawī (d. 481/1089) translated al-Sulamī's *Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya* {into Persian}, with certain additions, and this forms the basis of Jāmī's

Nafaḥāt al-uns. The author of *Kashf al-maḥjūb* made great use of al-Sulamī's *Ṭabaqāt* and al-Qushairī's *Risāla*. If we add to the aforesaid works Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār's *Tadhkira-i awliyā'* and al-Qushairī's *Risāla*, we will have presented almost all the major sources that were written up to the sixth/twelfth century. {On Ṣūfī biographical literature, see the survey by Jawid A. Mojaddedi, *The Biographical Tradition in Sufism: The Ṭabaqāt Genre from al-Sulamī to Jāmī* (Richmond, Surrey, 2001).}

11 For example, al-Qushairī's *Risāla* {Turkish trans. Nâfî Efendi as *Risâle-i Kuşayrîye* (Istanbul, 1307/1889–90), eds ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm Maḥmūd *et al*., as *al-Risāla al-qushairiyya* (Cairo, 1966), English trans. Rabia Harris as *The Risalah: Principles of Sufism* (distributed by KAZI Publications, Chicago, 2002)}, ʿAṭṭār's *Tadhkira*, {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, and {ʿAlī b. Ḥusain Wāʿiẓ Kāshfī Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt-i {ʿain al-ḥayāt* (Lucknow, 1308/1890), ed. ʿA. A. Muʿīniyān (Tehran, 2536/1977–8)}. The section that ʿAṭṭār devoted to al-Ḥallāj is very significant in this respect (Nicholson ed., pp. 135–45).

12 {Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 275.

13 *Ibid*., p. 323.

14 *Ibid*., pp. 348–50.

15 Barthold, *Turkestan {down to the Mongol Invasion*, Russian edn (St Petersburg, 1898–1900), English trans. (London, 1928), revised English trans. (London, 1968). Köprülü could not read Russian and apparently relied to some degree on Turkish emigrés from Russia to inform him of the contents of various Russian works.}

16 *Ibid*.

17 The Seljuk ruler Toghrıl Beg {d. 455/1063} was a zealous Ḥanafī. Ibn al-Athīr writes that his vizier ʿAmīd al-Mulk {al-Kundurī} even had permission from him to curse both the Rāfiḍīs and Ashʿarīs in the mosques of Khurāsān and that Toghrıl Beg was very fanatical against the Shāfiʿīs (*al-Kāmil*, vol. 10, p. 11). Alp Arslan {the nephew of Toghrıl Beg} ordered Abū Saʿīd Muḥammad b. Manṣūr Sharaf al-Mulk al-Khwārazmī to repair the *türbe* and mosque of Abū Ḥanīfa in Baghdad and establish a Ḥanafī *madrasa* {Islamic law school} there ({Niẓām al-Mulk,} *Siyāsatnāme*, ed. and French trans. Ch. Schefer {Paris, 1891–3}, trans., p. 2.) {English trans. H. Darke as *The Book of Government, or Rules for Kings* (London, 1960)}. In Niẓām al-Mulk's *Siyāsatnāme*, there is important information showing how severely Alp Arslan acted against the Shāfiʿīs and especially the Rāfiḍīs (see Chapters 21 and 42). Dozy also recognized that the Turks were ardent Sunnīs (*Essai*, Turkish trans., vol. 2, p. 495). Indeed, we find this {attitude} among the Turks in Baghdad even before the Seljuks. The Turks did not refrain from using any means to defend Sunnism against the Buwaihids who supported Shīʿism in Baghdad ({Zaydān,} *Medeniyyet-i islâmiyye*, vol. 4, p. 263). The other Turkish states in Turkistan also always defended Ḥanafīsm (Barthold, *Turkestan*).

18 See the mystical views of the Turkish Ṣūfīs in {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt* and {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt*. Very significant in this regard is the danger that Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār incurred in Samarqand around the end of the sixth/twelfth or beginning of the seventh/thirteenth century. In his *Mazhar al-ʿajā'ib* he had been very excessive in his praise of the Twelve *Imāms* {supreme leaders of Twelver Shīʿism}, especially ʿAlī, and had demonstrated his belief in the expected *mahdī* {an eschatological figure similar to a messiah}. Consequently, one of the great jurists of Samarqand accused him of being a Rāfiḍī {heretic} and issued a *fatwā* {legal opinion} that his book should be burned and that he should be executed. Farīd al-Dīn was able to save himself from this accusation only with difficulty (introduction to his *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'*, p. ی). {It is now recognized that *Mazhar al-ʿajā'ib* was not among ʿAṭṭār's authentic works. See Saʿīd Nafīsī, *Justujū dar aḥvāl va āthār-i Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār Nīshābūrī* (Tehran, 1320/1942), pp. 145–67; *EI*^{2}, s.v. "ʿAṭṭār" (H. Ritter).}

19 For information on the legend of Dede Korkut {*dede* = *ata*}, which was known on the banks of the Syr Darya (the old territory of the Oghuz), among the Turkmen, around

Derbend in Azerbaijan, in Anatolia, in short, all the areas to which the branches of the Oghuz spread, see my *Türk edebiyatı tarihine medhal* {i.e. "Türk edebiyatının menşe'i,"}, pp. 61–2. {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Dede Ḳorkut" (Fahir İz), and Geoffry Lewis trans. *The Book of Dede Korkut* (Harmondsworth, UK, 1974).}

20 E. Schuyler, {*Turkistan, Notes of a Journey in Russian Turkistan, Khokand, Bukhara, and Kuldja*, 6th edn. (London, 1877), (abridged reprint London, 1966)}, Turkish trans. {Ahmet Efendi} as {*Musavvar*} *Türkistan* {*tarihi ve*} *seyâhatnâmesi* {Istanbul, 1294/1878}, p. 302.

21 Blochet, "Mazdeism ve Türkler" {rather, "Madza'izmin Türk kavimlerinin i'tikadları üzerinde tesiri," which is the Turkish trans. of the first part of his "Études sur l'histoire religieuse de l'Iran: (1) De l'influence de la religion mazdéenne sur les croyances des peuples turcs," *RHR*, 38 (1898), 26–63}, *MTM*, 1 (1331/1913), 128ff. {See also his "Christianisme et mazdéisme chez les Turks orientaux," *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 27 (1929–30), 31–125.}

22 {Köprülü,} *Türk edebiyatı tarihi*, Chapter 1.

23 See my "Selçukiler zamanında Anadoluda Türk medeniyyeti," *MTM*, 2 (1331/1916), 193–232. {English trans. Gary Leiser as "Turkish Civilization in Anatolia in the Seljuk Period," *Mésogeios*, 9–10 (2000), 37–82.}

24 Ağa Aḥmad ʿAlī Aḥmad, *Risāla-i tarāna* (Calcutta, 1867), cited from *Majmaʿ al-ṣanāyiʿ*, p. 2. On this subject, see also {Shams al-Dīn Ibn Qays al-Rāzī or Shamsī Qays,} *al-Muʿjam fī maʿāyīr ashʿār al-ʿajam*, {eds Muḥammad Qazwīnī *et al.* (Tehran, 1314/1935)}. {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Rubāʿī," (C.-H. de Fouchecour *et al.*).}

25 See the section "Acemler'de mersiye" in my article "İslâm edebiyatında mersiye" {rather, "Bizde mersiye ve mersiyecilik,"} *YM*, 1 {1917}, no. 18, pp. 344–8. {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ḳaṣīda," (F. Krenkow [G. Lecomte], *et al.*), and "Ghazal" (R. Blachère *et al.*).}

26 See the foreword by J. Mohl to the French translation of {Firdawsī's} *Shāhnāme* (Paris, 1876–8) {as *Le Livre des Rois. . .* } .

27 See the version edited by W. Radloff in three large vols {*Das Kudatku-Bilik . . .* (St Petersburg, 1891–1910)}. [After Radloff's facsimile edn of the *Kutadgu Bilig*, which was based on the Herat MS currently in Vienna, Türk Dil Kurumu also published a facsimile edn of the same MS (Istanbul, 1942). The second MS of the *Kutadgu Bilig*, which is in the Khedival Library in Cairo, and which the Dil Kurumu also published as a facsimile edn in Istanbul in 1943, was very similar to this one. As for the third MS of the *Kutadgu Bilig*, which was written in the city of Farghānā in Turkistan and is much more important than the other two, it was first made known to the scholarly world by the late Reşid Rahmetî Arat. This was also published in a facsimile edn by Dil Kurumu in 1943.

Arat prepared a critical edn of the three currently known copies of the *Kutadgu Bilig* and the Türk Dil Kurumu published it in Istanbul in 1947. Arat also wrote a translation of the *Kutadgu Bilig* into Western Turkish (the Turkish of Turkey), which Türk Tarih Kurumu published in Ankara in 1959. This work, which is composed of 6645 couplets, has great value for Turkish intellectual history. In a number of respects, it is still in need of analysis. For more information on the *Kutadgu Bilig*, see issue 98 {9 (1970)} of *Türk Kültürü*, which was devoted to it.] {Now see *İA*, s.v. "Yûsuf Hâs Hâcib" (Kemal Eraslan), and *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥādjib" (R. Dankoff). English trans. of the *Kutadgu Bilig* by Robert Dankoff as *Wisdom of Royal Glory* (Chicago, 1983).}

28 {Köprülü is mistaken here. The verse prologue, which is not by Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib, asserts that the work is based on four fundamental principles: justice (*ʿadl, könilik*), fortune (*dawla, qut, iqbāl*), wisdom (*khirad*), and contentment (*qanāʿat wa ʿafyat*). The prose prologue, which is a summary of the verse prologue, renders these as justice, fortune, intellect, and contentment (*ʿadl, dawlat, ʿaql, qanāʿat*). Yūsuf himself (lines 355–7) gave

them as justice (*köni törü*), fortune (*qut*), wisdom or intellect (*uqush*), and man's last end (*ʿāqibat*).}

29 *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (Istanbul, 1926), Chapters 6, 2 (VI. Bab, 2). *Iran edebiyatı* {not further identified}, pp. 131ff.

30 Both Byzantine and Chinese sources state that the Turks had their own writing before Islam and wrote books with it. According to Chinese historians, the Uighur Turks had quite a brilliant and extensive literature in the fifth century CE {They do not fully emerge in history until the eighth century; see Peter Golden, *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples* (Wiesbaden, 1992), p. 157.} Not only did they have prose and poetic works, but there were also chroniclers at the courts of their *khāns* {rulers}. Indeed, by this means all events were recorded from the earliest periods of the Uighurs until almost the time of Chingiz Khān {d. 1227}. While mentioning that he came across a great many public libraries in the country of the Uighurs, the tenth-century CE Chinese traveler Wang Yen-te does not state that this was anything remarkable. In fact, despite all the invasions that have befallen Turkistan, translations of a great many stories and religious works have survived from those early periods, and the Orhan Inscriptions, which the old Göktürks had written, also bear witness to the early civilization of the Turks. Because the Turks who went to the ʿAbbāsid court in Baghdad were mostly desert people who lived a primitive life, they did not occupy themselves with learning and education. Thus, the Arab historians believed that the Turks were generally unfamiliar with learning and art. Ibn al-Athīr, for example, is surprised to find that Qutalmısh, the founder of the Seljuk dynasty of Anatolia, was interested in astronomy even though he was a Turk ({Zaydān,} *Medeniyyet-i islâmiyye*, trans. vol. 4, p. 294). [In his article, "Türk onomastique'i hakkında," *Tarih Dergisi*, 1 (1950), 227–30, Köprülü shows that the proper pronunciation of this name was Qutalmısh rather than the other forms {Qutulmush} in which it had previously been read.] The fact is, there were Turks who had preserved their early civilization at that time and lived a civilized life, and who had not left their country to enter the courts of the caliphs. The errors of the Arab historians are most obvious in this respect.

31 While the Persian poets of the Turkish rulers who were under Iranian influence, such as those at the court of Maḥmūd of Ghazna {d. 421/1030}, tried to develop Islamic Persian literature and raise it to a high level, the army, which was composed mostly of Turks, satisfied its {literary} taste with popular folk songs {s. *türkü*} and epics {s. *dastān*}. The same situation pertained in other Turkish armies. Gardīzī {*fl.* mid-fifth/eleventh century} reports that during a battle between Maḥmūd of Ghazna and the Qarakhānids, Maḥmūd's troops began to sing Turkish songs when they saw the Turkmen (Barthold, *Turkestan*, {English trans., p. 273, "Maḥmūd's soldiers 'sang a Turkish song to a Khotanese melody'; on hearing the sounds the Turks threw themselves in terror into the river, where part were drowned"}).

32 For these works, see Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī's *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* {(Istanbul, 1333–5/1915–17), English trans. Robert Dankoff and James Kelly as *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects* (Cambridge, MA, 1982–5)} written in 1077 {he began it in 464/1072 and completed it in 469/1077}.

33 The *Oghuz menkabesi*, which had long been well known among the Turks, survives in two main written versions. One is a piece written in the Uighur alphabet far from Islamic influence. It reveals the earlier form of this legend (Radloff, ed. *Das Kudatku-Bilik*, vol. 1, pp. x–xiii). The Islamic form is first mentioned by Rashīd al-Dīn {d. 718/1318}, the vizier of Ghazan Khān, in his *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*, and from there was transmitted to other works. If we take into consideration the similarity between the Uighur text and the version recorded by Rashīd al-Dīn and the fact that Rashīd al-Dīn had recourse to early Turkish sources while composing his work, we can conclude that this and similar legends have been recorded and written down from a very early period.

Indeed, before the appearance of the Ottomans, Abū Bakr ʿAbd Allāh al-Dawādārī, an official of the Egyptian {Mamlūk} ruler Muḥammad Qalāwūn {678–89/1279–80}, says in his *Durar al-tījān* that there were two ancient sacred books, the *Ulu Han Ata Bitigji* of the Qipchaqs and Mongols and the *Oghuznāme* of the other Turks. He states that he saw a copy of the *Oghuznāme* that had first been translated from Turkish into Persian and then later, in 211/826–7, was translated into Arabic by Jibrāʾīl b. Bakhtīshūʿ, the chief physician of Hārūn al-Rashīd. It had come from the treasury of Abū Muslim al-Khurāsānī. According to the information provided by this author, the work contained such things as the legends of "Ulug Karadağ," "Altun-Han," "Ulu Ay Atajı," "Ulu Ay Anajı," "Türkler yemini," "Chojuk," and "Arslan." It seems clear that *Kitab-ı Dede Korkut* {Book of Dede Korkut} was a later extract from this *Oghuznāme*, and that the Islamic version found in the work of Rashīd al-Dīn and the *Oghuz menkabesi* surviving in an Uighur text derived from the same source. Hence it is clear that the *Oghuznāme* is not, as some believe, a history, but a collection of legends. The *Jām-i jam āyīn*, which was said by its author {Beyâtî Shaikh Mahmûd} to have been compiled from the *Oghuznāme*, is confirmation of this. In fact, already a century ago, J. Klaproth mentioned the striking unity in the Chinese and Persian accounts of the Turks as evidence for the existence of early Uighur chronicles recording all such legends and traditions. For additional information on the *Oghuznāme*, see Chapter 7, section G below. {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Oghuz-nāma" (Irène Mélikoff).}

Map 1 Central Asia and Iran in the twelfth century.

2

THE LEGENDARY LIFE OF AḤMAD YASAWĪ

It seems that every personality who leaves a strong impression on the popular imagination has legends created about him even while he is still alive. Over the centuries, as they pass from generation to generation, these legends grow larger and larger until it is difficult to distinguish the true character of the original personality. In the Orient in particular, the Ṣūfīs had such a powerful influence on the popular imagination that with each passing century new legends were fabricated about them while each day more was forgotten about their true historical characters. Because the early Oriental historians were not able, for the most part, to distinguish history from legend, they simply transferred to their books verbatim the fanciful accounts that had been created in the popular imagination. Therefore, although my ultimate goal is to try to establish the historical character of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, I will first describe the legendary personality that tradition has handed down to us. Being a creation of the social consciousness, this personality, even if it does not correspond to the historical personality, has great social value and is worthy of study.

A His childhood

In the city of Sairām in Turkistan {Sairām is just east of Shymkent in modern Kazakhstan}, there was a shaikh named Shaikh Ibrāhīm, a descendant of ʿAlī. When he died, he left a grown daughter named Gawhar Shahnāz and a seven-year-old boy named Aḥmad.[1] From the time he was very young, Aḥmad received various manifestations {of God's grace} and displayed extraordinary qualities that belied his age. In his work entitled *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, he recounts successively, in a language appropriate to the Ṣūfīs, the spiritual powers that he had received.[2] At age seven, when he was orphaned by the loss of his father, Aḥmad, who since childhood had received the guidance of Khaḍir {a popular figure in Muslim legend, often identified with Elijah, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "al-Khaḍir" (A. J. Wensinck); Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *İslâm-Türk inançlarında Hızır yahut Hızır-İlyâs kültü* (Ankara, 1985); and Patrick Franke, *Begegnungen mit Khidr* (Beirut, 2000)}, was raised by another, spiritual father. This was Shaikh "Bābā Arslan" {Köprülü subsequently refers to him as Arslan Bābā}, one of the Companions of the Prophet. Guided

by spiritual direction {*mânevî işâretiyle*} from the Prophet, he went to Sairām to become Aḥmad's teacher.[3]

According to legend, Arslan Bābā was one of the foremost Companions {of the Prophet}. One well known report states that he lived to age 400, and another to age 700. His traveling to Turkistan and being charged to teach Aḥmad Yasawī were based on spiritual direction. It seems that during one of the Prophet's military expeditions, his noble Companions came to him hungry and pleaded for something to eat. The Prophet uttered a prayer and {the angel} Gabriel brought a dish of dates from paradise. One of the dates fell on the ground, whereupon Gabriel said, "This date is the portion of a member of your religious community named Aḥmad Yasawī." Because anything held in trust was naturally to be given to its owner {cf. Koran IV:58}, the Prophet proposed to his Companions that one of them undertake this duty. But none of them responded except for Arslan Bābā, who said that by apostolic favor he would be able to undertake this task. The Prophet then put the fallen date into Arslan Bābā's mouth with his own hand and added a bit of his own blessed saliva. A covering immediately formed over the date and the Prophet instructed Arslan Bābā how he would find Aḥmad Yasawī and commanded him to devote himself to his education.[4] Arslan Bābā then went to Sairām (or Yasī) and, after completing there the task that he had taken upon himself, died the following year. It is recorded in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* that "the Angel of Death took his soul, the *ḥūrīs* {female denizens of paradise} cut out a shroud from silk garments, and 70,000 weeping angels appeared and transported him to paradise."[5]

By age seven, Aḥmad Yasawī had already advanced through a series of high spiritual stages and then, under the direction of Arslan Bābā, the young Aḥmad reached a high level of maturity and slowly began to win fame from every quarter. His father Shaikh Ibrāhīm had already been renowned in that region for performing countless miracles {s. *karāma*} and many legends were told of him.[6] Consequently, it was recognized that, with respect to his lineage as well, this quiet and unassuming young boy, who always did his sister's bidding, held a spiritually important position. Around that time an extraordinary event occurred that spread Aḥmad's fame throughout Turkistan. A ruler named Yasawī was ruling as sultan in Transoxiana and Turkistan. He spent the winters in Samarqand and the summers in the mountains of Turkistan. Like all Turkish rulers, he was fond of hunting and used to pass the time in this pursuit in the mountains of Turkistan. One summer he wanted to go hunting on Qarachuq Mountain, but because it was so rugged, he gave up hope of doing so. He was never able to hunt on Qarachuq.[7] Consequently, he wanted to get rid of the mountain. He gathered together all the friends of God {i.e. the saints} in the lands that he ruled and requested them to remove this mountain by the blessing of their prayers. The saints of Turkistan agreed to the ruler's request. They wrapped themselves in *iḥrāms* {the garb of pilgrims going to Mecca} and for three days prayed and pleaded for this mountain to disappear. Contrary to expectation, however, all their prayers were in vain. Searching for the reason, they asked,

"Was there anyone among the *ʿārifs* {those who have knowledge of God} and saints of the country who did not come?" It turned out that Shaikh Ibrāhīm's son Aḥmad Yasawī had not been summoned because he was still very young. They immediately sent men to Sairām to summon him. The boy consulted with his older sister and she said to him, "Our father had some testamentary advice {for you}. The thing that will show whether or not your time to appear has come is a table cloth that is tied {in a knot} in our father's place of worship. If you can untie it, then go ahead {in response to the ruler's summons}, for that means the time of your appearance has come." The boy then went to the place of worship and untied the table cloth. This meant that his time to appear had come. He immediately took the table cloth and went to the city of Yasī.[8] All the saints were present there. He indicated {they should} pray over a piece of bread that was on the cloth. They agreed and recited the *Fātiḥa* {opening *sūra* of the Koran}. He divided the bread among those who were assembled and there was enough for everyone. There were 99,000 people present composed of the saints, the ruler's officers {*umarā'*}, and troops. When they saw this miracle, they had a better understanding of the greatness of Aḥmad Yasawī. {Meanwhile} Aḥmad Yasawī expected that the answer to his prayer was inside his father's dervish cloak. Suddenly, torrents of rain burst from the sky and all the land was flooded. When the prayer rugs of the shaikhs began to float on the waves, they pleaded and cried out. Aḥmad Yasawī stuck his head from the cloak. The storm immediately subsided and the sun appeared. And what should they see! Qarachuq Mountain had disappeared. Where the mountain once stood there is now a town called Qarachuq, where most of Aḥmad's descendants reside. The ruler Yasawī, who had witnessed this miracle, entreated Aḥmad to ensure that his name would remain on earth until the Day of Judgment. Aḥmad accepted his wish and said, "Whoever in the world loves me, may he recall me together with your name." Thus, from that day forward, he has been called "Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī."[9]

B His fame

The books of legends {*manāqib*} agree {Köprülü assumes this} in stating that Aḥmad Yasawī went to Bukhārā for a while on the advice of Arslan Bābā and attached himself to Shaikh Yūsuf Hamadānī, that city's most renowned spiritual guide, and that after his death he spent some time in Bukhārā carrying out religious propaganda {*halkı dâvete meşgûl*} and then, commending all of his companions to Khwāja ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī, went to Yasī on the spiritual direction of the Prophet.[10] While recounting successively, in a Ṣūfī manner, the kinds of spiritual manifestations that he exhibited between ages seven and fifty, Aḥmad Yasawī says in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* "that he fell in love {spiritually, i.e. with God} at age twenty-six, that he fought on behalf of the divine countenance {*dīdār*} like Manṣūr {al-Ḥallāj}, that he suffered various torments because he was not able to find a *pīr*, and that he finally found a *pīr* at age twenty-seven and then he escaped from his torments, and that it was then that he could be worthy

of that dervish convent." Indeed, one of the *ḥikmats* {religious poems} has the following refrain: "My great teacher, I came to take refuge with you" {*Zâtı ulu hoca'm, sana sığnıp geldim*}. One could guess that this refers to Yūsuf Hamadānī and that Aḥmad attached himself to him at age twenty-seven.[11]

Aḥmad Yasawī was occupied continuously with teaching and providing guidance in the town of Yasī. The number of disciples who gathered around him increased daily and his fame gradually spread throughout Turkistan, Transoxiana, Khurāsān, and Khwārazm. He was superior to all the saints of his time in both exoteric and esoteric knowledge. He lectured to his disciples on both types of knowledge. He spent {virtually} all his time worshipping God and doing pious acts. In his free time, he carved spoons and ladles and sold them to earn a living {Köprülü takes this from Bektashī lore without citation}. He always kept company with Khaḍir, who had been his father's old companion. Indeed, one day, Khaḍir said to Aḥmad, "I travel the seven climes seven times a day searching for a companion and there is no companion more capable and finer than you."[12] Aḥmad would not accept a single morsel from the endless gifts and votive offerings that were donated to his *tekke* {this term was not used in Central Asia}. Every day {word of} his saintly powers spread a little further among the people. "It is reported that the celebrated *khwāja* {master} had an ox. It would go about the city market with a saddle bag {on its back} in which spoons, ladles, and begging bowls were visible. Those who wanted to purchase them would take a certain amount {of these goods} and leave what they cost in the saddle bag. The ox would wander about every day until nightfall. Then it would go to the *khwāja*. He would take the contents {of the bag} in his blessed hand. If someone were to take something from the saddle bag without paying for it, the ox would follow him and would not go to another quarter {of the city} until he had returned the merchandise or paid for it."[13]

According to tradition, the *erens* {saints} of Khurāsān held Aḥmad Yasawī in high esteem, but they didn't realize the true magnitude of his greatness. One day they decided to hold a large assembly and invite the *khwāja* to it. One of them took the form of a crane and set out to inform the *khwāja*. Learning of this matter through his inner power, the *khwāja* told his disciples that seven saints were coming and took some of his dervishes with him {to meet them}. He also took the form of a crane and came out to greet the saints. At a large river on the border of Samarqand, the two groups met. The *erens* of Khurāsān were amazed and humbled by the *khwāja's* power. While they were all together, the *khwāja* looked at the river. A merchant was crossing it with all of his goods and animals. Suddenly, the water swept them all away. The merchant vowed that if he were rescued he would donate half of his goods {to his rescuer}. Hearing this, the *khwāja* immediately stretched out his hand and saved the merchant. He then immediately changed form and assumed the attire of an ordinary man. The merchant immediately clasped the hand of his rescuer and gave him half of his goods. Aḥmad took this merchandise and wealth and went to Khurāsān where he gave all of it away to the *erens*. He thus became the object of boundless reverence.[14]

As the fame of Aḥmad Yasawī spread and the number of his disciples grew into the thousands, the number of his opponents and rivals, of course, also increased. These hypocrites finally ventured a grave slander. Supposedly, women who did not cover themselves were attending the *khwāja's majlis* {religious assembly, course of instruction} and mingled with men in the *dhikr* {Ṣūfī séance}. The religious scholars of Khurāsān and Transoxiana, who strictly abided by the stipulations of Islamic law {*Sharīʿa*}, sent an investigator to determine if there was any truth to this rumor. The information that he collected made it clear that this was simply a case of slander. Still, Aḥmad Yasawī wanted to teach them a lesson. One day, while sitting in a *majlis* with his disciples, he brought out an inkstand closed with a seal. Addressing the whole congregation he said, "Who among the saints has never, since reaching the age of discretion, touched a woman with his right hand?" No one was able to answer. While the shaikh was saying this, one of his disciples, Jalāl Ata, stepped forward. Aḥmad Yasawī put the inkstand in his hand and sent him in care of it with the investigators to the countries of Transoxiana and Khurāsān. All the religious scholars and upholders of Islamic law in those countries got together and opened the inkstand. Inside were a fire and some cotton, neither of which had any effect on the other. The fire did not burn the cotton nor did the cotton extinguish the fire. At that moment, the religious scholars, who had sent out the investigators when the *khwāja* was under suspicion, understood the lesson that he wanted to give them in all its clarity. Even if men and women gather in a meeting of the people of God and attend the *dhikr* and worship together, God Almighty is able to cleanse their hearts of all spite and enmity. All the scholars were exceedingly ashamed and fearful and they tried to get their offense forgiven by sending gifts and votive offerings.[15]

C His *khalīfas*

Aḥmad Yasawī had 99,000 disciples who came from the four corners of the world.[16] According to another tradition, he had 12,000 "dervish disciples who were initiates of his sainthood, had the power to perform miracles, and who were perfect and excellent {in all respects}" {*velâyet-meâb, kerâmât-iktisâb, kâmil, mükemmel ashâb-ı suffası vardı ki*}, and who never left his presence. Not included among them were the *khalīfas* and shaikhs who were sent in all directions under his guidance and by his permission. The following were his leading *khalīfas*: Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend Zarnūqī, Sulaimān Ḥakīm Ata, Bābā Māchīn, Amīr ʿAlī Ḥakīm, Ḥasan Bulghānī, Imām Marghuḍī, and Shaikh ʿUthmān Maghribī.[17] The attachment of some of them to Aḥmad Yasawī came about in a very unusual manner. For example, before Bābā Māchīn joined Aḥmad Yasawī, he was, at age 400, a famous saint from among the Ṣūfī leaders of Khurāsān. Every day, in plain view, he would fly a distance of 24 parasangs {this is from the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*}. Deluded by the spiritual level that he had attained, he was about to reprove Aḥmad Yasawī for having men and women together in his *majlis*. On

Aḥmad Yasawī's order, however, Ḥakīm Ata and Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend seized him and, tying him tightly to a column of the *tekke*, gave him 500 blows. But they had no effect, so they beat him again. A mark became visible on his back and he began to weep. They then untied him from the column and he paid allegiance to his excellency the *pīr* and repented. "A powerful *jinn* {invisible beings, harmful or helpful, that interfere in the lives of mortals}," they said, "had settled on Bābā Māchīn's back. Every day, he {the *jinn*} used to fly a distance of some parasangs {carrying Bābā Māchīn}. Hurt by the 500 blows, he finally left Bābā Māchīn's back and fled. The last blow therefore struck Bābā Māchīn and thus he was saved." Afterwards, Bābā Māchīn underwent 40 days of penitence {*arbaʿīn*} and solitary religious devotions {*khalwa*}. In fact, he retired privately with Aḥmad Yasawī three times. Eventually, he became one of the most {spiritually} advanced of the shaikh's famous *khalīfas*.[18]

Another important *khalīfa* was Imām Marghuḍī (or Marghaḍī, Marwazī, i.e. from Marw {rather, Marghuzī, as in other works by Ḥazīnī, which may refer to Marghah near Marw}). At first, he did not want to admit to the greatness of the *khwāja*, but later he could not escape his magnetism. At the time when the *khwāja's* fame was spreading in all directions, four students from Yasī settled in the city of Urgench in the land of Khwārazm to study. Imām Marghuḍī was the most renowned and learned professor {*mudarris*} in Urgench. These students naturally went to his lectures. When the Imām learned where the students were from, he said to them, "We have heard that in Yasī Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī is behaving contrary to the *Sharīʿa*. I wonder if there is any truth to this rumor." In response to this grave question, the young students said that they knew nothing about the matter, only that the *khwāja* was a pious man and an upholder of the *Sharīʿa* and that he had 12,000 dervish disciples. The Imām could not allay his doubts and decided to go there himself and try to learn {the truth of} this matter. Saying, "Up to now, I have memorized 12,000 *mas'alas* {points of law}. Surely I can go and ascertain {the truth of} this matter," he set out on the road taking with him 400 eminent legal scholars {s. *dānishmand*} and 40 *muftīs* {those who give formal legal opinions}. While this caravan was en route, Aḥmad Yasawī, with the help of God, learned what was happening and said to his first *khalīfa* Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend, "Go see what is coming to us over the horizon!" Ṣūfī Muḥammad informed him that Imām Marghuḍī was coming with 3000 *mas'alas* in his memory. On the order of the shaikh, Ṣūfī Muḥammad then erased 1000 of those *mas'alas* from the memory of the Imām. Later, he also asked Sulaimān Ḥakīm Ata the same question. He said that Imām Marghuḍī of Khwārazm had set out with 3000 *mas'alas*, but 1000 had been removed, so now he was coming with the remaining 2000 *mas'alas*. Aḥmad Yasawī ordered him to erase 1000 more and he did so. Thus when the Imām arrived in Yasī only 1000 *mas'alas* remained in his memory. When Imām Marghuḍī saw Aḥmad Yasawī, the latter was wearing an old fur inside out on his back and a black conical hat made of sheep skin on his head, and he asked him, "Are you the one who leads God's slaves astray?" Unperturbed, Aḥmad Yasawī replied that the Imām would

first be his guest for three days and that afterwards they would be able to discuss matters. Three days later, they brought out a chair, which the Imām sat in. The shaikh ordered Ḥakīm Ata to erase his remaining 1000 *mas'alas*. Seated in the professorial chair, Imām Marghuḍī could not remember a single *mas'ala*. He leafed through his notebooks page by page, but every page was completely blank. He then realized his own fault and got off the chair. He begged the shaikh's forgiveness, and in the company of all his legal scholars and *muftīs*, was initiated into the order. After five years of retiring for solitary religious devotions, spending forty-day periods of penitence, and undergoing severe mortification of the flesh, he completed all stages {of spiritual development}. Finally, Aḥmad Yasawī sent him and five of his other *khalīfas* to carry out religious propaganda among, and instruct, the people of Khurāsān. These five were Shaikh Muḥammad Baghdādī, Saif al-Dīn Bākharzī, Shaikh Kamāl Shaibānī, Shaikh Sa'd al-Dīn, and Shaikh Bahā' al-Dīn.[19]

D *Chilla-khāne*

Since childhood, Aḥmad Yasawī had never fallen short in his attachment to any *sunna* {a saying or action} of the Prophet. Consequently, because the Prophet migrated from this transitory world at the age of 63, Aḥmad Yasawī wished to be buried as soon as he reached that age because he was attached to this *sunna*. At one side of the *tekke*, they dug a pit into which one could descend by a ladder. They cleared a path and built a cell from crude sun-dried bricks. Thanks to the spiritual succor of {the prophets} Ilyās {Elias} and Khaḍir, nothing has disturbed that structure for hundreds of years. Aḥmad Yasawī dug out a place there in the shape of a sarcophagus and made it his abode. The more he chanted religious formulas or prayers in that tight place, which resembled a sarcophagus, the more his knees rubbed against his breasts until both were worn through. For this reason, they called them سرحلقهٔ سینه ریشان {Chief of the Heart-Wounded}.[20] According to one report, Aḥmad Yasawī remained in that place until age 120, according to another until age 133,[21] and according to another, in circulation today in Yasī, until age 125; {in any case} he spent the rest of his life in that tight narrow *chilla-khāne* {place where religious devotees shut themselves up, lit. place of 40 (days)} exactly like the *aṣḥāb-i qubūr* {people of the tombs, i.e. the dead} engaged in mortification of the flesh and worshipping God.[22]

Even while he was living in this *chilla-khāne*, there was no end to the miracles that Aḥmad Yasawī performed. One day "that place of worship, which was like a sarcophagus, left a kind of fire and thirst in the bellies of the dervishes and mystics, and this made those in the *majlis* anxious. Ḥakīm Ata was enjoined to provide them with water. As he rose to get the water, the sound of streaming water reached his ears. Amazed, he turned around and looked. The center of the *majlis* was like an oven or the stokehold of a bath. Flames were everywhere and the mystics and dervishes were roasting in that fire. Ḥakīm Ata stood there overwhelmed and delirious {at the sight}. At that moment Aḥmad Yasawī

suddenly appeared with a drinking glass in his hand. He plunged the drinking glass into the fire and gave everyone there a drink. Ḥakīm Ata, who drank water from that glass, reported 'It was sweet as honey and cold as snow.' In this manner, the thirst of those in the *majlis* abated and then the shaikh of shaikhs lowered the palm of his hand over the fire and it immediately disappeared. By the wisdom of God, however, an earthen jar appeared. The Yasawīs call it '*khum-i 'ishq*' {the jar of love} and use it to derive omens. If one's wish is to be granted, the wisher's hand, no matter how short his arm, reaches the bottom and grasps a stone, a piece of straw, or the like. On the other hand, if the wish is not to be granted, the hand of the seeker, no matter how long his arm, cannot reach the bottom."[23]

Another legend describes an incident between a ruler named Qāzān Khān and Aḥmad Yasawī. Qāzān Khān noticed that Aḥmad Yasawī did not come to the mosque for Friday prayer and sent word to him about this via the shaikh's chief confidant Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend Zarnūqī. At that moment, the call was being given from the minaret for the Friday prayer. Quickly and fearfully, Ṣūfī Muḥammad entered the shaikh's presence and was told, "Oh, Ṣūfī Muḥammad, come! Stick with me! Let us go together to the Friday prayer." Ṣūfī Muḥammad obeyed the *khwāja's* command. Instantly, he found himself sitting in a row inside a mosque. As soon as the Friday prayer was finished, Ṣūfī Muḥammad, bewildered by this extraordinary event, looked for the shaikh but could not find him. He went in and out of the mosque door seven times without success. The caretaker of the mosque was cognizant of this mystery, however, and said to Ṣūfī Muḥammad, "Hey there, dervish! This place is Cairo and this mosque is the Mosque of al-Azhar. The friend for whom you search has performed the Friday prayer for a long time now." After spending a week there, Ṣūfī Muḥammad found his shaikh and immediately was returned to his cell. The *khwāja* ordered him to go and relate what he had seen. Ṣūfī Muḥammad came {back to Qāzān Khān} and recounted everything that had happened to him. The muezzins, however, had not yet finished making the call to prayer. Qāzān Khān and those in his retinue then properly understood the greatness of the *khwāja*.[24]

The people of the town of Ṣūrī (Savrān, Sabrān {Ṣūrī and Savrān/Ṣabrān are two different toponyms})[25] in the environs of Yasī had concentrated their hatred of the people of Yasī especially on the person of Aḥmad Yasawī. As the fame of Aḥmad Yasawī spread abroad, they became enraged. Finally, they hatched a plot by which they could accuse him of theft. They butchered a cow and secretly took it to the *tekke*, where they left it. Because it was the summer season, the disciples were spending time outside. Thus no one saw the butchered cow. Early the next morning, on the pretext of searching for their cow, the people of Ṣūrī gathered in front of the *tekke* and told the shaikh that they wanted to look inside. Addressing these hypocrites, Aḥmad Yasawī said, "Enter, curs! Enter, dogs!" They went inside, but by the wisdom of God they were all immediately transformed into dogs and began to eat the cow, which they had butchered and

placed inside the *tekke*. Their friends, who were observing all this from outside, became terribly frightened and immediately repented and begged the shaikh for forgiveness. The others were immediately returned to human form except for their tails, which remained in place as a memento of their evil deed and were passed on to all of their descendants.[26]

Despite all the spiritual blows that they suffered, the people of Ṣūrī simply could not refrain from fighting against the *khwāja*. The *khwāja* had a son named Ibrāhīm and also a beautiful horse. He said, "Whoever should bring word of the death of my son, I will give him this horse in thanks."[27] The people of Ṣūrī learned of this. One day, they found Shāhzāde Ibrāhīm sleeping beneath a tree. They cut off his head, wrapped it in a towel, and laid it before the *khwāja*. The *khwāja* asked those who brought it, "What's this?" They said it was a gift of fresh melon. Although the *khwāja* understood what was going on, he nevertheless gave the murderer that horse and also his daughter so that no blood feud would remain between them nor would any hatred or blood money ensue. According to the account of Ḥazīnī, Shaikh {Farīd al-Dīn} ʿAṭṭār reported this anecdote in his book *Manṭiq al-ṭair*. Now, every year blood is seen flowing from the place below the tree where Ibrāhīm was murdered. The *khwāja's* disciples and those who believe in him take that blood and, with God's permission, use it to cure all sorts of illnesses.[28] Among the Yasawī dervishes, there are many oral traditions like this about the *khwāja*.

E The miracles he performed after his death

Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī died after spending a long life in his *chilla-khāne*. Nevertheless, he continued to perform miracles. Of these countless miracles, only a few were able to pass into the histories and books of legends. For example, according to one old legend, Tīmūr's {Tamerlane} building of a *türbe* and mosque over the *khwāja's* grave was the result of one of the *khwāja's* miracles. The work entitled *Risāla-i tawārīkh-i bulghāriyya* records this legend in the following manner: "Finally, His Excellency Amīr Tīmūr intended to go to Bukhārā with Khaḍir, peace be upon him. On the way, he stopped in Turkistan {i.e. Yasī}. Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī of Turkistan appeared in Amīr Tīmūr's dream and said, 'Here there, brave young man! Go quickly to Bukhārā! God willing, the death of the ruler {*shāh*} there is in your hands, and many things are bound to happen to you. In any case, all the people of Bukhārā are waiting for you.' Amīr Tīmūr awoke from this dream and thanked God. The next day he summoned Nūghāibāq {Noghay Beg} Khān, the ruler of Turkistan, and gave him a lot of money to build a shrine at the tomb of Aḥmad Yasawī. As instructed, the ruler of Turkistan built an ornate shrine that still stands in all its beauty."[29]

We know from other sources, in fact, that Tīmūr believed very much in Aḥmad Yasawī. Indeed, when he marched to Anatolia to wage war against Sultan Bayezid I {1402}, he took omens from the *khwāja's maqāmāt* {"assemblies," a literary genre}.[30]

Naqshbandī tradition attributes the fact that the famous Sultan Abū Saʿīd Mīrzā {r. 1451–69}, of the Tīmūrid dynasty, was honored by the favor of Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh {Aḥrār} to a miracle of Aḥmad Yasawī. At a time when Sultan Abū Saʿīd Mīrzā had still no reputation or fame, Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh wrote his name on a piece of paper and inserted it in his turban. His disciples asked him who this Abū Saʿīd Mīrzā was. He answered, "The man who will be my ruler, your ruler, and the ruler of Taskhkent, Samarqand, and Khurāsān!" In fact, a very short time later, this came about as follows: around that time, Sultan Abū Saʿīd Mīrzā had a dream in which Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh recited the *Fātiḥa* to him as instructed by Aḥmad Yasawī. Abū Saʿīd Mīrzā asked Aḥmad Yasawī the name of the *khwāja* who was reciting the *Fātiḥa* to him and learned who it was. When he awoke the next morning, he asked those in his retinue if they knew anyone named Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh. He learned that there was a shaikh with that name in Tashkent and immediately set out for that city. Eventually, he had an audience with the *khwāja* in Farkat and begged him for one *Fātiḥa*. The *khwāja* laughed and said, "The *Fātiḥa* is one {*Fâtiha bir olur*}."[31]

In *Jawāhir al-abrār*, there is a description of one of the *khwāja's* miracles concerning Humāyūn {the Mughal emperor, d. 1556}. Sayyid Manṣūr Ata, the author's shaikh and a *khalīfa* of the Yasawīs,[32] once went to Turkistan, i.e. Yasī, and, visiting the *khwāja's türbe*, spiritually had an audience with him. During the audience, Aḥmad Yasawī said, "The Chaghatay ruler – i.e. Humāyūn the son of Bābur – wants to capture Samarqand and take control of that country, but the good spirits {saints?} are not pleased with this and want to direct him toward India. Remove an *ʿalam* {standard, badge} from my *türbe* and take it for his victories in that region." Upon this order from the *khwāja*, Sayyid Manṣūr removed an *ʿalam* and went to Kabul, the center of Humāyūn's government. Indeed, Humāyūn wanted to take Samarqand, the burial place of his grandfather Tīmūr, and destroy the Chingizids. The ruler's brother, Hindāl Mīrzā met with Sayyid Manṣūr for a rather long time in Kabul and, realizing his greatness, became a disciple. When Hindāl Mīrzā went back to Humāyūn, he related to him what had happened to him. Humāyūn also had had a dream in which he saw a wonderful vision presaging this occurrence. They then summoned Sayyid Manṣūr. He came bringing the *ʿalam* that Aḥmad Yasawī had given him. The ruler received him. Then a *dhikr* circle was organized and verses {s. *manẓūma*} from the *ḥikmats* of the *pīrs* of Turkistan were recited. Those who were listening reached a state of ecstasy. Afterwards, he said to Humāyūn, "The saints of Transoxiana bring you good news of the conquest of India. His excellency Aḥmad Yasawī sent this for victory. Please accept it." Humāyūn was very pleased with this good news. He marched on India, invaded and captured it.[33] In this manner, Aḥmad Yasawī performed another great miracle.

In his *Jawāhir al-abrār*, Ḥazīnī describes another miracle of Aḥmad Yasawī that he cites from his shaikh Sayyid Manṣūr Ata {rather, Sayyid Manṣūr}. When Sayyid Manṣūr first saw Aḥmad Yasawī's *chilla-khāne*, he was very astonished how he had endured living in this very depressing, small and narrow place for

years. But suddenly, he looked around and noticed that one end of that *chilla-khāne* that he thought was very small was in the East and the other end was in the West! He realized that what he had previously thought was mistaken and he once again thoroughly understood that God never causes his beloved servants to suffer from distress. He could make a small and narrow place that was a few spans wide bigger than the whole world.[34]

An American traveler named Schuyler, who stopped in Yasī while journeying in Turkistan shortly after the Russian invasion, recorded another legend about Aḥmad Yasawī that was in circulation among the people there. According to this legend, Aḥmad Yasawī, while still alive, went up the minaret of the mosque of Hazret {i.e. Ḥaḍrat-i Turkistan}, took the white turban from his head, and showed it to the people. The people interpreted this to mean that the city would soon fall into the hands of the Russians and therefore they did not put up any resistance to the Russian army.[35] On the other hand, the same traveler writes that because that mosque was considered to be the holiest mosque in Central Asia, all the religious scholars and the populace gathered there before the Russian invasion and entreated God to drive away the enemy who was about to fall on them.[36] Furthermore, there is a very famous Noghay legend that presents Edigü, one of the ancient folk heroes of the Turks, as a descendant of Aḥmad Yasawī.[37] And in the famous legend of Satuk Bughrā Khān published by R. B. Shaw, there is mentioned a ritual that was held at the *türbe* of Sulṭān Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī.[38]

There are many such legends concerning the miracles that Aḥmad Yasawī performed while he was alive and after his death. If we consider the profound spiritual influence that he exerted, not just in Central Asia and among the Northern Turks {this expression is no longer used} and the Qirghiz but in all the Turkish countries, then we can better understand the origin and nature of the legends concerning the many miracles that he performed even after his death.

F His *khalīfas* among the Qipchaqs

It can easily be seen from the *Risāla-i tawārīkh-i bulghāriyya*,[39] written by Ḥusām al-Dīn b. Sharaf al-Dīn {Muslimī} in 992/1584, that Aḥmad Yasawī enjoyed great fame among the Qipchaq Turks from a very early time and that the earliest shaikhs who appeared among them were directly or indirectly connected with him. In this work, which contains material of a legendary nature rather than of historical value, a number of the early shaikhs who were *khalīfas* of Aḥmad Yasawī are mentioned. One of them is Bayrāsh b. Ibrāsh Ṣūfī, an early shaikh of the Qazaqs. He was from the Jahriyya *ṭarīqa* and a student of Aḥmad Yasawī. He was sent to the region of the Bulghars on the shaikh's instructions. Ish-Muḥammad Tūq-Muḥammad-oghlu from the *avul* {nomadic settlement} of Aday-Chermish on the banks of the Buri River was a disciple of Bayrāsh Ṣūfī. Bayrāsh Ṣūfī was a shaikh for 36 years and attracted many disciples. He won fame under the byname Shaikh Bābā. After this famous representative of the

Jahriyya *ṭarīqa* in the north died, that entire region was without a *murshid* for a full 20 years. There was no longer anyone who knew the rules of the Ṣūfī way. During this time, Shaikh Hidāyat Allāh, a disciple of Aḥmad Yasawī, was in Yarkand at the head of the Jahriyya *ṭarīqa*. One of his Bulghar followers was Idrīs Dhū al-Muḥammad-oghlu from the *avul* of Terberdi Chāllı. He went to Yarkand and stayed with that shaikh for fifteen years. Twenty years after the death of Ṣūfī Ish-Muḥammad, Shaikh Hidāyat Allāh[40] sent Idrīs Khalīfa to the region of the Bulghars. Qāsim Shaikh Ibrāhīm-oghlu from Kazan was his *khalīfa*. In the *avul* of Bay Chura-Chermishi on the shore of the Aq-İdil {Volga} is the tomb of Khwāja Amīr Kalāl another disciple of Aḥmad Yasawī. This brief account clearly indicates the place of Aḥmad Yasawī among the Northern Turks.[41] In order to convey the significance of Aḥmad Yasawī among the Northern Turks, let me add that there is an oral legend in that region that even attributes to him the first use of tea among the Turks.[42]

The fact that we have so little information on the *khalīfas* of Aḥmad Yasawī who spread from the Qazaqs to the banks of the Volga results from the almost complete absence of documents that have survived from early times concerning the history of that region. Otherwise, we might have had considerable information on the legends and miracles of Aḥmad Yasawī's disciples along the banks of the Volga. While simple and general works, like {the anonymous} *Sharā'iṭ al-īmān*, which are very widespread in that area, show that the *khwāja* is still important for the {local} people, it is also clear from the famous *Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı* that a number of legends about Yasawī dervishes have been current there for a long time.[43]

G *Khalīfas* in the lands of the Western Turks {Rūm Diyārı}

According to tradition, the spiritual influence of Aḥmad Yasawī continued for a long time in all of the Balkans {Rumelia}, Asia Minor, Azerbaijan – in short, among the Western Turks generally – as a great many dervishes who claimed to be attached to him gradually began to enter those regions. In the various countries to which he traveled, Evliyā Chelebi {d. *c.*1685} visited the *türbes* of a number of saints who were considered to be connected with Aḥmad Yasawī and he lists them one by one:[44] Avshar Bābā, whose *türbe* in Niyāz-ābād was a place of pilgrimage;[45] Pīr Dede, who was buried in, and had a *tekke* in, Merzifon;[46] Akyazılı, whose great *tekke* was in the Bat-ova plain on the Black Sea coast and whose legends were famous;[47] Kademli Bābā Sulṭān, who was buried in Adatepe on the Filibe road;[48] Geyikli Bābā, who was buried in Bursa;[49] Abdāl Mūsā;[50] and Horos Dede, who was buried in Unkapanı {in Istanbul}.[51] All of them were *khalīfas* of Aḥmad Yasawī. In addition to the *faqīrs* of Aḥmad Yasawī who are mentioned by Evliyā Chelebi, the historian 'Ālī mentions someone named Amīr Chīn Osman in a series of shaikhs from the reign of Sultan Orhan. Another *khalīfa* of Aḥmad Yasawī, he went to Rūm after 600/1203–4 and built a famous

tekke, called the Osman Bābā Tekke, in the vicinity of the *sancak* {district} of Bozok.[52] Evliyā Chelebi, who says in various places in his book that he {himself} was a descendant of Aḥmad Yasawī, also describes the *tekkes* and tombs of two other Yasawī *khalīfas* who went to Rūm. One was the *tekke* of Shaikh Nuṣrat. It was located on the plain of Zile, which was north of Arık-ova and just past Çamlıbel. Shaikh Nuṣrat, who was from Khurāsān, had once gone to this place in Rūm on the order of his *pīr* {Aḥmad Yasawī}. Evliyā Chelebi says that his extensive and flourishing *tekke* had about 70 *faqīrs* and all the people in the region believed in the shaikh. Indeed, in front of the *tekke* stood an ancient mulberry tree that was used as a cure for fever (*Seyāḥatnāme*, Book 3, fo. 91a; {Evliyā explains that they used a splinter from the bark of the rotted part of the trunk to make a fumigatory}). The second *tekke* was that of Gajgaj {rather, Gıjgıj} Dede in Tokat, located on a small mountain that overlooked the city, a place to which people made excursions. When Evliyā Chelebi visited this *tekke*, it had a few dervishes who were satisfied with very little. The founder of the *tekke* was Gıjgıj Dede, a saintly disciple of Aḥmad Yasawī, who had gone to this place on his master's instruction. He took the name Gıjgıj "because he looked terrifying and roared (*gıjılda-*) like a dragon" (*ibid.*, Book 5, fo. 21b).

H The Bektashī tradition

It is fairly clear from the reports of Evliyā Chelebi that the early arrival among the Western Turks of a number of dervishes connected with the Yasawī *ṭarīqa* – which is definitely confirmed before the tenth/sixteenth century {Köprülü apparently assumes this} – resulted in the creation of a Bektashī legend about Aḥmad Yasawī and Ḥājjī Bektash. Only in books that were written in the tenth/sixteenth or subsequent centuries – like {'Ālī's} *Kunh al-akhbār* and Evliyā Chelebi's *Seyāḥatnāme* – does one come across stories that Ḥājjī Bektash was a disciple of Aḥmad Yasawī. This fact confirms the accuracy of the report that 'Āshıq Pasha-Zāde gives about Ḥājjī Bektash.[53] In any case, not a single word is to be found on the relationship of Ḥājjī Bektash with Aḥmad Yasawī in either 'Āshıq Pasha-Zāde or Tashköprü-Zāde.[54] Nevertheless, whatever its historicity, the Bektashī tradition {i.e. the *Velāyetnāme*}, which, as mentioned, took form in the tenth/sixteenth century {more likely in the late ninth/fifteenth century}, provides considerable legendary material on Aḥmad Yasawī. If it is combined with the reports by the historian 'Ālī and Evliyā Chelebi, it clearly shows that Aḥmad Yasawī had exerted a great influence on the Western Turks for a long time. Therefore, in order to complete {our treatment of} the legendary life of Aḥmad Yasawī, we must describe his place in Bektashī tradition.

Present-day Bektashī tradition is still, for a variety of reasons, in a state of disorder. The various hagiographies (*velāyetnāmes*) that were written about Ḥājjī Bektash, and later about his many disciples, sometimes differ greatly from each other. In the *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjim Sulṭān*, for example, it is stated that Ḥājjī Bektash was a direct *khalīfa* of Aḥmad Yasawī, while in the complete prose copies of the

Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash and the fifth volume of {ʿĀlī's} *Kunh al-akhbār* it is related that Ḥājjī Bektash was a disciple of Shaikh Luqmān-i Paranda and that this Luqmān-i Paranda received permission to initiate people into Ṣūfism from Aḥmad Yasawī or, according to another, rather weak, report from the *khwāja*'s ancestor, the famous ʿAlid Muḥammad Ḥanafī {i.e. Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya}. Thus, the legendary accounts that in the *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjim Sulṭān*, for instance, take place directly between Aḥmad Yasawī and Ḥājjī Bektash are shown in other works as taking place between Luqmān-i Paranda and Ḥājjī Bektash. Furthermore, the *velāyetnāmes* of Ḥājjī Bektash that contain the latter version of this story also record a number of legends that directly involve Aḥmad Yasawī and Ḥājjī Bektash.[55]

According to one legend in the *velāyetnāmes* of Ḥājjī Bektash, Bektash Veli was presented to Shaikh Luqmān-i Paranda for his education while he was still a child. Luqmān-i Paranda was a *khalīfa* of Aḥmad Yasawī and was a man thoroughly versed in exoteric and esoteric religious knowledge. He was initiated into the *perendelik* {flying like a bird} by Aḥmad Yasawī, or, according to a report by Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya. Bektash Veli performed many miracles while still a child. One day when Luqmān-i Paranda entered his presence, he was amazed to see the room full of light. Looking around, he saw two luminous persons, one to the left and the other to the right of Bektash. They were teaching him to recite the Koran. As soon as Luqmān entered, they disappeared. Luqmān asked the boy, "Who were they?" He explained that one was the Prophet and the other was ʿAlī.[56] On another occasion, Bektash Veli was reciting a lesson for Luqmān. The time for prayer arrived and Luqmān asked his pupil for some water with which to perform the ablution. Bektash said to his teacher, "Why don't you arrange it so that a stream flows in here? Then there will be no need to go outside." When his teacher said that his own power did not suffice for this, Bektash Veli immediately prayed to God, and Luqmān-i Paranda said, "Amen." At that moment, a little stream emerged from the middle of the school and flowed toward the door, and some beautiful irises {*ṣūṣām*} bloomed at the source of the spring.[57]

A short time after this event, Luqmān went on the pilgrimage. He went up to ʿArafāt {a hill near Mecca} and while his disciples turned toward the *qibla* {direction of Mecca} he said to them, "Friends! Today is the day before the religious feast {*arefe günü*}. Now in our country foods[58] are being cooked!" These words, by the power of God, were made known to Bektash. Just then various dishes were being cooked in the shaikh's house. Bektash took a tray of the food and instantly served it to Luqmān. When they {Luqmān and his disciples} returned to Nīshāpūr, Luqmān told everyone of this miracle performed by the boy and gave him the byname Ḥājjī {"Pilgrim"}. At about that time, the *erens* of Khurāsān came to congratulate Luqmān on his pilgrimage. When they saw the stream flowing in the school, they were amazed and asked about it. Luqmān said, "This is a miracle of Ḥājjī Bektash" and he told the *erens* his numerous miracles one by one. The *erens* of Khurāsān thought that it was strange for such

extraordinary things to be done by a child. Ḥājjī Bektash, who was present, said to them, "I am a descendant of ʿAlī. Don't think such things are too much for me. They are a divine gift." The *erens* of Khurāsān then asked, "If you are the 'possessor of the mystery' where is your sign?" Ḥājjī Bektash showed them two green moles on the palm of his hand and on his forehead. They all were dumbfounded and finally had to concede his greatness.[59]

One day the *erens* of Khurāsān assembled and asked Ḥājjī Bektash who his *pīr* was. Ḥājjī Bektash replied that whoever spread a prayer rug over iris petals and prayed, he would become his disciple. They all laughed at this proposition and asked if he would be able to perform this miracle himself. When he performed this miracle for them as well, they all removed their garb from their heads. His teacher Luqmān also removed his. Saying, "*Allāhu akbar*" {God is most great}, Ḥājjī Bektash had them put their headgear back on. Around this time, Sulṭān Ibrāhīm-i Thānī died. They offered the {spiritual} sultanate to Ḥājjī Bektash, but he would not accept it. He left it to one of his uncles, Ḥasan, and withdrew, preferring to do religious exercises {*khalwa* and *ʿuzla*} at a place of worship. After reaching the age of discretion, he remained in this state for forty years.[60] After this, there is no longer any mention of the name Luqmān in the *Velāyetnāme*. Subsequently, we find Ḥājjī Bektash associated with the aged shaikh Aḥmad Yasawī.[61]

In the *Velāyetnāme*, Ḥājjī Bektash's meeting with Aḥmad Yasawī is presented in a very unusual manner. According to this legend, Aḥmad Yasawī was the saint of all Khurāsān and the shaikh of 99,000 disciples. Now, the territory of Badakhshān was completely in the hands of unbelievers who continuously raided the realm of Islam. Finally, the people {of Khurāsān} became tired of this and went to Aḥmad Yasawī, imploring him to help them. So he placed a *tāj* {"crown," dervish headgear} on the head of his son Ḥaidar,[62] who was only twelve years old, girded his waist with a sword and gave him horsetails and a standard. Ḥaidar then went to war with 5000 warriors. While sending his son, the shaikh for some reason failed to mention the name of God, and so his army was defeated. Ḥaidar was taken prisoner and all of his men were put to the sword. Ḥaidar spent seven years in prison and the people of Khurāsān were spared no sufferings from the unbelievers of Badakhshān. At last, they went to Aḥmad Yasawī and implored him to help them. He made a fervent silent prayer to God and suddenly Ḥājjī Bektash appeared at the gate of his *tekke*. He entered, saluted the Shaikh, and rubbed his face on the threshold. Aḥmad Yasawī was very glad and said, "Behold! The possessor of the Kingdom has come." After a meal, Aḥmad Yasawī recounted all that had occurred. Ḥājjī Bektash immediately turned into a falcon and flew away. Aḥmad Yasawī's disciples were angry that he had shown favor to that naked *abdāl* {dervish} and left the *tekke*. But Ḥājjī Bektash instantly appeared with Ḥaidar, whom he had rescued from prison, and handed him over to his father. All the dervishes then acknowledged his greatness.[63] Ḥājjī Bektash was not satisfied with this, however, and by performing many wonders he converted the people of Badakhshān to Islam.[64]

After this, Ḥājjī Bektash was no longer going to remain in Khurāsān. On the order and instruction of Aḥmad Yasawī, he was going to go to Rūm. But the *Velāyetnāme* explains at length that he acquired, by performing a number of miracles, some things that Aḥmad Yasawī had held in trust, i.e. the *tāj*, *khirqa* {dervish cloak}, *sofra* {table cloth}, and *sajjāda* {prayer rug}.[65] In this manner, Aḥmad Yasawī turned these things, which he had kept for years, over to their rightful owner, saying, "Oh, Ḥājjī Bektash, you have now received your lot {*nasibini aldın*}. Congratulations that you have the rank of the chief of the greatest saints {*quṭb al-aqṭāb*, "pole of poles"} and your authority will last forty years. Up to now authority has been mine. Henceforth, it is yours. In fact, the time for my death has come. Now then, go! I have sent you to Rūm and placed you at the head of the *abdāls* of Rūm and appointed you their leader."[66]

In the *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjim Sulṭān*, there is another legend that shows the relationship between Ḥājjī Bektash and Aḥmad Yasawī: "His excellency Sulṭān Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī had a wooden sword. He brought it out, pronounced '*Allāhu akbar*,' and girded the waist of Sulṭān Ḥājjī Bektash Veli of Khurāsān with it. In the hearth, wood from a mulberry tree was burning. He grabbed a half-burned piece of wood and flung it toward Rūm. Then he said, 'Be it known that I have sent this half-burned piece of wood in Khurāsān, as an *er*, to Rūm. Let them receive it in Rūm.'" So that piece of wood was hurling through the air. Meanwhile, in Konya, there was a saint known as Sulṭān Khwāja Faqīh. He seized the wood and planted it in front of his cell. By the power of God, the half-burned piece of wood began to grow. The top of it was burned, but the bottom was mulberry. Even now it is still bearing fruit. That night Ḥājjim Sulṭān and Ḥājjī Bektash Veli lay down on the prayer rug. A divine voice cried, 'Don't tarry! Go to Rūm!' They arose, performed the morning prayer, and completed their litanies, saying «فاينما تولوا فثم وجه اللّه» {Wherever you turn, there is the face of God, Koran 2:115} and prostrated themselves to the friend {Aḥmad Yasawī}. They requested permission {*ijāza*} from him. Then Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī b. Muḥammad Ḥanafī {i.e. Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya} b. 'Alī 'l-Murtaḍā and 99,000 *khalīfas* blessed them and at that hour on a blessed Wednesday they set out on the road to the Ka'ba."[67]

I The legend of Sarı Saltuk

It is clear from Evliyā Chelebi's researches that there must have been a great many more legends telling how the great saint of Turkistan, Aḥmad Yasawī, never forgot the Turks who went to Rūm and continuously sent them assistants. The "Sarı Saltuk legend," which has long been very famous among the Western Turks, is very suggestive in this respect. According to the form of the legend recorded by Evliyā Chelebi, Aḥmad Yasawī first sent Ḥājjī Bektash {to Rūm} and then sent Muḥammad Bukhārī, known under the byname Sarı Saltuk, to assist him with 700 *erens* of Khurāsān. Girding Sarı Saltuk's waist with his famous wooden sword, he gave him the following advice: "My Saltuk Muḥammad!

May my Bektash send you to Rūm. Disguise yourself as Sarı Saltuk, the heretic, in the country of Poland, and kill that cursed one with a wooden sword! Earn a name for yourself and fame in Macedonia, Dobruja, and the land of the seven kingdoms!" When Sarı Saltuk arrived in Rūm, Ḥājjī Bektash carried out his shaikh's order and sent him to Dobruja. Sarı Saltuk performed a great many miracles in that region. He captured many places and converted their inhabitants to Islam. Evliyā Chelebi visited the *tekke* of this Sarı Saltuk, whose legends he narrates at length, in Silistria on the Black Sea coast.[68]

J Conclusion

It is possible to reach some historical conclusions from the information that I have provided on the legendary life of Aḥmad Yasawī. Until confirmed by other historical evidence, however, these conclusions must be considered tentative {indeed, Köprülü's dating for the spread of Aḥmad Yasawī's legend in various regions is pure conjecture}. According to the information currently available, the legends about Aḥmad Yasawī spread to three major Turkish areas: Turkistan and Qazaqstan (eastern central region), along the Volga (northern region), and Anatolia and Rumelia (western region).

The legends in {Ḥazīnī's} *Jawāhir al-abrār*, which was written by a Yasawī dervish from Turkistan, and those that passed via the Qazaqs and spread to the Northern Turks, and which exist in old, very simple popular books, like the *Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı*, and the traditions that have been preserved to this day in the dervish convent in Yasī represent the oldest version of the Aḥmad Yasawī legend and are the closest to historical reality.[69] This influence passed through the region of the Qazaqs and from there went even as far as the old Bulghar Turks and left prominent traces among them. It is a pity that so few historical documents have survived from these Northern Turks. Consequently, we cannot adequately determine the form in which the legend of Aḥmad Yasawī spread among them. A number of works that have probably been in circulation among the Northern Turks since fairly early times, such as {Ḥusām al-Dīn Muslimī's} *Risāla-i tawārīkh-i bulghāriyya*, the famous {anonymous} *Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı*, *Bâqirghân kitâbı*, and *Âhir-zamân kitâbı* {the last is attributed to Sulaimān Ḥakīm Ata}, have kept the legends of Aḥmad Yasawī and his disciples alive in that region for centuries. And finally, when the legend of Edigü took shape among the Noghays, Aḥmad Yasawī was incorporated into that legend as the grandfather of the hero {again, not exactly}. One can conclude from all of this evidence that by the ninth/fifteenth century, the legend of Aḥmad Yasawī was thoroughly familiar to the Northern Turks.

The legend of Aḥmad Yasawī spread rapidly in the Syr Darya region, i.e. in Yasī, Shāsh {Tashkent} and its environs, but this was not the case in Farghāna, Bukhārā, Samarqand, Khīva, and Khurāsān. In these areas, we find that the legend of Aḥmad Yasawī only began to spread after the eighth/fourteenth century, i.e. after the growth and spread of the Naqshbandī *ṭarīqa*. The fact that Tīmūr

had a *türbe* and mosque built and dedicated to this great shaikh in 800/1397–8 does not contradict this assertion. Tīmūr pursued a policy of supporting the *khwājas* and shaikhs in order to establish fully his influence over the people. With this goal in mind, he catered to the beliefs of the people in the Syr Darya region. Many of the shaikhs who appeared during the reigns of Tīmūr and his descendants were members of the Naqshbandī *ṭarīqa*. It was only when they became active that the Yasawī legend began more or less to make itself felt in the regions that had been thoroughly imbued with Iranian culture – such as Khurāsān and Bukhārā. But in the areas to the northeast where Turkish culture was more predominant, the influence of Aḥmad Yasawī spread, along with the fame of Ṣūfīs who wrote excellent poetry in Persian, even before the establishment of Naqshbandism.[70]

The legend of Aḥmad Yasawī had already spread among the Western Turks well before the formation of the Ottoman Empire. The Mongol invasion, as it swept like a flood from east to west, resulted in the transfer of many things from their original homeland to the Turks in Anatolia. Indeed, this invasion drove thousands of refugees before it. Among the people who went to Anatolia via Khwārazm, Khurāsān, and Azerbaijan, there were certainly dervishes and travelers who belonged to the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*. And for this reason the Yasawī legend also began to thrive in Anatolia and spread among its people. Nevertheless, because the documentation related to life in Anatolia in the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries is so meager, we do not find the Yasawī legend there in written form until after the ninth/fifteenth century, i.e. until after the Bektashī tradition had firmly taken hold and become established.[71] The Bektashīs followed a simple policy of taking over traditions that already existed among the people and inserting Ḥājjī Bektash into them. In this way, they skillfully ensured that the legend in its new form did not appear completely foreign to commonly held ideas. Therefore, by taking over the traditions that existed concerning Aḥmad Yasawī, the Bektashīs created a tie between him and Ḥājjī Bektash.[72] We can vigorously assert that the legend of Aḥmad Yasawī flourished among the Anatolian Turks since probably the second half of the seventh/thirteenth century and that, in this Western area, the legend was more confused and further from historical reality than it was in the Eastern and Northern areas.[73]

NOTES

1 Ḥazīnī's *Jawāhir al-abrār min amwāj al-biḥār*, which describes the legends of Aḥmad Yasawī {Hâlis Efendi Library now in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul}, unique MS, p. 66. See the bibliography for additional information on this work. {Now edited by Cihan Okuyucu (Kayseri, 1995). The manuscript containing the *Jawāhir al-abrār* is now preserved in the Istanbul University Library (TY 3893). Köprülü assumes (as everyone following him, including Okuyucu) that the manuscript contains a single work with this title, in which the author shifted from Turkic to Persian. This manuscript undoubtedly contained two of Ḥazīnī's works bound together, first the Turkic *Jawāhir*, and then a Persian work whose title remains unknown; one or more folios were lost,

and with them the end of the Turkic work and the beginning of the Persian work. See Devin DeWeese, "The Yasavī Order and Persian Hagiography in Seventeenth-century Central Asia: ʿĀlim Shaykh of ʿAlīyābād and his *Lamaḥāt min nafaḥāt al-quds*," in Leonard Lewisohn and David Morgan (eds), *The Heritage of Sufism*, vol. 3, *Late Classical Persianate Sufism (1501–1705), The Safavid and Mughal Period* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 389–414, especially p. 392, n.3.}

2 {Aḥmad Yasawī,} *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, Istanbul edn {1299/1881–2}, p. 6. The same information is found with very few differences in wording on pp. 183–6 of the same book. {The most recent Turkish edition of the *Dīwān* is by Hayatı Bice as *Divan-ı hikmet* (Ankara, 1993). Versions of this work have been published in Cyrillic Uzbek and Qazaq and Tatar. Facsimiles of manuscript versions have been published in Moscow (with a Cyrillic Türkmen transcription) and in Istanbul (by Yusuf Azmun in 1994). No critical text edition has yet been undertaken. Turkish scholars continue to cite the selection of poems published by Kemal Eraslan, Ahmed-i Yesevî, *Dîvân-ı Hikmet'ten seçmeler* (Ankara, 1983).}

3 *Ibid*., p. 7. {Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī Ṣafī – although in the original bibliography Köprülü gives his father Ḥusain b. ʿAlī Kāshifī al-Wāʿiẓ as the author} *Rashaḥāt*, Turkish trans. {(Istanbul, 1291/1874)}, p. 14, but the account in the *Rashaḥāt* itself is a bit shorter and vaguer: . . . *ve âvân-ı tufûliyyette Baba Arslan Hazretleri'nin manzûr-ı nazar-ı kimya-eserleri olmuşlardır. Rivâyet ederler ki Baba Arslan İşâret-i pür-beşâret-i Hazret-i Risâlet* صلى الله عليه و سلم *ile Hâce-nin terbiyetine meşgûl olmuşlar ve Hâce'ye anların mülâzemet ve hizmetlerinde küllî terakkıyât-ı ʿaliyye müyesser olmuş.* {And during (his) childhood, he was under the elixer-like gaze of His Excellency Bābā Arslan. It is reported that Bābā Arslan became preoccupied with Aḥmad's upbringing on the felicitous instruction of the exalted personage of the message (the Prophet Muḥammad), God bless him and grant him salvation, and that in his attendance and service Aḥmad was vouchsafed perfect spiritual progress.} On this matter, see the details that I have given in the text.

4 Sayyid {Bahā' al-Dīn} Ḥasan Khwāja Naqīb al-Ashrāf {Nithārī} Bukhārī, *Mudhakkir-i aḥbāb*, {Königliche Bibliothek Berlin} MS, pp. 299–301 {ed. Najīb Māyil Haravī (Tehran, 1377/1999)}. After relating this legend, the author says, "This story is recounted at length in books and is narrated by trustworthy authorities." In fact, in both the {Turkish} translation of {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt* and other books on the legends of the saints, such as {Ḥarīrī-Zāde} Kamāl al-Dīn {Muḥammad's} *Tibyān-i wasā'il {al-ḥaqā'iq*, Mulhak Fatih Library MSS 430–2} and {Ghulām Sarwar Muḥammad Lāhawrī's} *Khazīnat al-asfiyā* {(Lucknow, 1322/1904–5)}, it is related that Arslan Bābā carried out this duty of providing guidance {i.e. religious instruction} on the order of the Prophet Muḥammad (see the bibliography for information on these books). Indeed, it states in {Aḥmad Yasawī's} *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* that Arslan Bābā was *Sahâbeler ulusu hâss-ı bende-i Kird-gâr* {the greatest of the Companions and the noblest of God's servants}, p. 173. This legend circulated for centuries among the Yasawīs. A Yasawī poet named Shams tells this legend in a poem {*manẓūma*} that he wrote about Arslan Bābā: "One day the Prophet summoned Arslan Bābā and gave him a date. Then he said, 'After I die a child named Aḥmad will come into the world. He will be the quintessence of my religious community. Go see him and give him this date.' With the blessing of the Prophet's prayer, Arslan Bābā lived a long life. He searched continuously for the one whose date he held in safekeeping. Finally, 400 years later, he arrived in Turkistan. As usual, he sent word of his search in all directions. At last, he found him while on his way to school in Yasī. Arslan Bābā greeted the child and after the child returned the greeting he asked, 'Oh Bābā, where is the object you hold in trust?' Not expecting this question, Arslan Bābā was surprised and said, 'Oh saint, how did you know about this?' The child replied, 'God informed me.' Arslan Bābā then asked him his name.

He said that it was Aḥmad and Arslan Bābā surrendered to him what he had held in trust," *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, pp. 75–7. It appears from this poem that Arslan Bābā was from Utrar and that Māchīn Bāb{ā} was buried to the right of him and Qārgha Bāb was buried to the left of him {the former is mentioned below while the latter is not further identified}. However, we know that Māchīn Bābā was buried in the village of Farkat {فرکت} ({Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, p. 77) and that there was a tradition that Arslan Bābā was buried in the tomb {*türbe*} of Aḥmad Yasawī (the article entitled "Khalwa" {in Russian and not further identified} in the journal *Shūrā*, {Orenburg, March 1914}, p. 146).

5 {Aḥmad Yasawī,} *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, p. 7. However, neither {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt* nor the other books of legends confirm the story in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* that Arslan Bābā died the following year. For information on the descendants of Arslan Bābā, see the details on Manṣūr Ata in Chapter 4, p. 89.

6 Khaḍir was the companion of Aḥmad Yasawī's father Shaikh Ibrāhīm and his 10,000 disciples. Shaikh Ibrāhīm married ʿĀ'isha Khātūn, the daughter of Mūsā Shaikh, one of his leading *khalīfas*, and Khaḍir in particular was the cause of this marriage, {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, p. 74.

7 The "Qarachuq" Mountain, which is frequently mentioned in the Oghuz legends, and memory of which has been preserved for centuries, also appears here. This is quite natural because the Syr Darya region, which is where this legend flourished, was the early country of the Oghuz. {Qarachuq is close to Yasī/Turkistān. This name was applied to the mountains now called Qaratau/Karatau, but is now borne (in the Qazaq form Qarashıq) by a stream west of Turkistān.} See *EI*[1], s.v. "Ghuzz" (W. Barthold) {now see *EI*[2], s.v. "Ghuzz" (Cl. Cahen *et al.*) and Golden, *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*, pp. 205–11}.

8 The following tradition about this famous table cloth is widespread among the Bektashīs, who are a branch of the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*: "that dome-shaped Bektashī headgear {*qubba-i alif-tāj*}, the dervish cloak {*khirqa*}, lamp, table cloth, standard, and prayer rug that {the angel} Gabriel brought to the Prophet, God bless him and grant him salvation, by order of God, praise be to Him; the Prophet gave all these things and the regulations governing them to {his son-in-law} ʿAlī. ʿAlī gave them to {his son} Ḥusain. Ḥusain gave all this to {his son} Zain al-ʿĀbidīn. When Zain al-ʿĀbidīn was in the prison of Marwān, Abū Muslim {the leader of the revolutionary ʿAbbāsid movement in Khurāsān, cf. *EIr*, s.v. "Abū Moslem . . . Korāsānī" (Ḡ. Ḥ Yūsofī)} came and asked permission to emerge and he gave the dome-shaped headgear, cloak, lamp, table cloth, standard, and prayer rug and the regulations governing them to Abū Muslim {Zain died in 95/714, long before Abū Muslim and the ʿAbbāsids overthrew the last Umayyad caliph, Marwān II in 132/750}. Abū Muslim gave them to Muḥammad {b. ʿAlī al-}Bāqir {the son of Zain al-ʿĀbidīn}. Imām Muḥammad Bāqir gave them to his son Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq gave them to his son Mūsā Kāẓim. Imām Mūsā Kāẓim gave them to his son the Sulṭān {figuratively, i.e. this is an honorific title} of Khurāsān ʿAlī al-Riḍā. The Sulṭān of Khurāsān ʿAlī al-Riḍā gave them to Sulṭān al-ʿĀrifīn {an honorific title: the sultan of those who have knowledge of God}, the fountainhead of the *merdan* {heroes, the seven spiritual beings held to be the guides and rulers of the faithful} of the {ninty-nine} thousand *pīrs* {shaikhs, i.e. Ṣūfī masters, elders} of Turkistan, *Khwāja* Aḥmad Yasawī. Aḥmad Yasawī, may God have mercy on him, did not give them to any of the 99,000 *khalīfas*. When they requested these things, he said that their {rightful} owner would come – thereby indicating the coming of His Excellency Sulṭān {again, this is a figurative title} Ḥājjī Bektash Veli. Finally, His Excellency Sulṭān Ḥājjī Bektash came and he gave him those things," *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjim Sulṭān*, ed. R. Tschudi {as *Das Velayet-name des Hadschim Sultan* (Leipzig, 1914)}, pp. 7–8. This information in Ḥājjim Sulṭān's *Velāyetnāme* was taken from the famous work *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli*. This story {which of course

connects Aḥmad Yasawī with the first eight of the Twelver *imāms*} is the same in both the sixth chapter of the versified version of this work and the prose version. The author {Ḥazīnī} of *Jawāhir al-abyār* also says *Hoca Ahmed Yesevî'nin hırkatı ve revâcı Resûl-i Ekrem* صلى الله عليه و على آله و سلم *hırka-ı mi'râcından ve hâsiyyet-i mi'râc ve hurmâ-i latîflerindendir* {The cloak of Aḥmad Yasawī and its being in demand derived from the cloak of the ascent (to heaven) of the most noble Prophet, may God bless him and his family and grant him peace, and from the special nature of the ascent and his gracious date}, p. 27. {Köprülü assumes that the tablecloth of Ḥazīnī's story must be that in the *Velāyetname.*}

9 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 67–70.

10 {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans.; {Muṣṭafā 'Ālī's} *Kunh al-akhbār* {Istanbul, 1861–9}; *Baḥr al-wilāya* {MS in the Hâlis Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye Library, not further identified}; *Süleymân-ı Köstendilî* {not further identified}; {Ḥarīrī-Zāde's} *Tibyān-i wasā'il*; *Basātīn al-awliyā'* {not further identified}; {Lāhawrī's} *Khazīnat al-aṣfiyā* and various other books on the lives of the saints. No reference can be found at all, however, to Arslan Bābā in {Ḥazīnī's} *Jawāhir* {but Ḥazīnī does mention him in another of his works, unknown to Köprülü}. There is also no mention of Yūsuf Hamadānī in Bektashī tradition. In the *Jawāhir*, as in all the biographical dictionaries, it only states that Aḥmad Yasawī was attached to Yūsuf Hamadānī and was one of his four *khalīfas*, pp. 225–9 {in the Okuyucu edn, pp. 133–6, 113a.13–14, 113b.4, 8, and 115b.3–6. Surprisingly, Köprülü does not mention the *silsila* cited by Ḥazīnī in the *Jawāhir* leading back from Aḥmad Yasawī to the Prophet through Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī! Ḥazīnī does give a verse recapitulation of the Yūsuf Hamadānī story, with Aḥmad Yasawī as one of four *khalīfas* (though this appears in the acephalous Persian work bound with the *Jawāhir*, which, as mentioned, Köprülü took together as a single work), and Köprülü cites this (without comment on Ḥazīnī's reference to "Abū Yūsuf" instead of "Yūsuf"), but he ignores al-Suhrawardī's lineage altogether},

زو بسی ارباب دل کرده ظهور مقتدایان از ظهورش در حضور
چار سرور زو خلیفه در جهان هر یکی در طور شیخ پهلوان
خواجه احمد زان ولی لکن بزرک قطب الأقطاب جهان و پیر ترک
از یسی و ماوراء النهر و یمن در تصرف بر در او مرد وزن
. . . .

بود معشوق ابو یوسف تمام حضرت سلطان دین احمد بنام
بعد برقی وز بعد اندقی جانشین یوسف آن مرد تقی
حضرت سلطان چو بر سجاده شد کار اهل درد زو آماده شد
خرقه و خرمای حضرت یافته آفتاب فقر ازوی تافته

{From him many spiritual masters appeared.
From his presence, many spiritual guides are present.

From him four leading *khalīfas* are in the world.
Each one of them following the manner of the warrior shaikh.

But Khwāja Aḥmad is the greatest *khalīfa* from that saint.
Pole of Poles of this world and Pīr (shaikh, spiritual guide) of the Turks.

From Yasī and Transoxiana and Yemen
Men and women serve at his gate under his command.

. . .

There was one greatly beloved of Abū Yūsuf,
One named Aḥmad, sovereign of the Religion.

Following (Shaikh ʿAbd Allāh) Baraqī and (Shaikh Ḥasan) Andaqī
That pious man became Yūsuf's successor.

When that majestic sultan assumed the prayer-rug
He assumed the task of caring for the people of love-pain (i.e. the dervishes).

He received the cloak and the date of his majesty (the prophet Muḥammad)
From him shone the sun of poverty (i.e. being a *faqīr* or dervish).}

11 *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, pp. 11–12. {As noted in the introduction, the quotations from this work in "Westernized" form in *Early Mystics* are not meant to imply that the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was in Ottoman rather than Chaghatay.}

12 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, p. 72. On the relationship of Aḥmad Yasawī to Khaḍir, see also the pages below. This issue of friendly conversation with Khaḍir is not confined to Aḥmad Yasawī. If we take a look at the Ṣūfī biographical works, we would find a great many stories about Ṣūfīs who met Khaḍir. If we look, for example, at the contemporaries of Aḥmad, not only did Shaikh Yūsuf Hamadānī continuously meet with Khaḍir (see ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī, *Maqāmāt-i Yūsuf Hamadānī* {this work is appended to Ḥarīrī-Zāde's *Tibyān-i wasā'il al-ḥaqā'iq*, Ibrahim Ağa MS. 432 in the Fatih Library in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul; see Chapter 3, p. 75, n.20 for more on this author and his work, but we should note here that the attribution of the *Maqāmāt-i Yūsuf Hamadānī* to Ghujduwānī is doubtful}) but ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī also learned the *dhikr-i khafiyya* from him ({Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 25). Indeed, he was also the one who taught the *dhikr-i arra* to Aḥmad Yasawī (see Chapter 4, pp. 101–2) {these are silent and vocal *dhikrs*}.

13 {ʿĀlī,} *Kunh al-akhbār*, vol. 5, p. 54. This legend was taken completely from the *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli*.

14 *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli* {Köprülü used the MS in his private library, for editions see the bibliography; German trans. E. Gross as *Das Vilâyet-nâme des Haggi Bektasch* (Leipzig, 1927)}, دربیان اوصاف خواجه احمد یسوی قدس سره {Description of Aḥmad Yasawī, may (God) hallow his heart}. "Taking the shape of a bird and flying" is a motif frequently encountered in the legends of Turkish saints, as in this legend of Aḥmad Yasawī. One can find many examples in Bektashī legends. F. Grenard reports that such legends are found among the Eastern Turks of Turkistan (*Le Turkestan et le Tibet* ({part 2 of J.-L. Dutreuil de Rhins (ed.), *Mission scientifique dans la haute asie* (Paris, 1897–8)}, p. 240). They belong to many saints whose shrines are places of pilgrimage in that region. He states that according to the legend of Imām Jaʿfar Ṭayyār {the flyer}, whose {shrine – he has many – and} place of pilgrimage is in Chīrā in the environs of Khotan, he flew to that place from Mecca. According to Grenard, there is a great similarity between these miracles and the legends of the Buddhist saints described by {the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim} Hsüan Tsang {*fl.* first half of the seventh century}. In fact, he narrates a Buddhist legend resembling this flying story and also states that some of the tombs of Muslim saints were originally Buddhist convents. While it is true that Buddhism influenced the early beliefs of the Turks in this region,

it would nevertheless be mistaken to allege that the legends of the Muslim saints derived exclusively from the Buddhists. In any case, these are issues of religious sociology that require {further} research.

15 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 82–4.

16 *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli*. All Bektashī traditions agree on this point.

17 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, p. 75. According to this source, there is no reference at all in the other biographical dictionaries to Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend who was the first *khalīfa*. {Ḥazīnī simply names Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend. He does not say that biographical dictionaries do not mention him. If Köprülü meant to say that he could find no reference to Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend in such sources available to him, he is closer to the truth. In fact, Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend was the chief *silsila* link, as Yasawī's direct disciple, for the lineage that produces the earliest known Yasawī source, which was unknown to Köprülü; the work is the fourteenth-century Turkic work of Isḥāq Khwāja b. Ismāʿīl Ata, which survives in two redactions, one entitled only *Risāla*, the other entitled *Ḥadīqat al-ʿārifīn*. This work reflects the Ismāʿīl Ata tradition that seems to have been a rival of the Yasawī lineages traced through Ḥakīm Ata (hence the story from the *Ḥakīm Ata kitābı*, which Köprülü alludes to by saying that the work shows Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend as the "second *khalifa*," but which actually makes Ḥakīm Ata the "full" disciple and Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend a "half" disciple – a story also found in an earlier source, but with the two figures reversed in status). Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend also appears in some versions of the *Rashaḥāt*, whose presentation of Aḥmad Yasawī's four disciples is in fact more complex than is often recognized and than Köprülü allowed. Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend also appears in the *Lamaḥāt*, but is simply called "Ṣūfī Dānishmend."} Only Shamsī, a Yasawī dervish, reveals his presence in the tradition by mentioning his name in a poem that he wrote about Zangī Bābā, *Hak Mustafâ'nin peyrevî Sultân Hoc(a) Ahmed Yesevî/Sûfî Muhammed Mevlevî Yâ Zengî Bâbâ himmetî* {the true follower of Muṣṭafā is Sulṭān Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī/Ṣūfī Muḥammad Mawlawī, or the spiritual ambition of Zangī Bābā}, *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, p. 258. Furthermore, Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend in the {anonymous} *Ḥakīm Ata kitābı* (Kazan, 1901) is shown as the second *khalīfa* after Ḥakīm Ata. For some reason, this person whose historical existence was probably genuine did not become sufficiently renowned to enter the Ṣūfī biographical works. See Chapter 4, pp. 89–92 on Sulaimān Ḥakīm Ata. We have no other historical or legendary information on Shaikh ʿUthmān Maghribī {whose name recalls that of a tenth-century Ṣūfī known already from Hujwīrī and later hagiographies, but remains unidentified} or Imām Marghuḍī {his *nisba* is problematical, as noted below in the narrative, and the same figure (i.e. he plays the same role in the story below in the narrative of the erasure of the scholar's books and mind) is called "Imām Marāghī" in the *Lamaḥāt*. His memory has apparently survived in the local tradition of Turkistān, which calls him "Imam Marghuz" or "Imam Markozi" and identifies him with the Kök Tondï Ata" whose shrine still stands north of Turkistān in the village of Shobanak. On local tradition about him, see R. M. Mustafina, *Predstavleniia kul'ty, obriady u kazakhov (V kontekste bytovogo islama v Iuzhnom Kazakhstane v kontse XIX–XX vv.)* (Alma-Ata, 1992), pp. 89–90, 111; and Sadïq Sapabekŭlï, "Türkïstandaghï tarikhi ziyarat," in *Yäsaui taghïlïmï*, eds Khamid Imanzhanov and R. Zhüzbaeva (Turkistan, 1996), pp. 123–32} whose legend is mentioned with Amīr ʿAlī Ḥakīm {whose name recalls the one assigned, in various later traditions, to Yasawī's son-in-law and to a descendant of Yasawī's brother} and with Aḥmad Yasawī below. As for Ḥasan Bulghānī, it is likely that the form in which his name is shown is mispelled and is corrupted from Ḥasan Bulghārī {more likely Balghānī, perhaps linked to the Balqān mountains in south-western Turkmenistan}. This shaikh, who came from the land of the Bulghars {the Ḥasan Bulghārī to whom Köprülü refers derived his *nisba* from a seven-year sojourn

in Bulghār, but was actually a native of Nakhchivan} and met Saif al-Dīn Bākharzī and others, was a famous Ṣūfī of that era, {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 38. See the information given a little further below on Saif al-Dīn Bākharzī.

18 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 75–7; {Aḥmad Yasawī,} *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, 3rd Kazan edn {1311/1893–4}, 47th *ḥikmat*. With the exception of this very valuable work {*Jawāhir*}, which was based on Yasawī tradition, the *khalīfas* of Aḥmad Yasawī are presented in a different manner in the other books on the legends of saints. See Chapter 4, pp. 89–94 for critical information on this matter. Suffice it to say here that Bābā Māchīn is not mentioned in them {but he is found in Central Asian Yasawī sources unknown to Köprülü, especially the *Lamaḥāt*}. Nevertheless, the tradition is clear in this respect. In fact, Sulaimān Ata confirms this by saying *Baba Maçîn ol Sultân / Mürîd boldi bî-gümân* {Bābā Māchīn, that sultan / became his disciple without doubt}, *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, p. 271. The 47th *ḥikmat* in the 3rd Kazan edn of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* relates this legend in exactly the same way. After Bābā Māchīn died, he was buried in the town of Farkat. During a battle with the unbelievers, his foot sank into a stone and left a print that could be seen in the tenth/sixteenth century. Pilgrims visited it and made various requests that were granted, *Jawāhir*, p. 77.

19 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 78–81. Among them only the name and biography of Saif al-Dīn Bākharzī have been confirmed in the books of legends. This Ṣūfī, who wrote some noteworthy Persian quatrains, was a *khalīfa* of the famous shaikh Najm al-Dīn Kubrā. The shaikh, after himself extracting him from the *khalwa* during the second forty {days}, sent him to Bukhārā. Saif al-Dīn lived there a long time after the shaikh's martyrdom and died in 659/1261. His tomb is in Bukhārā ({Amīn} Aḥmad Rāzī, *Haft iqlīm* {Köprülü used the MS in the Hâlis Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul; ed. Javād Fāḍil (Tehran, 1960)} and {Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 487–8). Bākharz is a region between Nīshāpūr and Herat that had 168 towns ({Yāqūt,} *Mu'jam al-buldān*, {ed. F. Wüstenfeld (Leipzig, 1866–73)}, vol. 2, p. 28; Barbier de Meynard, *Dictionnaire géographique, historique et littéraire de la Perse et des contrées adjacentes* {Paris, 1861}, p. 74). As for the others: Shaikh Sa'd al-Dīn could be Sa'd al-Dīn Ḥammūyī, one of the *khalīfas* of Najm al-Dīn Kubrā; Shaikh Kamāl Shaibānī could be the famous Kamāl Khujandī {no, Kamāl Khujandī was a fourteenth-century poet; Köprülü may mean Kamāl Jandī, a disciple of Najm al-Dīn Kubrā, but the person in question was more likely Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusain b. Muẓaffar al-Shaibānī al-Baladī, a disciple of Jandī; see DeWeese, "Bābā Kamāl Jandī and the Kubravī Tradition among the Turks of Central Asia," *Der Islam*, 71 (1994), 58–94}; and Shaikh Muḥammad Baghdādī could be Shaikh Majd al-Dīn Baghdādī, but these identifications are very unlikely. There is absolutely no record of any of these legends in the biographical dictionaries, and also no account of Saif al-Dīn Bākharzī's relationship with Aḥmad Yasawī. In the *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 173, it is only mentioned that Shaikh 'Alī Lālā, a *khalīfa* of Najm al-Dīn Kubrā, was attached to Aḥmad Yasawī before joining him. See Chapter 3, p. 62 on this question. Some fifty Persian quatrains of Shaikh Saif al-Dīn Bākharzī were published in {S. Khuda Bakhsh, "Saifuddīn Bākharzī,"} *ZDMG*, 59 (1905), 345–54. On his *tekke* in Bukhārā, see Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, *Seyāḥatnāme* {i.e. his *al-Riḥla*, Turkish trans., Şerîf Pasha, (Istanbul, 1333–5/1914–17)}, vol. 1, p. 416, {English trans., H. A. R. Gibb as *The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa* (Cambridge, 1956–72), vol. 3, p. 554. And see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Sayf al-Dīn Bākharzī" (Hamid Algar).}

20 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 88–90.

21 *Ibid*., p. 90.

22 See the article "Khalwa" in the journal *Shūrā*, March 1914; {see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Khalwa" (H. Landolt).} In the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, p. 81, he also says, *Yüzyigirmi bışka* {as in 1st edn, more correctly *beşkä*} *kirdim bilalmadım/Erenler'din feyz-u fütuh alalmadım* {I became

125 years old and learned nothing/I did not acquire from the saints enlightenment and conquest}. {See DeWeese, "Sacred Places and 'Public' Narratives: The Shrine of Aḥmad Yasavī in Hagiographical Traditions of the Yasavī Sufi Order, 16th–17th Centuries," *Muslim World*, 90 (2000), 353–76.}

23 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 91–4. One frequently encounters allusions to this «**خم عشق**» in Aḥmad Yasawī's poetry, *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, Kazan edn, p. 262. {See DeWeese, "Sacred Places."}

24 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 98–100.

25 There is no reference at all to this small town in {Yāqūt's} *Mu'jam al-buldān*, but the legend given above indicates that it was around Yasī. The poet Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ indicates in his *Shaibānīnāme* that Yasī and Savrān were two towns close to each other. This conforms to the account in the legend given above (*Shaibānīnāme*, {German trans. and} ed. Arminius Vambéry {as *Die Sheïbaniade* (Vienna, 1885)}, p. 444 {new ed. E. Shādīev (Tashkent, 1989)}). Indeed, according to the information given by É. Reclus, Savān or Sāvrān is a town west of Yasī, currently in a desolate and ruined state. Reclus writes that it possessed two graceful minarets, known to be ancient monuments, and that one had collapsed and the other was on the verge of collapse (Reclus [ed.], *Nouvelle géographie universelle* {Paris, 1881–94}, vol. 6, p. 554). The American traveler Schuyler, who visited these places during the Russian occupation, gives quite a lot of information on this town because he passed through it on the way to Yasī. According to this account, the remains of rather large buildings and some ruins of a fortress were found there. The local people had fled to the east in the years corresponding to the Russian invasion. The same traveler writes that a very tall mosque built of brick had previously been there, but it had collapsed and the two remaining minarets had been destroyed by the Russians, so he could see nothing but their bases (Schuyler, *Turkistan*, {Turkish} trans., p. 90). K. Ujfalvy, who also saw Savrān, reports that this town had a fortress with thicker walls than had the other nearby towns and that a great many ancient monuments were excavated from there (Ujfalvy, *Le Syr-Daria* . . . {Paris, 1879}, p. 47).

26 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 101–2. The author also records a custom that survived as a memento of this legend, *Muhlislerden herkim rûh-i şerîflerinden istihâre için bir sığır cum'a gecesi def'-i beliyyât ve ref'-i âfât ve kazâ-yı hâcât için kurbân eylese ve ervâh-ı tayyibe için helva ve zâkirler için gül-suyu ve buhûr ve balmûmu yaksa ve bu silsile-i Yesevîye ehl-i irşâdına ihyâ-i leyl istid'â eylese murâd hâsıl ve duâ ve münâcât müstecâb olur* {Any sincere individual who sacrifices a cow on Friday eve (Thursday night) to obtain a dream-omen from the noble spirit (of the Prophet?) in order to repel calamities and remove disasters and attain wishes, and who makes sweetmeats for the good spirits (of the saints?) and makes rose-water and burns incense and candles for the performers of the *dhikr*, and who seeks a benediction by nightime prayer on behalf of the spiritual guides of the Yasawiyya order, his wish will be granted and his benediction granted and his prayers answered}, p. 102. In the *Velāyetnāme* of Ḥājjī Bektash, we come across this legend in slightly different form: "There was a meeting of those who were envious of his esteem and fame among the people and wanted to harm the *khwāja* in some manner or other. They butchered the ox of one of them and left only the feet of the animal in the slaughter house. They took the skinned ox directly to the *khwāja's* kitchen and hung it there. The next day, these hypocrites went to the judge {*ḥākim*} and complained. They searched every house for the ox. Finally, they produced evidence of a trail of ox blood and demanded to see the shaikh's kitchen. This unexpected accusation threw everyone into a state of bewilderment. Khwāja Aḥmad, who knew of this issue in advance because of his mystical power, gave them permission to enter. They entered the kitchen and found the ox. So they got their wish, but the shaikh suddenly performed a miracle: his accusers suddenly took the form of dogs and they devoured the flesh of

the ox" (from the versified version of the *Velāyetnāme* {see Bedri Noyan (ed.), *Firdevsi-i Rûmi, Manzûm Hacı Bektâş Veli Vilâyetnâmesi* (Aydın, 1986), pp. 113–14}). {On Aḥmad Yasawī's troubles with the people of Ṣūrī, see DeWeese, "Aḥmad Yasawī and the Dog-Men: Narratives of Hero and Saint at the Frontier of Orality and Textuality," forthcoming in the proceedings of the conference on "Theoretical Approaches to the Transmission and Edition of Oriental Manuscripts" (Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Istanbul).}

27 The *khwāja's* purpose in this was to follow the model of the Prophet {*sunnat-i nabawiyya*}, because the male children of Muḥammad also did not survive childhood.

28 *Jawāhir*, pp. 103–5. I was not able to find such a story in ʿAṭṭār's *Manṭiq al-ṭair*. {Köprülü found it later. See his "Ahmed Yesevî," *İA*, vol. 1, p. 210.} The death of this Ṣūfī poet, who says with the verses

کوفه وری تاخراسان گشته ام　　سیحن و جیحونش را ببریده ام

ملك هندستان و ترکستان زمین　　رفته چون اهل خطا ازسوی چین

{I have traveled to Kūfa and Rayy and as far as Khurāsān.
I have crossed over the Syr Darya and the Amu Darya.

I have gone to the realms of India and Turkistan.
By way of China, like the people of Cathay}

that he also visited Turkistan among a great many other places in the world, and who was accused of Shīʿī heresy at one time in Samarqand, was probably after 618/1221–2 (it cannot be determined for certain), i.e. 619–33/1222–34 according to various accounts. The miracle of someone whose name ʿAṭṭār did not even mention in his *Tadhkirat al-awliyāʾ* (he had not yet gained, of course, great fame) would naturally not be mentioned in the *Manṭiq al-ṭair* (in Nicholson [ed.], *Tadhkirat al-awliyāʾ*, see the introduction written by Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Qazwīnī. {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "ʿAṭṭār" (H. Ritter); English trans. of the *Manṭiq al-ṭair* by Afkham Darbandi and Dick Davis as *The Conference of the Birds* (London: Penguin, 1984), p. 129.}

29 {Ḥusām al-Dīn Muslimī,} *Risāla-i tawārīkh-i bulghāriyya* {Kazan, 1902}, p. 26. On this treatise, see the bibliography {and n.39 below}.

30 "When I went to the capital of Rūm {Anatolia}, I sought a good omen from the *maqāmāt* of His Excellency Shaikh Yasawī. I found the following good tidings: whenever you encounter difficulties, recite this quatrain:

Yeldâ giceni şemʿ-i şebistân itkân
Bir lâhzada ʿalemni gülistân itkân
Bes müşkil işim tüşübdür âsân itkân
Ey barçanı müşkilini âsân itkân

{You who make the night of the winter solstice a candle for the bedchamber
You who in a single glance make the world a rose garden
Then, when I have a difficult task, make it easy
You who make every difficult thing easy.}

I memorized this quatrain. When I confronted the army of the emperor of Rūm {i.e. Bayezid I}, I recited it 70 times and victory was achieved," *Vâkiʿât-i Tîmûr*, Turkish trans. by Qāḍī Makhdūm Nabī Jān Khāṭif Khujandī (Tashkent, 1308/1890–1) {also

known as the *Malfūẓāt* of Tīmūr, this work is a seventeenth-century compilation from Moghul India}.

31 {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 232. {In the Persian original Khwāja Aḥrār does not laugh. The text reads *fātiḥa yakī mībāshad* = the *Fātiḥa* is given once, i.e. he had already done it.}

32 {By calling Ḥazīnī's master "Sayyid Manṣūr Ata," Köprülü is conflating two separate figures, namely the "Sayyid Manṣūr" known from Ḥazīnī's works as his own master, and the "Manṣūr Ata" known from Ṣafī's *Rashaḥāt* as a son of Arslan Bābā and as the first of (a contrived) four *khalīfas* of Aḥmad Yasawī (aside from sources clearly dependent on Ṣafī's account, Manṣūr Ata appears only in Nithārī's *Mudhakkir-i aḥbāb*, and there only as a son of Arslan Bābā, and hence as Nithārī's own ancestor).}

33 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 308–14. After Humāyūn Shāh lost his dominion and took refuge with the Safavids, he captured Kabul from his brother Kāmrān Mīrzā with their help in 952/1448–9 and from there he set out to capture India in 961/1553–4 (Mullā ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Lāhawrī, *Pādishāhnāme* {Calcutta, 1866–72}, vol. 1, pp. 64–5). As for the death of Hindāl Mīrzā, it occurred in 958/1551 (Badā'ūnī, *Muntakhab al-tawārīkh* {Calcutta, 1868}, vol. 1, p. 454 {partial English trans. of the 1925 Calcutta edn, George Ranking *et al.* (Karachi, 1976–8)}). Consequently, Sayyid Manṣūr must have met Hindāl Mīrzā and Humāyūn Shāh in Kabul between the years 952/1545 and 958/1551. The information given in the *Jawāhir* on the life of Sayyid Manṣūr in fact supports this.

34 *Jawāhir*, pp. 97–8.

35 Schuyler, *Turkistan*, Turkish trans., p. 97. {In the original English version, 6th edn, vol. 1, p. 72, "It is probable that this ancient monument would have been entirely ruined had it not been that the Sheikh-ul-Islam mounted the minaret and showed the white flag, which was the precursor of the surrender." Köprülü misinterprets the Sheikh-ul-Islam to mean Aḥmad Yasawī, but he was simply an official in the town. Thus this comment has nothing to do with Aḥmad Yasawī.}

36 *Ibid*. {In the English version, vol. 1, p. 72, "This mosque is considered the holiest in all Central Asia, and had very great religious importance, as previous to the capture of the city by the Russians pilgrims of all ranks, even khans and amirs, assembled there from all quarters."}

37 See *EI*[1], s.v. "Aḥmed Yesewī" (Melioransky), p. 209. See the *Edigü* legend collected by Radloff from the Baraba, Tobolsk, and Tümen Tatars (W. Radloff, *Proben der Volkslitteratur der türkischen Stämme Süd-Siberiens* {St Petersburg, 1866–70; reprinted Leipzig, 1965}, vol. 4 of the {German} translation, pp. 35, 134, 241). {The "Noghay legend" makes Edigü a descendant of Aḥmad Yasawī only if we assume that Edigü's ancestor Bābā Tükles, whom Köprülü does not mention, is to be identified with Aḥmad Yasawī. On the Edigü legends, see DeWeese, *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition* (University Park, PA, 1994); and Andrea Schmitz, *Die Erzählung von Edige: Gehalt, Genese und Wirkung einer heroischen Tradition* (Wiesbaden, 1996).}

38 See Grenard, "La Légende de Satok Boghra Khân et l'histoire," *JA*, 9th ser., 15 {1900}, p. 14, who cites Robert Barkley Shaw, *A Sketch of the Túrkí Language as Spoken in Eastern Túrkistán* {*Káshghar and Yarkand, Together with a Collection of Extracts* (Lahore, 1875)}. This legend is very famous among the people of East Turkistan.

39 {The *Tawārīkh-i bulghāriyya* is a controversial work whose sixteenth-century dating, accepted by Köprülü, is obviously erroneous; the work was clearly compiled in the very late eighteenth century or the early ninteenth century. See Allen J. Frank, *Islamic Historiography and "Bulghar" Identity among the Tatars and Bashkirs of Russia* (Leiden, 1998); Michael Kemper, *Sufis und Gelehrte in Tatarien und Baschkirien, 1789–1889: Der islamische Diskurs unter russischer Herrschaft* (Berlin, 1998); and M. A. Usmanov, *Tatarskie istoricheskie istochniki XVII–XVIII vv.* (Kazan, 1972). The work's references to supposed followers of

Aḥmad Yasawī are also anachronistic and are discussed in Frank's book and his "Islamic Shrine Catalogues and Communal Geography in the Volga–Ural Region: 1788–1917," *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 7 (1996), 265–86.}

40 {The "Hidāyat Allāh" mentioned here is an echo of the famous seventeenth-century Naqshbandī shaikh of Yarkand, Khwāja Hidāyat Allāh Āfāq. See Frank, *Islamic Historiography* and "Islamic Shrine Catalogues." The name Kalāl also appears as Kalānī, which has been interpreted as "Kulāl" in some texts.}

41 *Risāla-i tawārīkh-i bulghāriyya*, pp. 22–4. This work, which has long been widely read among the Northern Turks, is not of great historical value. {See n.39 above.}

42 One day Aḥmad Yasawī visited a village in Turkistan on the border of Khiṭāy. He was exhausted because of the freezing weather and of the long distance that he had traveled by donkey. As it happened, just at that time the wife of the farmer in whose home he was staying as a guest was about to give birth. For this reason, the farmer asked Aḥmad Yasawī to pray for her. The *khwāja* wrote a prayer and they attached it to the woman's waist and there immediately occurred what he had wished. The farmer was very happy because his wife had given birth {without difficulty} and he prepared some tea. The *khwāja* perspired from drinking the very hot tea and it made his fatigue disappear. He then prayed, saying "This had a healing quality. Have your ill ones drink this that they may be cured. May God make this available until the Day of Judgment!" Then, according to tradition, tea has continued to be used among the Turks from that time and it has been a curative to everyone ('Abd al-Qayyūm Nāṣirī, *Fawāgih al-julasā'* [Kazan, 1884], p. 658). After this, 'Abd al-Qayyūm Nāṣirī says, "The village of Yasa is east of Kāshghar; Khwāja Aḥmad died in the year 369 of the Hijra." He goes on to give other historical and geographical information – all of which is, needless to say, totally without value. {The tea story appears in N. Katanov, "Materialy k izucheniiu kazansko-tatarskago narechiia," *Uchenye zapiski Kazanskago Universiteta*, 7–8 (1898), pp. 36–7 (trans.), 80–1 (text).}

43 Togan, *Türk-Tatar tarihi*, p. 62. The *Sharā'iṭ al-īmān* (Kazan, 1901), which is very widespread among the Northern Turks, is a work that explains in simple terms the Arabic alphabet, the ritual prayers, and the stipulations of Islam. At the end, after the topic of *madhhab* {"law school"}, the following catechism is found: "To whose *silsila* {chain of authority} do you belong?" "I am from the *silsila* of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī." "How many *silsilas* are there?" "Four." "What are they?" "First, that of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī; second, of 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī; third, of Shaikh Najm al-Dīn Kubrā; fourth, of Abū 'l-Ḥasan 'Ishq," p. 20. In Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Nūr Muḥammad al-Ṭāhirī's short work *Köylü îmânı* (Kazan, 1903), which is also of this type and was written in verse especially for a popular audience, the following simple lines of poetry are found that also reveal the fame of Aḥmad Yasawī among the Northern Turks, p. 12:

> *Bu sözlernin {sözlerniñ} köpisi*
> *Evliyâlar ulıgsı {uluġsı}*
> *Ahmed Yesevî sözi*
> *Ânı seven Allâh sen*
>
> {All of these words are the words of Aḥmad Yasawī, greatest of The Saints, whom God Loves.}

44 {See Müjgân Cunbur, "Evliyâ Çelebi Seyâhatnâmesi'nde Ahmed Yesevî," *Erdem*, vol. 7, no. 21 (1995), 887–917.}

45 Evliyā Chelebi, *Seyāhatnāme*, Book 2, fo. 312a.

46 *Horâsân'dan Türk-i Türkân Hoca Ahmed Yesevî izniyle Rûm'a gelüp şehr-i Merzifon'un cânib-i şimâlîsi hâricinde şehre nâzır bir mürtefi' zemînde sâkin olup kâhîce hamâmlarda yatup, meczûb-i*

Hudâ bir ârif-i billâh kimesne idi kim Orhân Gâzî asrından tâ Ebü'l-feth'e ermiş bir zât-i şerîf idi. Bâlâda menâkıbı vardır. Hâlâ âsitânesi Osmâncık'da Koyun Baba tekyesinden ziyâde binâ-yı azîm kıbâb-ı âlîler ile ârâste ve müte'addid meydânlar ve matbah u kilar ve dervîşân hücretleriyle pîrâste olmuş her şeb iki yüz ve üç yüz âdem konup göçer mihmân-sarây-ı Bektâşiyân'dır iki yüzden mütecâviz pâ-bürehne ve ser-bürehne erbâb-ı ma'ârifden dervîşân-ı dilrîşanları âyende vü revende müsâfirîne hizmet ederler. {With the permission of Türk-i Türkān Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, he came from Khurāsān to Rūm and settled north of Merzifon on a high spot overlooking the city. Sometimes he would pass the night in the baths. He was someone who had true knowledge of God and was ecstatic with divine love. He lived from the time of Orhan Ghāzī until that of Sultan Mehmed II. There are thousands of legends about this *pīr*, aside from those given above. His dervish convent is a large building – even larger than that of Koyun Bābā in Osmancık – outfitted with lofty domes and numerous squares, kitchens, pantries, and dervish cells. Every night 200 or 300 men are put up there, and over 200 barefooted and bareheaded wandering dervishes are served as guests.} *Ibid.*, Book 2, fo. 347b. {On Pīr Dede, see Suraiya Faroqhi, "The Life Story of an Urban Saint in the Ottoman Empire," *Tarih Dergisi*, 32 (1979), 655–78, 1009–18.}

47 *Belh u Buhârâ ve Horâsân'da cedd-i izâmımız Türk-i Türkân Hoca Ahmed Yesevî halîfelerindendir. Hattâ Hacı Bektaş-ı Velî Horâsân'dan Rûm'a teveccüh etdiklerinde yetmiş aded kibâr-ı kümmelîn erenler ile Bektaş-ı Velî Bursa gazâsına Orhân Gâzî'ye geldiklerinde Hazret-i Sarı Saltık Bay ki ism-i şerîfi Muhammed Buhârî'dir anlar ve Keligra Sultân ve bu Akyazılı Sultân Bursa'ya bile gelüp ba'de'l-feth mezkûr erenler Rûm diyârında Bektaş-ı Velî izniyle post sâhibi olurlar.* {He was one of the *khalīfas* of our illustrious ancestor Türk-i Türkān Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī in Balkh, Bukhārā, and Khurāsān. In fact, when Ḥājjī Bektash came from Khurāsān to Rūm and joined Orhan Ghāzī in his campaign against Bursa with seventy great saints, Sarı Saltuk Bay – whose name was Muḥammad Bukhārī – and Keligra Sulṭān and this Akyazılı Sulṭān came to Bursa together and after the conquest became shaikhs in Rūm with Ḥājjī Bektash's permission}. *Ibid.*, Book 3, fo. 122b. In the pages following this, there is important information on the legends of Akyazılı and details about the *tekke*. According to Bektashī tradition, Akyazılı was a Bektashī. Indeed, among the Bektashīs there is also a biography of Akyazılı, as there is of Qızıl-Deli Sulṭān (copy in my private library). In another Bektashī treatise, we find two separate biographies and a *gülbang* {collective prayer of the Bektashīs} attributed to Akyazılı (copy in the library of the late Hâşim Pasha).

48 *Anın tâ zirve-i a'lâsında Ziyâret-i Hazret-i Kademli Baba Sultân: Hacı Bektaş-ı Velî hizmetiyle tâ Horâsân'dan bile Rûm'a gelmiş Fağfûr diyârı hâkinde Kozak kavmi memlûklarından bir çâker-i hâkister-efkende muhibb-i hânedân ârif-i billâh-ı zî-şân kimesne imiş. Bektaş-ı Velî'nin cihâz-ı fakrı vaslalarına vâsıl olup tuğ u alem ve deff ü kudûm ü nefîriyle erre-i tevhîd-i sultânî ederek bu kûh-ı bülendi cây-ı me'men edinüp ber-seccâde olup yedi sene niçe bin cânlar andan me'zûn olup âhir dâr-ı âhirete min mahabbetillâh yönelüp bu mürtefi' cihânnümâ püşte üzre fukarâları cesed-i azîzi defn ederler.* {At the very summit of this place (Adatepe) is the shrine of Kademli Bābā Sulṭān. He came in the service of Ḥājjī Bektash together with him all the way from Khurāsān to Rūm. He was a humble servant among the slaves of the Kozak people in the land of China, a lover of the family of the Prophet, one who had true knowledge of God. Accepting the trappings of poverty from Ḥājjī Bektash – horsetail and standard, tambourine and drum and trumpet – and performing the royal saw-like *tawḥīd* (i.e. *dhikr*) he took refuge on this high mountain and assumed the prayer-rug. In seven years thousands of people received orders from him. Finally, out of love for God, he departed for the afterworld and his dervishes buried his blessed body on this lofty summit.} *Ibid.*, Book 3, fo. 132a.

49 *Fukarâ-yı Yesevî'den olup Azerbaycân şehirlerinden Hoy-ı hüsn-hûydandır. Kûh-ı azîmlerde vahşî sığınlara süvâr olup Orhân Gâzî ile sefer eşüp at tavlası gibi bir tavla sığınları var idi, bârhânesin*

bile vahşî gazâllara yükledirdi. {He was a Yasawī dervish from the city of Khūy of fine character (*Khūy-i ḥusn-khūy*) in Azerbaijan. He rode wild deer in the high mountains and went on campaign with Orhan Ghāzī. He had a stable for deer like a horse stable, and he even had his baggage loaded on wild gazelles.} *Ibid.*, Book 2, fo. 237b. Nevertheless, Bursalı {İsmail} Belig considers him to be a *murīd* of Bābā Ilyās and from the *ṭarīqa* of Shaikh Abū 'l-Wafā' Baghdādī (*Güldeste-i riyâzı irfân* {Bursa, 1302/1884}, p. 220). Indeed, the information provided by {Tashköprü-Zāde in his} *al-Shaqā'iq* {*al-nu'māniyya*, on the margins of Ibn Khallikān's *Wafayāt al-a'yān* (Būlāq, 1300/1882), new ed. Ahmet Furat (Istanbul, 1985)} shows that Geyikli Bābā was from Khūy {in Azerbaijan} and was a *murīd* of Bābā Ilyās, *al-Shaqā'iq*, {Turkish} trans. {Mecdî (Istanbul, 1269/1852–3)}, pp. 31–3. The information in {Sa'd al-Dīn's} *Tāj al-tawārīkh* {Istanbul, 1280/1863–4}, vol. 2, p. 406, and in {Joseph von} Hammer{-Purgstall, *Geschichte des osmanischen Reichs* (Budapest, 1827–35), Turkish trans. Mehmet Ata as *Devlet-i osmaniyye tarihi* (Istanbul, 1329–37/1911–19)}, vol. 1, p. 160, who cites all of it, corroborates *al-Shaqā'iq*. This Geyikli Bābā is somewhat reminiscent of the famous Zāhid-i Āhū-Pūsh {i.e. the hermit clad in deerskin} (Juvainī, {*Ta'rīkh-i*} *Jahān-Gushā*, {ed. Mīrzā Muḥammad Qazvīnī (London, 1912–37)}, vol. 2, p. 10) {English trans. J. A. Boyle as *The History of the World Conqueror* (Manchester, 1958), vol. 1, pp. 283–4}. {See M. Köhbach, "Vom Asketen zum Glaubenskampfer; Geyiklü Baba. Ein Beitrag zur osmanischen Hagiographie," *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 3 (1982), 45–52.}

50 *Bu dahi Hoca Ahmed-i Yesevî fukarâsı idi. Horâsân'dan Hacı Bektaş ile Rûm'a geldi. Niçe yüz keşf u kerâmetleri zâhir olmuşdu.* {He was also a Yasawī dervish. He came from Khurāsān to Rūm with Ḥājjī Bektash and performed numerous miracles.} Evliyā Chelebi, {*Seyāḥatnāme*,} Book 2, fo. 237b. Abdāl Bābā {Mūsā} was also a contemporary of Geyikli Bābā, {Tashköprü-Zāde,} *al-Shaqā'iq*, {Turkish} trans., p. 33. The information in *al-Shaqā'iq* is the same as that in {Sa'd al-Dīn's} *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, vol. 2, p. 407, and the {Turkish} trans. of Hammer, {*Devlet-i osmaniyye tarihi*}, vol. 1, p. 161. Ayakchı Shāh Abdāl Mūsā Sulṭān was the eleventh of the twelve *posts* {spiritual successors} in Bektashī tradition ({anonymous,} *Risāla-i bektāshiyya*, MS copy in my private library). Under his influence, Bektashī poets also wrote *nefeses* {folk religious poetry} about Abdāl Mūsā. Ḥusainī's *nefes*, which begins with the line *Abdal Mûsa Sultan gazaba geldi* {Abdāl Mūsā Sulṭān became angry}, is famous (the collection of Bektashī poetry in my private library). The legends of Qayghusuz Sulṭān recount in detail how Qayghusuz, whom the Bektashīs considered one of their own, went to the dervish convent of Abdāl Mūsā and, thanks to that, obtained guidance (*Manāqib-i Qayghusuz Abdāl* [*Sulṭān*], MS copy in my private library). I can state that this story by no means conforms to historical reality, as is the case with other Bektashī traditions. In order to understand why Abdāl Mūsā was considered to be connected with Ḥājjī Bektash, see 'Āshıq Pasha-Zāde, *Tawārīkh-i āl-i 'uthmān*, {ed. 'Ālī Bey, (Istanbul, 1332/1914)}, p. 205 {new ed. H. Nıhal Atsız as *Tevarih-i âl-i Osman, Aşıkpaşaoğlu tarihi* (Ankara, 1985)}. [For additional information on Abdāl Mūsā, see *Türk halk edebiyatı ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Abdal Mûsâ" (M. F. Köprülü). The article on Abdāl Mūsā in this encyclopedia, only the first fascicle of which appeared, was left unfinished. The remainder of the article was published by Orhan Köprülü based on his father's draft. See *Köprülü'den seçmeler* (Istanbul, 1972), ed. Orhan Köprülü. This article, with notes and bibliography, was also included in a second edition by Orhan Köprülü as M. F. Köprülü, "Abdal Mûsâ," *Türk Kültürü*, 11 (1973), 198–207.] {Now see also Abdurrahman Güzel (ed.), *Abdal Mûsâ velâyetnâmesi* (Ankara, 1999).}

51 *Horosî Dede, ceddimiz Türk-i Türkân Hoca Ahmed Yesevî hazretleri'nin fukarâlarından olup Hacı Bektaş Velî ile Horâsândan gelüp bir pîr-i fânî olup Ebü'l-feth ile Islambol'a gelirken asâkir-i Islâm içre şeb ü rûz yigirmi dörd sâ'atde yigirmi dörd kerre bâng-i horos urup Kum yâ gâfilûn deyü*

guzât-i müslimîni âgâh etdiğiyçün Horos Dede derlermiş. {Horos Dede was one of the dervishes of our ancestor Türk-i Türkān Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī. He came from Khurāsān with Ḥājjī Bektash Veli and became a saintly old man. While coming to (conquer) Istanbul with Mehmed II, he used to crow like a rooster every hour for twenty-four hours day and night, keeping the soldiers alert, and say "Get up, oh neglectful ones!" So he was called Horos Dede ("Grandfather Rooster").} *Seyāḥatnāme*, Book. 1, fo. 26b.

52 *Kunh al-akhbār*, vol. 5, pp. 58–61. ʿĀlī attributes the coming of the *ers* {saints} of Khurāsān to Rūm on spiritual advice {*maʿnevî işâretlerle*} to the fact that the domain of Rūm was the place of manifestation of God {*nazar-gâh-ı Hudâ*}. As for Amīr Chīn Osman, he came into the world in extraordinary fashion, as in the legends of a great many other saints. {Later,} according to their vows, his parents dedicated him to the service of Aḥmad Yasawī. He performed miracles like finding fresh grapes in the middle of winter and taking them to his shaikh. At last, some merchants from China came to the shaikh and pleaded for his help to get rid of a dragon that had appeared in their country. The shaikh girded the waist of Osman, who was still a child, with a wooden sword and sent him off. He went {to China} and killed the dragon. Subsequently, Osman was given the byname Amīr Chīn {Commander of China} and he was sent to Rūm by his shaikh. There he guided a great many people to Islam. While serving the warden {*muḥāfiẓ*} of the *sancak* of Bozok in 1005/1596–7, ʿĀlī heard and recorded this legend (which closely resembles Bektashī legends but is not found in the *velāyetnāmes*) from the shaikh of the *tekke* of Osman Bābā, ʿUmdat al-Māchīn. Evliyā Chelebi, {*Seyāḥatnāme*,} Book 3, fo. 90b, says that he was buried in the town of Ḥusain-ova, which was part of the *sancak* of Bozok, and also mentions that he received the byname Amīr-i Chīn because he killed a dragon in China with a wooden sword. He states too that he was the seventh *khalīfa* of Aḥmad Yasawī. {Ocak tries to identify him further, "Un cheik Yesevī et Babaī dans la première moitié du XIII^{e} siècle en Anatolie: Emīrci Sulṭān (Şerefu'd-Dīn İsmāʿīl b. Muḥammed)," *Turcica*, 12 (1980), 114–24, and also his "Emirci Sultan ve Zaviyesi: XIII. yüzyılın ilk yarısında Anadolu (Bozok)'da bir Babâî şeyhi: Şeref'ud-Din İsmail b. Muhammed," *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 9 (1978), 129–208.}

53 According to the information provided by ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde, one of the earliest Ottoman historians, Ḥājjī Bektash went from Khurāsān to Sivas with his brother Mentesh, then from there to Bābā Ilyās, from there to Kırşehir, and from there to Kayseri. When Mentesh {later} went from Kayseri to Sivas, he was martyred there. Ḥājjī Bektash went from Kayseri to Kara-öyük where he married Khātūn-ana and {later} died. This historian, who states rather clearly that he knew, in particular, the entire life of Ḥājjī Bektash and his brother, says *Kendi bir meczûb-ı budala azîzdi; şeyhlikten ve müridlikten fârigdi* {he was a saint ecstatic with divine love and had no interest in being a shaikh or having disciples}. He rejects categorically the reports that had no historical basis, such as the one that Ḥājjī Bektash met Orhan and that he prayed for the janissary corps. The numerous notes that ʿĀlī Bey added to this subject in his annotations to ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde's *Tawārīkh* – for example, that Ḥājjī Bektash went to Rūm in 680/1281–2, that he lived for ninety-two years, that he died in 738/1337–8, that Khātūn-ana was engaged to Khwāja Idrīs who was a member of the *ʿulamāʾ*, that during his life Ḥājjī Bektash gave the position of shaikh in the convent built by Sultan Orhan to the children of Khwāja Idrīs, that his father's name was Sayyid Muḥammad Ibrāhīm-i Thānī and his mother's name was Khatme Khātūn, and that he was born in Nīshāpūr in 646/1248–9 – are all based on Bektashī traditions. Unfortunately, they have no historical value. To compare legendary stories like these, drawn from the *velāyetnāmes*, with the clear and precise statements in ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde's history (pp. 204–6) can never be considered correct behavior for a historian.

Indeed, ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde's remarks on Ḥājjī Bektash can be easily corroborated by other evidence. Prof. Jacob has also reached virtually the same conclusion in his research on Ḥājjī Bektash {see his *Die Bektaschijje*}. On this subject, see Chapter 4, p. 104.

54 See respectively their *Tawārīkh*, pp. 204–6, and *al-Shaqā'iq* {Turkish} trans., among the shaikhs of Murad I, vol. 1, p. 44.

55 *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli*, MS in my private library. There are many manuscript copies of this famous work.

56 *Ibid.*, p. 6.

57 *Ibid.*, p. 7. This legend is found in almost the same form in the *velāyetnāme* of Ḥājjīm Sulṭān. We find there, however, Aḥmad Yasawī in place of Luqmān-i Paranda.

58 {In the original, the food is specified as *biṣi*, a special kind of pastry. See Gölpınarlı (ed.), *Vilâyet-Nâme*, p. 6.}

59 *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli*, MS in my private library, p. 8.

60 *Ibid.*, p. 9.

61 No one named Luqmān-i Paranda is found in the precursors of the Naqshbandīs {*hâcegân silsila*} in {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt* {it is difficult to know why Köprülü thought he should be}, nor is this title found in the works mentioning the legends and lives of the saints. Only the historian ʿĀlī presents some of the legends mentioned above as if they had taken place between Ḥājjī Bektash and Luqmān-i Paranda, but he gives no information about Luqmān, *Kunh al-akhbār*, vol. 5, p. 53. In like manner, Luqmān is shown as a *murshid* of Ḥājjī Bektash in such books as {ʿAbd al-Ghaffār b. Ḥasan Kirimī's} *ʿUmdat al-tawārīkh*, which doubtless indicates that *Kunh al-akhbār* was the source of these works in this respect. ʿĀlī certainly took this story from Bektashī tradition. We learn from {Mīrkhwānd's} *Rawḍat al-ṣafā* {ed. Riḍā Qulī Khān (Tehran, 1270–4/1853–6; new edn, Tehran, 1338–9 sh./1960)} that Shaikh Luqmān-i Paranda was not completely imaginary, like a number of other personalities in the *Velāyetnāme*, but actually existed. While mentioning him among the famous people from the reign of {the Tīmūrid} Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā {1469–1506}, this work states that he had a very well known *tekke* and shrine {*mezarlık*} in Herat. The literary scholar Mawlānā Yūsuf Badīʿī Andijānī (d. 898/1492–3), who wrote a treatise on the rules of the *muʿammā* {a genre of verse}, was buried in the cemetery of Luqmān-i Paranda, *Rawḍat al-ṣafā*, vol. 7, p. 122; {Khwāndamīr,} *Ḥabīb al-siyar* {Bombay, 1273/1857}, vol. 3, p. 327. We also learn {from *Rawḍat al-ṣafā*} that the famous Sayyid Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad Andijānī, a contemporary who had the byname Mīr-i Ser-Burehne {Bare-headed Amīr}, was placed in charge of this tomb and was appointed the shaikh, and that every year this shrine received 150,000 *kepeki* dinars from *waqfs* {pious endowments} and votive offerings, *Rawḍat al-ṣafā*, vol. 7, p. 116. This brief report shows us that Shaikh Luqmān-i Paranda was a great and famous shaikh buried in Herat {Mīrkhwānd does not clearly show this}, that his *tekke* and tomb were renowned among the people in that region in the ninth/fifteenth century, and that it possessed rich *waqfs*. Most probably this shaikh was a member of Aḥmad Yasawī's *ṭarīqa*, but one could state with great likelihood that he, like a number of the other shaikhs mentioned in the *Velāyetnāme*, had absolutely no historical connection with Ḥājjī Bektash. If more information were available on the life of this shaikh, it would probably shed light on a number of points that have remained obscure up to now. In any case, I have not been able to find any information on Luqmān-i Paranda in either the description of Herat in {Ẓāhir al-Dīn Bābur's} *Bāburnāme* {ed. A. S. Beveridge as the *Bábár-náma* (Leiden, 1905); new ed. Eiji Mano, *Bâbur-nâma (Vaqâyi') I: Critical Edition Based on Four Chaghatay Texts, II: Concordance and Classified Indexes* (Kyoto, 1995–6); English trans. Wheeler Thackston (Oxford, 1996)} or under "Herat" in Barbier de Meynard's *Dictionnaire géographique*. The references in *Rawḍat al-ṣafā* and {Khwāndamīr's}

Ḥabīb al-siyar that reveal the historical existence of Luqmān-i Paranda have, to date, not attracted any attention. There is also some brief information on this person in {Nā'ib al-Ṣadr Shīrāzī's} *Ṭarā'iq al-ḥaqā'iq* {Tehran, 1318/1900} that is included in the work that I will publish on the Bektashiyya. {Never published. See his article "Bektaş" in *İA*.}

62 {Curiously, Köprülü does not mention that the Ḥaidar who is mentioned as Aḥmad Yasawī's "son" in the *Velāyetname's* account is expressly identified there as Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaidar, eponym of the Ḥaidarī dervishes and a figure linked to Aḥmad Yasawī also by Nawā'ī's *Nasā'im al-maḥabba*.}

63 *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli*, pp. 10–15. This legend is not found in the *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjim Sulṭān*.

64 *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli*, pp. 15–21. This legend is also not found in the *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjim Sulṭān*.

65 See section A above for information on these items with which Aḥmad Yasawī had been entrusted. When the *khalīfas* of Aḥmad Yasawī requested these entrusted items from him they usually received the answer "*sâhibi vardır, gelir*" {their rightful owner will come to claim them}. One morning they resolved to take them, so after the morning prayer they sat down and lit a big fire. At that moment, Aḥmad Yasawī appeared and knew their intention. There was a heap of millet grain {Köprülü misread *çeç* = heap as *çiçek* = flower. The test was to perform the prayer on a millet heap without disturbing a single grain. See Gölpınarlı (ed.), *Vilâyet-Nâme*, pp. 15–16} at one side of the square at that place. Aḥmad Yasawī said *Kim bu darı çeçinin üstüne seccâdesini koyup namaz kılarsa, o emânetler gelip onun başı ucuna dikilirler. Hem zâten nâfile zahmet çekmiyin, sâhibi nerede ise buraya gelir!* {Whoever places his prayer rug over this heap of millet and prays, those entrusted things will come and station themselves at his head. Anyway, don't trouble yourselves in vain. Their owner will be here soon!} At that moment, Ḥājjī Bektash appeared and greeted them. The *khwāja* and his *murīds* rose to their feet. Shortly afterwards, Aḥmad Yasawī shouted, "*Yâ Bektaş!*" {Oh, Bektash!}. On this signal, Ḥājjī Bektash placed his prayer rug on the heap of millet and performed two prostrations. Not one grain of millet moved from its place. The crown in trust then immediately took flight and moved to Bektash's head. The cloak rose in the air and settled on his back. The lamp rose from its place, lit up, and stood before him. The Prophet's standard rose from its place and stationed itself above his head. The prayer-rug rose from its place and spread itself underneath him *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli*, pp. 24–5. {Köprülü made a jumble of this passage. We have followed Gölpınarlı's edn, p. 16}.

66 *Ibid*., p. 25. This tradition was so widespread among the Western Turks that even Evliyā Chelebi described Ḥājjī Bektash's coming to Rūm in the same manner, *Yine bunların zamân-ı hilâfetinde cedd-i 'izâmımız Türk-i Türkân Hoca Ahmed Yesevî hazretleri Horâsân'dan halîfesi olan Hacı Bektaş Velî'yi üçyüz fukarâsıyle sâhib-i seccâde edüp deff ü kudûm ve 'alem u çırâğ verüp . . . Orhân Gâzî'ye gelüp mülâkât olduğu gibi Bursa üstüne gelüp fethetdiler* {At the time of his (i.e. Sultan Orhan's) sultanate, our illustrious ancestor Türk-i Türkān Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī placed his *khalīfa* Ḥājjī Bektash in charge of 300 dervishes and gave him the tambourine and drum, standard and lamp . . . He came from Khurāsān to Orhan Ghāzī and met with him. Then they went to Bursa and conquered it.} *Seyāḥatnāme*, Book 1, fo. 23b. In a *nefes* on the qualities and miracles of Ḥājjī Bektash, a Bektashī poet named Dīdārī stated in the following lines of verse that he was associated with Aḥmad Yasawī, *Hâce-i Yesevî onun pîridir / Kerâmeti dağlar taşlar yürütür* {Khwāja Yasawī was his *pīr* / His miraculous grace moved mountains and rocks}. In a MS that I have of a collection of Bektashī works, the chain of authority of the *ṭarīqa* of Ḥājjī Bektash is given as follows: Ḥājjī Bektash Veli, Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, Mumshād Dīnawarī {a well known figure from the early generations in

reconstructed Ṣūfī *silsilas*}, Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaidarī {he is indeed linked to Aḥmad Yawawī by Nawā'ī and in Bektashī tradition}, Imām Mūsā Riḍā, Imām Mūsā Kāẓim, Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, Imām Muḥammad Bāqir, Imām Zain al-'Ābidīn, Imām Ḥusain, Imām 'Alī 'l-Murtaḍā, the Prophet Muḥammad, {the angel} Jibrā'īl, {the angel} Mikhā'īl, {the angel} Isrāfīl, {the angel} 'Azrā'īl. There is no need to state that this chain has absolutely no historical value. {This list may not, in fact, have been intended to be understood as a *silsila* in any real sense.} However, it is clear from this as well that all Bektashī traditions wanted to trace Bektashism back to Aḥmad Yasawī.

67 *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjim Sulṭān*, pp. 15–16. This legend is also found in somewhat abbreviated form in the *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli*, but according to this version it was not Aḥmad Yasawī who hurled the piece of wood, but rather one of the *erens* of Khurāsān, and the one who caught it in Konya was named Aḥmad. He planted it at the convent of Bektash Veli, p. 26. In the *Velāyetnāme* we also learn that Aḥmad Yasawī gave a giant {or demon?} to the service of Ḥājjī Bektash and, after Ḥājjī Bektash went to Rūm, he gave it in turn as a gift to Qaraja-Aḥmad, p. 30.

68 Evliyā Chelebi, {*Seyāḥatnāme*}, Book 1, fo. 212b; Book 2, fos 266a–267b. Sarı Saltuk, i.e. the legend of Kaligra (Kalliakre) Sulṭān, is described at length in these pages. Evliyā Chelebi not only says that Sarı Saltuk had a shrine in Bābāeski (Book 3, fo. 170a), but he also states, while mentioning Babadağı {in Dobruja} in the same volume, that Sarı Saltuk had a *maqām* {tomb} there; and he adds that Yazıcı-oğlu {Mehmet Chelebi, d. 1451} and the governor of Ochakov {Özi} Kenan Pasha {d. 1659} each wrote a work on his legends, Book 3, fo. 127b. Unfortunately, we have no information about these two works. In any case, Sarı Saltuk was a very well known hero among the Western Turks. The poet Naw'ī-Zāde 'Aṭā'ī {d. 1635}, the author of *Khamsa*, tells of one of his great miracles in his *Kitāb-i Nafḥat al-azhār der jawāb-i maḥzan al-asrār* (copy in my private library) and Kemāl Pasha-Zāde {d. 1534} speaks of his spiritual height in his *Mohaçnāme* {book 10 of his *Tarih-i āl-i osman*, ed. and French trans. Abel Pavet de Courteille as *Histoire de la campagne de Mohacz par Kemal Pachazadeh* (Paris, 1859)}, saying *Dobruca Kırı dedikleri yerde sâhib-i serîr-i velâyet, tâcdâr-ı iklîmi-i kerâmet Sarı Saltık Sultan'ın ki havârık-ı âdât-ı kâhire ve bevârık-ı kerâmât-ı bâhire ile zâhir olan emîr-sûret, fakîr-sîret azîzlerdendi* . . . {In the place they call the land of Dobruja, the possessor of the throne of sainthood, king of the realm of miracles, Sarı Saltuk was one of the saints who were *amīrs* in appearance and *faqīrs* in character, and who manifested extraordinary marvels and superior miracles . . . }, pp. 80–3. There is in fact a historical basis to this legend. In 662/1263–4 a number of Turks went to Dobruja in the company of Sarı Saltuk and later, at the time of 'Īsā Bey, one of the Karası-oghulları at Balıkesir, they emigrated to the area of Karası. This migration is mentioned in the MS of {Yazıcı-oğlu 'Alī's} *Saljūqnāme* in the Revan Köşkü {in Topkapı Sarayı; this work was edited by Th. Houtsma as vol. 3 of *Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des seldjoucides* (Leiden, 1902)}, which states *Dobruca İli'nde duran Müsülmanlar dahî kâfirden uşinen, göçüp Karesi iline geçtiler* {the Muslims, who were in the land of Dobruja, were harried [?] by the unbelievers, they emigrated and went to the land of Karası}, Ahmed Tevhid, {"Rum selçuki devletinin inkiraziyle teşekkül eden tevâif-i mülûkdan Kara Hisar-i Sahibde Sahib Ata Oğulları,"} *TOEM*, 9 {1327/1910}, 565. Tevhid says that there is a work in the Imperial Library in Vienna by the *shāhnāme* writer {*şehnâmeci*} Sayyid Luqmān on the conquests of Sarı Saltuk Ghāzī. It is a treatise mentioned in G. Flügel's catalogue {*Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der Kaiserl.-Königl. Hofbibliothek zu Wien* (Vienna, 1865–7)}, vol. 2, p. 225. A short treatise bearing the title *Ijmāl-i aḥwāl-i āl-i saljūq ber mūjib-i naql-i oghūzname-i Sayyid Luqmān* was published by Dr. J. J. W. Lagus in Helsinki in 1854. The traveler Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who was a contemporary of Sultan Orhan, mentions Sarı Saltuk in his *Riḥla*

ثم وصلنا الى البلدة المعروفة باسم باب سلطوق و يذكرون ان سلطوق هذا كان مكاشفا

لاكن يذكر عنه اشياء ينكرها الشرع

{We came to the town known by the name of Bāb Salṭūq. They relate that this Salṭūq was an esctatic devotee, although things are told of him that are reproved by divine law; cf. Gibb, trans. vol. 2, pp. 499–500} ({eds C. Defrémery and B. R. Sanguinetti as *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*} [Paris, 1853–8], vol. 2, p. 416). While providing information on Sarı Saltuk in the annotations to his translation of the *Mohaçnāme*, Pavet de Courteille says that his tomb was in Babadağı, that it was widely venerated, and that it was visited by Sultan Süleyman in 945/1538, p. 177. In any case, these historical works mention no connection whatsoever between Sarı Saltuk and Ḥājjī Bektash. Nevertheless, it is recorded in detail in Bektashī tradition, which is always completely contrary to the historical facts, that Sarı Saltuk was a shepherd, that on the order of Ḥājjī Bektash he took Ulu Abdāl and Kichi Abdāl with him and traveled from Sinop to Georgia on a prayer rug, that he converted the Georgians to Islam, that he then went to the fortress of Kaligra in Dobruja where he killed a dragon, that he then invited the people of the surrounding region to Islam, and that he established a *tekke*. Sarı Saltuk returned for a time after Ḥājjī Bektash's death, but he went back again to Dobruja and died there. In accordance with his will, when he died seven coffins were laid out. His *murīds* and those who believed in him came from various cities and took one of them and looked in it. They saw Saltuk Bābā in each one and thus they happily took him to their own cities where they buried him. According to Bektashī tradition, this was why he had a *maqām* in seven places (*Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli*, pp. 62–7). In the versified version of the *Velāyetnāme*, the legend is the same, lacking only the trip to Georgia and his return to the mother lodge. Naw'ī-Zāde 'Aṭā'ī shows quite clearly in his *Khamsa* that in the eleventh/seventeenth century the Bektashīs considered Sarı Saltuk to be a great member of their order, just like Qızıl-Deli Sulṭān (MS in my private library). [For Köprülü's subsequent work on Sarı Saltuk and the *Saltuk-nāme*, see the text and notes of his "Anadolu Selçukluları tarihinin yerli kaynakları," *Belleten*, 7 (1943), 430–41 {English trans. Gary Leiser as *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Their History and Culture According to Local Muslim Sources* (Salt Lake City, 1992), pp. 43–52}. See also Orhan F. Köprülü, "Tarihî kaynak olarak XIV. ve XV. asırlardaki bâzı Türk menakıbnâmeleri," Dissertation Istanbul University, {1951,} Tarih Semineri, ktp. no. 512, pp. 21–83.]{Now see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ṣarı Ṣalṭūḳ Dede" (G. Leiser); and Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Sarı Saltık* (Ankara, 2002).}

69 Ḥazīnī, who was originally from Turkistan {from Ḥiṣār west of Dushanbe in modern-day Tajikistan} but wrote his work to be presented to Sultan Murad III in Istanbul, also shows Ḥājjī Bektash as one of his *khalīfas*, but by using the phrase *diyorlar ki* {they say that}, he does not make this claim himself, p. 75. Because his *Jawāhir* does not include all sorts of legends from the Bektashī tradition, provides rather plausible information on the family of Aḥmad Yasawī, and incorporates much material on the rules of the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*, we can regard this work as being uniquely important in preserving the version of the legend of Aḥmad Yasawī found in Turkistan {but Köprülü was unaware of the substantial literary legacy produced by Yasawī tradition, or reflecting it, in Central Asia}. Speaking of Aḥmad Yasawī in the versified version of the *Velāyetnāme* of Ḥājjī Bektash, the verse *Murâd îden menakıbında göre / Olan pervâne îren şem'-i nûrâ* {He who wishes may consult his *Manāqib*; it is the moth that attains the candle of light} could be evidence, although not very definitive, that some kind of legend about him had appeared in that region and that he was known there.

70 There is nothing on Aḥmad Yasawī in any of the works of Bābur Shāh or Nawā'ī or in {Mīrkhwānd's} *Rawḍat al-ṣafā*, or {Khwāndamīr's} *Ḥabīb al-siyar*. Only {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt*, which was written in the early years of the tenth/sixteenth century, contains a little information on him. Even Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt* has no reference to him. {Bābur, indeed, does not mention Aḥmad Yasawī; but Mīrkhwānd does mention his shrine, as does Khwāndamīr. Nawā'ī, of course, gives the extremely important account of Aḥmad Yasawī in his *Nasā'im al-maḥabba*, along with several other figures who may be linked with the Yasawī tradition; the work was a Chaghatay translation, with expansion (especially a section on the Turkic shaikhs) of Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt*. Köprülü's failure to use it for *Early Mystics* was remedied in a later article, "Orta-Asya Türk dervişliği hakkında bazı notlar," *TM*, 14 (1964), 259–62, in which, however, he merely paraphrased the work's accounts without adding any analysis or comparison. On the earliest edition of the additions, see Carl Brockelmann, "Newa'is Biographien türkischer und zeitgenössischer Mystiker," in *Documenta Islamica Inedita (Festschrift R. Hartmann)*, ed. J. Fück (Berlin, 1952), pp. 221–49 (full of misprints and based on a manuscript with many problems) and Kemal Eraslan's edition in Turkish-based transcription, Alî Şîr Nevâyî, *Nesâyimü'l-mahabbe min şemâyimi'l-fütüvve* (Istanbul, 1979), 2nd edn (Ankara, 1996). Eraslan does not mention Brockelmann's work. As for the *Rashaḥāt*, it is indeed an important source on Aḥmad Yasawī and the Yasawī tradition, but it garbles or over-systematizes the tradition's *silsila*, among other things. Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt* does not accord a separate biographical entry to Aḥmad Yasawī, but it does mention him in its account of the four successors of Yūsuf Hamadānī. See the critical edition of *Nafaḥāt al-uns* by Maḥmūd 'Ābidī (Tehran, 1370/1991), pp. 382, 388, 438.}

71 Setting aside the *Velāyetnāme*, we first encounter the tradition of Ḥājjī Bektash in written form in {'Ālī's} *Kunh al-akhbār* and Evliyā Chelebi's *Seyāḥatnāme*. It is quite obvious that the tradition of Ḥājjī Bektash was fixed and established, and the *Velāyetnāme* was created, in the tenth/sixteenth century, which we consider to be the period in which the present-day Bektashiyya took form and developed, and that both 'Ālī and Evliyā Chelebi made use of it. 'Ālī summarized the information on Ḥājjī Bektash, apart from the section on Chīn Osman, from material wholly derived from the *Velāyetnāme*. The fact that the arrangement of the material in the *Velāyetnāme* is the same as that in the *Kunh al-akhbār*, and the fact that there is not even the slightest difference between the legends, are sufficient proof of this. Furthermore, 'Ālī states that he saw the {spiritual?} genealogy of Ḥājjī Bektash (vol. 5, p. 53) and informs us that he visited his convent in 1005/1596–7 and met there with Iskender Chelebi, a descendant of Balım Sulṭān. All of this is sufficient evidence to confirm that the *Velāyetnāme* of Ḥājjī Bektash existed at that time and was commonly known.

72 The legend of Sarı Saltuk is evidence for this Bektashī practice. In addition, the fact that historical personalities like Yūnus Emre, Sayyid Maḥmūd Ḥairānī, and Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, whose legends were widespread among the people, were mixed with the Bektashī legend in various ways is also evidence for this practice. If we possessed Yazıcı-oğlu's *Sarı Saltuk menkabesi*, which Evliyā Chelebi says was extant, we would surely learn the extent to which he was associated with Aḥmad Yasawī. I wonder if this relationship, which is mentioned by Evliyā Chelebi, had long existed as a legend among the people or if it was created later under the influence of the Bektashī legend. For now no definite answer can be given to this question. The second possibility appears to be more likely, but because certain dervishes like Chīn Osman – and numerous Yasawī *khalīfas* mentioned by Evliyā Chelebi – who are not included in the Bektashī tradition are associated with Aḥmad Yasawī in early legends among the Western Turks, the first possibility cannot be completely rejected. {Köprülü, however, has no evidence of these legends' early attestation.}

73 Another possibility arises here. I wonder if the legend of Aḥmad Yasawī spread among the Western Turks after the spread of the Naqshbandiyya. The spread of the Naqshbandiyya among the Western Turks took place in the second half of the ninth/fifteenth century after Shaikh Ilāhi-i Simāvī, or more correctly in the tenth/sixteenth century, {Tashköprü-Zāde,} *al-Shaqā'iq*, {Turkish} trans., vol. 1, p. 262; {İsmâ'îl Belig,} *Güldeste-i riyâz-ı irfân*, p. 144; {Laṭīfī,} *Tadhkira*, {ed. Ahmed Cevdet as *Tadhkira-yi Laṭīfī* (Istanbul, 1314/1896)}, p. 50. In any case, the present form of the legend of Ḥājjī Bektash, 'Ālī's history, Evliyā Chelebi's *Seyāḥatnāme*, and even {Ḥazīnī's} *Jawāhir* all came into being after the ninth/fifteenth century, in the tenth/sixteenth century, i.e. after the spread of the Naqshbandiyya. By dismissing all this evidence as coincidence, could it not be a mistake to assert that the legend of Aḥmad Yasawī had already spread among the Western Turks before the formation of the Ottoman state?

In my view, this possibility is not very strong. The aforesaid annotations can be cause to reject it and several other factors could be considered in this regard. For example, if 'Ālī and Evliyā Chelebi had taken the legend of Aḥmad Yasawī from {Ḥazīnī's} *Jawāhir*, then we could conclude that this legend had come to the Western Turks as a result of the spread of the Naqshbandiyya, but the fact is that they both took this legend from the Bektashī tradition. Indeed, because it is not mentioned in Kātib Chelebi's *Kashf al-zunūn*, we could conclude that the *Jawāhir* cannot have been well known at that time. Although it is true that the Bektashī tradition was fixed in the tenth/sixteenth century, this does not prove that the Yasawī legend had appeared at that time. If it had, then one would have to believe that the legends of Yūnus Emre, Sayyid Maḥmūd Ḥairānī and others had also come into existence in the tenth/sixteenth century. I have explained above, however, that Aḥmad Yasawī legends are to be found in 'Ālī and Evliyā Chelebi, which differ from those derived from the *velāyetnāmes*. As will be described in the second part of this book, there is a definite resemblance between the work of Yūnus Emre and his associates and the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, which further strengthens my aforesaid assertion. In any case, until new documents provide proof to the contrary, we can state categorically that the legend of Aḥmad Yasawī had already existed among the Western Turks before the formation of the Ottoman state. {Köprülü was on to something in suggesting that the Naqshbandīs had a role in spreading Aḥmad Yasawī's fame among the "Western Turks," but that role probably came later. His argument against his suggestion stresses the weak arguments and misses the main one, namely that the *Velāyetname* of Ḥājjī Bektash was undoubtedly compiled before the end of the fifteenth century (the notion that Evliyā Chelebi could have gotten his information on Aḥmad Yasawī from Ḥazīnī's work makes no sense). Finally, he goes too far in claiming that the circulation of legends about Aḥmad Yasawī in Anatolia before the formation of the Ottoman state is "categorically" affirmable without negative proof!}

3

THE HISTORICAL LIFE OF AḤMAD YASAWĪ

Legends created by the popular imagination always contain an element of truth, i.e. they faithfully represent the form in which any personality or event is reflected in the general consciousness. It is the duty of the historian first to describe the legendary form of this personality or event and then to establish and animate its historical reality. If the first duty has been adequately done, it will greatly facilitate translating and reducing the myth to its true proportions.

A His childhood

Aḥmad Yasawī was born in the town of Sairām, which today is part of the district of Aqsu in the region of Eastern Turkistan in China. It is located 176 km northeast of {the town of} Aqsu.[1] Sairām is a small town on the stream called the Qara-su, which flows into the Shāhyār River, a tributary of the Tarim River.[2] Although the date of Aḥmad Yasawī's birth is not known for certain, we can estimate that it occurred around the middle of the fifth/eleventh century.[3] Aḥmad's father, Shaikh Ibrāhīm, was one of the most famous shaikhs of Sairām. He married ʿĀ'isha Khātūn, the daughter of Mūsā Shaikh, one of his *khalīfas*. From this union, a daughter, Gawhar-Shahnāz, and later a son, Aḥmad, were born. Their mother predeceased their father, who died when Aḥmad was seven years old.[4] Thus we find him under the guardianship of his sister. According to tradition, Shaikh Ibrāhīm's family was traced back to Imām Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya b. ʿAlī al-Murtaḍā in the following manner: Shaikh Ibrāhīm b. Shaikh Ilyās b. Shaikh Maḥmūd b. Shaikh Maḥmūd (?!) b. Shaikh Muḥammad b. Shaikh Iftikhār b. Shaikh ʿUmar b. Shaikh ʿUthmān b. Shaikh Ḥusain b. Shaikh Ḥasan b. Shaikh Ismāʿīl b. Shaikh Mūsā b. Shaikh Mu'min b. Shaikh Hārūn b. Shaikh al-Shuyūkh Baḥr al-ʿIrfān Jabal al-Iṭmi'nān Quṭb-i Turkistān Khwāja Isḥāq Bāb b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān b. ʿAbd al-Qahhār b. ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ b. Imām b. al-Ḥanafiyya b. ʿAlī al-Murtaḍā.[5]

It can be supposed that, for unknown reasons, Aḥmad Yasawī went to Yasī when he was still young and settled there. The traditions about how he took the byname Yasawī and about how Arslan Bābā met him in Yasī both support this notion. Because the city of Yasī – as it is called today {Ḥaḍrat-i} Turkistan – was

the center of government of Oghuz Khān, it was a famous place that had already passed into Turkish legend.[6] And the fact that Khwāja Aḥmad took the byname Yasawī, based on residence in this city, further increased its historical importance in the Turkish world. In any case, Aḥmad, who went to this city and settled there with his sister, received there the favor, kindness, and blessing of the well known Turkish shaikh Arslan Bābā.[7] Because the latter died while Aḥmad was quite young, the tradition that Arslan Bābā had a strong influence on his personality cannot be regarded as historically correct. {In any case,} it is likely that Aḥmad did spend the first years of his education in Yasī, for we find him, while he was still a youth, going to Bukhārā, which was a great Islamic center, in order to complete his education.

B Khwāja Yūsuf Hamadānī in Bukhārā

In the sixth/twelfth century, Bukhārā was under the political control of the Qarakhānids. This city had lost the political significance that it had had in the Sāmānid period, but it maintained its fame as the most important center of the Islamic sciences in Transoxiana. Its *madrasas* were full of students coming from throughout the Muslim world, and especially Turkistan. The city was ruled by a very rich family of *'ulamā'* known as the Āl-i Burhān. All the learned members of this family, who were Ḥanafīs, were given the byname Ṣadr-i Jihān. The founder of the family was Burhān al-Milla wa 'l-Dīn 'Abd al-'Azīz b. 'Umar, who was well known under the byname Nu'mān-i Thānī. He lived from about the second half of the fifth/eleventh century to the early years of the sixth/twelfth century. Although subordinate to the Qarakhānids, this *ṣadr* {paramount or foremost person} usually lived like an independent ruler. He was succeeded by his son, Ḥusām al-Dīn 'Umar, who held the reins of power in Bukhārā until he was killed by the Qara Khiṭāy in 536/1143–4.[8] In any case, it is rather easy to guess what kinds of religious currents were prevalent in the *madrasas* of Bukhārā during the rule of these *ṣadrs* who were Ḥanafī religious scholars and supported 6000 *faqīhs* {jurists}. It was at such a time and into such a milieu that Aḥmad Yasawī arrived. He attached himself to Shaikh Yūsuf Hamadānī, one of the leading religious scholars and Ṣūfīs of the period, and his personality was formed under his influence.[9]

Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf b. Ayyūb b. Yūsuf b. al-Ḥasan b. Wahara[10] was born in 440 or 441/1049–50 in the town of Būzanjīrd in the region of Hamadān.[11] Sometime after 460/1067–8, he went to Baghdad,[12] where he attached himself to Shaikh Abū Isḥāq Shīrāzī and in a short time surpassed his friends in {the study of} *uṣūl al-fiqh* {the principles of jurisprudence} and *khilāf* {divergences among the legal schools} and won the respect of his master. According to the information given by al-Sam'ānī, who was in Yūsuf Hamadanī's *tekke* in Marw and who met there and later in Bukhārā with Ḥasan Andāqī, he had extensive knowledge of *fiqh* and, above all, *'ilm-i naẓar*. Later he studied *Ḥadīth* with the great traditionists of the age in Baghdad, Isfahan, and Samarqand. Finally, after

acquiring great knowledge and erudition in the religious sciences, he abandoned them on the impulse of his mystical temperament and studied Ṣūfism directly from the famous Shaikh Abū ʿAlī Fārmadī. It is reported that he also conversed with Shaikh ʿAbd Allāh Juvainī and Shaikh Ḥasan Simnānī.[13]

After following the path of asceticism and struggle against his carnal self, Yūsuf Hamadānī went to live in Marw. A short time later, he left for Herat. He stayed there for a fairly long time, but when the people of Marw asked him to return to their city, he did so. {Nevertheless,} he left a second time for Herat. In Rabīʿ I 535/October–November 1140, while on the way back to Marw from Herat, he died in the town of Bāmiyīn.[14] According to one report, Ibn al-Najjār, one of his disciples, later had his body taken to Marw, where his tomb now is.[15]

Khwāja Yūsuf Hamadānī was a very ardent follower of the "Greatest Imām" {Abū Ḥanīfa} and was a follower of his *madhhab* {the Ḥanafī school of law}. He lived in different cities in Iraq, Khurāsān, and Transoxiana where he was occupied with providing spiritual guidance to the people. He spent a rather long time in Bukhārā and even lived for a while on Kūh-i Zar {near Mt Dāmghān}.[16] It seems that Aḥmad Yasawī joined Yūsuf Hamadānī when he was in Bukhārā – or, according to another tradition, when he was in Samarqand – and learned from him the rules, as well as the sciences (both exoteric and esoteric), of the mystical way. He may also have traveled about various countries with his shaikh. In any case, Yūsuf Hamadānī spent most of his time in Marw al-Rūd. Abū 'l-Saʿd al-Samʿānī says that he had a *tekke* in Marw,[17] and other sources report that his *tekke* in that city was so famous and important at that time that it was regarded as the Kaʿba of Khurāsān.[18] Yūsuf Hamadānī, who won widespread fame in the Muslim world for his erudition and virtue and for the miracles that he performed, went to Baghdad in 515/1121–2. In the famous Niẓāmiyya Madrasa founded by the Seljuk Vizier Niẓām al-Mulk, he gave sermons and spiritual counsel to a select assembly who had hastened there from all directions. During one sermon, a famous *faqīh* named Ibn al-Saqqā' stood up and asked the *khwāja* a question. In reply he said, "Sit down! I detect the odor of unbelief in your words. It is likely that your death will not be within the Muslim faith." This in fact came to pass. Ibn al-Saqqā' went to Constantinople with the Byzantine ambassador who had come to Baghdad and he became a Christian.[19] Yūsuf Hamadānī performed a great many similar miraculous and marvelous deeds.

Khwāja ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī, in his treatise *Maqāmāt-i Yūsuf Hamadānī*,[20] provides considerable information that shows, in the most sincere manner, the life and character of the shaikh. Thanks to this work, the figure of the learned Ṣūfī, which al-Samʿānī, whom we can consider to be the earliest source on this subject, and various other sources only vaguely bring to life, takes very clear and lively form. We learn not only of Yūsuf Hamadānī's physical appearance, character, and habits, but also the full essence and depth of his spirit.

{According to the *Maqāmāt*,} Yūsuf Hamadānī was a tall, thin man with pockmarks and a long, light-brown beard. He wore wool clothing that was always patched. He gave no importance to worldly affairs and would not visit the homes

of rulers or great men. Whatever he acquired, he gave to the needy. He would not accept anything from anyone. He did not know Turkish. He was single for seventy-five years and then finally married. His wife died forty days before he did. He was very kind to everyone. He was patient and tender-hearted and would ask visitors about the dervishes in their provinces. As he silently performed the *dhikr*, he would imprison his carnal self and therefore sweat profusely.[21] He was always occupied with reading the Koran. From the place called Khosh-dūd, which was within the Ghātfar quarters, to the mosque he would make a complete recitation of the Koran. From the door of the mosque until he arrived at the home of Khwāja Ḥasan Andāqī and Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, he would recite *Sūrat al-Baqara*. On the way back, he would complete *Sūrat Āl ʿImrān*. While going from his mosque to the dervish cells, a distance of 700 feet, he would also recite part of the Koran. In between, he would turn his face toward Hamadān and weep profusely. He possessed the staff and turban of Salmān Fārsī {a Persian barber who was taken into Muḥammad's household and became the model of spiritual adoption}. At the beginning of every month, he would summon the mullās of Samarqand and discuss the *Sharīʿa* with them. Khaḍir was his constant companion. He would apply medications to pains and wounds, write *nuskhas* (amulets) for fevers, and try to alleviate everyone's suffering. He was never loath to teach the obligations of the faith to all the villagers, Turk and Tajik alike. He was always preoccupied with teaching. He accepted all the basic dogmas of Islam without esoteric interpretation. He lived in a continuous state of asceticism and spiritual struggle {against his carnal self}. He advised his disciples to follow the ways of the Prophet and his Companions. His heart was full of deep affection for all creatures. He would go to the homes of Christians and Zoroastrians and recount to them the splendors of Islam. He was patient and forbearing with everything. He showed respect and affection to everyone. A harsh word never passed his lips. He never called a Muslim an unbeliever. He was inclined to poverty and would not use anything made of gold or silver. He regarded the poor more highly than the rich. In his room, there was a rush mat, a felt, a water jug, two cushions, a saucepan and nothing else. He would always speak to his disciples of the legends and virtues of the *Chahār yār* {the first four caliphs} and advise them to pray, fast, hold *dhikrs*, practice asceticism, and struggle against their carnal desires.

On Wednesday, 11 Ramaḍān 504/March 25, 1110, Sultan Sanjar sent a letter to Qāsim Jūkī in Samarqand. In this letter, he made known his respect and deference toward Shaikh Yūsuf Hamadānī. He also sent 50,000 gold pieces to the dervishes of his *tekke* and added that "they should inform him about the way of life of this great shaikh, who did not deviate from the path of the Aṣḥāb-i Kirām {Companions and disciples of the Prophet}, and should request for himself {the recitation of} the *Fātiḥa* from the Shaikh."[22] Meanwhile, Shaikh Yūsuf had gone to the cell of Khwāja ʿAbd Allāh Baraqī in order to meet his disciples. Khwāja Ḥasan Andāqī, Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, Khwāja ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī, and several others were all there. The disciples informed him of

Sultan Sanjar's offering, and Shaikh Yūsuf recited a *Fātiḥa* for his deed. He then said that he had no deeds that Sanjar should be informed of except for moral slips and errors. When his dervishes pressed him, he said, "Write down whatever you see me do that is in conformity with the prophetic *Sharī'a*!" Granted this permission, the dervishes wrote his biography and sent it {to Sanjar}.

Before he died, 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī asked him about his *khalīfas* and received the following answer: "My *khalīfas* will be Khwāja 'Abd Allāh Baraqī, and after him Khwāja Ḥasan Andāqī, and after him Aḥmad Yasawī. When the turn of *khalīfa* has come to Aḥmad Yasawī, he will travel to the province of Turkistan and you will become the *khalīfa*." This in fact came to pass. On the day of his death, he turned his back to the *miḥrāb* {niche indicating the direction of Mecca} and ordered his companions to heat some water {to wash his corpse}. Then he turned his face to his four *khalīfas* and the others who were present and said, "I have left my place to 'Abd Allāh Baraqī. Follow him! Do not oppose him! State the rules of behavior that we wrote for Sultan Sanjar to our disciples and companions!" Turning to Aḥmad Yasawī, he asked him to read the *Sūrat al-Fāṭir*, *Sūrat Yāsīn*, and *Sūrat al-Nāzi'āt*. When this was finished, a cry broke out.[23] When Yūsuf Hamadānī, who had won great fame during his life for his strict observance of the stipulations of the *Sharī'a* and the *sunna* of the Prophet and for his erudition in the religious sciences, closed his eyes, many of the attributes that contributed to his fame passed to his *khalīfas* and within a short time they too won great renown.[24] Yūsuf Hamadānī was often cited in books on Ṣūfism.[25] These references as well as some legends confirm that he wrote several works,[26] but unfortunately none has come down to us.[27]

Thus, Khwāja Aḥmad regarded his spiritual guide and teacher Yūsuf Hamadānī as a model of knowledge and learning, excellence and virtue. In this period, which was dominated by Turkish rulers who closely adhered to the stipulations of the *Sharī'a* and were opposed to Mu'tazilism {theological doctrine stressing rationality},[28] he acquired, like his teacher, a great knowledge of the sciences of the *Sharī'a* and became so renowned for his religious knowledge, asceticism, and piety that, in his old age, Yūsuf Hamadānī selected him to be a *khalīfa* together with his other three *murīds*.[29] For a while after the deaths of the first two *khalīfas*, Khwāja 'Abd Allāh Baraqī (d. 555/1160–1) and Khwāja Ḥasan Andāqī (466–552/1073–1157), he was the head of the *tekke* in Bukhārā. However, after serving in this post for a time – how long we do not know, but it was probably not very long – he left all his disciples to the fourth *khalīfa* Khwāja 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī and went straight to Turkistan, to Yasī.[30]

C His return to Yasī

After completing his training in the Ṣūfī path with the most famous shaikh of the age and acquiring the position of *khalīfa*, Aḥmad Yasawī did not remain in Bukhārā, but returned to Yasī for unknown reasons. Although we do not know exactly when he returned, it was probably after the death of the first *khalīfa* 'Abd

Allāh Baraqī, i.e. after 555/1160–1. If so, we must conclude that Aḥmad did not reside very long in Yasī and that he died about ten years after his return, because all the different biographical dictionaries agree that his death occurred in 562/1166–7 {the "first" *khalīfa*, Baraqī, died in 555, and the "second" *khalīfa*, Andāqī, died in 552. Köprülü has the latter in mind when he says "ten years"}.[31] If we compare the very few historical documents in our possession to the legendary accounts, we must conclude that either the tradition according to which Khwāja Aḥmad lived 125 or more years, or else his historical death date, is mistaken. If the tradition were accepted as correct, this would require advancing his death date into the early years of the seventh/thirteenth century, but this would obviously be absurd.

The report on Shaikh ʿAlī Lālā in {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt* indicates that Aḥmad Yasawī was a contemporary of the famous Najm al-Dīn Kubrā.[32] A point on which all the historians agree is that Najm al-Dīn Kubrā was martyred in 617/1220 during the Mongol invasion.[33] Even if this story of contemporaneity were accepted as correct, we would still not have to conclude that Aḥmad Yasawī died around the end of the sixth/twelfth century or the beginning of the seventh/thirteenth century, because if we consider that Najm al-Dīn Kubrā {b. 540/1145} was still young when he met Aḥmad Yasawī, we can easily admit that Khwāja Aḥmad could then have been nearing the end of his life. In this case, however, we would have to conclude that Shaikh ʿAlī Lālā lived for almost a century (d. 3 Rabīʿ I 642/August 9, 1244). Despite the long lives of most Ṣūfīs, when we take into account the birth date of Shaikh ʿAlī Lālā this story is unacceptable.[34] When we consider the fact that, in {Ḥazīnī's} *J̌awāhir*, which has the best record of the Yasawī tradition, Shaikh Saif al-Dīn Bākharzī, who was a *khalīfa* of Najm al-Dīn Kubrā, is also mentioned as a *khalīfa* of Aḥmad Yasawī, then it appears probable that there was some basis to this story in {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt* and that Shaikh ʿAlī, for example, was in a Yasawī *tekke* – perhaps in Yasī – where the {living} memory of Aḥmad Yasawī had not yet been forgotten. Thus, based on these extrapolations, I see no reasonable justification for now to reject the report that Aḥmad Yasawī died in 562/1166–7.[35]

Yūsuf Hamadānī's learned *khalīfa* gathered around him thousands of disciples from Turkistan during the years that he lived in Yasī. The general situation at that time was very conducive to {the spread of} religious and Ṣūfī propaganda. Sultan Sanjar, who had united Transoxiana and Khurāsān under the same political rule after Malik-Shāh, had died (552/1157) and the Khwārazm-Shāhs had begun to show signs of creating a large Muslim state. At exactly the same time, a powerful Islamic movement was developing around Yedi-Su {Semirechy} in the vicinity of Qūlcha {Kulja} in Eastern Turkistan.[36] During this period, when the shaikhs possessed enormous influence throughout Muslim Asia and *tekkes* were being built everywhere, Aḥmad Yasawī won fame along the Syr Darya, around Tashkent, and even in the steppes to the north. He gathered around him not the educated men who had a knowledge of Persian language and literature and were familiar with Iranian customs, as was the case in Bukhārā, Samarqand,

or the cities of Khurāsān, but the simple and naive Turks who were newly, but very strongly, attached to Islam. Consequently, although he knew, of course, the Arabic religious sciences and Persian literature quite well, he had to address his disciples in a language they could understand. Instead of writing in Persian, like other Ṣūfīs who had lived within the Persian cultural milieu, he used Turkish; and in order to expound the rules of the Ṣūfī path to Turkish dervishes who did not know Arabic and Persian, he wrote moralizing and mystical verses using the simple forms derived from Turkish popular literature {this is all speculation based on no sources whatsoever}.

According to tradition, after Aḥmad Yasawī reached the age of sixty-three, he had a *chilla-khāne* that was three yards deep made to one side of his *tekke* and withdrew to it. Unfortunately, we do not know when this took place. Using mystical language, he recounts at length in many passages in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* how he withdrew to his *chilla-khāne*, and the reasons for his seclusion. His life in this *chilla-khāne* was probably not as long as was reported, nor did he collect about him 99,000 disciples as was claimed in the traditional stories. This great age and large number are simply meant to indicate the wide fame that he enjoyed at that time. Until his death, Khwāja Aḥmad continued to write Ṣūfī verses under the heading of *ḥikmat*. In this fashion he expounded to his disciples the rules of Ṣūfī behavior and discipline, mystical truths, the need for the purification of the inner self and moral betterment, and religious traditions. He used his *ḥikmats* to explain these things to those who could not read about the primary religious sciences in Arabic or Persian. Because Aḥmad Yasawī was a Ḥanafī *faqīh* and a scholar of the *Sharī'a* just like his teacher, he continuously welded the *ṭarīqa* with the *Sharī'a*. He tried to propagate the idea that neglect of religious obligations did not accord with the rules of behavior of the *ṭarīqa*.[37]

After the sections that he abridges and cites from 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī's *Maqāmāt*, Aḥmad b. Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Kāsānī {Makhdūm-i A'ẓam} gives the following information on the *khalīfas* of Yūsuf Hamadānī: "Oh holy ones {*azizler*}, you should know that his Excellency Khwāja Abū Yūsuf[38] Hamadānī had four *khalīfas*. The first was 'Abd Allāh Baraqī who was his immediate successor. His noble tomb is outside the gate of Gülābād {rather, Kalābādh} in Bukhārā, on Shūristān hill and near the tomb of his Excellency Khwāja Isḥāq-i Gülābādī. The second was Khwāja Ḥasan Andāqī, who was immersed in the world of ecstatic contemplation and beatitude. His tomb is also near that of Khwāja Isḥāq. Andāq is a village six parasangs from Bukhārā. The third was Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī. One of his miracles and wonders was that whoever, with sincere intention, had the honor of his company would become a saint. In fact, he used to say, 'Your intentions are your companions' {*Niyyâtın koldaşın*}. He departed from this world in 512/1118–19. His blessed tomb is in Turkistan. His sublime dervish convent is enormously prosperous." It is obvious that the date of 512 given here is a copyist's error for 562/1166–7.[39]

As is clear from an examination of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* and the milieu in which his personality was formed, Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī was a serious, far-sighted,

discerning Turkish Ṣūfī {this characterization is Köprülü's own}. Junaid of Baghdad said that Ṣūfism consisted of "the abandonment of pretensions and concealment of accomplishments" {*terk-i deâvi ve kitmân-i meâni*}. These words apply perfectly to Aḥmad Yasawī. In his works, one finds no hints that might upset common beliefs. The ideas and tendencies of many Iranian Ṣūfīs who behaved somewhat carelessly with regard to the *Sharī'a* are virtually absent from this great Turkish shaikh. Khwāja Aḥmad was so devoted to the stipulations of the *Sharī'a* that he once exclaimed: "There is no difference between someone who neglects even one of his prayers and a pig." In every poem he mentions his sins and asks forgiveness, or he speaks of heaven and hell and Ṣūfī legends and concludes by humbly asking God to forgive his sins. Even when he becomes most absorbed in the philosophy of the unity of God and speaks most often of the stage {*maqām*} of لی مع اللّٰه {To me with God}, the palace {*sarāy*} of موتوا قبل ان تموتو {death before dying}, and the sea {*deryā*} of فنا في اللّٰه {obliteration of the self in God}, he does not forget the weapon of the *Sharī'a*.[40] His ability to attract so many disciples was not only due to the great care that he exercised with respect to the *Sharī'a* and the depth of his knowledge of the religious sciences; it was also aided very much by his speaking to the people simply and categorically of the principles that he defended, and addressing them in a language that they more or less understood and in a form of verse to which they were accustomed. In short, Aḥmad Yasawī profoundly understood the needs of his milieu and tried to meet them. The dense fog of legends that still envelops his historical personality is an indication of the great sanctity in which he has been held in the popular imagination over many centuries.

D His children and grandchildren

Both a present-day tradition in Yasī and a legend in {Ḥazīnī's} *Jawāhir* agree that Aḥmad Yasawi's son named Ibrāhīm died during his father's lifetime. According to the tradition in Yasī, the *khwāja* also had a daughter named Gawhar Khūshnās or Gawhar Shahnāz. The lineage of a great many people who, over the centuries, considered themselves to be the descendants of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī is traced to this daughter.[41] Even today, many people among both the Eastern and Western Turks claim that they are descendants of Aḥmad Yasawī.[42] Khwāja Ḥasan Naqīb al-Ashrāf {Nithārī} of Bukhārā says that Shaikh Zakariyyā', a tenth/sixteenth-century notable from Transoxiana who for a while was in the company of 'Abd Allāh Khān, recited poetry from time to time, and lived in Samarqand, was a descendant of Aḥmad Yasawī.[43] We find among the Western Turks as one of the descendants of Aḥmad Yasawī the poet Mevlidji Üsküplü 'Aṭā, who wrote a work entitled *Tuḥfat al-'ushshāq* in the style of the *Tajnīsāt* of Kātibī.[44] In addition, the famous eleventh/seventeenth-century Ottoman traveler Evliyā Chelebi states in several places in his book that he too was a descendant of Aḥmad Yasawī.[45]

We learn very clearly from {the Ottoman admiral} Sayyidī 'Alī Ra'īs' *Mir'āt al-mamālik* that there were found across the great expanse of Asia in the tenth/

sixteenth century a great many Ṣūfīs who claimed kinship with Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī. Sayyidī ʿAlī Raʾīs was a famous poet with the pen name Kātibī. While passing through the regions of Sind, Punjab, Afghanistan, Transoxiana, Khurāsān, Azerbaijan, and Iran during a long journey that he made in 961–4/1553–7, he came across the following Ṣūfīs who claimed to be related to Aḥmad Yasawī: the first was Ṣadr-i ʿĀlam Shaikh. Baraq Khān, whom Sayyidī ʿAlī Raʾīs met in Samarqand, had this man accompany him as an envoy (*Mirʾāt al-mamālik* {Istanbul, 1313/1895–6}, pp. 65, 72 {new Turkish edn, Mehmet Kiremit (ed.), *Mirʾâtülmemâlik* (Ankara, 1999); English trans. A. Vambéry as *The Travels and Adventures of the Turkish Admiral Sidi Ali Reʾis in India, Central Asia and Persia in the Years 1553–1556* (1899; reprinted Lahore, 1975)}. The second was Bābā Shaikh, who was to be killed by the Circassians while on the way to Astrakhān (*ibid.*, p. 89). The third was Shaikh Muḥammad Dam-tīz b. Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, whom he visited in Gurgān, which he reached after passing through Abhar near Sulṭāniyya on the Qazwīn–Baghdad road (*ibid.*, p. 92) {actually the admiral mentions only his grave}. These details indicate how extensively and vigorously Yasawism and Yasawī influence had spread in Muslim Asia in the tenth/sixteenth century.

After the eleventh/seventeenth century, we only encounter a Ṣūfī named Khwāja Ḥāfiẓ Aḥmad Yasawī Naqshbandī who claimed to be related to Aḥmad Yasawī. According to a statement by the author {Lāhawrī} of *Khazīnat al-asfiyāʾ*, this dervish "was a performer of wonders and miracles and a source of illuminations and epiphanies." Separated from his homeland by the hand of fate, he spent time in Arabia, Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem, Damascus, Iraq, Anatolia, and Russia, and then went to India and Kashmir where he went into seclusion. He would not meet with anyone. Sometimes, however, he would go to the *tekke* of Shaikh Āgāh Mullā Shāh. A few years later, Khwāja Niẓām al-Dīn b. Muʿīn al-Dīn recognized his spiritual superiority and entered his service. With great difficulty he convinced him to come to the city with him. After the death of Niẓām al-Dīn, Khwāja Nūr al-Dīn Muḥammad Āftāb entered his service and became his disciple. In this manner, he acquired great fame in the region. This Naqshbandī – or more correctly Yasawī – shaikh, who was a descendant of Aḥmad Yasawī, died in 1114/1702–3 or 1116/1704–5 and was buried in Kashmir.[46]

E His *türbe* and mosque

The world conqueror Tīmūr, who throughout his life followed an Islamist political policy aiming to take advantage of the spiritual influence that the *khwājas* and shaikhs had over the people,[47] who abolished the old *yasa* {"law," tribal custom} of Chingiz Khān, and who established a new {religio-political} organization inspired by Twelver Shīʿism,[48] built the Dilgushā Garden in 799/1396–7 {in Samarqand} and then headed toward Tashkent. Crossing the Syr Darya River, he ordered his army to take up winter quarters in the towns in the vicinity and he himself went to Yasī to visit the grave of Aḥmad Yasawī, whose great fame

had spread throughout Turkistan and the Qazaq steppes. According to the account of Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAlī Yazdī, the author of the *Ẓafarnāme*, he ordered the construction of a lofty shrine over his grave "out of respect for this great Muslim who was a descendant of Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya" and issued a *ferman* {edict} to this effect.[49] This project was placed under the control of Mawlānā ʿAbd Allāh Ṣadr and it was begun under the architectural direction of one Khwāja Ḥusain Shīrāzī.[50] A magnificent building, including a large dome, two minarets, and innumerable anterooms, cells, and cupolas, was completed in two years.[51] As required by Tīmūr's orders, the dome and walls of the building were decorated with tiles and the tombstone of the *khwāja* was made of marble and embellished with superb carving. Thus both the exterior and interior of this building were created in a form that was virtually flawless. On each side of the *miḥrāb* were enormous lamps, made in Tīmūr's name in 899/1493–4 by an artisan from Isfahan.[52] There was also inside the shrine[53] a huge cauldron inscribed with verses from the Koran, which apparently was donated as a *waqf* in 801/1398–9.[54] The carvings on the door were of exceptionally fine and elegant detail. After this great building was completed, Tīmūr bestowed many gifts and gave many alms to the poor and needy in the city. When these ceremonies were finished, he returned to his army. According to {Schuyler's} report, this architectural monument was last repaired by ʿAbd Allāh Khān.[55]

According to Ujfalvy {*Le Syr-Daria*}, who made a scientific exploration of that region about a half century ago {*c.*1875}, this shrine was an architectural monument in the full sense. Both Mir-Salikh-Bekchurin and Schuyler indicate that the shrine was not only the principal monument of the city of Turkistan but was also an artistic work that could perhaps take its place among the architectural masterpieces of the entire world. I feel compelled to cite briefly here the valuable information that Schuyler provides on this shrine.

> The mausoleum is an immense building, crowned by a huge dome, and having annexed to the rear another small mosque, with a melon-shaped dome. The front consists of an immense arched portal, at least a hundred feet high, flanked by two round windowless towers with crenelated tops . . . The archway there is a large double door of finely carved wood, and over this a small oriel window, dating from the last reconstruction by Abdulla Khan. The walls are of large square-pressed bricks, well burnt, and carefully put together. Only the rear and side still bear the mosaic facings of enamelled tiles, though in a very injured condition. The blue tiles which covered the dome have nearly all fallen off, and of the inscriptions in large Cufic letters which surround it only the end can now be deciphered. . . . Similar inscriptions – gigantic ornamental texts from the Koran, in blue on a white ground – run around the frieze, and the building, which is still grand in its decay, was evidently once wondrously beautiful. Earthquakes and despoilers have ruined it, leaving

Figure 1 The shrine of Aḥmad Yasawī in Ḥaḍrat-i Turkestan, Kazakhstan, during restoration. (Photo courtesy of the Turkish Ministry of Culture.)

Figure 2 The shrine of Aḥmad Yasawī in Ḥaḍrat-i Turkestan, Kazakhstan, after restoration. (Photo courtesy of Jonathan Bloom.)

large cracks, now filled up in many places with coarse plaster. The front was apparently never completed, for the old beams which once served as scaffolding, remain standing in the walls, occupied now by immense storks' nests. . . . In the middle of the mosque {i.e. shrine} is an enormous hall, under the lofty dome which rises to a height of over a hundred feet, and is richly ornamented within with alabaster work in the style common in Moorish buildings, and especially seen in the Alhambra. On the right and left are rooms filled with tombs of various Kazak sultans of the Middle and Lesser Hordes, among them the celebrated Ablai Khan. One room answers for a mosque, where the Friday prayers alone are said, while under the small dome at the back of the building are the tombs of Ahmed Yasavi and his family;[56] and opening out of a long corridor full of tombs is a large room with a sacred well. Next to the tomb of the saint the most interesting monuments are those erected to a great-granddaughter of Timur, Rabiga-Sultan-Begim, daughter of the famous Ulugh-Bek. She was married to Abulkhair-Khan, and died in 1485. One of her sons lies next to her.

The walls of the first room are covered with numbers of inscriptions, chiefly short prayers or verses from the Koran, one of which is said to have been written by Muhammed Ali Khan of Khokand, who was killed by the Amir of Bukhara in 1842; and in the middle, standing on a pedestal, there is a large brass vessel like a kettle, which would contain at least fifty gallons of water[57] . . .

In the little enclosure in front of the portal are numerous tombs bearing inscriptions, and in a corner of the large court-yard is a small and very elegant mosque, with a lemon-shaped cupola, covered with blue tiles. The local legend runs that this was the temporary resting-place of the body of Rabiga-Begim, whose early death caused Timur such grief that he built the great mosque {shrine}. Unfortunately history shows that she died some eighty years after him, and it is very doubtful if he ever saw her.

The termination of the great mosque {shrine} called Hazret was almost contemporaneous with Timur's death. The word *Hazret*, an Arabic word, meaning literally "presence," is used in the sense of "majesty" for rulers, and with the meaning "sanctity" is frequently applied to saints, especially to those most reverenced, and in this case the celebrity of the saint has given a name to the town, which is often called "Hazreti-Turkestan," or even simply "Hazret."

Besides the mosque {shrine} there is little in Turkestan to interest one. The city has much fallen off, and barely numbers six thousand souls.[58]

With regard to its architectural style, this work follows the same basic lines as the others built in Central Asia during the reign of Tīmūr.

F Present-day Yasī

Still retaining its historical repute, Yasī, today called Turkistan, is a small dilapidated Turkish {rather, Qazaq} town on the Orenburg–Tashkent railway. It is the capital of the district of Turkistan, which constitutes the sixth division of the province of the Syr Darya, which was divided into eight divisions in the Tsarist period. About a century ago {*c.*1820}, it had 965 houses and a population of 5223 composed of Sarts {rather Uzbeks} and Qazaqs. The city's ruined fortress and its only monument, the Jāmi'-i Ḥaḍrat, which is in the middle of the fortress, are visible. Ascending to a high point on this building, one is greeted by a very picturesque landscape. First, the dilapidated Sart city spreads round about with its dirty tangled streets and gloomy houses. Among the confused mass of streets and buildings, the ruins of the old palace of the Khān and the Russian church stand out. Then, beyond the limits of the city and past the well tended arable fields lie the town of Īqān and other Qazaq villages and in the distance the snow-capped peaks of the Karatau range. This part of Asia, in fact, is covered with ruins. The fortresses that served to defend the fords of the Syr Darya have long been abandoned and mounds are scattered about the plain. South of Yasī are Utrar, where Tīmūr died, and Savrān {actually northwest of Yasī}, each of which is nothing but a heap of ruins.[59]

After belonging to various dynasties of Asia at different times, Yasī became for a while the capital of the Qazaqs[60] and finally in 1864 it was taken by the Russians. The walls of Jāmi'-i Ḥaḍrat still bear marks of the terrible Russian artillery bombardment.[61] Nevertheless, thanks to the mosque and to Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī who lies beneath its dome, this small city still retains its sacred character among all the Eastern and Northern Turks. Over the centuries, not only have a great many rulers visited it but poets have also never stopped praising its holiness.[62] Even today, throngs of people come from various places in Turkistan to visit {i.e. make a pilgrimage to} the tomb of the *khwāja.* This tomb is visited continuously, but once a year on 10 Dhū 'l-Ḥijja {'Īd al-aḍhā}, the Ṣūfīs withdraw into seclusion with extraordinary ceremonies.[63] Up to recent years, 5000–6000 people used to gather there solely for this purpose.[64] Visiting the tomb of Aḥmad Yasawī, whose legends and miracles are related in popular works among the Northern Turks and throughout the steppes, and about whom many eulogies and hymns are sung,[65] is considered in that region to be of greater merit than making the pilgrimage to Mecca.

The *khwāja's* greatest influence is over the people of the steppe. Throughout this area, one finds numerous legends, as well as tombs of the *khwāja's* disciples, which testify to this influence. For example, the name of the town of Awliyā Ata, which Howorth claims to be identical with the old city of Ṭarāz, was taken from the byname of a Ṣūfī named Qarakhān, who was a descendant of Aḥmad Yasawī. His *türbe*, which is a ruined building made simply of bricks, has given its name to the entire town. Also, according to a local tradition, the great *türbe* of Asa Bibi, a kinswoman of Qarakhān, is next to the road ten miles west of the town of Awliyā Ata.[66]

According to the report of a Russian traveler, if a rich Qirghiz or Qazaq belonging to the Great or Middle horde dies in the winter, he is not immediately buried. Instead, his corpse is tightly wrapped in a piece of felt or cloth and then hung from a tree. As soon as spring arrives, his corpse is taken to Yasī and buried near the tomb of Qara Aḥmad – their name for Aḥmad Yasawī.[67] Indeed, the rich, while still alive, buy a plot of land near the *türbe* and place feathers on it, and when they die they are buried there.[68] Qazaqs who do not have children go to the shrine and sacrifice sheep to the spirit of the *khwāja* next to the great cauldron.[69] All of these reports show that this early influential leader of Turkish Ṣūfism in the Syr Darya region and throughout Central Asia has still maintained over the centuries his legendary greatness in all its former glory.[70]

NOTES

1 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, p. 49. This account is found only in this book. All other sources state that the *khwāja* was born in Yasī. Nevertheless, it would not be wrong to prefer this work to the other sources, which all transmit the same material, because it contains the most plausible accounts of the *khwāja* and was written by a Yasawī dervish who was most familiar with the Yasawī tradition. There are a number of other historical reasons for preferring this narrative. According to tradition, Sairām had long been an important Islamic center and its inhabitants were divided into three clans (*uruǧ*), i.e. three divisions: the Shāh clan, who traced their descent to the early Tajik shāhs; the Amīr clan, who traced their descent to the early *amīrs* and *mīrzās* {princes}; and the Khwāja clan, who were the descendants of ʿAlī. Naturally, this third *uruǧ*, who were related to the family of the Prophet, were held in greater esteem than the others. This tradition, which has been current among the people of Sairām up to recent times, considers all the *khwājas* to be descendants of Imām Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya (Mullā Mūsā b. Mullā ʿĪsā Sairāmī, *Taʾrīkh-i amaniyya* [Kazan, 1905], p. 286). {This is a rather garbled version of local Sairāmī tradition.} Indeed, the author of this history traces his own genealogy from Kamāl al-Dīn Bāb Shaikh, whose descent from the Prophet was confirmed in a *yarlıǧ* {edict} given by ʿAbd Allāh Khān in 945/1538–9 to Imām Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya in the following manner: Kamāl al-Dīn Bāb, Sayyid Ibrāhīm Bāb, Sayyid ʿAbd al-Jabbār Bāb, Sayyid ʿAbd al-Karīm Bāb, ʿAbd al-Majīd Bāb, ʿAbd al-Wudūd Bāb, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Bāb, Arslan Bāb, Ilyās Bāb, Maḥmūd Bāb, Iftikhār Bāb, ʿUthmān Bāb, ʿUmar Bāb, Ismāʿīl Bāb, Isḥāq Bāb, ʿAbd al-Karīm Bāb, ʿAbd al-Jalīl Bāb, ʿAbd al-Raḥīm Bāb, ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Bāb, ʿAbd al-Jabbār Bāb, ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ Bāb, Imām Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya; *ibid*. If we compare this genealogy with that of Aḥmad Yasawī mentioned above, we find a very close similarity. Ilyās Bāb was Aḥmad Yasawī's grandfather. Thus it appears that Arslan Bāb Ibn Ilyās Bāb, who was the grandfather of Kamāl al-Dīn Bāb, was the brother of Shaikh Ibrāhīm, Aḥmad Yasawī's father. The fact that there were others in Sairām who claimed that they were descendants of Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya – or, rather, that there were enough of them to constitute a clan – fully corroborates the birth of Aḥmad Yasawī in Sairām. On Imām Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, see {al-Samʿānī,} *al-Ansāb* {facsimile ed. D. S. Margoliouth (London, 1912), eds al-Muʿallimī *et al.* (Hyderabad, Deccan, 1952–82)}; and especially Ibn Khallikān, {*Wafayāt al-aʿyān* (Būlāq, 1299/1881–2), new ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās (Beirut, 1968–72), vol. 4, pp. 169–73, English trans. MacGuckin de Slane as *Ibn Khallikān's Biographical Dictionary* (Paris, 1842–71); see also *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya"

(Fr. Buhl)}. {In the text, Köprülü was in error in placing Sairām in Eastern Turkistan. He later corrected this in his article "Ahmed Yeseví" in *İA*. In the note above, Köprülü states that "all other sources" affirm Aḥmad Yasawī's birth in Yasī. This is not quite true. In so stating, Köprülü ignores the fact that the earliest sources (the *Rashaḥāt* and Nawa'ī) say this, and he goes on to defend Ḥazīnī's account on the basis of a nineteenth-century source by a native of Sairām! There seems to have been some competition for the distinction of being Aḥmad Yasawī's birthplace, and there are good grounds for claiming that Sairām's claim came later. In addition, there is no basis for dividing Ḥazīnī's account of Aḥmad Yasawī's youth into "historical" and "legendary" elements. Finally, on genealogical traditions linked to Aḥmad Yasawī, see DeWeese, "The Politics of Sacred Lineages in 19th-century Central Asia: Descent Groups Linked to Khwaja Ahmad Yasavi in Shrine Documents and Genealogical Charters," *International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies*, 31 (1999), 507–30, with further references.}

2 Shams al-Dīn Sāmī, *Qāmūs al-a'lām* {Istanbul, 1889–98, reprinted Ankara, 1996}. Chavannes (*Documents*, p. 238) says that the information given by Arab authors on this city, which is not mentioned in {Yāqūt's} *Mu'jam al-buldān*, was collected and summarized by É. Quatremère, {"Notice de l'ouvrage qui a pour titre *Mesalik Alabsar fi Memalik Alamsar*, Voyages des yeux dans les royaumes de différentes contrées,"} *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits* {*de la Bibliothèque de Roi*}, 13 (1838), p. 224, n.1. See the detailed information on this city in Chapter 5, p. 133.

3 According to tradition, he died in 562/1166–7 after the age of 120. Also according to tradition, Arslan Bābā took upon himself his education in the fifth/eleventh century. {Köprülü never seriously grapples with the date of Aḥmad Yasawī's death. This issue is more complicated than he suggests. Indeed, there is little reason to give credence to the notion that Aḥmad Yasawī died in 562. The invocation here of "tradition" as a source for this death date or for his "training" by Arslan Bābā makes no sense; the first comes from a specific source, while the second is based on a source that never gives any kind of date.}

4 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, p. 66. When speaking of his father's tomb, Aḥmad Yasawī gives it the name Aq-türbet (*Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, p. 33). {Note: this same account of Aḥmad Yasawī's family is presented in the previous chapter from the same source as "legendary."}

5 *Ibid*., pp. 48–9. I mentioned above that Bektashī tradition also presents Aḥmad Yasawī as a descendant of Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya. No such detailed genealogy is found, however, in any other source. {Aḥmad Yasawī's descent from Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya is attested, for example, in Sharaf al-Dīn 'Alī Yazdī's work from the early fifteenth century; and a full genealogy appears already in the Turkic work of Isḥāq Khwāja b. Ismā'īl Ata from the fourteenth century.} Yet there are some things that corroborate this in a number of verses in the published version of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, which was written by Yasawī dervishes in different periods based on early tradition, on his belonging to the lineage of Ḥaidar (*Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, p. 267), and on Isḥāq Bābā and Shaikh Ibrāhīm (*ibid*., p. 270). It is not particularly difficult to investigate the origin of these legends. Even today there are several legends in Turkistan about how some of the descendants of 'Alī, and especially those related to Ja'far al-Ṣādiq and Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, went as far as that region. Mullā Mūsā of Sairām states that Ja'far al-Ṣādiq had a place of pilgrimage in Khotan; that Imām 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'Alawī, who was renowned under the name Baṭṭāl Ghāzī and was buried in Aqsu, was the fourth grandson {removed} of Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya; that the tomb of Alp-Ata the sixteenth grandson {removed} of Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya was in Turfan; that the tomb of Bābā Qanbar Walī, 'Alī's master of the horse {*mirahor*}, was in Kūchā; that those of a number of *imāms* were in Ush-Turfan;

and even that there was a tradition in the latter place that ʿAlī had visited it ({Mullā Mūsā,} *Ta'rīkh-i amaniyya*, pp. 316–19, 358). There are a great many legends similar to these in other places in Turkistan. Needless to say, they have no historical value. {On the narrative of Islamization focused on Isḥāq Bāb, an ancestor of Aḥmad Yasawī, see DeWeese, "Yasavian Legends on the Islamization of Turkistan," in Denis Sinor (ed.), *Studies in Altaic Civilization III* (Bloomington, IN, 1990), pp. 1–19, and Safī ad-Din Orïn Qoylaqï, "*Nasab-nama*", ed. Äshirbek Qŭrbanŭlï Muminov and Zikiriyä Zamankhanŭlï Jandarbekov (Turkistan: "Mŭra," 1992).}

6 While discussing the region of "Turkistan and the Steppe" in Chapter 27 of his *Jihān-numā*, Kātib Chelebi gives the following information on Yasī: *Yüzbir derece tûl, kırküç derece ʿarzda dâr-ı mülk-i Türkistan bir meşhûr şehirdir. Selefte Özbek Hanlığı'nın tahtı idi. Meşâyih-i nakşbendîye'den Hoca Ahmed bu şehire mensûpdur* {It is a famous city in the country of Turkistan at 101 degrees longitude and 43 degrees latitude. At a former time it was the capital of the Özbek khānate. Khwāja Aḥmad, who was a Naqshbandī shaikh, got his byname from this city} (published version {apparently Istanbul, 1145/1732}, p. 367). Aḥmad Vefik Pasha, under the rubric "Turkistan" in his *Lehce-i osmânî* {2nd edn (Istanbul, 1306/1890)}, says *Semerkand şimâlinde sâbıkâ Kazaklar'ın şehri, Nesâ', Ahmed Nesâ'î makâmı, türbet-i hazret* {formerly the city of the Qazaqs north of Samarqand, Nasā', the tomb of Aḥmad Nasā'ī, the *türbe* of the exalted one}, thus confusing Nasā' with Yasī. Similarly, Yasī appears as Nasā' in the published edition of {Mīrkhwānd,} *Rawḍat al-ṣafā* (vol. 6, p. 126). The reason for this is that the authors, or those who copied them, confused these two names. Kātib Chelebi mentions two Nasā's, an upper Nasā' and a lower Nasā', in Farghāna, and another, a third, in Khurāsān and says that the last one was famous (*Jihān-numā*, p. 357). A great many *ʿulamā'*, in fact, came from this Nasā' in Khurāsān. Yāqūt mentions four more cities with this name (*Muʿjam al-buldān*, Chapter 8, pp. 282–3); Barbier de Meynard, *Dictionnaire géographique*, p. 564). The French Orientalist Louis Dubeux, while discussing Yasī, reports that it had previously been called Ṭarāz (*Tartarie* {*Béloutchistan, Boutan et Népal*} [Paris, 1848], p. 113), which is totally mistaken, however. This old historic city {Ṭarāz}, which was very well known to both Chinese travelers and historians and to the Arabs, indeed, even to the Byzantine ambassador Zemarchus, had long had great importance because it was at a pass at the junction of two major trade routes between Iran and Turan. The {sixth-century} Byzantine historian, Menander Protektor, who cited the embassy of Zemarchus, called this city "Tālās." The Chinese traveler Hsüan Tsang called it "Ta-lu-si" and some Chinese historians called it "Ta-la-za." The Arabs called it "Ṭarāz." According to H. Howorth, it is none other than the present-day Awliyā Ata (*History of the Mongols* [London, 1880–8], vol. 2, part 1, Chapter 4, n.1 {i.e. part 2, division 2, pp. 284–7}. Virtually all the information on this city is collected here {Howorth}. Chavannes, *Documents*, p. 238). It is clear from all of this that Ṭarāz, which had been known since the sixth century CE, is completely different from Yasī. Detailed information is given on these cities in Chapter 5, p. 154, n.28.

7 See Chapter 4, p. 92 for information on the historical existence of Arslan Bābā and on his family.

8 After Bukhārā passed into the hands of the non-Muslim Qara Khiṭāy, the influence of these *ṣadrs* continued, however, in a different form. Alptigin, the governor appointed by the Qara Khiṭāy ruler, was obliged to refer all questions to Ṣadr-i Imām Aḥmad b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz (see Barthold, *EI*[1], s.v. "Bukhārā" and "Burhān," who cites Niẓām-i ʿArūḍī). For the information on the *ṣadrs* provided by Mīrzā Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Qazvīnī, see the first vol. of {Muḥammad ʿAwfī's} *Lubāb al-albāb*, eds E. G. Browne {and Qazvīnī (London, 1903)}, vol. 1, pp. 332–3. The most important research on sixth/twelfth-century Bukhārā, based on Arabic and Persian sources, is found in Barthold's *Turkestan*. For the summary above, I was content with referring to

this book and his *EI*[1] articles "Bukhārā" and "Burhān." These *ṣadrs* are also mentioned in one of the *Mathnawī* stories {of Rūmī}. {See *EI*[2], s.v. "Ṣadr" (J. Calmard *et al.*).}

9 An important treatise entitled *Maqāmāt-i Yūsuf Hamadānī*, attributed to Khwāja ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī {appended to Ḥarīrī-Zāde's *Tibyān-i wasā'il al-ḥaqā'iq*, Ibrahim Ağa MS 432 in the Fatih Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul}, states clearly that eleven people – Ghujduwānī among them – went with Khwāja Yūsuf from Hamadān to Samarqand; also that Yūsuf Hamadānī went to Samarqand at the direction of Khaḍir; and that while he was residing at Maḥalla-i Khūsh, Khwāja Ḥasan Andāqī and Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī arrived and nine months later were joined by Khwāja ʿAbd Allāh Baraqī. But {Muḥammad Pārsā's} *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, and also {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt* and {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, which cite it, report that ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī became an adherent of Khwāja Yūsuf in Bukhārā – indeed, that Aḥmad Yasawī also became an adherent of him there (*Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, MS in the {Istanbul} University Library). Still, Imām {ʿAbd Allāh b. As'ad} al-Yāfiʿī's history {*Mir'āt al-janān wa ʿibrat al-yaqzan fī ma'rifat ḥawādith al-zamān* (Hyderabad, 1337–9/1918–21, and Beirut, 1984)} and al-Samʿānī's *al-Ansāb* specify that Khwāja Yūsuf had previously resided in Baghdad, Isfahan, Bukhārā, and Samarqand for the purpose of learning *Ḥadīth*, and if we take into consideration contemporary dervish life, the possibility that he could also have been in those places later cannot be completely ruled out. In any case, the story in the *Maqāmāt* is not implausible enough to be rejected outright or be regarded as a fabrication. {Wilfred Madelung, in his "Yūsuf al-Hamaḏānī and the Naqšbandiyya," *Quaderni di Studi Arabi*, 5–6 (1987–8), 499–509, highlights the discrepancies between the early and reliable biographical tradition about Hamadānī, on the one hand, and the version of his biography incorporated into Naqshbandī tradition, on the other. Köprülü himself already noted the discrepancies, but he did not explore them in depth, and was unable to get out from under the assumption that Aḥmad Yasawī was a disciple of the historical Yūsuf Hamadānī. In any case, Madelung's study demolishes the synthetic view of Hamadānī accepted in nearly all secondary literature, including Köprülü.}

10 {Yāqūt,} *Muʿjam al-buldān*, vol. 2, p. 302. This lineage was taken from there. Ibn Khallikān says that he did not know the meaning of the name Wahara at the end of this genealogical chain {*Wafayāt*, ʿAbbās edn, vol. 7, p. 80}.

11 On Yūsuf Hamadānī, Ibn Khallikān made use of al-Samʿānī's *al-Ansāb* and Ibn al-Najjār's *Taʿrīkh Baghdād* ({Wafayāt,} vol. 2, pp. 464–5 {ʿAbbās edn, vol. 7, pp. 78–81}). {See *EI*[2], s.v. "Ibn al-Naḏjḏjār" (C. E. Farah).}

12 Based on the information that Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā gives in his *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, which was taken from Mawlānā Sharaf al-Dīn ʿAqīlī, the author {Ṣafī} of the *Rashaḥāt* writes that Yūsuf Hamadānī was eighteen years old at that time (p. 13). Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā's verbatim account of this matter is as follows:

مولانا شرف الملة والدين العقيلى الانصارى البخارى روح اللّٰه تعالى روحه كه از كبار علما اند
واز خاندان خواجگان بخط مبارک ايشان مكتوب است كه شيخ يوسف همدانى قدس اللّٰه روحه هژده
ساله بودندكه ببغداد رفتند و از ابو اسحاق فقيه علم فقه آموختند و در علم نظر بدرجهٔ كمال
رسيدند وبر مذهب امام اعظم ابو حنيفه رضى اللّٰه عنه بودند ودراصبهان وبخارا تعلم كردند
ودرعراق وخراسان وخوارزم وماوراء النهر صاحب قبول بودند

{Mawlānā Sharaf al-Milla wa ʿl-Dīn al-ʿAqīlī al-Anṣarī al-Bukhārī, may God rest his soul, one of the great *ʿulamā'*, of the dynasty of the Khwājagān (Naqshbandiyya), has

written in his own hand that Shaikh Yūsuf Hamadānī, may God sanctify his soul, was eighteen years old when he went to Baghdad. He studied *fiqh* with Abū Isḥāq Faqīh, and reached perfection in philosophical speculation (*'ilm-i nazar*). He was a Ḥanafī by *madhhab*. He studied in Isfahan and Bukhārā, and became an authority (*ṣāḥib-qabūl*) in Iraq, Khurāsān, and Transoxiana,} (*Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, MS in the {Istanbul} University Library). Nevertheless, Ibn Khallikān, whose information is credible given the sources on which he relied, indicates that he went to Baghdad after 460/1067–8 {*Wafayāt*, 'Abbās edn, vol. 7, p. 78}. Taking this into consideration, we would have to admit that Yūsuf Hamadānī probably went to Baghdad after age twenty. {Again, see Madelung, "Yūsuf al-Hamaḏānī." On the Khwājagān, see *EI²*, *Supplement*, s.v. "Khwādjagān" (Th. Zarcone)}

13 {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 12; and {Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 409. This story is also based on the information that Khwāja Muḥammad Pārsā {*Faṣl al-khiṭāb*} derived from Sharaf al-Dīn 'Aqīlī.

14 Ibn Khallikān, {*Wafayāt,*} vol. 2, p. 465; {*Yāqūt,*} *Mu'jam al-buldān*, vol. 2, p. 303; {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 13; {Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 409. Ibn Khallikān indicates that Bāmiyīn {Bāmayīn} is between Herat and Baghshūr, while Yāqūt makes it a place subordinate to Bādhghīs. According to the explication in the *Mu'jam*, Bāmiyīn was the center of the *qaṣaba* {district} of Bādhghīs between Marw al-Rūd and Herat. The same source also states that Baghshūr was between Herat and Marw al-Rūd (see *Mu'jam*, vol. 2, and Barbier de Meynard, *Dictionnaire géographique*).

15 {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans. p. 13. {The *Rashaḥāt's* identification of Ibn al-Najjār as one of Yūsuf Hamadānī's disciples is an example of garbled transmission. Ibn al-Najjār was a thirteenth-century author of a work that incorporated biographical traditions about Hamadānī, but through Pārsā, Jāmī, and the *Rashaḥāt*, he became a disciple of Hamadānī.}

16 *Ibid.*, p. 12, citing {Muḥamad Pārsā,} *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*. {Madelung, "Yūsuf Hamadānī," points out that Hamadānī is shown as a Shāfi'ī in the early biographical tradition, but becomes a Ḥanafī in the (no doubt spurious) texts circulated about his role in the Khwājagānī *silsila*.}

17 *Ibid.*, p. 13, citing al-Sam'ānī, {*al-Ansāb*}. {The issue of whether Aḥmad Yasawī "joined" Hamadānī in Bukhārā or Samarqand is, in fact, an important point that helps to delineate the separate textual traditions that contributed to the *Rashaḥāt's* composite account of Aḥmad Yasawī as a disciple of Hamadānī.}

18 The famous Iranian Ṣūfī poet Ḥakīm Sanā'ī {d. *c.*525/1131} went from Ghaznīn {Ghazna} to Khurāsān, became an adherent of Yūsuf Hamadānī, and resided for a time in his *tekke* in Marw (Dawlat-Shāh, *Tadhkira*, p. 97). Dawlat-Shāh, p. 95, also states the following about the fame of the *tekke* of Yūsuf Hamadānī: خانقاه اورا از تعظیم و قدر کعبهٔ خراسان می گفته اند {Out of reverence, they call his *khānqāh* (dervish convent) "the Ka'ba of Khurāsān"}. In {'Abd al-Waḥḥāb al-Sha'rānī's} *al-Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya* {Cairo, 1305/1887–8} his importance, some of his legends and sayings are mentioned in exceedingly reverential fashion as well, vol. 1, p. 135 {published as *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā* (Cairo, 1898; reprinted Cairo, 1965)}.

19 Ibn Khallikān, {*Wafayāt,*} vol. 2, p. 464; {Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 411. On this matter, Ibn Khallikān relies on Abū 'l-Faḍl Ṣāfī b. 'Abd Allāh's account and those of Ḥāfiẓ Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd, well known as Ibn al-Najjār. In the *Nafaḥāt* trans. (p. 411), we find the note *Bâzılar İbnü's-Sakkâ hikâyesini buna muhâlif naklettiler* {Some cite the story of Ibn al-Saqqā' in opposition to him}. This legend of Yūsuf Hamadānī was so famous that Ibn al-Athīr briefly relates it while mentioning Yūsuf Hamadānī among those who died in 535/1140–1 (*al-Kāmil*, vol. 2, p. 31).

20 I was not able to obtain an old copy of this Persian treatise that was appended to the third volume of {Ḥarīrī-Zāde's} *Tibyān-i wasā'il* {*al-ḥaqā'iq*}. There are some treatises belonging to ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī in the Esad Efendi Library {in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul}, MS 3702, but despite all my efforts it was not possible to see them. Perhaps the original of the *Maqāmāt-i Yūsuf Hamadānī* is there. I have carried out considerable research to determine if this treatise is a complete fabrication or if it is really a work by ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī and has some historical value. There are, in fact, clear contradictions between the information provided by this treatise and the reports in al-Samʿānī and other sources. For example, Khwāja Yūsuf's lineage, in a wholly fictitious manner, is traced to Abū Ḥanīfa. Then, not only is his birth date erroneous but we also find, for example, a report to the effect that he never cursed Chingiz Khān, whereas Chingiz Khān appeared only after the death of the *khwāja*. In addition, there are a number of exaggerations, such as "that he made the pilgrimage to Mecca 32 times on foot, that he made 10,000 complete recitations of the Koran, that he memorized 700 books of *fiqh*, *tafsīr* {exegesis, especially Koranic} and *kalām* {scholastic theology}, and that he converted 8000 idolaters to Islam." For a *murīd* who believed in his shaikh, however, these exaggerations were of no consequence. A number of things like this, which cast doubt on the {historical} reliability of the treatise, may have been introduced through the process of copying and recopying over the centuries, or could have been added by a later copyist for various reasons. If we take into consideration how much the "dynasty" (*sulāla*) of the Khwājagān {Naqshbandiyya} was in demand and respected in Central Asia at the time of the rulers who were descendants of Chingiz Khān, then we could readily grant that any dervish could add such things in order to curry favor with the ruler. Otherwise, the information that ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī gives in his own biography and the descriptions that he gives of the *khalīfas* of the *khwāja*, their actions and character, conform exactly to the other sources and complement them in an exceptional manner. If this treatise had been completely fabricated, then its author would be someone so unfamiliar with chronology as to consider Chingiz Khān a contemporary or predecessor of Khwāja Yūsuf Hamadānī, and he would not have known that period of history and the *khwāja's* spiritual personage so completely and accurately, and so would have filled this treatise with a bunch of wild legends. In light of all these observations, we can conclude that this treatise, which portrays Yūsuf Hamadānī in such a manner, was written by ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī, but that the version that has come down to us was corrupted and altered as it was copied and recopied [on Ghujduwānī and the *Maqāmāt-i Yūsuf Hamadānī*, see *İA*, s.v. "Gucduvânî" (Kasım Kufralı), {cf. *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ghudjduwānī" (S. Naficy)}].

In the rich and truly valuable library of Bağdadlı Vehbî Efendi {in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul}, there is a *Risāla-i bāburiyya* by Aḥmad b. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Kāsānī {known as Makhdūm-i Aʿẓam, d. 1542–3, see *EIr*, s.v. "Aḥmad Kʷājagī" (J. Fletcher)} on Ṣūfī rules and another treatise on Yūsuf Hamadānī. {These two works are bound together. The latter is ascribed to Makhdūm-i Aʿẓam and stands as sixteenth-century evidence for the circulation of a work similar to the *Maqāmāt* of Hamadānī ascribed to Ghujduwānī.} As the author clearly states, part of this treatise was abbreviated from ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī's *Maqāmāt-i Yūsuf Hamadānī*. At the end of it, there is rather abundant information on the *khalīfas* of Yūsuf Hamadānī and on the chains of authority of Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband and Saʿd al-Dīn al-Kāshgharī. The first part of this treatise, equivalent to an abridged version of one section of the copy of the *Maqāmāt* that I have studied, indicates that this work was not fabricated, but that it had been current among the Naqshbandī dervishes for centuries. There is nothing so incongruous here as the issue of Chingiz Khān as to undermine one's confidence in the text. Clearly, such details as this were added by various people as the treatise

passed from hand to hand. It is stated in this work too, however, that Yūsuf Hamadānī died in Samarqand in 505/1111–12. The year 505 could well be a mistake for 535/1140–1. As for his death in Samarqand, this contradicts Ibn Khallikān. Nevertheless, these details show that the work attributed to ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī cannot be simply rejected. The author {al-Kāsānī} of the treatise says, "Although Khwāja {ʿUbaid Allāh} Aḥrār had a great many *khalīfas*, the last of whom was Aḥmad b. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Kāsānī, the real *khalīfa* of *khalīfas* was his {the latter's} own *murshid* Mawlānā Muḥammad al-Qāḍī and this man was buried at the feet of Khwāja Aḥrār." This treatise, which was apparently copied in India in 1184/1770–1, includes the following biographical note on the author: "The shaikh of shaikhs, his excellency Shaikh Burhān al-Dīn Qılıch was a companion of Shaikh Abū 'l-Qāsim Gurgānī and Khwāja Yūsuf Hamadānī. He died in 490 {1096–7}. His excellency my father used to say 'My son has become an adherent of his excellency Shaikh Burhān al-Dīn Qılıch and they will call his son Qılıchlığ Ata.' If this shaikh looked at a withered tree, it would turn green. If he saw someone deviating from the path of the *Sharīʿa*, one look from him would behead him. He was very awe inspiring and quick tempered." {This detail confirms the identity of the treatise that Köprülü saw with a treatise, ascribed to Makhdūm-i Aʿẓam (who was a descendant of "Qılıch Ata"), found in some, but not all, collections of Makhdūm-i Aʿẓam's treatises. In some collections it is called the *Risāla-i ʿilmiyya*.}

{On the problems with the *Maqāmāt*, see Madelung, "Yūsuf al-Hamaḏānī" and DeWeese's forthcoming analysis. A version of this work was published by Saʿīd Nafīsī as "Risālah-i ṣāḥibiyah," *Farhang-i Īrān-zamīn*, 1/1 (1332/1953), 70–101. This work cannot be by Ghujduwānī. It survives in fuller manuscript versions and is paralleled by another set of traditions about Ghujduwānī and Hamadānī that probably reflect communal splits in the early Khwājagānī tradition. It cannot be used at face value as a source on Hamadānī. The dates mentioned in the work (and the supposed letter from Sanjar mentioned below) are also completely unreliable. It is worthy of note that the text credits Hamadānī with going on holy war and converting unbelievers to Islam. Depending on the version, they are identified as "Jete" or "Toqmaq," which are fourteenth and fifteenth-century terms for Mongol groups, or as Russians, which is evidence of the late date of the text.}

21 It is also mentioned in the *Maqāmāt* that Yūsuf did not do the *dhikr* aloud and, indeed, that at that time there was no audible *dhikr*. Somewhat different information is given on this, however, in the translation of {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt*. See Chapter 4, p. 101.

22 Malik Shāh's son Sultan Sanjar was appointed governor of Khurāsān by Barkyārūq who had taken possession of the entire sultanate on the death of his brother Maḥmūd in 487/1094 and then became involved in the fighting between him and their other brother Muḥammad. From the death of Barkyārūq in 498/1105 to the death of Muḥammad in 511/1118, he ruled Khurāsān independently. According to the aforesaid story, his sending a letter to Khwāja Yūsuf Hamadānī thus occurred during this time. From Sanjar's attitude toward al-Ghazālī {see below, n.28}, we can suppose that he would certainly have had a great interest in legal and mystical questions and in particular that he would want to learn about the lifestyle of a shaikh famous for his great devotion to the *sunna* of the Prophet. We learn from a very amusing and clever episode that Dawlat-Shāh cites from *Ṣuwar al-aqālīm* {not further identified} how contemptuous Sanjar was of Shīʿī beliefs (Dawlat-Shāh, *Tadhkira*, p. 66).

23 {Ghujduwānī,} *Maqāmāt-i Yūsuf Hamadānī*. According to this account, Khwāja Yūsuf must have died in Samarqand. Other sources, however, are unanimous in giving a much different report. To be sure, even in the *Maqāmāt*, it is not explicitly stated that his death occurred in Samarqand; rather, this can only be inferred from the context. {More tellingly, the *Maqāmāt* insists he was buried in Samarqand, while Yūsuf Hamadānī's shrine in Marw is well known.}

24 Among these *khalīfas*, Aḥmad Yasawī and ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī in particular won great fame. The first two *khalīfas* did not become very famous.

25 In his *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*, for example, Muḥammad Pārsā cites him frequently and uses phrases that express deep respect for him. Al-Samʿānī {*al-Ansāb*} also says that he was a well known traditionist {*muḥaddith*}.

26 Shaikh Najīb al-Dīn Shīrāzī states that he came across some of the *khwāja's* works and that the *khwāja* appeared in one of his dreams and told him that these works, the name of the author of which was not clear, belonged to him ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 410). {The subject of the story mentioned here from Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt* actually refers to himself (in the dream) as Abū Yūsuf, not Yūsuf Hamadānī.}

27 An Arabic work by Yūsuf Hamadānī under the title *Nahj al-asrār wa maʿdan al-anwār fī manāqib li-sādāt al-akhyār min al-mashāyikh al-abrār* is mentioned with the number 4340 in the catalogue of the Ayasofya Library, but this work is nothing but Nūr al-Dīn ʿAlī Ibn al-Jawzī's *Kītāb-i Bahjat al-asrār wa maʿdan al-anwār*, which describes the legends of ʿAbd al-Qādir Jīlānī. {A Ṣūfī work entitled *Kashf al-asrār* is ascribed to Yūsuf Hamadānī, but apparently it has not survived.}

28 Because both the Qarakhānids and Seljuks were simple Muslims, they showed great respect to the *ʿulamā'* and Ṣūfīs. The members of these two dynasties were extreme in their support of Sunnism – downright fanatic, in fact. Nevertheless, the Shīʿī movement, which had already appeared in Khurāsān in the Sāmānid period, was secretly present in Transoxiana. The *ʿulamā'* in Bukhārā, which was the most important center of Sunnism in Transoxiana, fought continuously against Shīʿism. In 436/1044–5, a great Shīʿī movement broke out in Transoxiana. Bughrā Khān crushed it by massacring the Ismāʿīlīs (Ibn al-Athīr, {*al-Kāmil,*} vol. 8, p. 180). In any case, according to the information provided by Barthold, we can say that in the fifth/eleventh and sixth/twelfth centuries the rulers of Transoxiana and the *ṣadrs* of Bukhārā were fervent Ḥanafīs. In this regard, see Chapter 1, p. 15, n.17 (Barthold, *Turkestan*). Niẓām al-Mulk clearly shows what a fanatical Sunnī Alp Arslan was (*Siyāsatnāme*, sections 21 and 42). We also know very well how Sultan Sanjar dealt with al-Ghazālī for a while over an accusation of Muʿtazilism ({Mehmed} Şerefeddin {Yaltkaya}, "Sencer ve Gazzâlî," {*Darülfünûn İlâhiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 1 (1341/1925), 39–57}). Recent research on the subject of the *madhhabs* in the Seljuk period has corroborated all this (Şerefeddin, "Selçukiler devrinde mezâhib," {*TM*, 1 (1925), 101–8}).

29 {Ghujduwānī's} *Maqāmāt*, {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt*, {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, and all the other biographical dictionaries that rely on them are unanimous on this point.

30 It is certain that Aḥmad Yasawī became shaikh in Bukhārā, probably after the death of Yūsuf's first *khalīfa*, i.e. after 555/1160–1 (on the date of the death of ʿAbd Allāh Baraqī, see {Lāhawrī,} *Khazīnat al-asfiyā'*, vol. 1, p. 531), because it is evident that both the first and second *khalīfas* were in Bukhārā and both were buried in Bukhārā near the tomb of Shaikh Abū Isḥāq Gülābādī ({Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 13–14). {Köprülü is apparently not bothered by the fact that Lāhawrī (whose dates are mostly worthless) has Baraqī, the first *khalīfa*, dying in 555, but Andāqī, the second *khalīfa*, dying in 552. The accounts of the succession to Hamadānī all affirm that succession came upon the death of the prior successor (until Aḥmad Yasawī broke the practice). Hence the curious death dates of Baraqī and Andāqī. On Aḥmad Yasawī's abdication of leadership to Ghujduwānī, see DeWeese, "The *Mashā'ikh-i Turk* and the *Khojagān*: Rethinking the Links between the Yasavī and Naqshbandī Sufi Traditions," *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 7 (1996), 180–207. Here DeWeese shows that the depiction of Aḥmad Yasawī handing his disciples off to Ghujduwānī is clearly a story contrived to favor the Khwājagān and Naqshbanidyya in competition with the Yasawiyya, etc.}

31 Mawlānā Ghulām Surūr Lāhawrī, a religious scholar from India {i.e. Lahore in modern Pakistan}, describes the Naqshbandī *silsila*, cited from {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt*, in his

famous biographical dictionary of saints called *Khazīnat al-aṣfiyā'*, and while doing so provides information on Aḥmad Yasawī. As an addendum, he mentions the following chronogram of his death, which is equivalent to 562/1166–7 (*Khazīnat*, p. 532),

شیخ احمد چون بفضل ایزدی رفت درجنت ببزم احمدی

نیر نور الهی شد عیان سال وصل آن ولی متقی

نیز احمد کاشف حق کن رقم هم بگو احمد ولی جنتی

{The Shaikh Aḥmad, by divine grace, went to Paradise in the party of Muḥammad
The divine luminary became visible: the year that pious saint died
And Aḥmad, revealer of Truth, add the numbers and say: "Aḥmad saint of Paradise"

(the letters in احمد ولی جنتی = 562). There are, in fact, other chronograms given in the *Khazīnat al-aṣfiyā'*, which were cited already in K. G. Zaleman (ed. and Russian trans.), "Legenda pro Khakim-Ata," *Izvestiia Akademii nauk* (SPb.), 9/2 (1898), 105–50.} Melioransky, in *EI*[1], s.v. "Aḥmed Yesewī," says "The year of his birth is not known, but in his *Dīwān* it is stated that he was 63 years old when he died." This remark can be refuted on several grounds. First, absolutely no one can state his own death date in his own *dīwān*! Second, not only does the existing tradition indicate that Aḥmad Yasawī probably lived more than sixty-three years, but his poetry proves it. It is obvious that Melioransky did not understand that "entering the earth" in the line "*ol sebepden altmışüçte kirdim yirge*" {for that reason at age sixty-three I entered the earth} meant "withdrawing from the tumult of the world," i.e. "entering the *chilla-khāne*," and thus he interpreted it to mean death. {Köprülü actually pictures Aḥmad Yasawī "entering the earth" at age sixty-three and continuing to write there. It did not occur to him that perhaps some later devotee of Aḥmad Yasawī wrote the verse about entering the earth as a reflection of the traditions about him.}

32 *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 492–4. Shaikh Raḍī 'l-Dīn 'Alī Lālā was in Aḥmad Yasawī's *tekke* in Turkistan. One day a man came from Khwārazm. Shaikh Lālā was in a cell doing his religious retreat {*khalwa*}. Shaikh Aḥmad asked the man "Is there a dervish occupied with guiding people on the mystical way in Khwārazm?" The man answered, "A new young man has come. He is guiding people on the mystical way and has attracted a great many *murīds*." Aḥmad Yasawī asked his name. The man said, "Najm al-Dīn Kubrā." Shaikh 'Alī Lālā had once seen Najm al-Dīn Kubrā in a dream and, interpreting this to mean that he {Najm al-Dīn} would guide him {'Alī Lālā} on the mystical way, had searched for him for years. As soon as he heard his name during his retreat, he leapt up and girt his loins for a journey. Because it was winter, Khwāja Aḥmad advised him to wait. But the exuberant dervish could not wait another day. He immediately went to Khwārazm and joined the service of Najm al-Dīn (p. 493). {Köprülü did not know that Jāmī took this story from a much earlier source, the *Chihil majlis* of Amīr Iqbāl Sīstānī, a collection of sayings he compiled from his master, 'Alā' al-Dawla Simnānī, and dates from *c.*1325. It is the earliest reliably datable source to mention Aḥmad Yasawī.}

33 Mīrzā Muḥammad b. 'Abd al-Wahhāb Qazvīnī, introduction to {'Aṭṭār's} *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'*, citing various sources like Yāfi'ī's {*Mir'āt al-janān*}, {Nūr Allāh al-Shustarī's} *Majālis al-mu'minīn*, {Rāzī's} *Haft iqlīm*, {Dārā Shukōh's} *Ṣafīnat al-awliyā'*, {Hidāyat's} *Riyāḍ al-'ārifīn*, and {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 480.

34 Shaikh Raḍī 'l-Dīn 'Alī Lālā died in 642/1244 during the caliphate of al-Musta'ṣim and was buried in Khurāsān ({Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī Qazwīnī,} *Ta'rīkh-i Guzīda*,

facsimile ed. E. G. Browne [London, 1910], p. 751 {new ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Navā'ī (Tehran, 1362 [1983 or 1984]}). Originally from Ghazna, he was a cousin of Ḥakīm Sanā'ī. According to {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, his father Shaikh Saʿīd was a cousin of Sanā'ī. His father and Sanā'ī went on the pilgrimage to Mecca together. Also according to the *Nafaḥāt*, he had been in the company of Yūsuf Hamadānī. We showed above {n.18} that Ḥakīm Sanā'ī spent some time in Marw and in the *tekke* of Yūsuf Hamadānī. It is highly likely that Shaikh Saʿīd's meeting with Yūsuf Hamadānī occurred at that time. Raḍī 'l-Dīn ʿAlī Lālā was born in 563/1167–8 or 566/1170–1 in Khusraw-i Shīrgīr in the province of Juwain. Later he wandered for years as a dervish, visiting many countries in Asia. He was famous for having obtained *ijāzas* {permission to teach a work on the authority of its author} from 400 great shaikhs and for meeting in India with the legendary Abū 'l-Riḍā Bābā Ratan Hindī – who, just like Arslan Bābā, was a companion of the Prophet or, according to another story, was an apostle of Jesus, and lived 1400 years – from whom he received the comb of the Prophet (Dawlat-Shāh, *Tadhkira*, p. 222). On Bābā Ratan, see {Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb al-Fīrūzābādī,} *al-Qāmūs* {*al-muḥīt*}, {Turkish} trans. {Ahmed Âsım Ayintabi as *al-Ūqiyānūs al-basīṭ fī tarjamat al-qāmūs al-muḥīṭ* (Istanbul, 1268–72/1851–5)}, vol. 3, p. 636. Bābā Ratan Hindī is a well known personage throughout the Eastern world. There are numerous references to him in various sources. See above all, for example, Evliyā Chelebi, {*Seyāḥatnāme*,} Book 3, fo. 67a {now see German trans. of this section by Korkut Bugday as *Evliya Çelebis Anatolienreise aus dem dritten Band des Seyahatname* (Leiden, 1996), p. 130}; and in the *dhail* {supplement} to {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq* {i.e. *Ḥadā'iq al-shaqā'iq* (Istanbul, 1268/1852 and 1269/1852–3)}, vol. 1, p. 66, there is very good information cited from different sources. There is a poem of 4000–5000 couplets entitled *Qissa-i Bābā Ratan* by the famous Indian poet Shāh Muḥammad Walī Allāh Dakkānī. See Garcin de Tassy, *Histoire de la littérature hindoui et hindoustani* {Paris, 1870–1}, 2nd edn, vol. 3, p. 287. {Now see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ratan" (Moḥammad Shafīʿ).}

35 {In fact, there is greater uncertainty over his death date than Köprülü allowed. The generally accepted date is not attested until the latter sixteenth century and was itself clearly contrived in connection with the equally contrived story of Aḥmad Yasawī's succession to Hamadānī. The story of Aḥmad Yasawī's link to ʿAlī Lālā, moreover, is not just from Jāmī. He took it from a source from the early fourteenth century and that source contains the earliest reliably datable reference to Aḥmad Yasawī. See above, n.32.}

36 Barthold, *Turkestan*, {English trans., p. 353.}

37 {On the traditions surrounding Aḥmad Yasawī's "retirement" underground, see DeWeese, "Sacred Places and 'Public' Narratives." Treating the story of Aḥmad Yasawī's withdrawal as part of his historical biography (and to take the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* as an "autobiographical" source on it, rather than as an echo of the traditions from several centuries later) was irresponsible even on the basis of the sources that Köprülü had on hand. Furthermore, claiming that Aḥmad Yasawī was a Ḥanafī jurist again has no basis.}

38 {Note that Abū Yūsuf is not the same as Yūsuf, which is another clue to problems in the traditions about Hamadānī.}

39 {In fact, other manuscripts of this work by Makhdūm-i Aʿẓam give other dates that are not so easily construed as errors for 562.}

40 *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*.

41 "Khalwa," in the journal *Shūrā*, March 1914, p. 14.

42 {On traditions of familial descent from Aḥmad Yasawī, see DeWeese, "The Politics of Sacred Lineages."}

43 {Nithārī Bukhārī,} *Mudhakkir-i aḥbāb*, among the poets whom the author knew and who were alive when he wrote about them, and who lived in places other than Bukhārā, p. 252.

44 ʿĀshıq Chelebi, *Tadhkira* {i.e. his *Mashāʿir al-shuʿarā'*, MS in Köprülü's private library}, pp. 250ff. {now ed. G. M. Meredith-Owens (London, 1971).} ʿĀshıq Chelebi says that his grandfather was this Naqshbandī poet who had come from Iran and had written two works, *Tajnīsāt* and *Tuḥfat al-ʿushshāq*. {Kınalı-Zâde} Ḥasan Chelebi only mentions that he wrote the treatise *Tajnīsāt*, although he says that he was from the Yasawī lineage, {*Tadhkirat al-shuʿarā'*, MS.TY 1737, Istanbul University Library}, pp. 137ff. {now ed. İbrahim Kutluk (Ankara, 1979–81)}; Laṭīfī does not describe his lineage, but apart from that gives the same information, {*Tadhkira*,} p. 246. There exists a copy of the *Tuḥfat al-ʿushshāq* that ʿAṭā wrote in 911/1505–6 in imitation of Kātibī's *Tajnīsāt* in my private library; thus it appears that ʿĀshıq Chelebi mistakenly considered the imitation of the *Tajnīsāt* and the *Tuḥfat al-ʿushshāq* to be two different works. ʿAṭā tells of his own lineage in this work in the following couplets,

Niceyedek ey ʿAtâ bu kîl-ü kâl
Hâl iste kim olasın nûr-hâl
Kâtibî'nin şehri Nîşâbûr ise
Melce'-i ʿAttâr gibi nûr ise
Sen Yesû'dan Şeyh Ahmed Pûr'sun
Maʿni yüzünde o şemsin nûrısun
Gerçi hak-i hitta-î Üsküb'sün
Maʿdenî sen zer gibi üsküb'sün
Resmini haddim değil tavsîf edem
Gün gibi rûşen nice taʿrîf edem
Her sözünü nisbet et ol merde sen
Dirilüb tâ olmayasın mürde sen
Çün o deryâdan ola sana gıdâ
Pes muʿînindir hakîkat mâʿadâ

{For how long, Oh ʿAṭā, will you depend on hearsay?
Seek out ecstasy, so that you become well-off.
If Kātibī's city is Nīshāpūr
– city of light, refuge of ʿAṭṭār –
You are Shaikh Aḥmad Pūr from Yasu
– spiritually, you are the light of the sun.
Although you are from the soil of Üsküb,
Your ore is gold, like a golden head-dress
Describing his form is beyond my capacity.
How can I portray what is bright as the sun?
Relate each of your words to that saintly man.
You are dead until you come back to life.
Since your nourishment is from that sea,
He is your helper, other than the Truth.}

45 {*Seyāḥatnāme*,} Book 1, fos 23b, 26b, Book 3, fo. 122b. Dr Mordtmann does not mention, for some reason, that he was from the family of Aḥmad Yasawī in his article "Evliyā Čelebi," in *EI*[1] {cf. *İA*, s.v. "Evliya Çelebî" (Cavid Baysun)}.

46 *Khazīnat*, vol. 1, p. 657. The author always identifies the Yasawīs as Naqshbandīs. {The account of Khwāja Ḥāfiẓ Aḥmad Yasawī mentioned by Köprülü, citing the *Khazīnat al-aṣfiyā'*, was taken by the latter work from an earlier history of Kashmīr, so the date is more reliable. But both versions of the account leave no doubt that he was

regarded as a Naqshbandī shaikh, whatever his natural descent. Köprülü's insistence that he was a Yasawī underscores his confusion about (or blurring of) the distinction between *silsila* and natural descent. He does so because he adopted the version of the Yasawī *silsila* preserved in the *Rashaḥāt* and thus repeated in general Naqshbandī works, and by the time he wrote there was no Yasawiyya as such.}

47 All the historians who have done research on Tīmūr – including Léon Cahun, although we cannot consider him to be a true historian – agree on this (Léon Cahun, *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Asie, les Turcs et les Mongoles*, [Paris, 1896], p. 471). {Köprülü's description of Tīmūr's "Islamist policy" and Shī'ī leanings was unfounded. Cf. Beatrice Forbes Manz, *The Rise and Rule of Tamerlane* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 17–18.}

48 See the Persian text of the {anonymous} *Tūzūkāt* or L. M. Langlés's translation {as *Institutes politiques et militaires de Tamerlan, proprement appellé Timour* . . . (Paris, 1787); English trans. and Persian text by Major Davy as *Institutes, Political and Military* (1783; reprinted Tehran, 1342/1963)}. In a letter that he sent to the emperor of China, Sultan Shāh Rukh states that "Tīmūr abolished the *yasa* of Chingiz Khān and the *yarghu* {tribunal}; he put into force in all countries the maxim *amr-i ma'rūf wa nahy-i munkar* {commanding the good and forbidding the bad} according to the commands of the *Sharī'a*; and in his time the Muslims reached their full splendor" (Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū, *Ẕubdat al-tawārīkh* {MS in the Damad Ibrahim Pasha Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul} among the events of 815/1412–13). There is a full translation of this important letter in my critical article on *'Ajā'ib al-laṭā'if* {i.e. his review of the Turkish trans. of Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Naqqāsh's *'Ajā'ib al-laṭā'if: Hatây* (i.e. Khaṭā'ī) *seyâhatnâmesi* by Çelebi-Zâde Âsım,} (*MTM*, 2 {1331/1915}, 356–7).

49 There is a minor discrepancy among historians about the date on which this building was constructed. Sharaf al-Dīn says in his famous *Ẕafarnāme* {Calcutta, 1887–8} that the order was given to build the *türbe* in 799/1396–7 after the construction of Dilgushā Garden and its pavilions (among the events of 799, and in Muḥammad 'Alī b. Darwīsh 'Alī Bukhārī, {Chaghatay} trans., *Ẕafarnāme-i Tīmūr*, {MS 3268 Nuruosmaniye Library in Istanbul; French trans. of the Persian MS Pétis de la Croix as *Histoire de Timur-Bec* (Paris, 1722), English trans. as *The History of Timur-Bec* . . . (London, 1723)}). We see this story, which is not found in Hātifī's work {*Tīmūrnāme*, also known as *Ẕafarnāme*, various MSS} nor in {Ibn 'Arabshāh's} *'Ajā'ib al-maqdūr*, in Mīrkhwānd in a special chapter entitled

ذکر خواستگاری دختر خواجه اغلان بازدواج امیرزاده اسکندر و توجه رای عالم آرای بعمارت

باغ دلگشای

{Proposal of marriage of Khwāja Oghlan's daughter to Amīr-Zāde Iskandar and the intention of the World-Adorner (= Tīmūr) to build the Dilgushā Garden} among the events of 800/1397–8 (*Rawḍat al-ṣafā*, vol. 6, pp. 127–8). Melioransky indicates, perhaps also based on this, that this shrine was constructed in 800/1397–8 (see *EI*[1], s.v. "Aḥmed Yesewī"). This date is also given in Schuyler's *Turkistan* (Turkish trans., p. 93). Mir-Salikh-Bekchurin {"Opisanie mecheti Azreta, nakhodiashcheisia v Turkestane," *Voennyi sbornik*, 9/8 (1866), 209–19; French trans. L. Leger as "Description de la Mosquée de Hazret (Khodja Ahmed Yessevy)," *Recueil d'itinéraires et de voyages dans l'Asie Centrale et l'Extrême-Orient* (Paris, 1878), pp. 245–58} and Ujfalvy accept the date of 806/1404 without giving a source (Ujfalvy, *Le Syr-Daria*, pp. 17, 50). In the second volume {*sic*, only one volume} of his work *Manuel d'art musulman* {Paris, 1907}, which discusses architecture, Henri Saladin says, while discussing the monuments of

Turkistan, that the *türbe* – with the famous name Jāmi'-i Ḥaḍrat – was constructed in 806/1404 (p. 359). In any case, the most accurate of these accounts is what I have mentioned above.

50 The name of this architect is not found in the Oriental sources; but Ujfalvy and N. I. Veselovsky, who personally visited the shrine, and the author {Saladin} of *Manuel d'art musulman*, who cites them, all agree on this point.

51 Both Sharaf al-Dīn {Yazdī} and Mīrkhwānd give almost the same description of this building. Because Mīrkhwānd most certainly copied Sharaf al-Dīn, I will cite verbatim the description in the *Ẓafarnāme* (*Ẓafarnāme* MS) {we have used the edn by Muḥammad 'Abbāsī (Tehran, 1336/1957), vol. 2, p. 16},

وحضرت صاحبقرانی بقریهٔ یسی بزیارت شیخ احمد یسوی توجه فرمود که از فرزندان امام زاده محمد حنفیة است علیه وعلی آبائه السلام وبتعمیرآن مزار متبرك اشارت عالی ارزانی داشت وعمارتی معتبر اساس انداختند مشتمل برطاق وسیع رفیع با دو منار وگنبد مربع سي گز در سي گز وگنبد دیگر دوازده گزدر دواز ده گز با چهار صفه برای مرقد منوردر قبلی گنبد بزرگ متصل بآن ودر دو جانب گنبد دو چهار صفهٔ دیگر هر یکي سیز ده گز ونیم در شانزده گز ونیم جهت جماعت خانه ودیگر حجرات وتوابع ولواحق وفرمان شد تا دیوار وقبهٔ آنرا از کاشی کاری تزیین دهند وقبر از سنگ سفید بتکلف تراشیده نقشهای بدیع بر آن نگارند واتمام آنرا بعهدهٔ اهتمام مولانا عبید اللّه صدر – روضة الصفاده وظفرنامه ترجمه سنده "عبداللّه" – فرمود وبر حسب فرموده بعرض دو سال باتمام پیوست وچون میامن اقامت رسم زیارت قرین روزگار سعادت آثار گشت همت پادشاهانه صلات وصدقات بسیار بمجاوران مزار وسایر ارباب استحقاق وافتقار تصدق فرمود واز آنجا باز گشته باردوی همایون معاودة فرمود.

{His majesty, lord of the auspicious conjunction (i.e. Timūr), visited the tomb of Shaikh Aḥmad Yasawī in the town of Yasī; he was a descendant of Imām-Zāde Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya – peace be upon him and upon his ancestors. Tīmūr issued the order to repair that holy tomb. The foundation was laid of a great edifice, with a wide and tall arch; two minarets; a square cupola 30 cubits by 30 cubits; another cupola 12 cubits by 12 cubits; a rectangular room for the resplendent sepulchre to the south of the great dome adjoining it; two other rectangular rooms on the two sides of the cupola, each 13½ cubits by 16½ cubits, as the congregational prayer-hall; and other chambers and appurtenances. It was ordered that the walls and the dome be ornamented with tilework and the tomb be made of carved white stone etched with fine designs. The Ṣadr, Mawlānā 'Ubaid Allāh ('Abd Allāh according to *Rawḍat al-ṣafā* and *Ẓafernâme Tercümesi* {this comment inserted by Köprülü in Turkish}), was charged with carrying out this task, and work was completed in two years, as ordered. When the visitation ceremonies were completed, Tīmūr performed the ritual prayer and gave many alms to the residents at the tomb and to the other worthy dervishes. He then departed from there and returned to his camp.}

52 {See A. A. Ivanov, "O bronzovykh izdeliiakh kontsa XIV v. iz mavzoleia Khidzhi Akhmeda Iasevi," in B. A. Litvinskii (ed)., *Sredniaia Aziia i ee sosedi v drevnosti i srednevekov'e*

(Moscow, 1981), pp. 68–84; Thomas Lentz and Glenn Lowry, *Timur and the Princely Vision: Persian Art and Culture in the Fifteenth Century* (Los Angeles, 1989), pp. 29–31 and catalogue no. 4.; and Linda Komaroff, *The Golden Disk of Heaven: Metalwork of Timurid Iran* (Costa Mesa, CA, 1992), pp. 17–49, 237–49.}

53 {Köprülü calls it a mosque after its popular name Jāmi'-i Ḥaḍrat. Shrine makes more sense, although the complex does contain a small mosque as well. There is enormous literature on this shrine complex. See especially L. Iu. Man'kovskaia, "K izucheniiu priemov sredneaziatskogo zodchestva kontsa XIV v. (mavzolei Khodzhi Akhmada Iasavi)," *Iskusstvo zodchikh Uzbekistana*, 1 (1962), pp. 93–142, English paraphrased translation with additional references by Lisa Golombek as "Towards the Study of Forms in Central Asian Architecture at the End of the Fourteenth Century: The Mausoleum of Khvāja Aḥmad Yasavī," *Iran*, 23 (1985), 109–27; and *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, s.v. "Ahmed Yesevî Külliyesi" (Emel Esin).}

54 Schuyler, *Turkistan*, {Turkish trans.}, p. 96.

55 *Ibid.*, p. 94.

56 The *khwāja's* tomb is currently under the building erected by Amīr Tīmūr. There is no inscription or anything of the kind on the tomb. Next to the *khwāja* is the tomb of his wife. There are quite a few who believe that those who visit these two tombs will acquire more merit than that obtained from going on the pilgrimage to Mecca. They make visiting the *khwāja's* tomb the top priority for those who visit such tombs. The *khwāja*, who encouraged the visiting of tombs, mentioned them as follows, "Bu Arslan Bāb Evliyā, Bu Abū 'l-Khair, Bu Āblāy, Bu Muḥammad Ḥanafī {i.e. Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya}, Ḥaḍrat-i Sulṭān al-'Ārifīn, so that there are 77,000 shaikhs and 88,000 *servers* (princes, saints) . . . etc. This visiting is continuous" ("Khalwa," in the journal *Shūrā*, March 1914, p. 140). {Claiming that "the *khwāja*" is known to have encouraged the visitation of tombs, and even commended going to his own – since "Ḥaḍrat-i Sulṭān al-'Ārifīn" refers to Aḥmad Yasawī – and to the eighteenth-century Qazaq *khān* Ablay makes no sense of course. The article from *Shūrā*, signed by a certain "T," recounts a visit to Aḥmad Yasawī's shrine in January 1914. The listing of graves comes as the caretaker – who belonged to the social/familial group known as *khwājas* (who claimed descent from Yasawī's daughter, see DeWeese, "The Politics of Sacred Lineages"), hence perhaps Köprülü's confusion over who was encouraging the visitation of these shrines – was identifying particular graves. The "Bu" in these phrases simply means "this," in the sense of "here lies."}

57 There was water in this vessel "for the the use of the persons who live in the mosque {i.e. shrine} and the pilgrims and students who come there. It is said to have been cast in Churnak {rather, Qarnaq}, now in ruins, about fifty miles from Turkestan {25 km north of Turkistan}. Around this vessel there are several lines of Arabic inscriptions, in different characters . . ." These inscriptions concern the importance of water. It appears from them that, on the order of Tamerlane, the vessel was made by Ustādh Abū 'l-'Azīz Ibn Sharaf al-Dīn al-Tabrīzī and placed there (Howorth, citing Schuyler, *History of the Mongols*, from notes at the end of part 8 of Chapter 2 {i.e. part 2, division 2, pp. 682–3, corresponds to Schuyler, vol. 1, pp. 71–2}). {All citations from Howorth (Schuyler) here and below are given in the original English, which differs a bit from the Turkish translation.} Today people in Yasī believe that this cauldron also survives from the time of Aḥmad Yasawī ("Khalwa," {in the journal *Shūrā*,} p. 147). {According to a Soviet-era report, the inhabitants of Qarnaq still showed the nearby site where the cauldron had been cast. See M. E. Masson, *Mavzolei Khodzha Akhmeda Iasevi* (Tashkent, 1930), p. 16, n.1. Masson's article is one of the most valuable early descriptions of the shrine. It has been reprinted in K. M. Baipakov (ed)., *Goroda Turkestana: Sbornik nauchnykh statei* (Almaty, 1999), pp. 9–29.} In the *ZDMG*, 51 (1897), Vambéry has an article on the legends of Tīmūr ({"Eine legendäre Geschichte

Timurs,"} pp. 215–32) that includes the text and translation of a Persian historical document entitled

داستان یورش حضرت صاحبقران بدشت قپچاق بر سر توقتمش خان

{Account of the campaign of His majesty the Ṣāḥib-qirān into the Qipchaq Steppe against Toqtamish Khān}. This document, which was apparently written in 1192/1788 at the time of Abū 'l-Ghāzī Bahādur Khān, is of much more legendary than historical value. {The text cited here from Vambéry's article in *ZDMG* comes from a work known as the *Kunūz al-aʿẓam*, compiled by a certain ʿAbd al-Raḥmān Sīrat in the early eighteenth century. See DeWeese, "The Descendants of Sayyid Ata and the Rank of *Naqīb* in Central Asia," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 115 (1995), 612–34.} Legendary works of this kind are very common to both Chingiz Khān and Tīmūr. Indeed, I have mentioned above, while describing the feelings of respect that Tīmūr had for Aḥmad Yasawī, certain legends and legendary works {of this kind}. We find one of these legends, which derived from the fact that Tīmūr had a *türbe* built for Aḥmad Yasawī, at the beginning of this document that Vambéry published. It indicates – naturally in a purely legendary fashion – the origin of this famous cauldron in the *türbe* and how it came to be there. Let me quote this part verbatim, with the addition of a few minor, but necessary, corrections and emendations {he actually left out some fairly important things},

چون حضرت صاحبقران به یورش دشت قپچاق آماده شد بقلعهٔ ترکستان (یسی)
آمد امیر ملك خواجه احمد یسوی را ملازمت کرد گفتند اینجا قلعه است قبا نام هفت روزه
دورتر طایفهٔ ترکمان یوز (غوز، اوغوز) می نشینند که انها خود را نسل افراسیاب میگیرند
پسران ارغون خان تورکمانند پنج برادرند بر کسی انقیاد ندارند در ینوقت ایلچیان آن پنج
برادر در نامهٔ ایشان این قطعه بود که

ما پنج برادر از قبایم دریا دل و آفتاب رایم . . . .

هر کدام خنده ها کردند عقیده کرده اند که غیر از قبا جای دیگر نباشد میرزا عمر
شیخ جواب داده فرستاد که

نمرود سگ علیه لعنه میگفت خدای خلق مایم . . . .

صاحبقران از ترکستان سوار شده رفته قبل کرد اول ایشانان بجنگ بر آمدند بعد که
کثرت سپاه صاحبقرانرا دیدند قبل شدند چهل روز قافیهٔ ایشانان تنگ شد نوشته فرستادکه

ما پنج برادر از قبایم در قحط و نیاز مبتلایم

القصه صاحبقران گناه ایشانرا ببخشیدند و دیگر از مس به بلندی ده گز و دو ره اش
ده گز از زمان افراسیاب مانده بود بصاحبقران پیشکش کردند صاحبقران بر سر مزار
حضرت خواجه احمد یسوی فرستادند که آن دیگ هنوز آنجاهست.

{When his majesty, lord of the auspicious conjunction (i.e. Tīmūr), during his campaign to the Qipchaq Steppe, arrived at the fortress of Turkistan (Yasī), he paid his respects to the *amīr-i mulk* (commander of the kingdom) Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī. He was told that there was a fortress nearby called Qaba, and that a seven-day journey further on there dwelt a tribe of Turkmen Yuz (i.e. Oghuz) who traced their descent back to Afrāsiyāb. They are descendants of Arghun Khān Turkman, five brothers, and are obedient to no one. Now envoys came from those five brothers with a letter containing the following verses:

We are five brothers from Qaba;
Our hearts are like the sea, our minds like the sun . . .

Everyone broke out laughing, for they truly believed that there was no place like Qaba [and that they were masters of the entire world]. Mīrzā 'Umar Shaikh sent the following reply:

Nimrod, the dog, God's curse be upon him,
Said: "I am the lord of creation."
[God drove him mad with half a flea.]

The lord of the auspicious conjunction mounted, left Turkistan, and laid siege [to Qaba]. At first they fought back, but when they saw the great number of Tīmūr's forces, they withdrew into their fortress. After forty days they began to weaken, and sent the following message:

We are five brothers from Qaba;
We are straightened from hunger and need . . .

In short, Tīmūr forgave them their fault, and they presented him with a copper kettle, ten cubits high and ten cubits in circumference, which had come down to them from the time of Afrāsiyāb. Tīmūr sent it to the tomb of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, and it is still there.}

According to this legend, this copper cauldron, which was ten *arşın*s {cubits} high and ten *arşın*s in diameter and survived from {the time of} Afrāsiyāb, was given as a gift to Tīmūr in Qaba by five brothers from a Turkmen family. There is some information in this text about the cauldron, the name of the maker of which was inscribed on top, and its correct size. But this document only confirms the continuous influence Aḥmad Yasawī had in Central Asia.

58 Howorth, citing Schuyler, *History of the Mongols*, vol. 2, notes at the end of the eighth part of the second chapter {i.e. part 2, division 2, pp. 681–3, corresponds to Schuyler, vol. 1, pp. 70–3}. According to the information provided by Schuyler, "The Sheikh-ul-Islam has several documents from various rulers of Central Asia in whose possession Turkestan has been, conferring privileges on the shrine, one of them of the year 1591, signed by Abdulla Khan" (*ibid.*, {i.e. part 2, division 2, p. 683, corresponds to Schuyler, vol. 1, p. 72}). {Here Köprülü seems to understand that Schuyler's "Sheikh-ul-Islam" was not Aḥmad Yasawī.}

59 Ujfalvy, *Le Syr-Daria*, pp. 17, 51; Reclus, *Nouvelle géographie universelle*, vol. 6, pp. 553–4.

60 Sığnak was the government center of the state of the White Horde founded by Jūjī's {d. 1225} oldest son. Subsequently, however, during the period of the Qazaqs, this state was divided into three parts, the Great, Small, and Middle {hordes}. Yasī was the capital of the strongest of them, the Middle Horde (Howorth, *History of the Mongols*, vol. 2, Chapter 2, p. 647).

61 Reclus, *Nouvelle géographie universelle*, p. 554. According to Mir-Salikh-Bekchurin's account, the Shaikh al-Islām, who saw that the shrine was in ruins, ascended the minaret with great difficulty and waved the white flag to the Russians, and in this way the most beautiful monument in the region of the Syr Darya was saved from complete ruin (Ujfalvy, *Le Syr-Daria*, p. 18). The current state of the shrine, however, is one of utter ruin. In recent times several attempts have been made to raise funds to repair it, but nothing has come of this ({"Khalwa" in} the journal *Shūrā*, March 1914, p. 145). The Russian committee that has been preoccupied with research on Central and East Asia sent N. I. Veselovskii to make a special study of this monument, but it is probably doomed to destruction. {Later, when the territory now called Kazakhstan became part of the Soviet Union, repairs were carried out from time to time beginning in 1928. It was eventually almost completely restored, although not without some problems. See Naim-Bek Nurmuhammedoğlu, *Hoca Ahmed Yesevî türbesi* (Ankara, 1991), pp. 51–3. This work, with many photographs, was originally published in Alma-Ata in 1980 and then republished in Ankara with the addition of a Turkish translation of the text.}

62 Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ Mīrzā, the well known Central Asian Turkish poet of the tenth/sixteenth century, wrote a famous poem entitled *Shaibānīnāme* to spread the word about the events of the sultanate of Shaibānī {now generally read as "Shībānī"} Khān, and at the end of it he mentions Aḥmad Yasawī and Yasī while praying for Shaibānī Khān (*Shaibānīnāme*, Vambéry [ed.], p. 444),

Ey zafer yolunu açgan Tingri'm
Şâdlık eşkini saçgan Tingri'm
Hanga çün munca inâyet kıldıng
Hâtırın munca ri'âyet kıldıng
Eyleding lûtf anga Türkistan'ını
Ya'ni kim Yesi bile Savrân'ını
Hâce Ahmed Yesevî'ga anı
Eyleding hemdem-ü yâr-ı cânı

{Oh God, who opens the way to victory,
God, who scatters the tears of joy
You have shown such care for the Khān,
You have been so solicitous on his behalf
You have favored him with Turkistan,
That is, with Yasī and Savrān
You have made him the companion
And sincere friend of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī.}

On this poet, see my still unpublished work *Tîmûrlular devrinde Orta-Asya Türk edebiyatı* {never published, but see his article in *İA*, s.v. "Çagatay edebiyatı," pp. 312–13}. Neither Vambéry nor Melioransky, who published a more accurate and reliable edition of this work, was able to provide adequate information on him.

63 "Khalwa" in the journal *Shūrā*, March 1914. In order to understand the meaning and nature of *khalwa* in the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*, see the next chapter.

64 *Ibid.*, p. 148.

65 Passages in the simplest works, such as {the anonymous} *Sharā'iṭ al-īmān*, reveal the significance of Aḥmad Yasawī (see Chapter 2, p. 30), and works like *Fawz al-najāt* by Ṣūfī Allāhyār (written in 1180/1766–7), which were quite famous in Central Asia, also speak of him with respect. In one place in his *mathnawī* {the aforesaid *Fawz al-najāt*}, Ṣūfī Allāhyār delivers a eulogy to him (Istanbul edn, {n.d.}, p. 111),

Türk içinde Hâce Ahmed Yesevî
Olar irür köp meşâyıh serveri

{Among the Turks Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī
Is the leader of all the shaikhs.}

In the section entitled در بیان ختم یازده احمد: {Concerning the Eleven Seals of Aḥmad}, he mentions him again in a couplet (Kazan edn, 1895, p. 79),

Birisidür Hâce Ahmed Yesevî
Zâhir-ü bâtında ol erdi kavî

{One of them is Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī
He was powerful in the exoteric and esoteric matters.}

The famous Khwāja Sulaimān, known as Ḥakīm Ata, also wrote a description of him in a famous hymn, the relevant passage of which states (*Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, Istanbul edn, p. 111),

Baksa Ka'be görüngân bassa yirler türülgân
Ledün ilmi birilgân Hâcem Ahmed Yesevî
Aslı irür hânedân bilmez anı göb nâdân
Bilür anı Hak Yezdân Hâcem Ahmed Yesevî

{When he looks, the Ka'ba appears;
when he steps the ground folds up.
He has been given the science of *ladun* (nearness to God);
my Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī.
His lineage is the family of the Prophet.
Many ignorant ones do not know him.
But God knows him; my Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī.}

66 {The Qarakhān, or Awliyā Qarakhān, whose shrine gave the town one of its many names, was regarded in local tradition as a descendant of one of the three Islamizing figures descended from Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya (Aḥmad Yasawī was a descendant of another of the three). See DeWeese, "Yasavian Legends on the Islamization of Turkistan," in Denis Sinor (ed.), *Aspects of Altaic Civilization III* (Bloomington, IN, 1990), pp. 1–19. The same tradition plays a prominent role in the genealogical texts collected recently by Ashirbek Muminov and Zikiriya Zhandarbekov mentioned above in the Foreword. Finally, Köprülü is relying on Schuyler here in referring to the shrine west of town as that of "Asa Bibi" (in Schuyler "Assa Bibi"). In fact the shrine of 'Ā'isha Bībī is relatively well known. See Robert Hillenbrand, "The Mausoleum of 'A'isha Bibi and the Central Asian Tradition of Funerary Architecture," *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 18 (1994), 111–20.}

67 Cited from *Description des hordes et des steppes des Kirghiz-Kazaks ou Kirghiz-Ka'issaks* by a Russian scholar named {A. I.} Levshin {or Levchin} and translated {from Russian} by Ferry de Pigny {Paris, 1840} (Dubeux, *Tartarie*, pp. 135–6). Not only Ābläy-Khān, the Qazaq ruler of the Middle and Great hordes, was buried there, but Ondan Sulṭān, one of the most famous of the White Horde *amīrs* and a descendant of Chingiz Khān, was buried there as well (Howorth, *History of the Mongols*, vol. 2, part 2, pp. 636–47). {Köprülü's identification of Ondan Sulṭān as a Chingizid implies that Ablay was not a Chingizid. All the *khāns* of the Qazaqs were Chingizids, or at least claimed to be. There are, in fact, many other Qazaq *khāns* said to be buried at Aḥmad

Yasawī's shrine complex.} Such Qazaq customs as keeping the corpse unburied until spring are vestiges of pre-Islamic Turkish funeral rites.

68 Ujfalvi, *Le Syr-Daria*, p. 52.

69 *Ibid*., p. 51. {On the role of Aḥmad Yasawī's shrine and of stories and practices connected to it, in the context of contemorary Qazaq religion, see Bruce G. Privratsky, *Muslim Turkistan: Kazak Religion and Collective Memory* (Richmond, Surrey, 2001).}

70 According to Schuyler, the expenses of the shrine were managed by its *waqfs*. Before the city was conquered by the Russians, the Khān of Khokand used to send 500 gold coins (*tila*) every year to help to cover the expenses of the mosque. In addition, those who visited the mosque always gave some {monetary} assistance to its employees and distributed the sacrificial animals that they slaughtered to the poor (Howorth, *History of the Mongols*, vol. 2, cited from *Turkistan*). Mir-Salikh-Bekchurin also says that this mosque was managed by *waqfs*. Those who trained the *murīds* who looked after the *türbe* and who considered themselves to be descendants of Aḥmad Yasawī benefited in particular from this. In the popular language, these men were given the title *azlar*, a corruption of *'azizler* {holy ones} ("Khalwa" in the journal *Shūrā*, March 1914, p. 145).

4

THE *KHALĪFAS* AND *ṬARĪQA* OF AḤMAD YASAWĪ

A His first *khalīfas*

As I have stated above (Chapter 2, pp. 24–6), it is certain that Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī sent many *khalīfas* throughout Turkistan. Although most of them have been forgotten among the thousands of complex events in life, the memory of some of them who had strong personalities has survived until today and the Yasawī *silsila* has continued with them. It would be useful, therefore, to review the most famous of these first *khalīfas* and those with whom the Yasawī *silsila* was maintained until around the end of the tenth/sixteenth century.

Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī's first *khalīfa*, to whom an important and prominent place was given in {Yasawī} tradition, was Manṣūr Ata, the son of Arslan Bābā. Manṣūr Ata was succeeded by his son ʿAbd al-Malik Ata, who was replaced by his son Tāj-Khwāja, who in turn was the father of the famous Zangī Ata.[1] The second *khalīfa*, about whom we have little information, was Saʿīd Ata of Khwārazm, who died in 615/1218–19.[2] As for the third *khalīfa*, Sulaimān Ḥakīm Ata, not only do we know that he uttered "wisdom-filled and moral-pointing anecdotes about the conditions of the dervishes in the Turkish language" {*dervişler ahvâlinden Türkî dilde kelimât-i hikmet-âmiz ve latâif-i ibret-engîzleri*}, but we also possess detailed information about his deeds and *khalīfas*. Based on this, we can show that Sulaimān Ḥakīm Ata was the most well known *khalīfa* of Aḥmad Yasawī among the Turks. Ḥakīm Ata lived in Khwārazm providing spiritual guidance to the people in that region. Although he died before the other *khalīfas* of Aḥmad Yasawī, he remained a source of spiritual authority for a rather long time and gathered about him most of the disciples who were attached to the *ṭarīqa*. According to tradition, his wife, ʿAnbar Ana, was the daughter of the ruler Bughrā Khān.[3] According to another story, he died in 582/1186–7[4] and was buried in Aq Qūrghān.[5]

We know of the legend of Ḥakīm Ata because it circulated among the Northern Turks for centuries in a book of legends with the title *Ḥakīm Ata menkabesi* {i.e. The legend of Ḥakīm Ata}.[6] Ḥakīm Ata's original name was Sulaimān. When he was a boy, he used to go to school holding the Koran in his hand out of respect and would not dangle it on his neck like the other boys. When he left

school, he used to turn his face to the school and his back to his home. One day, while sitting at the threshold of his *masjid* {mosque}, Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī observed this behavior and it pleased him. With the consent of the boy's mother and his teacher, Aḥmad Yasawī took him into his service and instructed him in the Koran. After reaching age fifteen, Sulaimān became a disciple of the *khwāja*. One day Khaḍir, peace be upon him, came to visit the *khwāja* who sent the boys out to fetch some firewood in order to cook dinner. While they were returning with the firewood, a terrible rainstorm began and all the wood got wet. Only the wood that Sulaimān had brought was dry because he had taken off his clothes and used them to wrap it. Thanks to this, they were able to ignite the other wood. Khaḍir, peace be upon him, asked Sulaimān how he had kept his wood dry and Sulaimān told what he had done. Khaḍir was very pleased with this and said to the boy, "Henceforth may your name be Ḥakīm {wise}!" He then placed some of his blessed saliva in Sulaimān's mouth and the boy's heart was filled with light. Khaḍir then said, "Come on! Don't stop! Show your spiritual power!" At that moment, Ḥakīm Ata began to recite some wisdom quatrains {*ḥikmats*} and other verses {*manẓūmas*}.[7]

One day in the month of sacrifice {Dhū 'l-Ḥijja}, 99,000 shaikhs were present in the *tekke* of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī. The *khwāja* acted as the prayer leader {*imām*} and they began to pray. At his right was Ḥakīm Ata and at his left was Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend. During the prayer, a noise emerged from the *khwāja*. The congregation said, "The *imām* has broken wind" and abandoned the prayer because it was not ritually acceptable. The *khwāja*, however, paid no attention. He continued the prayer. Without hesitation, Ḥakīm Ata followed suit. Ṣūfī Muḥammad took his cue from Ḥakīm Ata and also continued. Finally, after all greetings were finished {following the prayer}, the *khwāja* said, "I did this on purpose to see what level you had reached in your religious training. That sound did not emerge from me. It came from a piece of wood that I had inserted at my waist. It is apparent that I have one disciple who has reached perfection and one who has come half way to perfection. The others are all ignoramuses." He then gave Ḥakīm Ata an order saying, "Tomorrow just before dawn a camel will come to you. Mount it and wherever it stops that will be the place where you will dismount."[8]

The next morning just before dawn, Ḥakīm Ata mounted the camel that appeared and gave it free rein. The camel headed out of Turkistan {i.e. Yasī} toward the east. Just west of the city of Khurāsān, it came to a place called Bī-nawā Arkası {Behind the Beggar} and stopped. They tried with all their might, but the camel would not budge. It only brayed. For this reason, they called that place Bāqirghān {"It brayed"}.[9] When the camel stopped, Ḥakīm Ata dismounted. This was a place where Bughrā Khān's herd of horses grazed. The horse herders wanted to drive him away from there. "I am a dervish. I won't go anywhere," he said. They then attacked him with the sticks that they used to herd the horses. Ḥakīm Ata gave an order to the trees that were there, saying, "Hold them!" The trees seized three of them tightly, while two others fled and reported to Bughrā

Khān what had happened. The Khān was very pleased with these events and said, "For three days I have been getting whiffs of the odor of *erens*. This means that an *er* {saint} has appeared in our country." He sent someone named ʿAbd Allāh Ṣadr to ascertain the matter. ʿAbd Allāh Ṣadr asked the dervish who he was and what he wanted, and learned that he was Ḥakīm Sulaimān, a Yasawī disciple. When he realized why the herdsmen were left in the trees, a voice came from the trees, saying, "This is what happens to those who act like this." Convinced of the sublimity of this dervish, ʿAbd Allāh then returned to inform the Khān.[10] In order to conciliate the dervish, Bughrā Khān gave him one of his very beautiful daughters named ʿAnbar and also sent him many camels, sheep, and horses. Ḥakīm Ata accepted all of these things and made his residence at the place called Bāqirghān. Bughrā Khān and all his viziers became his disciples and followers. Ḥakīm Ata's fame spread in all directions.

Ḥakīm Ata had three children by ʿAnbar: Muḥammad Khwāja, Aṣghar Khwāja, and Ḥubbī Khwāja. When the first two had grown up, they were sent to Khwārazm to study with a very famous religious scholar {*ʿālim*} named Jārullāh ʿAllāma Shaikh. They performed many miracles there and attracted hundreds of disciples.[11] As for the youngest, Ḥubbī Khwāja, every day he would ride about the mountains and plains on horseback hunting deer and would bring them to his father. Ḥakīm Ata had no idea what a high level of spirituality his youngest son had attained.

One day, by a strange turn of events, he learned of this fact. Ḥakīm Ata had a disciple named Shaikh Sāʿat from the town of Ṭarādīkān (طرادیکان) {rather, Ṭurā, so far unidentified} in the province of Junūq {rather, Khīvaq or Khīva}. Ḥakīm Ata summoned him and he immediately came running. A little later he also summoned Ḥubbī Khwāja. He was a bit late and, as usual, brought his father a deer. The boy's late arrival annoyed his father. Perceiving this, Ḥubbī Khwāja explained the reason for his delay, saying "Two ships in the ocean were sinking and requested my help. I am late because I was busy with them." His father did not believe this. "If you don't believe me," his son continued, "in exactly five months they will bring 10,000 gold pieces here as a token of gratitude. Then you will see." And truly it happened that way. All the men who brought the money became disciples of Ḥubbī Khwāja. Ḥakīm Ata now began to understand his son's high degree {of spirituality}.

Again, one day his son posed the following question: "I see that you always perform here recommended acts {*sunna*} of the ritual prayer, but where do you perform its obligatory acts {*farḍ*}?" In response to this question, his father said that he performed the obligatory part at the Kaʿba. "Very well," he said, "but it is a lot of trouble to go that far. Can't you bring the Kaʿba here?" Ḥakīm Ata confessed that he did not have that much power. The next day, however, he was suddenly shocked to find that his son had brought the Kaʿba to Bāqirghān and he became somewhat jealous. Now, two saints certainly cannot occupy the single official position of the shaikh in a Ṣūfī order {*post*}. One day Ḥakīm Ata assembled his disciples. They sacrificed nine oxen[12] and held *dhikrs* and *samāʿs* {Ṣūfī séance

with music}. Everyone was summoned except Ḥubbī Khwāja. Meanwhile, he returned from the hunt with the deer he had caught. When he saw that everyone had been summoned but no word had been sent to him, he was upset and asked his father the reason for this. By means of a miracle, he then brought back to life the oxen that had been slaughtered. All the people who witnessed this became his followers. Consequently, his father called him and said that the two of them could not remain together in the same place.[13] Ḥubbī Khwāja understood the meaning of these words very well and said to his father, "You stay!" He went out and bade farewell to his mother. He put on his burial shroud and stood in the middle of his cell. He told his mother not to weep for him but to try to please his father. He pulled in his head, and disappeared except for his shroud, which remained in the cell. His father and mother wept profusely over this. Ḥakīm Ata recited many *ḥikmats* about his grief for his son.

Ḥakīm Ata's behavior toward his son required divine punishment. It was revealed to him that if Ḥubbī Khwāja had lived, sixty saints would have appeared among his descendants. Because they were prevented from coming into the world, as an atonement, water would flow over him for forty years, and only in this way would he be cleansed of his sin. And in fact this is what happened. After his death, the Amu Darya flooded the city of Bāqirghān, and water flowed for forty years over Ḥakīm Ata's *türbe*. Then the water receded, but no one knew what had become of his *türbe*. Finally, by the spiritual direction of Ḥakīm Ata, someone named Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn found his grave and erected a tall building over it. People flocked to visit it from all directions.[14]

The best known of Ḥakīm Ata's many *khalīfas* was Zangī Ata. When he was in Tashkent, he learned of his shaikh's death and immediately went to Khwārazm to visit his tomb and offer his condolences to his family. Because he was a descendant of the Arab Arslan Bābā, he was an ugly man with black skin {Arab can mean "African," "black"}. After the canonically prescribed waiting period for an engagement had ended {to see if she were pregnant}, he asked for the widow ʿAnbar Ana as a result of the spiritual direction of her deceased husband. ʿAnbar Ana was very loath to remarry, but finally, as a result of one of Zangī Ata's miracles, she was compelled to give her consent.[15]

Zangī Ata was a thick-lipped negro {*zanjī*} cattle herder in the mountains of Tashkent. He used to support himself and his family with the meager wages he received from the people of Tashkent for herding their cows. Because he spent his life in the countryside, he would do his prayers on the plains or in the valleys. Afterwards, he would begin a loud *dhikr*. According to tradition, whenever he did this, all the cattle would stop grazing, form a circle around him, and listen. One day, Zangī Ata collected a huge pile of thorny brush from among the thickets in the mountains and was tying it with a rope in order to take it home. At that moment, four young men appeared before him. They greeted him and he acknowledged their greeting and asked where they had come from and where they were going. {They replied that} while studying in a *madrasa* in Bukhārā, they resolved to follow the path of God and were now searching for a shaikh

who could give them guidance. "Wait a bit!" said Zangī Ata. "Let me sniff in the four directions. Wherever I perceive the fragrance of the perfect guide, I will inform you." The youths waited with pleasure. Zangī Ata turned his face to the four directions and sniffed. At last he said, "No one but me is capable of making you reach perfection."

These four youths who had come from Bukhārā in search of a shaikh were Uzun Ḥasan Ata, Sayyid Ata, Ṣadr Ata, and Badr Ata. They eventually became Zangī Ata's four great *khalīfas*. Uzun Ḥasan and Ṣadr were the first of the four to become his followers based on his promise. For this reason, they were the first to reach the level of perfection. Sayyid Aḥmad,[16] because he had some education and came from a respected family, found it rather strange that a black cowherd would undertake to guide him. This conceit, however, only blocked his path, and his efforts proved fruitless. Finally, he implored ʿAnbar Ana to intervene with Zangī Ata on his behalf in this matter. ʿAnbar Ana promised to help him, saying, "Tonight wrap yourself in a black felt and wait by Zangī Ata's path. Just before dawn, when he goes out to relieve himself, he will see you in this condition and pity you!" Indeed, that night, this very kind-hearted woman asked her husband why Sayyid Aḥmad had not received his favor and said that he was worthy of it. Zangī Ata smiled and explained that when Sayyid Aḥmad first saw him, it had awakened conceit in his heart. He added that, as a result of ʿAnbar Ata's intercession, he would forgive his original fault. The next morning just before dawn, when Zangī Ata went outside, he saw a black object lying in his path. When he touched it with his foot in order to discover what it was, Sayyid Aḥmad prostrated himself at the shaikh's foot and begged forgiveness. In response to this, Zangī Ata treated Sayyid Aḥmad with such favor that everything that he wished for was revealed to him at that moment.[17]

As for Ṣadr Ata and Badr Ata, who were the third and forth *khalīfas* of Zangī Ata, their names were Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad and Badr al-Dīn Muḥammad. When they were in Bukhārā, they lived in the same cell, studied the same lessons, and never left each other's company. After becoming a disciple of Zangī Ata, Ṣadr al-Dīn's level {of spirituality} rose. In contrast to this, that of Badr al-Dīn continuously declined. Finally, grieved by this, Badr al-Dīn went to ʿAnbar Ana weeping profusely and explained his dilemma. When her husband was in a light-hearted mood, she described Badr al-Dīn's anxiety to him. Zangī Ata laughed and said, "When he first met me, Badr al-Dīn said to himself that this negro with camel lips was claiming too much. That is the reason he has not yet been able to attain enlightenment. But since you have intervened, I have forgiven this fault of his." Afterwards, in fact, there was no difference in the progress of the spiritual training of these two friends.[18]

The tomb of this famous Turkish shaikh, whose memory was sung for centuries by the Ṣūfī poets of Central Asia,[19] is eight miles from Tashkent on the Samarqand road.[20] Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh Aḥrār, the great and renowned Ṣūfī of Central Asia, held Zangī Ata in very high regard and used to say that whenever he visited his tomb he would hear the cry of "Allāh Allāh" from within.[21]

The Yasawiyya spiritual chain traces back above all to the two disciples of Zangī Ata, Sayyid Ata and Ṣadr Ata. After receiving his shaikh's forgiveness, with the intervention of ʿAnbar Ana, Sayyid Ata made great spiritual progress and had many debates with his contemporary Khwāja ʿAzīzān.[22] The most famous *khalīfa* of Sayyid Ata, many of whose miracles are mentioned in the books of legends, was Ismāʿīl Ata from Ḥūziyyā.[23] A pure Turk, Ismāʿīl Ata paid no attention to the attacks on him by the mullās and would not give up his duty as a spiritual guide.[24] One day, however, while passing in front of the tomb of Khwāja Muḥammad al-Nāmī, the ancestor of Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh Aḥrār Tashkandī, he said, "Rotten straw is good for nothing," alluding to the fact that Muḥammad al-Nāmī had died long ago and therefore could no longer have any influence. Suddenly a piece of straw came through the air and struck him in the eye. As a result, he lost the eye.[25] Nevertheless, Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh always spoke highly of him. As for Ismāʿīl Ata's son Isḥāq Khwāja, he spent a rather long time in Isfījāb[26] providing the people with guidance. Some of the exploits of this shaikh, who gained fame among the Turks, were firmly proven and famous.[27] Khwāja Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband appeared shortly after him, but the Yasawī spiritual chain maintained its fame with the original *khalīfas* of Ṣadr Ata.

Another *khalīfa* of Ṣadr Ata was Ayman Bābā, whose *khalīfa* was Shaikh ʿAlī, whose *khalīfa* was Mawdūd Shaikh. The latter's two leading *khalīfas* were also famous: Kamāl Shaikh and Khādim Shaikh. Kamāl was a contemporary of Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh Aḥrār. Khādim already had many disciples in Tashkent and Transoxiana when the *khwāja* appeared on the scene and subsequently had an audience with him. The author {Ṣafī} of the *Rashaḥāt* reports a number of sacred words of this shaikh cited from Khādim Shaikh's *khalīfa* Jamāl al-Dīn Bukhārī.[28] According to {Ḥarīrī-Zāde's} *Tibyān-i wasā'il*, the Yasawī chain of authorities that derived from Khādim Shaikh was as follows:[29] Khādim Shaikh, Shaikh Jamāl al-Dīn Bukhārī, Shaikh Khudāidād ʿAzīzagī, Mawlānā Kūh-i Zarrī (Kūh-i Zarī), Shaikh Garmīnī, Muḥammad Mu'min Samarqandī, Shaikh Ākhūnd, and Mullā Khurd ʿAzīzān. The same source records the chain of authorities from Kamāl Shaikh as follows: Kamāl Shaikh Īqānī, Shaikh ʿAlīyābādī, Shaikh Shams Özkendī, Abdāl Shaikh, Shaikh ʿAbd al-Wāsiʿ, and Shaikh ʿAbd al-Muhaimin who was alive in Tashkent in 974/1566–7. Ḥazīnī, however, gives a rather different chain than this from Zangī Ata.[30]

B Yasawī rules of behavior

Like all *ṭarīqas*, the Yasawiyya had a number of rules. The fundamental principles of these rules did not differ from those of the other Ṣūfī paths, but they had their own special features that are worthy of study. The basic number of rules that a disciple who entered the Yasawiyya *ṭarīqa* was required to observe can be reduced to ten {these ten are actually listed by Ḥazīnī}. (1) He must not recognize anyone as superior to his shaikh and must submit to him unconditionally. Spending

the days eating all sorts of food and the nights sleeping in the presence of the Guide cannot close the doors to esoteric spiritual knowledge. But a dervish who left his shaikh, {even though he} fasted and stayed awake to his own satisfaction, and carried on naked and weeping, would have the door to progress closed. (2) The disciple should be intelligent and perceptive and be able to understand the shaikh's allusions {*rumūz*} and directions {*ishārāt*}. (3) He must submit to and obey all words and actions of the shaikh. (4) In all service to the shaikh, he should not be lazy but be quick and nimble, so that he may obtain his approval, because the approval of the shaikh is tantamount to the approval of God. (5) He should speak the truth and keep promises, so that if the shaikh's temperament changes, this may not be a reason for rejection. He should never feel uncertainty or doubt. Otherwise, disappointment would be inevitable. (6) He should be faithful and firm in his oath of allegiance. (7) The disciple should be prepared to place all his property at the disposal of his shaikh. The way to inner spirituality can be opened in no other manner. (8) He should keep the shaikh's secrets and beware of disclosing them. (9) He should keep in mind all the shaikh's suggestions, admonitions, and counsels and never neglect them or try to circumvent them. (10) For the sake of divine union, he should be prepared to give his heart and soul for the sake of the shaikh. He should be the friend of his friend and the enemy of his enemy. If necessary, in order to meet the shaikh's needs, he should be willing to sell himself as a slave.[31]

The principles of the fortified city {*shahristān*} of the *ṭarīqa* are six: knowledge of God, absolute generosity, true honesty, absorption in certainty, trust in God pending bestowal of spiritual or material possessions, and critical meditation. The pillars of being a shaikh and role model are also six: knowledge of the true faith, true manifest forbearance, praiseworthy patience, sublime contentment, Abrahamic sincerity, and bountiful nearness.[32] The duties of the *ṭarīqa* are also six: seeking the Possessor of Perfection and approaching the Possessor of Glory, longing for union with the Everlasting, fearing the imperishable King day and night, being hopefully expectant under all conditions, mentioning continually {God's name}, and contemplating union with the transcendent everliving God. The customary practices of the *ṭarīqa* again are six: congregational prayer, staying awake until just before dawn {*seherlerde uyanıklık*}, maintaining a state of spiritual purity, {seeking} the presence of God, invoking God, and obedience to the righteous and to the guides.[33] Laudable {but not required} actions are also six: to look after a guest cheerfully and with pleasure, to accept a guest just as he is, no matter how long a guest remains to regard this as a Godsend, to extend hospitality, to try to do whatever a guest wishes, and to pray for Aḥmad Yasawī and the shaikh. The rules of the *ṭarīqa* are also six: to fall to one's knees and sit in a humble, well behaved manner, to see oneself as inferior to all others, to see everyone else as superior to oneself, to know all the shaikhs and saints[34] and to remain quiet in their presence, not to speak without permission in the sessions of the shaikhs, and to keep in one's memory the saintly {*velāyet*} secrets and miraculous signs of one's own shaikh and other shaikhs.[35]

According to Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, the passing {*murūr*} of the novices {s. *mubtadi'*}, the rise {*ṣudūr*} of those of middle range {s. *mutawassiṭ*}, and the appearance {*zuhūr*} of those who have reached the goal {s. *muntahī*} are dependent upon four conditions. The first is place. The second is time. The third is the brethren {of the order}. And the fourth is attachment to the ruler.[36] In order for the devotees to be free from distraction and to be preoccupied with litanies {*awrād*}, it is necessary first of all for the place to be flourishing. In order for there to be no boredom[37] among the {religious} students and ordinary people, which could result in idleness and neglect {of duties}, it is necessary to be protected from the disturbances {s. *'āriḍa*} of the time. In order for the required ardent yearning to be present at all spiritual levels {*maqāmāt*}, in the *khalwa* {retirement for devotions}, and in the forty-day periods of penitence, one needs true brethren who are seekers of poverty {*faqr*, i.e. the dervish life} and passing away {*fanā'*, see glossary}.[38] Finally, it is also necessary to be attached to the ruler, for control by the ruling authorities assures the privileges of those who possess spiritual knowledge.[39] According to the Yasawīs, the ultimate goal {*muntahā*} for devotees and the final stage of all strivers {s. *mujāhid*} is the road of poverty. Ḥazīnī describes the hardships of this road in the following manner:

> *Fakr yolunda lâ yu'ad velâ yuhsâ seferler olur. Ol cümle seferlerden âlem-i bâtın ve kişver-i gaybü'lgayb içinde üçyüzaltmış deryâ ve kırkdört berzah ve perde ve hicâblar açılır ve her berzah ve perde ve hicâb tahtından ve zımnından ve zuhûrundan kırkdört yol çıkar ve dokuz taht ve her taht üzre bir müstakıl sultân-ı mütecemmil emrü fermân ve hükmeder. Çün ol taht-gâh ve sultânlardan geçilse, iki azîm kapı* {*kuyu* in Okuyucu's edn} *ve refîü'l-bünyân bâb-ı hümâyûn ve der-i meymûn zuhûr eder ve herbir kapı ve bâb-ı hümâyûn ve der-i meymûn karşısında üç deryâ-yi mehib ve 'amîk mevc urur. Bu kapı ve deryâ-yi mevvâcdan 'ubûr olup geçilse, nâgâh bir kubbe peydâ olur ve altı yol ki onsekizbin âlem, ol altı yolu başında mütahayyir ve mütegayyir ve muztar kalmışlar fakrü fenâ ile. İş bu menâzil ve merâhil beyâbân-i fakrü fenâ ki mehip ve acîbdir; muktedâsız ve kilağuzsuz sülûk ve 'ubûr ve mürûr kılmak müteazzir ve* {*belki* in Okuyucu's edn} *muhaldir. Bu menâzili geçmeyince fakr idrâk olunmaz* {*olunmaya* in Okuyucu's edn}.
>
> {There are innumerable journeys on the road of poverty. From all these journeys 360 seas and 44 obstacles, screens, and barriers are open to the inner world, the country of the invisible of the invisible. And from beneath every obstacle, screen, and barrier, from within and from without, 44 roads emerge. There are nine thrones on each of which sits an independent and splendid sultan who commands and rules. When those thrones and sultans are passed, two great and lofty gates, the gate of fortune and the gate of auspiciousness, appear. The waves of three dreadful deep seas strike against each door and the gate of fortune and the gate of auspiciousness. When one passes this door and across this rough sea, suddenly a dome appears, and six roads, at which the 18,000

> worlds are dazzled, transformed, and constrained (*muztar*) with poverty and passing away. These stages and levels of the wilderness of poverty and passing away, which is awful and wondrous, are impossible and inconceivable to traverse without a guide. If one does not traverse them, it is impossible to understand (true) poverty.}[40]

According to Aḥmad Yasawī, a true Ṣūfī must become accustomed to asceticism and striving {for union with God}. He must distance himself from the comfort of eating and drinking, from *khalwa*,[41] sexual desire, and carousing. Abandoning the pomp of this world, he should make it a practice to turn toward God and to meditate, so he may become a genuine Ṣūfī. For this reason, three different {forms of} asceticism and striving are stipulated for the followers of the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*. According to them, if voluntary fasting is done for three days, dust and darkness will be lifted from the inner self; if done for five days, the divine secrets {*mughayyabāt*} of the *jinns* and the good spirits will be subdued {i.e. made obedient}; if done for six days, the springs of the heart's seas will open and begin to flow; if done for nine days, it results in the revealing of hearts {*qulūb*} and the uncovering of tombs {*qubūr*}. But all these ascetic practices and strivings must be done with the permission and approval of the shaikh. If not, they are of no use. Indeed, they will cause harm.[42]

In the *Jawāhir*, there are more descriptions of the Yasawiyya that provide details about its procedures and rules. These are very important in demonstrating the characteristics of the *ṭarīqa*. We can relate their general outline as follows. In the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*, it is the custom, while offering greetings in every encounter, to place the back of the left hand on the ground and to cup the right hand behind one's back. The dervish places his left foot on the ground and, also placing the left side of his face on the ground, extends his right foot, heel first, like a sheep to be sacrificed. With humility and contrition, he describes his faults with a hundred griefs in the presence of the Ṣūfī master {*pīr*}. Finally, the master says *Allāhu akbar* and thus makes his devotee, who has taken the form of a sacrificial sheep, reach the state of "death before dying." In like manner, according to the *Sharī'a*, it is prophetic custom {*sunna*} for a superior to initiate the greeting to an inferior, and not vice versa. If his excellency the *pīr* does not state his faults, he increases the number of sacrificial {*kurban*} *takbīrs* {to say "God is most great"} as an answer. The dervish, thanking the *pīr* for the favor of pronouncing the *takbīr*, must withdraw with his left hand and depart, while again asking forgiveness for his faults. If there is something in his hand, he makes an entreaty and presents it. If nothing is present in his hand, it suffices to make an entreaty. In order to open the way to esoteric knowledge, he must ask for forgiveness for his faults and in this manner his entreaty before the guide results in nearness to God. The guide's prayer in response to his entreaty is acceptable. As long as the Ṣūfī devotee does not dwell at the door of faults and entreaty and is not upright, the door of acceptance and the gate of nearness to God are closed to him and his wish will not be fulfilled. It is as Aḥmad Yasawī said, "Prayer opens the way."

The dervish should spend the night in prayer by reading the short *sūras* {chapters of the Koran}, because not everyone is able to read the long *sūras*. After doing night vigil prayers of sixteen *rakʿas* {bending of the torso while upright followed by two prostrations} with special rules, he should recite the *tamjīd* prayer {spelled out in the Okuyucu edn, fo. 126a, as سبحان اللّٰه والحمد لله ولا اله الا اللّٰه} twice and the fivefold prayer {اللّٰهم صلى على محمد وعلى آل محمد بعدد من صلى عليه . . .} three times. After this, *istighfār Allāh* {i.e. the prayer *astaghfiru'llāh* "I ask God's forgiveness"} is said 101 times in a sad voice and with humility and anguish, and حسبى ربى جل اللّٰه ما فى قلبى الا اللّٰه {Sufficient for me is my glorious Lord; there is nothing in my heart but God} is recited five times, and the *istighfār* is recited five times, and the *kalima-i istighfār* is recited three times, and the *kalima-i Jalāl* is recited 101 times in a loud strong voice. Then he is occupied with the *dhikr-i arra* {of the saw, see below}. This *dhikr* must also be performed forcefully and vigorously so that the dervish breaks into a sweat. As the Ṣūfīs have confirmed, only in this way can the ritual impurity of the *ṭarīqa* be cleansed. Then, the length of the night permitting, the *sūras Yāsīn*, *al-Muzzammil*, *Sūrat al-Aʿlā*, *alam nashraḥ* {= *Sūrat al-Sharḥ*}, *innā anzalnā* {= *Sūrat al-Qadr*}, and *li īlāf Quraish* {= *Sūrat Quraish*} are chanted. Just before dawn, a silent fervent prayer to God, done sorrowfully and with weeping, is accepted by Him. After the dawn prayer, *subḥān Allāh* is repeated twenty-five times, *al-ḥamdu li'llāh* is repeated twenty-five times, *lā ilāha illā 'llāh* is repeated twenty-five times, and *Allāhu akbar* is repeated twenty-five times. The great name of God {*ism-i Jalāl*} is recalled 101 times and the *dhikr-i arra* is continued with love, passion, and enthusiasm, for the *dhikr-i arra* leads to the annihilation and passing away, and to poverty and eternal union with God {*baqā'*}. Then one reaches a state of pleasurable meditation and chants the *Yāsīn* {*sūra*} with full reverence. Then one asks God's forgiveness. The *Fātiḥa* is recited for the spirits of the shaikhs and the ancestors. Then one shakes hands with everyone in the gathering {*majlis*}.

According to the interpretation of a noble tradition {*Ḥadīth-i sharīf*} which was handed down from Ḥaḍrat-i Anas {b. Mālik}, "Whoever does the morning prayer with the congregation, then sits to perform the *dhikr* until sunrise, and then does two *rakʿas*, he receives a reward equal to that of a pilgrimage and a full minor pilgrimage {to Mecca, *ʿumra*}." For this reason, after the *tasbīḥ* {saying *subḥān Allāh*}, *tahlīl* {saying *lā ilāha illā 'llāh*}, *qirā'at* {reading the Koran}, *khatm* {complete reading of the Koran}, prayer, and greeting each other, a two-*rakʿa* morning {*ishrāq*} prayer is done with complete supplication and humility. In each *rakʿa*, the *Fātiḥa* is recited followed by {saying} five {times} *qul huwwa 'llāh* {= *Sūrat al-Ikhlāṣ*}. Then a two-*rakʿa* asking for forgiveness {*istakhāra*} prayer is done saying *qul yā* {= *Sūrat al-Kāfirūn*}, and *qul huwwa 'llāh*. Then a four-*rakʿa* forenoon prayer is recited: in the first, *wa 'l-ḍuhā* is recited, in *muʿawwadhatain* the second *alam nashraḥ lak*, and in the third and fourth.

For the noon prayer, the custom is four *rakʿas* in which four *quls* are recited; and for the afternoon prayer the custom is also four, in which ten *wa 'l-ʿaṣr* are recited: four in the first *rakʿa*, three in the second, two in the third, and one in the

fourth. After reciting the prayers, *istighfār Allāh* is said seventy-one times and the great name {of God} is said 101 times with modesty and humility and then one begins the *dhikr-i arra* {on this, see section D below}. In the evening at nightfall, one prays and beseeches God while recalling the darkness and solitude of the grave. After each of the five daily prayers, the five well known *sūras* that are the obligation of the superiors {*wazīfa-i buzurgān*} must be chanted. If this is not feasible, one *Fātiḥa*, one *Āyat al-kursī* and three *Ikhlāṣ sūras* must be recited. This is to receive God's mercy and forgiveness for one's sins. It is meritorious to fast on Mondays that coincide with the birthday of the Prophet. It is also meritorious to fast on Thursdays, which is the day on which people's deeds are presented before God for judgement.[43]

C *Khalwa* {retirement for religious devotions}

Khalwa has a special significance in the Yasawiyya *ṭarīqa* and has its own special rules. According to Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, a number of subtle meanings are found in the letters in the word *khalwa*: *khā'* derives from *khālī* {empty, devoid of everything}, *lām* from *lail* {night}, *wāw* from *wuṣla* {union with God}, and *tā'* {i.e. *hā'* as *tā' marbūṭa*} from *hidāya* {guidance}. {A similar, but not identical, explanation of the letters in this word is found in the *Lamaḥāt*.} During the *khalwa*, pleasures pertaining to the senses and to satan are burnt away and disappear. Fire and light appear from divine ecstacies. The gloom and other afflictions of humanity are removed. The layers of the inner self are illuminated and cleansed and many {other forms of} divine favor {*faiḍ*} like this are acquired.

There are two *khalwas*. One is the canonical {*Sharī'a*} *khalwa* and the other is the mystical {*ṭarīqa*} *khalwa*. Without the canonical *khalwa*, the mystical is impossible. The canonical *khalwa* is based on complete repentance for all actions that can be considered shameful, all inauspicious words and all other faults and sins. If this is not done, the devotee of the *ṭarīqa* is not worthy of its *khalwa*. Furthermore, the fast must be done in a manner in which the limbs and sensory organs are guarded and preserved from the things that are canonically forbidden. The early great Ṣūfīs had a number of views about the *ṭarīqa khalwa* {in the Okuyucu edn, p. 22, "about *khalwa* and *arba'īn*"} and various principles and rules were established according to these views.[44] Only the perfect spiritual guide can determine how the devotee who will do the *khalwa* should behave during this period in accordance with the devotee's nature. Otherwise, harm is bound to occur.

Ḥazīnī describes the traditional forms and ceremonies of the *khalwa* in the Yasawī *ṭarīqa* in the following manner. One day beforehand, with the consent of their guide, the devotees must fast to purify themselves for the *khalwa*. After the morning prayer on the eve of the *khalwa*, they repeatedly say *subḥān Allāh* and *lā ilāha illā 'llāh* and recite the *dhikr-i mulaqqin* {in the Okuyucu edn, p. 33, "*mulaqqan*"} and *wird-i murakhkhaṣ*. After pronouncing the *dhikr Allāh*, they stand in line and, in a loud voice, say *Allāhu akbar* eight times in the direction of Mecca. The purpose of this is to ask for succor and victory from God at the beginning of the war to be

waged against the army of carnal desires. After the afternoon prayer on the day before the *khalwa*, the holes, doors, and chimneys of the place of worship and the *khalwa* cell are closed so that no wind or cold may spoil the training {*sulūk*, but in the Okuyucu edn, p. 34, *ḥarāra* = heat, adding "and so that they may progress on their path} of the disciples who are going to begin the *khalwa*. Then, until the sun sets, while imploring God and shedding tears, the disciples devote themselves to the *awrād* {litanies}, *istighfār* and *dhikr*s, which have been authorized and ordered for this. After the evening {sunset} prayer, they wash hands {in preparation} for a meal. Whoever is serving brings hot water in a jug for breaking the fast. The fast is broken with it and then no additional water is brought. Afterwards, *khalwa* soup is provided, made from black millet {*kara darı*} that sprouted thanks to the miracles of Aḥmad Yasawī. If this cannot be found, red millet can be used. The soup is served to everyone individually. The purpose of this is to ensure that a situation does not arise in which someone does not participate and thus fails to attain divine favor. Then, in order to counteract the heat, a bit of watermelon or some *ayran* {a cool drink made of yogurt and water} may be served. After eating, a *sūra* or a number of verses of the Koran are chanted. Standing in line, they say three *takbīrs* in a loud voice. Then all are seated and occupied with invoking God's name {*dhikr Allāh*} with reverence and respect until midnight. During this time, hymns of the Yasawī shaikhs, called *ḥikmat*, are read solemnly and in an inspirational manner{*telkînlerle*} in order to encourage and excite the dervishes.[45] After this, they go to another place to have their heads shaved. When the razor and whetstone are ready, another three *takbīrs* are recited. After shaving, they line up in the *khalwa* cell and give three *takbīrs* to the four directions, beginning with the direction of Mecca. When this is finished, they form a circle and begin the *dhikr*. This continues until the candles go out. When this occurs, several hours are spent resting "in order to remove hardship and repel fatigue." During this period, many veils are lifted and divine lights are uncovered. With permission, the dervishes recount their dreams to the shaikh and solicit his interpretation. If the dream is auspicious, they perform supplication; if inauspicious, they admit fault, and thus the dream is annulled and made auspicious, by the grace of God. If supplication and admission of fault are delayed or neglected, this is evidence of a lack of progress and decline.

In this manner, day and night, the *khalwa* and *arbaʿīn* are completed. With permission, kitchen servants are the first to leave the *khalwa* cell and they slaughter sacrificial animals. It is the custom not to give the blood of these animals to dogs, but to bury it and preserve the bones.[46] The esophagi of the slaughtered animals are roasted and given to the participants in the *khalwa* along with cold water or *ayran*. No one spends that night in the *khalwa* cell. The dervishes rest in the houses of the other friends and Ṣūfīs. Then they gather for the morning prayer and chant religious formulas. They pray that their *khalwa* be acceptable {*khair yād* misread for *khair bād* in Okuyucu edn, p. 35} with three *takbīrs* and make supplication. Then all disperse to their homes with tranquil hearts. This then is the character and form of the *khalwa* that is very famous in the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*.[47]

D *Dhikr-i arra*

One of the features of the Yasawī *ṭarīqa* and of the Turkish Ṣūfīs whose religious training was traced to Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī is a *dhikr* known as *dhikr-i arra* {i.e. of the saw}. They gave it this name because the sound that emerges from the larynx of one performing the *dhikr* resembles the sound of a bucksaw. One day, according to legend, Khaḍir came to have a chat with Aḥmad Yasawī. He had always found the *khwāja* to be cheerful and light hearted, but on that day he saw that he was distressed and worried. With surprise and astonishment he asked the reason for this, saying, "Having attained these lofty states and stages {of spirituality}, what is the cause of your affliction?" Aḥmad Yasawī gave this reply: "Sorrow has seized the hearts of the companions and dervishes. I am grieved and distressed because I see no way to remove it." Khaḍir then began to mention the name of God {*dhikr Allāh*} saying, "Ah, ah!" The anxiety disappeared and this *dhikr*, by his command, became a litany {*wird*} throughout the *silsila*. This, therefore, according to legend, was the basis and nature of the *dhikr-i arra* in the Yasawī *ṭarīqa* and how it entered the Yasawiyya.[48] The Yasawī *ṭarīqa* is, in fact, from the Jahriyya {i.e. those who recite the *dhikr* aloud}.[49]

There are a number of stories about the effect and spiritual power of the *dhikr-i arra*. {For example,} Shaikh Maḥmūd Khalwatī Zāwrānī, a disciple of the Turkistanī Shaikh Mawdūd, was once near Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh in one of the districts of Samarqand. Because the loudness of his public instruction and the clamor of his *dhikr-i arra* clashed with Khwāja {ʿUbaid Allāh} Aḥrār's meditation and silent *dhikr*, Aḥrār wrote a letter specifically asking him to abandon this practice. As soon as Shaikh Maḥmūd received this letter, he kissed it and placed it to his head. Heaving a heart-burning sigh, he began such a *dhikr-i arra* and loud public instruction that the man who had brought the letter and the other partisans of silence were overcome with dread and amazement. Khwāja Aḥrār was offended by this and tried to change Maḥmūd's mind by spending the night in prayer and seeking divine guidance in dreams. He was not, however, able to accomplish anything. Finally, he revealed his greatness by admitting that Maḥmūd was not defeated but, rather, was victorious. They met and had a friendly discussion and a strong friendship developed between them.[50]

As described in detail in {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt*, Kamāl Shaikh, one of the leading *khalīfas* of Mawdūd Shaikh, used to live in the region of Shāsh {Tashkent}. Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh Aḥrār, when he went to Tashkent from Khurāsān, frequently met with him. One day in Tashkent, Kamāl Shaikh visited Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh, who asked that he perform a *dhikr-i arra* for him. Kamāl Shaikh, in agreement with his disciples, performed the *dhikr* forcefully seven or eight times. ʿUbaid Allāh then said, "Enough! It has infected my heart with suffering." He thus acknowledged the powerful spiritual effect of this *dhikr*.[51]

On this type of *dhikr*, which was also called *dhikr-i minshārī* {saw-like}, Shaikh Muḥammad Ghawth {Gwaliyārī, d. 1562} gives the following information. For the *dhikr-i minshārī*, one must put his two hands on his two thighs and exhale

toward the navel saying "Ha!" Then, he prolongs this by causing the breath {to be squeezed} from below the navel, and as his head, waist, and back come parallel, he must say "Hay!" forcefully and then repeat all of this. Just as a carpenter makes a sound when he draws a bucksaw over wood, the person performing the *dhikr*, in order to get his heart in the right condition and to attain ease, must draw the *dhikr* over the tablet of the heart {*lawḥ-i qalb*}. Some shaikhs perform the *dhikr-i minshārī* by saying "Hu! Hay!" Others perform it by saying "Allāh!" As is known to those who acquire it, the benefits of this *dhikr* are beyond calculation.[52] The description that Shaikh Sālim b. Aḥmad Shaikhān Bā-ʿalawī-ī Ḥaḍramī gives of the performance of the *dhikr-i minshārī* is clearer and more detailed:

> The *dhikr-i minshārī* is performed in five manners. In each one, the person doing the *dhikr* presses a little on his belly and draws his breath upward from below his navel. Then, relaxing his belly a little, he extends his breath toward his navel and exhales. This aspect {of the *dhikr*} is very much like a carpenter sawing back and forth with a bucksaw on a piece of wood. In the first of the five manners, the person doing the *dhikr* sits on his knees, places his hands on his thighs, begins to draw his breath from his navel toward his palate, and says "Ha!" Then, extending his breath toward his navel, he forcefully exhales downwards in such a way that his head, waist, and back are parallel and says "Hay!" These cries actually resemble the sound that a carpenter makes when he pushes and pulls the bucksaw over a piece of wood. "Ha!" points to *Āyat-i nafs* and "Hay!" points to *Āyāt-i āfāk* {allusion to Koran 41:53, i.e. one signals the signs of God within oneself, and the other the signs of God outside oneself "on the horizons"}, or the reverse. This aspect in the first is according to the victory of necessity over possibility or in the second according to the victory of possibility over necessity. In the second manner, the person says "Hu!" while drawing his breath and "Hay!" while exhaling downward. Or, in both instances {in and out}, he says "Allāh!" In the third manner, he says "Allāh!" while drawing his breath and "Hu!" while exhaling downward. In the fourth manner, he says "Hay!" in both instances. In the fifth manner, he also says *dā'im, qā'im, ḥāḍir, nāzir*, and *shāhid* in both cases. The benefits of this *dhikr* are many. It was handed down from Zacharia, peace be upon him.[53]

E *Ṭarīqas* originating from Aḥmad Yasawī

With respect to the pedigree of the religious order {*sülûk silsilesi*}, the most important *ṭarīqas* connected with Aḥmad Yasawī are two: the Naqshbandiyya and the Bektashiyya. In addition, there are a few small branches that also originated from Aḥmad Yasawī, such as the Īqāniyya, but they cannot be considered as truly separate *ṭarīqas*. In each of the major *ṭarīqas* a number of minor branches

also sprang up, but they did not depart from their basic features. Many such branches cannot yet even be properly identified.[54]

The Naqshbandiyya is considered to be traced back to Aḥmad Yasawī because the *pīr* of this *ṭarīqa*, Muḥammad b. Muḥammad al-Bukhārī, known as Khwāja Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband {d. 1389}, spent some time with Qutham Shaikh and Khalīl Ata, both Yasawī shaikhs, and was enlightened by them. In his youth, Khwāja Bahā' al-Dīn was instructed by Amīr Sayyid Kalāl to join the company of Qutham Shaikh and he spent more than two or three months with him. Then Qutham Shaikh bestowed an honor on him, saying, "I have nine sons. You are the tenth and are preferred to all of them!" After this, when Qutham Shaikh went from Nakhshab to Bukhārā, the *khwāja* paid him extraordinary respect.[55]

Khwāja Bahā' al-Dīn has a second connection with the Yasawiyya because be was also initiated into this order by the Yasawī shaikh Khalīl Ata. He personally describes his discussions with him in the following manner:

> In my youth, I had a dream in which Ḥakīm Ata commended me to a certain dervish. I had a pious grandmother to whom I related my dream. She explained it {by saying} that I would be initiated into a dervish order by a Turkish shaikh. One day in the Bukhārā market, I encountered the dervish whom I had seen in my dream, but I was not able to meet with him. That evening someone came to my house and he told me that that dervish, whose name was Dervish Khalīl, wanted to see me. With supplication and eagerness, I immediately went to his *majlis*. I started to tell him my old dream. He stated in Turkish that this had, in fact, been known to him from the beginning. {Now,} chance made that dervish the ruler of Transoxiana. He took the title Sulṭān Khalīl. He also met with me at that time and showed me great kindness. Sometimes gently, sometimes harshly, he taught me the rules of the *ṭarīqa*. I remained in his company in this manner for about six years. I made great progress in religious training and in acquiring spiritual power. I used to be in his service among the people. When we were alone, I was his special confidant. Subsequently, the sultanate of Sulṭān Khalīl took a turn for the worst. In an instant, nothing remained of that former reign. When I saw this, my heart completely lost its enthusiasm for the affairs of this world. I went to Bukhārā and settled in one of the neighboring villages.[56]

Khwāja Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband, in fact, received his spiritual training from Khwāja 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī. For this reason, it is by no means a mistake to regard the latter as part of the Khwājagān {i.e. Naqshbandiyya}. Thus, the Naqshbandiyya naturally resembles the Yasawiyya in many respects because it was influenced by the Yasawiyya, on the one hand, via Qutham Shaikh and Khalīl Ata and, on the other, via Khwāja 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī, who was

the *khalīfa* of Yūsuf Hamadānī, after Aḥmad Yasawī. After Bahā' al-Dīn, the Naqshbandiyya spread widely among the Turks of Transoxiana and Khurāsān and from one point of view restricted the area of influence of the Yasawiyya. With respect to the general features of the Naqshbandiyya, however, we must add that they differed little from those of the Yasawiyya[57] and that it was indebted to the Yasawiyya for laying the groundwork that allowed it to spread throughout Central Asia in a short time.[58]

The second great *ṭarīqa* that originated from Aḥmad Yasawī is the Bektashiyya. While discussing the legendary life of Aḥmad Yasawī, I have described the place given to him in Bektashī tradition (Chapter 2, pp. 32–5). In some Ṣūfī genealogies, the *silsila* of the *ṭarīqa* of Ḥājjī Bektash Veli is presented in a totally different manner, but none of these has any historical value.[59] The reason is, as I explained above based on 'Āshıq Pasha-Zāde, that Ḥājjī Bektash Veli was a dervish obsessed with divine love who went to Anatolia and settled there before the founding of the Ottoman state and he did not by any means establish a *ṭarīqa*. Indeed, his personality militated against founding such a great order. Like many other *madhhabs* and *ṭarīqas* of various types that were involved in the religious upheavals that began among the Turks in Anatolia in the seventh/thirteenth century and continued vigorously in the eighth/fourteenth, ninth/fifteenth, and even the tenth/sixteenth centuries, the Bektashī *ṭarīqa* proper most likely took shape in the early years of the ninth/fifteenth century, if not earlier, and chose as its *pīr* Ḥājjī Bektash Veli, whose historical character had been forgotton and whose legends had grown up among the people since the seventh/thirteenth century.[60]

The tradition in those legends that Ḥājjī Bektash Veli was a Yasawī disciple has two possible explanations. One is that, because numerous Yasawī disciples did go to Anatolia before the founding of the Ottoman state, Ḥājjī Bektash Veli was considered to be one of them. The other is that Ḥājjī Bektash Veli was indeed a Yasawī disciple. Whichever of these is true, it would not indicate that the Bektashī *ṭarīqa* is related to the Yasawiyya, because this *ṭarīqa* is not something that Ḥājjī Bektash himself established. Despite some external similarities, such as the use of Turkish rather than Arabic and Persian in the religious ceremonies of the Bektashīs and the widespread use of hymns written in plain Turkish and in the popular meter and language, exactly as among the Yasawīs, there is no factual connection between the two orders. From the very first appearance of the Bektashī *ṭarīqa* those who joined it were regarded as heretics {*zindīqs*} who considered everything that was religiously unlawful to be religiously permissible,[61] or they were deemed part of the Ḥurūfī sect[62] and thus outside the *Sharī'a*. This state of affairs, which pertained from the very first appearance of the *ṭarīqa*, strengthens the notion that the generally held opinion that the Bektashiyya was originally a Ṣūfī *maslak* {path} within the scope of the *Sharī'a* like other *ṭarīqas*, but later was taken over by Ḥurūfīs, *mulḥids* {heretics, unbelievers}, and *zindīqs* and thus lost its original character, is historically mistaken.

The author {Ḥarīrī-Zāde} of *Tibyān-i wasā'il* indicates that, in addition to these two great *ṭarīqas*, there are two other *ṭarīqas* that are branches of the

Yasawiyya, but, in fact, they are not individual *ṭarīqas* but subdivisions of the same *ṭarīqa*. The first of these two subdivisions is the Īqāniyya. It goes back to Shaikh Kamāl Īqānī, a *khalīfa* of Mawdūd Ata.[63] Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh Aḥrār met this shaikh, who lived in the region of Tashkent, when he went to that city from Khurāsān and showed him great respect and affection. Indeed, as a result of their mutual affection, they were constantly engaged in discussions. Because I have described above the pedigree of the Īqāniyya, which derived from Kamāl Shaikh, there is no need to repeat it here (see section A, p. 94). As for the second of these two subdivisions, Ḥarīrī-Zāde, without ever mentioning it by name, is content with stating that it extended via a *silsila*, which I mentioned above, from Khādim Shaikh to Shaikh Ākhūnd Mullā Khurd ʿAzīzān, who died in 975/1567 and was a *khalīfa* of Shaikh Khwājagī-i Kāsānī {Makhdūm-i Aʿẓam}.

F Conclusion

In light of the analytical details that have been given to this point about Aḥmad Yasawī and the Yasawiyya, it is possible to present a synthetic view of the origin and nature of Turkish Ṣūfism in Central Asia and its basic features and characteristics. The significance of Aḥmad Yasawī in Turkish history does not derive, in fact, from his being an early poet who wrote only five or ten pieces or {even} a few volumes of Ṣūfī verse {*manẓūma*}. Instead, it derives from his holding sway for centuries over the {Turkish} spirit by creating for the first time among the Turks, in the centuries during which Islam was beginning to spread among them, a Ṣūfī *maslak*. It is not that prior to him no one among the Turks had entered the Ṣūfī *maslaks* (Chapter 1, pp. 7–8), but those who did had been Persianized as a result of Iranian cultural influence in the great cities of Islam or, because of the general acceptance of the new religion, were forgotten after being absorbed among the great masses of the Turks. Not one of them left a lasting legacy or succeeded in establishing anything of permanence, whereas Aḥmad Yasawī, thanks to his powerful personality, founded a great *ṭarīqa* among the Turks that lasted for centuries. And this *ṭarīqa* was the first to be founded by a Turk among the Turks. Thus, by critically examining the Yasawiyya and Aḥmad Yasawī, we can shed light on a number of the oldest and most original aspects of Turkish Ṣūfism.

The Yasawiyya, i.e. Turkish Ṣūfism, was born under the powerful influence of a great Persian Ṣūfī in an area that was dominated by Persian culture. Shaikh Yūsuf Hamadānī, the scion of a Zoroastrian family from Hamadān that had been Muslim for only three generations, was not, however, one of those broad-minded, free-thinking, Persian Ṣūfīs who tried to reconcile and interpret ancient Indian and Iranian beliefs on the basis of Islam. Instead, because he was a *Ḥadīth* scholar, in the full sense of the term, who was deeply imbued with the sciences of the *Sharīʿa*, he held the Koran and *sunna* above everything and did not advance interpretations that would be unacceptable to the upholders of religious law.[64] It is here that one will find the basic principles that later dominated the Yasawiyya.

Aḥmad Yasawī, who was completely imbued with the ideas of his shaikh and who was fundamentally a great religious scholar, tried to propagate and instill his shaikh's ideas when he returned to Yasī and, within a short time, he had great success. This success of a Ṣūfī *maslak* that instilled simple and plain religious and ethical principles – or, more correctly, that made religious and ethical propaganda – in an equally simple and plain environment, which had recently entered the Islamic milieu and in which philosophical subtleties were not yet understood, is quite natural. Moreover, Aḥmad Yasawī addressed the people in a language that they understood and in literary forms to which they were accustomed, and so his success was all the greater.[65]

Just as the Yasawiyya never attempted to propagate or instill a subtle and profound "pantheism," so it never allowed certain {eclectic} ideas and views produced by the coalescence of various beliefs and deriving from various sources.[66] The spiritual and intellectual history of the area in which it developed, not to mention the personality of its founder, was never conducive to such things. These things were possible, indeed natural, in milieus that, over the centuries, had become accustomed to an ancient religion and to a high philosophy to which it gave rise, and that, long remaining under the ebb and flow of various civilizations, took a keen interest in their spiritual sediments. But they were almost completely impossible for the Turkish milieu at the time that Aḥmad Yasawī flourished.

Up to that time, the Turks had been in contact with the ideas and beliefs of India, China, Iran, and even, to some degree, Christianity, but they had never adopted them as their own. They were content with the simple views of the ancient primitive religion that was peculiar to them. For this reason, they felt no need to go beyond the fundamental beliefs of Islam, with which they were just becoming familiar, or to exceed that framework.[67] The fact that a number of Buddhist monasteries were located in the Syr Darya region where the spiritually guiding voice of Aḥmad Yasawī first resounded did not and could not lead to even a slight Indian influence on the Yasawiyya.[68] We do find, however, some traces of the ancient primitive religion – not, to be sure, in the fundamental Yasawī teachings propagated by Aḥmad Yasawī and his *khalīfas*, but in a number of Yasawī legends that became current among the people. This is a natural phenomenon that commonly occurs in the history of the religious development of mankind.[69] We can also say that the Naqshbandiyya, which was founded and spread a rather long time after the Yasawiyya and had very close connections with it and similarities to it, possesses the same basic characteristics as the Yasawiyya.[70]

The reference by Sayyidī ʿAlī Ra'īs shows that in the tenth/sixteenth century Yasawī shaikhs {he actually says Yasawī descendants} were found in Khwārazm, Astrakhān, and Western Iran in addition to the places that I have mentioned. Furthermore, I can mention an Indian Yasawī dervish named al-Shaikh al-Sharīf Muḥammad al-Hindī who died in the fortress of Lippa in Temeshvar {in modern Romania}. According to ʿAṭā'ī, this shaikh, who was originally from Agra, "was a *pīr* in the *ṭarīqa* of Aḥmad Yasawī and a *khalīfa* of Shaikh Riḍā, who

recovered his health in the service of Shaikh Ḥājjī Bektash." He was a vizier of Shāh Humāyūn {the Moghul emperor} and the two took refuge together at the court of Shāh Tahmasp in 960/1552–3, but when his Sunnism was detected and he realized that his life was in danger, he fled to the Ottoman Empire. After living for four years in Istanbul, where Sultan Süleyman granted him a daily allowance of 120 *akchas*, he went to the fortress of Lippa in Temeshvar with a *zeamet* {land grant} of 20,000 *akchas* and died there in 974/1566–67 (the supplement to {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq* {i.e. *Ḥadā'iq*}, vol. 1, p. 191). The information that Evliyā Chelebi provided above on "the Yasawī dervishes in Rūm" can also show very well the areas to which this order spread.

Historically, it is not possible to follow precisely the development and spread of the Yasawiyya in Central Asia. Nevertheless, I can give some details about it that are probably fairly accurate.[71] According to what can be gleaned from existing documents, this *ṭarīqa* first took hold in Tashkent and its environs in the Syr Darya region, and then spread to Khwārazm, while also beginning to grow in strength in Transoxiana. I have also given some information above, deduced from surviving legends, on the historical development of this *ṭarīqa*, which spread from the Syr Darya Valley and Khwārazm toward the northwest and the Qipchaq regions and, by means of various dervishes, went as far as Khurāsān, Azerbaijan, and Anatolia (Chapter 2, pp. 36–7). Let me add here that this *ṭarīqa*, which we can regard as exclusively Turkish, generally held sway in the Turkish countries until the appearance of the Naqshbandiyya.[72] After the appearance of this new order, it won a major place among the Turks of Transoxiana in particular and also spread to all of Khurāsān and Khwārazm. Because of the close relationship between the Yasawiyya and Naqshbandiyya, this state of affairs naturally caused no injury to the fame of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī and was no obstacle to the spread of Yasawī shaikhs throughout the Turkish world. In fact, in the tenth/sixteenth century, we not only find Yasawī *khalīfas* in Khurāsān,[73] but we also find Yasawī shaikhs in various places in Central Asia and even in Kabul, Diyarbakir, the Hijaz, and Istanbul.[74] Nevertheless, by that time, the Naqshbandiyya had acquired much greater importance than the Yasawiyya.[75] The overriding influence and importance of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī was only maintained in the Syr Darya region and in the Qazaq steppes, where it was never supplanted by another *ṭarīqa*. As I have explained above (Chapter 3, pp. 69–70), the enormous respect and reverence for this great *pīr* that the Qazaqs have nourished for centuries is of a different order and much stronger than the respect and reverence they have felt for any other saint or spiritual guide. We can safely say that of all the various *ṭarīqas* that have taken shape over the centuries, the one that is most characteristically Turkish is the Yasawiyya.[76]

NOTES

1 {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 15. Manṣūr Ata died in 594/1197–8. {Lāhawrī,} *Khazīnat al-asfiyā*, records the following chronogram for him (vol. 1, p. 535):

چو منصور از جهان رخت سفریست　　وصال پاك آن پیر مزکی
یکی منصور حق اهل جلال است　　وگر منصور محبوب معلی
خرد قطب زمین منصور فرمود　　زدل شد صاحب اسرار پیدا

Tāj-Khwāja died in 596/1199–1200. The same work (vol. 1, p. 535) has the following chronogram for him:

چو تاج آتاشه دین تاج عزت　　زحق شد تاجدار خلد اعلی
عیان گردید سال ارتحالش　　زتاج اولیا محبوب مولی

{These dates are meaningless and appear for the first time in the *Khazīnat al-asfiyā'* from the mid-nineteenth century.} Nithārī Bukhārī, the author of the biographical dictionary *Mudhakkir-i aḥbāb* and member of the family of Arslan Bābā via Zangī Ata, shows in the following manner the material and spiritual {*maddī wa ma'nawī*} *silsila* of his own grandfather ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Khwāja: ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Khwāja, Sulaimān Khwāja, Yaḥyā Khwāja, Hārūn Khwāja, Ṣadr Khwāja, Zangī Ata, Tāj-Khwāja, ʿAbd al-Malik Khwāja, Manṣūr Ata, Arslan Bāb (pp. 299–300). Ḥazīnī, *J̌awāhir*, also indicates that he was a descendant of Manṣūr Ata (p. 231). It is apparent that the legendary account that I recounted at great length in Chapter 2 (pp. 20–1) was formed around these details, because Arslan Bābā was certainly a historical figure and from the black race. {Köprülü relied completely on the *Rashaḥāt's* account of the succession to Aḥmad Yasawī, which is completely contrived, in order to assign him four *khalīfas* (requiring the insertion of two ciphers, one of whom is never anything more than a name). It is odd that he did not trust Ḥazīnī, whose work he emphasizes for so much else. As it stands, he failed to use fully Ḥazīnī's extensive information on the Yasawī lineage leading to his own master, Sayyid Manṣūr, and failed even to consider the other successors of Aḥmad Yasawī, as named by Ḥazīnī, whom he mentioned earlier. Also, even if we could accept Arslan Bābā as historical (which is not clear), there is no evidence that he was "from the black race." One of his descendants is called "Zangī Ata," but elsewhere Arslan Bābā is called an Arab.}

2 {The date given for Saʿīd Ata is meaningless. It is found no earlier than the nineteenth-century *Khazīnat al-asfiyā'*.}

3 Although {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., indicates that the wife of Ḥakīm Ata, the famous ʿAnbar Ana, was the daughter of Burāq Khān (p. 16), the author {Nithārī Bukhārī} of *Mudhakkir-i aḥbāb* especially makes the point of correcting this to the daughter of Bughrā Khān (p. 299).

4 {The death date for Ḥakīm Ata never appears in "a story." It too appears no earlier than the *Khazīnat al-asfiyā'*. The date was probably chosen to yield a round twenty years from the death date of Aḥmad Yasawī. Our earliest source to give a death date for Ḥakīm Ata, from the sixteenth century, says he died in 523 AH, and is thus also clearly meaningless.}

5 {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 16. The author {Lāhawrī} of *Khazīnat al-asfiyā'* records the death date of Ḥakīm Ata in the following chronogram (vol. 5, p. 534):

چو پیوست با احکم الحاکمین　　حکیم جهان اهل حکمت حکیم
بسالش بخوان افتاب زمان　　وگر هم بدان اهل حکمت حکیم

As for Aq Qūrghān, where Ḥakīm Ata was buried, we know of two towns with this name in the region of Central Asia and Turkistan where the Yasawiyya spread. One is a winter pasture {*kışlak*} in the environs of the town of Shīr-ābād near the present-day Bukhārā and Afghan border. The French Traveler G. Capus gives considerable information about it (*A travers le royaume de Tamerlan* . . . [Paris, 1892], pp. 120, 140). The other one is a ruined site that the Qazaqs today call Aq Qūrghān in the Tekesh valley southeast of Qūlcha (Kulja). It was a government center of the former Mongol *khāns* (Reclus, *Nouvelle géogrqphie universelle*, vol. on Russian Asia, p. 562). Because tradition puts Ḥakīm Ata in the vicinity of Khwārazm, it is more likely that the Aq Qūrghān in question was the town visited by Capus. Nevertheless, because the name Aq Qūrghān was a common designation that could be given to the *türbe* of any saint, just as the *türbe* of Aḥmad Yasawī's father Shaikh Ibrāhīm was called Aq Türbet, it is also possible that Ḥakīm Ata is buried in an Aq Qūrghān that has nothing to do with these two towns. {The problem here is that there are two apparently different stories about the burial place of Ḥakīm Ata. The anomalous one is also the most influential, since it is from the ubiquitous *Rashaḥāt*: it calls his burial place Aq Qurghān, further explaining this name in Persian as *qalʿah-i safīd*, leaving no doubt that the form "Aq Qurghān" was indeed intended, at least by the author of the *Rashaḥāt*. The author may, however, have had written material at hand in which his burial place was given as "Bāq.rghān" or the like, and interpreted the initial *bā* as the Persian prefix, and the rest as a garbled *āq-q.r.ghān*. In any case, the name "Bāqırghān" (i.e. the form "Bāgh.r.ghān") is attested as the burial place of Ḥakīm Ata already in the early sixteenth century, i.e. not long after the *Rashaḥāt* was compiled, and that name is widely associated with Ḥakīm Ata. We have, of course, the other etymology of the place name, as the site where the saint's camel bellowed. Köprülü could not have read Barthold's brief article "K voprosu o rodine Khakim-Ata," *Sochineniia*, II/2, p. 361 (originally published in 1902), whose title was somewhat misleading since the legend of Ḥakīm Ata says nothing of his "native land" (and in fact implies that he was in the same town as Aḥmad Yasawī already in his boyhood). Köprülü does point out the similarity in pronunciation below in n.9, but in any case his long discussions of two places called Aq Qurghān are in vain.}

6 {The work to which Köprülü refers is actually known as *Ḥakīm Ata kitābı* (as he himself acknowledges below in n.7 and elsewhere).}

7 {Anonymous,} *Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı* (Kazan, 1901). {The best known published version of this work was one that Köprülü evidently knew but never obtained: K. G. Zaleman (ed. and Russian trans.), "Legenda pro Khakim-Ata," *Izvestiia Akademii nauk* (SPb.), 9/2 (1898), 105–50. Zaleman's version was based on the earliest known manuscript and is much better than the 1901 printing. What Köprülü proceeds to give above in the text is a much-paraphrased rendering of the eleven stories of this work. He leaves out a great deal and does not, or could not, compare the stories with other versions in independent sources. Moreover, much of the work only makes sense with an understanding of the hereditary Ṣūfī traditions linked to Ḥakīm Ata, Sayyid Ata, and others, in Khwārazm, but Köprülü could not have known of those.} In the most important works like {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt*, Sulaimān Ata and Ḥakīm Ata are described as two different people, but this is not correct. Not only does the *Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı* testify to this, but even a book like {Ḥazīnī's} *Ǯawāhir*, which is one of the most important works on this subject, describes Sulaimān Ḥakīm Ata as a single person. For more detailed information on the works of this important Yasawī *khalīfa*, see Chapter 6, pp. 175–6 of this work. {Köprülü glosses over a very real problem: it is quite true that many other sources affirm the status of Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend as Aḥmad Yasawī's disciple, but the fact that early versions of the *Rashaḥāt* replace Ṣūfī Muḥammad among Aḥmad Yasawī's four successors by splitting Ḥakīm Ata into two people is significant nonetheless.}

8 {The term *tekke* is virtually never used in Central Asia, and in this particular instance it is not mentioned in the text of *Ḥakīm Ata kitābı*. Its use has the effect of imposing a Turkish form (institutionally, even) on a Central Asian reality it does not fit. Köprülü's rendering of the story here, moreover, obscures the difference between what he is translating and what he is explaining or interpreting, and is very unfortunate. Zaleman's text makes it clear that what Aḥmad Yasawī fastens at his waist is a sheep's bladder, from which he both expels air audibly and pours water.}

9 {Anonymous,} *Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı*. This was the reason the name Sulaimān Bāqirghānī was given to Ḥakīm Ata; but it is nevertheless apparent that this resulted from a folk etymology rather than from a historical tradition. The similarity in pronunciation between Aq Qūrghān and Bāqirghān is evidence to support this.

10 It should not be forgotten that the man whom Tīmūr ordered to build the *türbe* of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī was also named ʿAbd Allāh Ṣadr. It seems very likely that the ʿAbd Allāh Ṣadr in this legendary account represents an altered version of this historical personality.

11 {Here Köprülü leaves out major elements of two stories: the Jārullāh with whom the two sons go to study in Khwārazm is the famous scholar al-Zamakhsharī (d. 538/1144); and the story recounts the profligacy of the two sons in the city, where they drink wine and miraculously evade the punishment recommended by their father.}

12 The sacrifice of these nine oxen was also a vestige of the pre-Islamic religious traditions of the Turks. For considerably more information collected on the sanctity of the number nine among the Turks and Mongols, see my "Türk edebiyatı tarihine medhal" {never published, see his "Türk edebiyatının menşe'i,"}, pp. 101–2. This sacrifice and inviting everyone to the feast are reminiscent, in fact, of the old *şölen* (public feast); see *ibid*.

13 {The point of the story is again obscured by Köprülü's rendering: it shows the increasing tension between father and son, which culminates in the son showing up his father by reviving the slaughtered oxen. It is surprising that Köprülü omitted the proverb uttered by Ḥakīm Ata to explain why his son had to get lost, namely that "two rams' heads cannot be boiled in the same cauldron" (to which the son replies that even three will fit, if you just remove the horns!). This proverb is found already in al-Kāshgharī, Dankoff and Kelly (trans.), *Compendium*, vol. 2, p. 345.}

14 One night Ḥakīm Ata appeared to Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn in a dream. He said, "Seek me out! Build a mausoleum over me!" Based on this spiritual guidance, Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn went to Turkistan with many goods and returned from there to Bāqirghān. Just then, however, the weather suddenly turned very bad. The sky darkened and a terrible wind blew. When the weather cleared, the goods and animals of the merchants had all been swept away. Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn went up a hill and looked around. Opposite him, he saw a mountain and on top of it he saw a woman. He went over and greeted her and asked the location of Ḥakīm Ata's *türbe*. The woman didn't know. She suggested that the *khwāja* go with her to her old mother and ask her. The old woman told them that that area was under water and the *türbe* was lost, and she said, "Near the water is an ornamental tree {*süs ağacı*, i.e. not fruit bearing}. Every night deer gather around it and remain there until dawn paying homage. Those who pass by hear the sound of a *dhikr*. Perhaps that is the place." Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn traveled there that very night. He saw the deer, listened to the sounds of the *dhikr*, and fell asleep. Ḥakīm Ata appeared to him again in a dream, saying "Go forward seven paces from the place where you lay down! Dig there! A reed mat will emerge and, under it, a bouquet of roses. That place is my *türbe*. Don't worry about your lost goods because all of it is in the caravanserai. Retrieve it and come! Build a mausoleum over me and take up permanent residence at my tomb!" When Khwāja Jalāl al-Dīn awoke, he did as he was instructed, found the tomb and set up a marker. Then he departed

and retrieved his goods. Later he had skilled craftsmen brought from Khwārazm and 100,000 gold *tenges* were spent to build the mausoleum. He took the name Shaikh Jalāl al-Dīn and lived on the site. Everyone in the region rushed to visit him (*Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı* {a paraphrase of the original Chaghatay}). On the sanctity of trees among the Turks, see the *Uygur menkabesi* of Juvainī {probably a reference to J. Marquart, "Ǧuwaini's Bericht über die Bekehrung der Uiguren," *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1 (1912), 486–502. Cf. Boyle's translation of Juvainī, vol. 1, pp. 53–61}, Radloff's famous work on Shamanism {*Das Schamanenthum und sein Kultus, eine Untersuchun* (Leipzig, 1885)}, and Grenard {*Le Turkestan*}. Ancient deer legends and popular folk tales clearly show the importance of deer in popular beliefs. {Köprülü's continuous search for "survivals" is noteworthy.}

15 Because Ḥakīm Ata was very dark skinned, ʿAnbar Ana one day somehow thought to herself, "I wish my husband were not so black." Ḥakīm Ata learned of this through the miraculous light of saintliness and prayed, saying, "May it happen soon that you be the companion of one blacker than me." And, indeed, a short time later Ḥakīm Ata died and Zangī Ata came and asked ʿAnbar Ana for her hand in marriage. ʿAnbar Ana, turning away her face with rage, rejected this proposal, saying "I will not marry anyone after Ḥakīm Ata, least of all such a negro," but her neck remained in that position {i.e. twisted}. Zangī Ata then sent her a message reminding her of what had previously passed between her and her deceased husband. When she learned that this proposal of marriage had simply resulted from a saintly miracle, she wept and had to accept ({Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 16–17). The *Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı* presents this legend in a different manner: Ḥakīm Ata was black, while ʿAnbar Ana was white and beautiful. One day, while Ḥakīm Ata was washing {himself}, ʿAnbar Ana was in bed. She looked at him and wondered why she, the daughter of Bughrā Khān, had become the wife of {lit. fallen to} this black man. Ḥakīm Ata knew what she was thinking and he said to her, "You do not like my looks. But after me you will become the wife of one so black that he has nothing white except his teeth!" ʿAnbar Ana then regretted what she had thought and wept. But it was too late. When the time approached for Ḥakīm Ata to pass away, he sent for his sons from Khwārazm and said to them, "After my death, when you serve the funeral banquet on the fortieth day, forty *abdāls* from the people of the Kaʿba will come from the East {*sic*}. Among them will be a black *abdāl* blind in one eye and lame in one leg. After the required waiting period before remarrying has passed, marry your mother to him!" And indeed, forty days after Ḥakīm Ata's death, the *abdāls* arrived, but there was no black *abdāl* among them. The sons asked about him. They learned that he had remained behind and they sent for him. His name was Zangī {i.e. "Negro"}. They married their mother to him according to their father's will. At that time, no one knew of the saintliness of this Zangī. Zangī Bābā took his wife and departed for his native country. ʿAnbar Ana suffered great distress because of this Zangī as a result of her former husband's saintly miracle, but she put up with it and gave advice to other women on this subject (*Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı*). {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Zangī Ātā" (Th. Zarcone). In the narrative, Köprülü switches from *Ḥakīm Ata kitābı* to the *Rashaḥāt's* account of Ḥakīm Ata and Zangī Ata (who are not portrayed in the former work as ever meeting one another!), but mixes the two accounts together for a while. Zangī Ata is made a descendant of Arslan Bābā in the *Rashaḥāt* and in Nithārī's work, but the *Ḥakīm Ata kitābı* says nothing of this. The idea that Zangī's black skin (or ugliness!) was because he was a descendant of Arslan Bābā (who does not appear to be identified as an Arab in any source) is Köprülü's own invention.}

16 {The saint Köprülü usually calls "Sayyid Aḥmad," using the *Rashaḥāt*, is more often known as "Sayyid Ata," who stands at the head of an enormously important Ṣūfī and familial tradition in Central Asia. See the following articles by DeWeese: "A

Neglected Source on Central Asian History: The 17th-century Yasavī Hagiography *Manāqib al-akhyār*," in Denis Sinor and Bakhtiyar A. Nazarov (eds), *Essays on Uzbek History, Culture, and Language* (Bloomington, IN, 1993), pp. 38–50; "The Descendants of Sayyid Ata"; "The Sayyid Atā'ī Presence in Khwārazm during the 16th and Early 17th Centuries," in DeWeese (ed.), *Studies on Central Asian History in Honor of Yuri Bregel* (Bloomington, IN, 2001), pp. 245–81; and *EIr*, s.v. "Atā'īya Order."}

17 {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 17–19. The *Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı* mentions certain legends about Sayyid Ata that are not found in the *Rashaḥāt* and describes his relationship to Ḥakīm Ata as follows. One day *Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı* was being read in Sayyid Ata's teaching circle and his legends and miracles were being discussed. Sayyid Ata asked if any of the *sayyids* had taken up residence at his tomb. When he learned that none had done so, he went to Bāqirghān taking three people with him. Sayyid Ata asked Shaikh Jalāl, who was there, if he would cede the post of resident {*mujāwir*} to him. Shaikh Jalāl, who had been personally hurt by his coming, stated that he had come there on the order of Ḥakīm Ata. Sayyid Ata then made the following suggestion: "Tonight let the two of us go and petition {Ḥakīm Ata}, and whomever Ḥakīm Ata wants will stay." Shaikh Jalāl agreed to this and that night they went. Ḥakīm Ata said, "Oh, my son Shaikh Jalāl, Sayyid Ata came here on the order of the Prophet. Cede the post of *mujāwir* to him. Near Khwārazm is a place called Aqtash. Go there and establish a halting place {or caravansarai}. Let whoever comes to visit me, visit you first. I will not accept those who have not gone to you first." Shaikh Jalāl happily ceded the post of *mujāwir* and went straight to Aqtash. Sayyid Ata spent a long time there as *mujāwir*. Finally, his time to pass away arrived. His *murīds* asked him, "Shall we take you to the Ka'ba or bury you here?" He answered, "Put my coffin on a large cart and depart {with it} from Bāqirghān in the direction of the Ka'ba. That night, however, firmly tie up your animals. Don't make any noise. Stay in your homes. If you hear a sound, beware. Don't go outside. When dawn breaks, look outside. Wherever the cart has stopped, bury me on that spot." All of this, in fact, happened. The next day they saw that the cart had stopped next to the *türbe* of Ḥakīm Ata. They immediately buried Sayyid Ata there. That night the spirits of the Ka'ba *erens* fought with the spirits of the Bāqirghān *erens* for possession of Sayyid Ata. The latter were victorious. Now those who come to Bāqirghān first visit the tomb of Ḥakīm Ata, then that of Sayyid Ata, and afterwards the other tombs (*Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı*). We find the death date {chronogram} of Sayyid Ata, who died in 702/1302–3, as follows in {Lāhawrī's} *Khazīnat al-asfiyā* (vol. 1, p. 540) {again, a meaningless date}:

سید آتا (آن) شریف نیك ذات　　شد چو در خلد معلی از جهان

شاه ابرار است سال وصل او　　نیز سید مقتدا کامل بدان

سال وصل او شهادت کن رقم　　شاه تاج وهادئ مخدوم خوان

Sayyidī 'Alī Ra'īs says that he visited the tombs of Ḥakīm Ata and Sayyid Ata while going from Khīva to Khwārazm and that both were in the same place (*Mir'āt al-mamālik*, p. 71).

Riḍā Qulī Khān gives the following information on Ḥakīm Ata and his tomb in his famous *Safarnāme-yi Khwārazm* {ed. and French trans. Ch. Schefer (Paris, 1879)}: "Ḥakīm Ata is the name of a place on the bank of the Amu Darya. Ḥakīm Ata, who is buried there, was a Turkish shaikh of the Naqshbandī *silsila*. Khwārazm stretches along the banks of the Amu Darya and most of its villages are on its banks. All of them are a distance of three or four parasangs or a little more from the banks of the

Amu Dayra. Ḥakīm Ata is at the extreme limit of the cultivated and inhabited part of Khwārazm. Beyond it one encounters the Qazaqs and Qaraqalpaqs who are subject to the Khān of Khīva. They live in this arid region between the Syr Darya and Amu Darya, which takes twenty days to cross" (Persian text, p. 101). Schefer, who made an annotated trans. of the *Safarnāme*, corrects and supplements this information, based on {Lāhawrī's} *Khazīnat al-asfiyā*, by stating "Ḥakīm Ata was buried in Aq Qūrghān." He also says that there was an early copy of the story of Ḥakīm Ata and that it was published in Kazan by I. Gottwald (Schefer trans., p. 101). Furthermore, Riḍā Qulī Khān mentions an Adun-Ata Fountain among the halting places of the Turkmen and states that this Adun-Ata was a *murīd* of Zangī Ata (Persian text, p. 41; Schefer trans., p. 65). This would again confirm that the influence of the Yasawī *murīds* had expanded widely in the the Turkmen region.

18 {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 20–1. According to one tradition, Ṣadr Ata died in 656/1258–9 ({Ḥarīrī-Zāde,} *Tibyān-i wasā'il*). This, however, is clearly a mistake, for 656 was the year of Zangī Ata's death {again, a meaningless date}.

19 A poet named Shams wrote a *munājāt* {supplication} in the *musammaṭ* mode {"pearl stringing," see Walter Andrews, *An Introduction to Ottoman Poetry* (Minneapolis, 1976), pp. 59–60} addressed to Zangī Ata. It is published in Aḥmad Yasawī's *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*. This work, which was written in the *'arūḍ* meter and begins with the verse

> *Ol Seyyid-i âdem hakkı yâ Zengî Bâbâ himmeti*
> *Ol mefhar-i âdem hakkı yâ Zengî Bâbâ himmeti*
>
> {For the sake of that chief of mankind, O spiritual guidance of Zangī Bābā!
> For the sake of that pride of mankind, O spiritual guidance of Zangī Bābā!}

has very defective versification (*Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, Istanbul edn, p. 285). Far superior is the eulogy of Kemmī Tāshkandī, a fellow countryman of Zangī Ata, which includes the passage,

> *Dergeh-î Hak pâsbânı Hazret-i Zengî Atâ*
> *Sırr-ı gaybî râzdânî Hazret-i Zengî Atâ*
> *İrdiler zâhir siyeh-fâm-ü lîkin bâtınen*
> *Tabtılar nûr-ü ziyâ'nı Hazret-i Zengî Atâ*
> *Turfa bir keşf-i kerâmet görgüzüb dehr ehligâ*
> *Aldılar Anbar-Anâ'nı Hazret-i Zengî Atâ*
>
> {Guardian of the court of God, his majesty Zangī Ata
> Confidant of the mystery of the unseen, his majesty Zangī Ata
> Outwardly he was black, but inwardly
> He found the Light of Light, his majesty Zangī Ata
> Demonstrating a wondrous miracle to the people of the age
> He married 'Anbar Ana, his majesty Zangī Ata}

(*Mecmua-i Hazînî*, Tashkent lithograph edn {1329/1911}, p. 47).

20 Schuyler, *Turkistan*, {Turkish} trans., p. 189. It is also recorded in {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt* that Zangī Ata's home and burial place were in Shāsh (Tashkent), p. 16. As for his death date, Zangī Ata died in 656/1258–9. {Lāhawrī's} *Khazīnat al-asfiyā* records the following chronogram for him (vol. 1, p. 539) {again, a meaningless date}:

چو در خلد معلی از جهان رفت جناب خواجهٔ مسعود زنگی
ولی اللّٰه مرشدکو وصالش دوبارا عاشق محمود زنگی

While traveling from Khīva to Krasnovodsk, Capus says that the places between Zamakhshar and Cherechelī (چره چلی) were still abandoned because of the depredations of the Turkmen. {He adds that} there is a town of Zangī Bābā among these old towns that today only appear as ruins because they were thus abandoned (Capus, *A travers*, pp. 405, 406, 410, 412).

21 {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 16. Ḥazīnī {*Jawāhir*} mentions this famous story in the following manner:

خواجهٔ احرار گفتی بر دوام　　میر سد در گوش جان هرصبح وشام

از تراب مرقد زنگی آتا　　نالهٔ اللّٰه گفتن بر ملا

{Khwāja Aḥrār used to say: There comes to the ear of my soul every morning and evening,
From the tomb of Zangī Ata, the cry "Allāh" spoken for all to hear.}

Kemmī Tāshkandī's eulogy also refers to this with the couplet

Eylegaylar tâ memâtidan beri vird-i zebân
Allâh Allâh Rabbenâ'nı Hazret-i Zengî Atâ

{Ever since his death, he will utter this litany:
"God, God, Our Lord. His majesty Zangī Ata."}

22 {This is Khwāja ʿAlī ʿAzīzān Rāmītanī, a prominent figure from the Khwājagānī *silsila*. See DeWeese, "Khojagānī Origins and the Critique of Sufism: The Rhetoric of Communal Uniqueness in the *Manāqib* of Khoja ʿAlī ʿAzīzān Rāmītanī," in Frederick De Jong and Bernd Radtke (eds), *Islamic Mysticism Contested: Thirteen Centuries of Controversies and Polemics* (Leiden, 1999), pp. 492–519.}

23 {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., indicates this town between Sairām and Tashkent, p. 19. {Ismāʿīl Ata is portrayed in the *Rashaḥāt* as hailing from an unidentifiable town called there "Kharzīyān." The reading is uncertain, but it is definitely not Ḥūziyyā. The same source also makes Ismāʿīl Ata a disciple of Sayyid Ata, but this is in all likelihood wrong. It is not supported by the work of Ismāʿīl Ata's own son, mentioned earlier. The story of the straw in Ismāʿīl Ata's eye, in the narrative below, involves an ancestor of Khwāja ʿUbaid Allāh Aḥrār, who was indeed a Tāshkandī. Ismāʿīl Ata begins an important Yasawī Ṣūfī lineage, primarily hereditary, that was entirely unknown to Köprülü. For a discussion of it, see DeWeese, "Yasavī Šayḫs in the Timurid Era: Notes on the Social and Political Role of Communal Sufi Affiliations in the 14th and 15th Centuries," in Michele Bernardini (ed.), *La civiltà timuride come fenomeno internazionale* [= *Oriente Moderno*, Rome, NS, 15 (76), No. 2 (1966)], pp. 175–9, 185–6.}

24 *Ibid.*

25 *Ibid.*, p. 242.

26 The people in the area between Sairām and Tashkent had converted to Islam very early; see Chapter 1, pp. 4–6. On this city, see the detailed information in the discussion of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī's work in Chapter 5, p. 133.

27 {Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 20.

28 *Ibid.*, pp. 22–3.

29 {Here Köprülü dispenses with the entire Yasawī *silsila* after the fifteenth century. He uses unreliable sources, gives the wrong form of names, and sometimes splits people into two or fails to recognize specific appellations. Access to the *Lamaḥāt* would have

spared him these errors, but he could have done much better had he truly used the works of Ḥazīnī to which he had access. In order: Khudāidād's *nisba* was "Ghazīragī," though "'Azīzagī" is easy to understand and shows up in manuscripts as well (Ghazīrah is/was a town near Samarqand). "Mawlānā Walī Kūh-i Zarī" is the best form of the next person's name. "Shaikh Garmīnī" clearly refers to the most important Yasawī shaikh of the second half of the sixteenth century, Qāsim Shaikh Karmīnagī (Karmīnah is a famous town between Bukhārā and Samarqand). Muḥammad Mu'min Samarqandī was the father of 'Ālim Shaikh, who wrote the *Lamaḥāt*; this was as close as Köprülü got to him. It is not clear whom Köprülü had in mind with "Shaikh Ākhūnd, Mullā Khurd 'Azīzān." All this probably refers to one person, not two, namely Mawlānā Khūrd 'Azīzān (a son and successor of the Naqshbandī Makhdūm-i A'ẓam), who died in 977/1569–70 in Balkh, and who is mentioned later by Köprülü in this chapter of the narrative. As for the lineage of Kamāl Shaikh Īqānī, the latter's disciple is shown in better sources as "Shaikh Sayyid Aḥmad," and it is not clear why Köprülü (or the *Tibyān*) gives "Shaikh 'Alīyābādī." This Aḥmad was one of the figures to whom A. K. Borovkov suggested ascribing some of the poems from the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* ("Ocherki po istorii uzbekskogo iazyka (opredelenie iazyka khikmatov Akhmada Iasevi)," *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie*, 5 (1948), 229–50). Shams Özkendi (Uzgandī) is known most extensively from the *Lamaḥāt*. Köprülü took the three names following him from the late *Tibyān*, but that work's source must have been, directly or indirectly, another work of Ḥazīnī that was unknown to Köprülü, the *Jāmi' al-murshidīn* (preserved in a unique manuscript in Berlin). For the most extensive discussion of the post-fifteenth-century Yasawī *silsila* lines to date, see DeWeese, "The Yasavī Order and Persian Hagiography in Seventeenth-Century Central Asia: 'Ālim Shaykh of 'Alīyābād and his *Lamaḥāt min nafaḥāt al-quds*," pp. 389–414.}

30 The *silsila* given in {Ḥazīnī's} *Jawāhir* is as follows: Zangī Ata, Ṣadr Ata, Jamāl Shāshī (in Khwārazm), his son Ḥasan Shaikh, 'Alī Khwāja, Khwāja 'Alī {*sic*}, who had two *khalīfas*, Shaikh Pehlivān {just an epithet}, and Shaikh Mawdūd (the shaikh of Sultan Abū Sa'īd). Shaikh Mawdūd's *khalīfa* Khādim Shaikh, Shaikh Jamāl al-Dīn (in Bukhārā, his tomb was in Herat), Shaikh Sulaimān Ghaznawī (he studied first from 'Ubaid Allāh Aḥrār and then Jamāl al-Dīn), Shaikh Khudāidād, Mullā Walī Kūh-i Zarī (Kūh-i Zarrī), Qāsim {*sic*} Shaikh, and Shaikh Khudāidād's other *khalīfa* Shaikh Matīn {an epithet}, from whom Shaikh Amīn {an epithet} received permission to initiate others, and from whom in turn Sayyid Manṣūr Ata received this permission, and from whom in turn Ḥazīnī the author of this work received this permission (summary of the rhymed Persian {Ṣūfī} genealogical tree {*silsilanāme*} at the end of *Jawāhir*, pp. 232–43). The reason for these differences is obvious. A given shaikh had numerous *khalīfas*, only some of whom were recorded in the genealogical tree. Many were forgotten or their correct genealogical trees were later lost. The author {Ṣafī} of *Rashaḥāt*, so it would seem, took the Yasawī *khalīfas* who had won fame up to his time from Jamāl al-Dīn Bukhārī. As for Ḥazīnī, he seems to have recorded the genealogical tree of his shaikh Sayyid Manṣūr. The author {Ḥarīrī-Zāde} of *Tibyān-i wasā'il* also cites the genealogical tree of some dervish or other that resembles this one. {Köprülü misunderstood Ḥazīnī's account of the Yasawī *silsila* in several respects. His *silsila* chart has often been repeated and cited in other works, but it is thoroughly misleading and incomplete and thus should no longer be used. The problems posed by Ḥazīnī's account in the earliest stage of this *silsila* are indeed confusing, and cannot be sorted out on the basis of his accounts alone. Adding the data in the *Lamaḥāt* is essential. Köprülü is to be criticized primarily for implying that the presentation is straightforward, not for misunderstanding a confusing account. The more important errors begin with Shaikh Sulaimān Ghaznawī and Khudāidād. Köprülü implies that the latter was the disciple of the former – and there are, in fact, the sort of conflicting

accounts that should tell us that two separate lineages claimed supremacy for their own spiritual ancestor – but there is abundant evidence (some from Ḥazīnī himself) that Khudāidād was a direct disciple of Jamāl al-Dīn. Next, Mawlānā Walī Kūh-i Zarī is indeed consistently shown as a disciple of Khudāidād and as a master of Qāsim Shaikh; but Ḥazīnī's account then goes on to say that another of Khudāidād's disciples was Darwīsh Shaikh (to whom the epithet "Shaikh-i Matīn," i.e. "the firm master," is applied), and that after Darwīsh Shaikh came "the powerful shaikh, Mullā Amīn," from whom Ḥazīnī himself obtained guidance, in addition to his relationship with his principal master, Sayyid Manṣūr (who was a disciple of Sulaimān Ghaznawī). The Mullā Amīn mentioned here may be another epithet referring to a known disciple of Khudāidād who came to prominence after Darwīsh Shaikh. In any case, "Darwīsh Shaikh" was not recognized as a proper name, in effect, by Köprülü (or Okuyucu), primarily because they did not know the *Lamaḥāt* (Darwīsh Shaikh was a grandfather of that work's author, ʿĀlim Shaikh). Finally, it is worthy of note that Ḥazīnī's master is never called "Sayyid Manṣūr Ata" (except by Köprülü).}

31 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, p. 120. Here it suffices for us to cite briefly from Ḥazīnī's work the rules (*ādāb*) of the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*. The details given on this subject in this work, which was written in the tenth/sixteenth century, are not found in other sources, so they are also very valuable with respect to the general history of Ṣūfism. Comparing these details with the rules and principles of other *ṭarīqas*, however, is a subject completely beyond the scope of the present work. On the rules of the *ṭarīqa*, Ḥazīnī cites a work called *Bustān al-ʿārifīn* (*Jawāhir*, p. 137), but I know of no work by Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī with this title. The work with this title that is renowned throughout the Muslim world is one on *Ḥadīth* transmission, canonical rules and ethics by Imām Abū ʿl-Laith Naṣr b. Muḥammad Samarqandī Ḥanafī who died in 375/985–6 {rather, between 373/983 and 393/1003}. There are many copies in our libraries. Kātib Chelebī adds that there were three versions of this work, large, medium, and small, and that the small one was the version commonly found throughout Rūm and the Arab countries (*Kashf al-ẓunūn* [Būlāq, 1274/1857], vol. 1, p. 153). Kātib Chelebi also states that Imām Muḥyī ʿl-Dīn Yaḥyā b. Sharaf al-Dīn al-Nawawī al-Shāfiʿī (d. 676/1277) had a work with this title. {It is not quite clear that Ḥazīnī intended to ascribe the *Bustān al-ʿārifīn* to Aḥmad Yasawī. He mentions it twice, once without ascription, and once ascribed to the *shaikh al-mashā'ikh*, a phrase typically used to refer to Yasawī, but nevertheless somewhat ambiguous.}

32 According to Aḥmad Yasawī's declaration, one could not become a shaikh without studying seventy sciences and passing through seventy stages {*maqāms*}. One gradually attained these sciences through forty-four stages. One who set out to be a shaikh without studying them would be detested by the men of God {*ahl Allāh*; in the Okuyucu edn of Ḥazīnī, p. 63, *awliyā' Allāh*, i.e. the saints}. The stages are as follows: sincere repentance, beneficial knowledge, lofty forbearance, perfect discernment, comprehensive knowledge, whole-hearted submission, humble dignity, complete contentment, being as truthful as Caliph Abū Bakr, being as certain of what is right as Caliph ʿUmar, being as pious as Caliph ʿUthmān, praising God like Caliph ʿAlī, being as piously ascetic as Ḥasan, being as obliterated {in God} as Ḥusain, placing complete trust in God like Imām Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya, perfect endurance {of this world}, giving thanks for divine benefaction, submission to one's fate, fortitude in the face of tribulation, enjoyment of blessings, generosity from what one possesses, sincerity towards people of distinction, praisworthy ethics, abstinence from what is religiously forbidden and cleanliness and fasting, general humility, permanent fear {of God}, wishing for all contingencies and terrors, compassion and weeping, longing for and being perceptive to God, ecstasy of God, goodness and virtue,

kindness and generosity, the guidance of God, being fearful {of God} in outward reverence, being fearful {of God} in inward submission, devoutness in rejecting what is forbidden and resolution in conforming to what is commanded, wisdom and experience in word and deed, being innocent of great sins, being innocent of minor sins, the illumination of separation {from God} and the ardor of yearning {for God}, melancholia and madness {as a form of love}, love and affection {for God}, modesty before God and men {in the Okuyucu edn followed by *wa 'l-dawabb*, and animals}, signs of union, and approaching and drawing near God. In the words of this shaikh, the following eight stages are the bases of these forty-four stages: (1) the stage of the penitent ones – asceticism and striving {for God} – the master of the penitent ones is Adam; (2) the stage of the learned ones – humility and supplication and turning toward God and seeking the five *ḥaḍaras* {presences} – the master of the learned ones is Idrīs; (3) the stage of the ascetics – compassion and attention and love and affection – the master of the ascetics is Jesus; (4) the stage of the patient ones – forbearance and putting trust in God and reflection – the master of the patient ones is Job; (5) the stage of the contented ones – joyfulness and sociability and attachments – the master is not specified; (6) the stage of the grateful ones – declaring the unity of God and chanting in praise of God and praising God – the commander is Noah; (7) the stage of the lovers – reciting and private worship and *dhikrs* and asking God's pardon – the one who asks the lovers to bear witness is Abraham; (8) the stage of those who know God – fasting, and praying and meditation – the supporter of those who know God is our Prophet and master {i.e. Muḥammad} ({Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 108–14).

33 {In the Okuyucu edn of Ḥāzīnī, p. 73, the last word is '*urafā*', mystics.}

34 {In the Okuyucu edn of Ḥāzīnī, p. 74, we find "to know that all the shaikhs and *pīrs* are holy and saintly" instead of "to know all the shaikhs and saints."}

35 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 129–31.

36 {A similar formula, with *ikhwān* (brethren), *makān* (place), and *zamān* (time) noted first and then *ta'alluq be-pādshāhān* (attachment to the ruler) added as the essential ingredient to ensure the first three, is articulated in a treatise of the Naqshbandī Makhdūm-i A'ẓam, entitled *Tanbīh al-salāṭīn*, written most likely around 1530, and his treatment has been discussed briefly in Baxtiyor M. Babadžanov, "On the History of the Naqšbandīya Muğaddidīya in Central Māwarā'annahr in the Late 18th and Early 19th Centuries," in Michael Kemper, Anke von Kügelgen, and Dmitriy Yermakov (eds), *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries* (Berlin, 1996), p. 406.}

37 {*Usanç* (boredom) is Köprülü's rendering of Ḥazīnī's *fütûr u nüfûr* (disquiet and fear), Okuyucu (ed.), p. 110, that could arise because of current events.}

38 {The Okuyucu edn is much more explicit. "One needs brethren who will reinforce and support the rules and regulations of the *khalwas* and the forties in order to attain the mystical states and to complete the mystical stations," p. 111.}

39 Ḥazīnī, *Jawāhir*, pp. 181–4.

40 *Ibid.*, pp. 116–17. In order to understand the expression *faqr wa fanā'* {poverty and passing away} among the Ṣūfīs, see al-Qushairī's *al-Risāla*. There are also highly detailed discussions of it in {Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī's} *'Awārif al-ma'ārif* and {Muḥammad Pārsā's} *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*. One can refer as well to al-Ghazālī and the works of other Ṣūfīs. According to the great Ṣūfīs, a dervish had to serve his shaikh with sincerity and devotion for at least forty years before he could wear the dervish cloak.

41 {Köprülü seems to have gotten confused here. The original passage that he cites recommends *khalwa*, along with hunger, etc., as part of ascetic discipline.}

42 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 58–60. The asceticism and striving for God {ریاضت ومجاهده} of the great Ṣūfīs was renowned among the dervishes. According to tradition,

Abū Yazīd Bistāmī ate just one morsel of food every sixty days. In the Yasawī *ṭarīqa*, Maḥmūd Khwāja ate one morsel every thirty days, Ulug Khwāja ate two morsels every forty days, Zangī Ata ate one morsel every nineteen days, and Ṣadr Ata ate one every fifteen days (*ibid.*, p. 57). {There is a remarkable, if not exact, parallel to this passage from Ḥazīnī's *Jawāhir* on the number of days through which one morsel sufficed the various saints. It appears in a Turkic work known as the *Mir'āt al-qulūb* and is ascribed to Ṣūfī Muḥammad Dānishmend. A version has been published by Necdet Tosun, "Yesevîliğin ilk dönemine âid bir risâle: Mir'âtü'l-kulûb," *İLAM Araştırma Dergisi*, 2/2 (1997), 41–85. This parallel, shared by these sources from two independent traditions, suggests that for once we are close to something that, in fact, goes back fairly close to the time of Aḥmad Yasawī himself.}

43 *Ibid.*, pp. 244–55.

44 *Ibid.*, pp. 30–4. The words *khalwa* and *'uzla* have long been special Ṣūfī terms and are used synonymously. The object of *khalwa* is to withdraw from the world in a relatively deserted place. *'Uzla* is the attribute of one pure in heart; *khalwa* is the mark of union with God. With regard to the *murīd*, he first has to withdraw {*'uzla*} from his fellow men and finally he has to choose *khalwa* for *uns-i Ḥaqq* {intimacy with God}. However, whoever chooses *'uzla* must believe that he has chosen this action in order to protect the people from his own wickedness, not to be protected from the wickedness of the people, for the contrary would cause vanity and conceit. Abū Bakr {Muḥammad b. 'Umar} Warrāq {al-Tirmidhī} said, "I found the goodness of this world and the next in *khalwa* and scarcity {*qilla*} and I found wickedness and harm in this world and the next in mixing with people and in abundance" (al-Qushairī, *al-Risāla*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 82–5) {vol. 1, p. 273 in the Maḥmūd *et al.* Cairo edn}. Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī, whose works on Ṣufīsm were of great value and importance, discusses *khalwa* at length in the chapter *Futūḥ al-arba'īn* in his *'Awārif al-ma'ārif* and gives its rules and conditions. According to him, the object of *khalwa* is not to witness a number of strange and wondrous events or make discoveries. Whoever prefers *khalwa* over mixing with people has to desist from all *dhikrs* except *dhikr Allāh*, from all desires except the desire for God, and from seeking all intermediate causes {*kāffa-i asbāb*; as opposed to God, the ultimate cause}. Otherwise *khalwa* would lead to dissention or disaster. On this matter al-Suhrawardī says, "Some people enter the *khalwa* without observing its conditions; they continually recite one of the *dhikrs*, focus their spiritual faculties on one point and block their outward senses from external affairs. Monks, brahmans, and philosophers, in fact, do this. This state of affairs can certainly have an influence in bringing about inner peace. But the *khalwa* that is done by following the stipulations of the *Sharī'a* and *sunna* results in illumination of the heart, asceticism, a refined *dhikr*, and acting with sincere devotion in prayer and chanting the Koran. Those who do not observe the canonical principles on this matter and do not follow the *sunna* will only fortify (?) the carnal self," Mehmed Alî Aynî, citing Carra de Vaux, *Hüccetü'l-İslâm-ı Gazâlî* {Istanbul, 1908}, pp. 272–3.

45 There are details in Chapters 5 and 6 below on the *ḥikmats* of the *khwāja* and his followers and on how they were composed and read in the *dhikr* sessions.

46 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 51–5. The custom of burying the blood of the sacrificial victim and preserving its bones is not Islamic. It would be more correct to look for the influence of the pre-Islamic religious traditions of the early Turks in this matter. Perhaps this was a vestige of early Buddhism.

47 *Ibid.*, p. 56.

48 *Ibid.*, pp. 72–3. The same legend is repeated in a Persian poem in this work, p. 229. {There are several other legends recorded about the origin of the *dhikr-i arra*. One links it with lamentation over the murder of Aḥmad Yasawī's son. See A. L. Troitskaia,

"Zhenskii zikr v starom Tashkente," *Sbornik Muzeia antropologii e ètnografii AN SSSR*, 7 (1928), 189–92.}

49 The *dhikrs* of Yūsuf Hamadānī and other *khwājas* are the *dhikr-i 'alāniyya* {public or loud *dhikrs*}. Only 'Abd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī was charged with the *dhikr-i khafiyya* {private or quiet *dhikrs*} by Khaḍir. Yūsuf Hamadānī, who was his shaikh, did not change this ({Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 25). Shaikh Rukn al-Dīn 'Alā' al-Dawla Simnānī asked the famous Khwāja 'Azīzān about the nature of the *dhikr-i jahr*. Answering him, he said, "I also heard you do the *dhikr-i khafiyya*. The purpose of the *khafiyya*, however, is that other people be unaware. Once people know about it, both are equal. Indeed, a reputation for *khafiyya* is tantamount to hypocrisy." According to the noble *Ḥadīth* . . . لقنوا موتاكم, it is lawful to do the *dhikr* at the last breath with a shout and teach it {*telkîn etmek*} to a novice. Every breath of the dervish is the equivalent of the last breath. For this reason the *dhikr-i jahr* is regarded as inappropriate for them. Khwāja Maḥmūd Injīr Faghnawī also said that "the *dhikr-i 'alāniyya* is for him whose tongue is free of lies and gossip, whose throat is free of what is unlawful and suspicious, and whose heart is free of hypocrisy and vanity, and whose head is free from turning away from God to what is other than God." {Köprülü presents here a few of the many claims and counterclaims about who did what kind of *dkhir* that can be found in the Khwājagān and Naqshbandī literature from the fourteenth to the sixteeth centuries as "evidence" that seems to favor a particular claim, when what they actually reflect is a long process of polemics.}

50 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, pp. 157–8.

51 *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 21. According to another story, Khwāja 'Ubaid Allāh said, "Enough! He has burned from Heaven to Earth," and then "I thought if an unbeliever asks what kind of *dhikr* this is, how should one answer him?" And he recited the couplet,

مرغان چمن بهر صباحی \ خوانند ترا باصطلاحی

{The birds of the field, every morning, Address you with technical terms (i.e. in language that others do not understand).}

52 The author {Ḥarīrī-Zāde} of *Tibyān-i wasā'il* (vol. 3, p. 265) cites this passage from a work by Shaikh Muḥammad Ghawth entitled *Jawāhir-i khams* {or *al-Jawāhir al-khamsa* in the original Arabic}.

53 *Ibid*., vol. 3, p. 266. This passage was also taken from Shaikh Sālim's work entitled *al-Sifr al-manthūr li 'l-dirāya wa 'l-dhikr al-manshūr li 'l-wilāya*. It is evident that this author saw *Jawāhir-i khams* and made use of it. At the end of the information that he provides, Shaikh Sālim says, "according a well known tradition {*qawl*}, this *dhikr* goes back to Sayyid Aḥmad Badawī. The attribution is so well known that it has become known as *dhikr-i Badawī*." This is not correct. The author {Ḥarīrī-Zāde} of *Tibyān-i wasā'il*, in fact, quite rightly criticizes and corrects this by saying, "Tracing this *dhikr* back to Sayyid Aḥmad Badawī is an error by either the copyist or author. In truth, it must be Aḥmad Yasawī, because he used this *dhikr* before Aḥmad Badawī, and after him numerous shaikhs also imitated it and Aḥmad Badawī was among them" (*Tibyān-i wasā'il*). There is also a report in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* about how the *dhikr-i arra* derives from Zacharia. I cite verbatim the information that {Ḥazīnī's} *Jawāhir* gives (pp. 230–1) on this type of *dhikr* in order to complete the explanation above:

ای خوشا تعلیم وهم تلقین خضر　　عین ذکر حق بود تعیین خضر

صیقل مرأت دل این ذکر ماست　　ذکر اره موج بحر کبریاست

دلربا ذکریست در بیداء روح — روح را زین ذکر باشد بس فتوح
آه گو اللّٰه گوی وهو وحی — اشك ریزان ناله کن بایاد وی
وه چه خوش گفت آن جکر افروخته — اشك ریز درد مند سوخته
نالم اورا نالها خوش آیدش — کز دو عالم ناله وغم بایدش
تا نگرید کودك حلوا فروش — بحر بخشایش کجا آید بجوش
تا ننالد طفل کی دوشد لبن — تا نگرید ابر کی خندد چمن
ذکر اره ناله وفریاد وآه — کاه حی وهو وکاه اللّٰه وآه
چرخ دل در تاب و پیچ از برق ذکر — یافت مذکور آنکه آمد غرق ذکر
ذکر اره جوش دریای قدم — در وصل آید بکف زو دمبدم
وصف ذکر اره را نی منتهی — ابتدا وانتها فقر وفنا

{What fine instruction and suggestion of al-Khaḍir,
The very remembrance (*dhikr*) of God, the determination of al-Khaḍir.
This *dhikr* of ours is the polisher of the mirror of the heart.
The *dhikr-i arra* is a wave of the sea of divine glory.
It is a heart-stealing *dhikr* in the desert of the spirit.
Many an opening comes to the spirit from this *dhikr*.
Say "Āh" and "Allāh" and "Hū" and "Ḥayy,"
Shedding tears and crying out with remembering Him.
Oh how fine spoke that one with ardent heart,
Shedding tears and burning with the pain of love:
"I cry out to Him. My cries are pleasing to Him
Because He must have cries and grief from both the worlds."
If the child selling sweets does not cry out
How will the Sea of Giving be set in motion?
If the baby does not cry, when will it get milk?
If the cloud does not weep, when will the meadow bloom?
The *dhikr-i arra* is crying out and sighing,
Now "Ḥayy" and "Hū," now "Allāh" and "Āh."
The sphere of the heart twists and turns from the lightning of *dhikr*.
He who is drowned in Remembrance (*dhikr*) has found the one Remembered.
The *dhikr-i arra* is a motion of the sea of pre-eternity.
From it the pearl of joining-to-God comes every moment to hand.
There is no end to the description of the *dhikr-i arra*:
The beginning and end of it is poverty (or, being a dervish) and annihilation.}

54 {In this paragraph are additional errors that have unfortunately been frequently repeated: the idea that the Naqshbandiyya can be "traced back" to Aḥmad Yasawī is more immediately preposterous than a similar claim about the Bektashiyya only because there is so much better, and earlier, documentation about the former. And there is no "branch" of the Yasawiyya known as the Īqāniyya. This is a later invention

of systematizers who knew of Kamāl Īqānī but not of any of his successors and merely assumed there must have been some who thereby constituted a branch.}

55 {Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 416–17. Khwāja Bahā' al-Dīn's first meetings with Qutham Shaikh are described as follows: *şöyle düştü ki Kasam Şeyh kavun yerdi. Kabuğunu Hoca'dan yana itti: Hoca'nın dahî taleb-i harâreti nihâyette olmağın ber sebîl-i teberrük ol kabuğu tamâmca yediler. Üç def'a ol mecliste öyle vâki' oldu. Hemen mecliste Şeyh'in hâdimi içeri girip üç deve dört at yavu-kıldım dedi. Şeyh Hoca Hazreti'ne Türkçe işâret edip ayıttı ki atı yahşı tutunuz. Mürîdlerden dört kimse şöyle heybet ile Hoca'ya bakıp, incindiler ki gûyâ ortalarında kan vâki' olmuştu. Hazret-i Hoca buyurmuşlar ki, Meşâyih-i Türk'ün her kim sıfatın anlamaya, elbette onların tarîkından ötürü onlardan nevmîd olur ve i'tirâz eyler. Pes Hazret-i Hoca, iki dizi üzerine oturup murâkabe ettiler ve müteveccih olup akşam namazını kıldıktan sonra, hâdim yine içerü girup ayıttı: Develer ve atlar kendileri geldiler . . . Kasam Şeyh âhir Buhâra pazarlarından birine gelip, türlü türlü alış-veriş etti ve çıkıp gitti. Âsâr-i mahabbet üzerinde zâhir idi. Bir dükkânda oturdu ve oğullarından ve mütâbi'lerinden kendi ile berâber olanları dâvet eyledi ve ayıttı: Bizim naklimiz zamânı erişmiştir: tevhîd kelimesin muvâfakatle diyelim. Pes kendisi dedi ve cümlesi dediler. Fi'l-hâl teslîm-i rûh eyledi* {It so happened that Qutham Shaikh was eating a melon. He pushed its rind toward the *khwāja*. Because the *khwāja's* quest for (religious) fervor was very great, as a way of receiving a blessing he ate the entire rind. This happened three times at that *majlis*. The shaikh's servant entered that same *majlis* and said, "I have lost three camels and four horses." The shaikh indicated this to the *khwāja* in Turkish and said that he should keep a good hold on the horses. Four of the *murīds* looked at the *khwāja* in dread. They were pained, as though a matter of blood-guilt had arisen between them. The *khwāja* said, "Anyone who does not understand the character of the Turkish shaikhs will surely despair of them and will find their way objectionable." Then his excellency the *khwāja* rested on his knees and went into a state of meditation. He turned his face (toward Mecca) and performed the evening prayer. Afterwards the servant entered again and said, "The camels and horses returned on their own . . ." Finally Qutham Shaikh went to one of the markets of Bukhārā, made various purchases and departed. Tokens of love were visible upon him. He sat in a shop. He summoned his sons and followers who were with him and said, "My time to pass away has arrived. Let us pronounce the *tawḥīd* in concord." Then he uttered it and they all uttered it, (and) he immediately surrendered his soul} (*ibid.*). {On the stories of Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband's links with Qutham Shaikh, see DeWeese, "The *Mashā'ikh-i Turk* and the *Khojagān*."}

56 Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn b. Mubārak al-Bukhārī, *Maqāmāt Muḥammad Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband*, {Turkish} trans. Süleyman Azmî (Istanbul, 1328/1910), pp. 19–20, and {Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 417–18. {On the stories of Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband's links with Khalīl Ata, see Zeki Velidi Togan, "Gazan-Han ve Hoca Baheddin Nakşbend," in *Necati Lugal Armağanı* (Ankara, 1968), pp. 775–84, and Jürgen Paul, "Scheiche und Herrscher im Khanat Čaġatay," *Der Islam*, 67 (1990), 278–321.}

57 Compare the details given here on the rules of the Yasawiyya with the *maqāmāt* and *sulūk* books, such as {Naṣr Allāh Efendi's} *Risāla-i Bahā'iyya* (Istanbul, 1328/1910), on the rules of the Naqshbandiyya. Their many common points are immediately apparent.

58 {Köprülü's assertion here is belied by the long Yasawī-Naqshbandī rivalry in Central Asia.}

59 Bursalı Ahmed Lütfî Efendi, a Khalwatī shaikh, gives the *silsila* of Bektash Veli in the following manner: Ḥājjī Bektash Veli of Khurāsān received the *ṭarīqa* from Shaikh Luqmān-i Paranda, who received it from Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, who received it from Shaikh Naṣr Allāh Ḥasan Sanjarī, who received it from Shaikh Rukn al-Dīn Abū Muḥammad Jurjānī, who received it from Shaikh Quṭb al-Dīn Sānābādī, who received it from Qāḍī Muḥammad Bukhārī, who received it from Abū Bakr Muḥammad Ḥā'ilī, who received it from Shaikh ʿAbd Allāh Wāsiṭī, who received it

from Abū Jaʿfar Shahīd Ṭāhir Mashhadī, who received it from Shaikh Muḥammad Aslan Ṭūsī, who received it from Imām ʿAlī Riḍā, who received it from his father Imām Mūsā Kāẓim, who received it from his father Imām Jaʿfar Ṣādiq, who received it from his father Imām Muḥammad Bāqir, who received it from his father Imām Zain al-ʿĀbidīn, who received it from his father Imām Ḥusain, who received it from ʿAlī; {Ḥarīrī-Zāde,} *Tibyān-i wasā'il*, vol. 1, chapter on the Bektashiyya. While the section down to Aḥmad Yasawī in this chain of transmission follows tradition, the section after him {i.e. to ʿAlī} is completely unfounded. It has neither legendary nor historical value. In another chain of transmission written by Selânikli Muhammed b. Osman Efendi in 1140/1727–8, we have the following: Bektash Veli received the *ṭarīqa* {from} Nuʿmān Sarīn (a corruption of Luqmān-i Paranda), who received it from Sayyid Aḥmad Badawī, who received it from Shaikh Quṭb al-Dīn Ejder (Ḥaidar), who received it from Khwāja ʿAbd al-Rabb, who received it from Khwāja Yūsuf Hamadānī (*Tibyān-i wasā'il*, same vol. and chapter). Although this chain concludes with Yūsuf Hamadānī, Aḥmad Yasawī's shaikh, it too certainly has no value. Indeed, the author Kamāl al-Dīn {i.e. Ḥarīrī-Zāde} says that the Bektashī way {*ṭarīq*} was not a branch of the Badawiyya – despite Bektash Veli's meeting with Sayyid Aḥmad Badawī as cited from {Hüdāʿī's} *Wāqiʿāt-i Uftāda* – and that the link with the Badawiyya here is different from, and contradicts, the well known link, i.e. the {traditional} chain of transmission. Adhering to the ideas and reflections of the majority, he considers the Bektashiyya as a branch of the Yasawiyya (*Tibyān-i wasā'il*, vol. 3, chapter on the Yasawiyya). {To declare that divergent versions of the Bektashī *silsila* have no value ignores the potential clues they provide to differing traditions, rivalries, and the like.}

60 In his research on the Bektashiyya, Jacob writes that this *ṭarīqa* was founded by Balım Sulṭān who died in 922/1516 and that this *ṭarīqa* has definitely been in existence only since the beginning of the tenth/sixteenth century (*Bektaschijje*, p. 24, and *EI*[1], s.v. "Bektāsh" [R. Tschudi]). Shams al-Dīn Sāmī, while attributing historical value to the legendary stories about Ḥājjī Bektash, also confirms that the official religious ceremonies and rules of the Bektashī *ṭarīqa* were established by Balım Bābā (*Qāmūs al-aʿlām*, s.v. "Bektash Veli"). However, based on a number of new documents currently in our possession, which Jacob did not see, we must date the founding of the Bektashī *ṭarīqa* to at least a half century or a century earlier. In fact, Khunkār Ḥājjī Bektash Veli is mentioned in a poem {*manẓūma*} entitled *Khaḍirnāme* written by a Bektashī poet named Muḥyī al-Dīn in 880/1475–6. And even famous personalities like Sarı Saltuk, Yūnus Emre, Aḥmad Badawī, Mawlānā {Rūmī}, Sulṭān Walad, Maḥmūd Ḥairānī, Qarāja Aḥmad and Fāṭima Bājī, who later appear in the *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli* or in the chains of transmission, and a large number of Anatolian *erens* are presented as followers of Bektash Veli (unique MS in my private library). While discussing the symbols (s. *ʿalāma*) on the headgear (*tāj*) of the shaikhs, Amīn al-Dīn Bābā b. Dā'ūd Faqīh, in his *Risāla-i Qudsiyya* (from a unique MS belonging to Kilisli Rifat Bey) addressed to Sultan Bayezid II in 903/1497–8, also mentions the "*alifī tāj*" {tall headgear}, which is famous in Bektashī tradition: *Ve bir dahi meczûb-ı mutlak ve mahbûb-ı Hʷond-kâr Hacı Bektaş Hazreti'dir kim ol dahî şol makâma cezb olmuştur kim aşk âlemidir ve aşkın kisvelerinden bir kisve anın başında elifî tacdır. Şol maʿnâya delâlet eder kim bu cümle mahlûkâtın îcâd olmasının aslı bir elifdendir ve elif hem cemîʿ hurûfun aslıdır ve ben ol makâma vardım ve anın sırrına mahrem düştüm. Anın alâmetin başında komuştur* {And there was another, obsessed with absolute divine love and beloved of the Ruler {i.e. God}, his excellency Ḥājjī Bektash. He was attracted to that mystical stage, which is the world of love, and one of the garments of love is the *alifī tāj* on his head. The meaning of this is that the origin of the creation of all creatures is from an *alif* {the first letter of the Arabic alphabet}. The *alif* is the origin of all letters and he reached that stage and became privy to its secret. For this reason, he put the symbol of it on his head}. These two

documents thus demonstrate that not only the Bektashī legend but also the Bektashī *ṭarīqa* with all its religious ceremonies and rules – even up to the shape and nature of the *tāj* – were established in the ninth/fifteenth century. The most accurate information on Ḥājjī Bektash and the historical nature of the *alifī tāj* is found in the reports of ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde, one of the leading figures of the ninth/fifteenth century, which shows that this *ṭarīqa* definitely was founded in that century (ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde, *Tawārīkh-i āl-i ʿuthmān*, pp. 204–6). In light of these documents, therefore, the opinion embraced by Jacob that the Bektashī *ṭarīqa* has only been in existence since the tenth/sixteenth century (*Bektaschijje*, vol. 2, p. 20) collapses, and it is obvious that its origin must be pushed further back. [For more extensive and bibliographic information on the Bektashī *ṭarīqa* and the views and research on this matter, see, *İA*, s.v. "Bektaş" (F. Köprülü).] {Now see, for example, Suraiya Faroqhi, *Der Bektaschi-Orden in Anatolien* (Vienna, 1981); Irène Melikoff, *Hadji Bektach un mythe et ses avatars* (Leiden, 1998); and *EIr*, s.v. "Bektāš" and "Bektāšīya" (H. Algar).}

61 ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde, one of the great figures of the ninth/fifteenth century, says *Bengî ve zenkî, toplak ve zaplak ve şeytânî âdetler bunlarda çoktur ve bu halk bilmezler âmı şeytânî midir*? {Drug addiction and satanic practices are common among them and the people are uncertain whether or not it is satanic} (ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde, *Tawārīkh-i āl-i ʿuthmān*, p. 206). The comment of the author {Tashköprü-Zāde} of *al-Shaqā'iq* on the meaning of this belongs to a later period. Amasyalı Hüseyin Hüsâmeddin {*Amasya tarihi* (Istanbul, 1328/1910)} alleges, based on *waqf* documents, that Ḥājjī Bektash Veli died before 691/1292 (see Chapter 7, p. 228, n.30 of the present work). There are supplementary details on the Bektashiyya below in Chapter 10, pp. 366–7.

62 During the ninth/fifteenth century, disciples of Faḍl Allāh Ḥurūfī spread to Anatolia. We know that among them was the famous ʿAlī ʿl-Aʿlā who went to Anatolia where he established himself in a Bektashī *tekke* and then propagated Ḥurūfī beliefs in the name of the Bektashiyya. He died in 822/1419 (see İshak Efendi's *Kâşifü'l-esrâr ve dâfiʿü'l-eşrâr* {Istanbul, 1290/1873–4}. Prof. Browne and Dr Jacob have also accepted this opinion about the Ḥurūfiyya's penetration of the Bektashiyya). The author {Ḥarīrī-Zāde} of *Tibyān-i wasā'il* also agrees with this, "Ḥājjī Bektash named no one as his *khalīfa* while he was alive. Later, someone belonging to the Ḥurūfī sect named ʿAlī ʿl-Aʿlā, known by the title 'Ishıq,' arrived and claimed to be Ḥājjī Bektash Veli's *khalīfa*.' Many people adopted his *ṭarīqa* and thus went astray and led others astray. They were a troop of *zindīqs* who regarded as {religiously} permissable the renunciation of prayer and {other} things that are forbidden" (vol. 1, art. "Bektâşîye"). I will describe in the second part of this book a number of men who had propagated beliefs contrary to the *Sharīʿa* under the name of Ṣūfism in Anatolia before the Ottomans. Furthermore, we know very well that a forceful political policy was pursued against the Ḥurūfīs with the encouragement of the *ʿulamā'* in the ninth/fifteenth century ({Tashköprü-Zāde,} *al-Shaqā'iq*, {Turkish} trans., vol. 1, art. "Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAjamī," pp. 82–3), and we also encounter numerous similar actions in subsequent periods. There are also some important references in tenth/sixteenth-century documents to the *ıshıqs* – i.e. Ḥurūfī dervishes – mentioned in the *Tibyān-i wasā'il*. Faqīrī, a poet of that century, describes them in his famous work, *Risāla-i taʿrīfāt* in the following manner, which can serve to indicate the general opinion about them:

Işık oldur ki olamaz hep de hâric
Kamu lûtî ve bengî vü havârîc
ʿAlî aşkında yanub şöyle pişmiş
Cihânda onsekiz kez ton değişmiş
Yanında cürʿadan yancıklarıdır
Sanasın Kerbelâ kancıklarıdır

{*Işıks* are those who . . . (?) are outside.
They are all pederasts and drug addicts and heretics.
They are so ardent in their love for ʿAlī,
They have changed garments eighteen times in the world.
They wear small water skins:
You would think they are the bitches of Karbalā'}

(From the MS in my private library. For detailed information on Faqīrī and his work, see my article "X. asır hayatına âit bir vesika" in the newspaper *İkdam*, 1332, June 10 and 12. {Reprinted as "Onuncu asıra âit vesikalar: Fakîri'nin Risâle-i tarîfâti" in *Hayat Mecmuası*, 1 (1927), 22–3}). Absolutely no historical study has been done to date on the spread of the Ḥurūfiyya in Anatolia. Rızâ Tevfik's studies on this subject and the information provided by Huart are not really critical historical studies (*Textes Persans relatifs à la secte des Houroufis* [Leiden, 1909]). Details on this word *ushq*, which had appeared by the eighth/fourteenth century, can be found in my still unpublished work on the Bektashiyya. One can show that this word existed before the establishment of the Ḥurūfiyya and that it meant not only Ḥurūfī, but also more generally *bāṭinī*. [Because Köprülü's detailed research on the Ḥurūfiyya was never published, see for now the following studies: Rıfkı Melûl Meriç, "Hurûfîlik," Istanbul University, Edebiyat Fakültesi, unpublished graduate thesis, 1936 (university library, no. 305); *İA*, s.v. "Hurûfîlik" (eds), especially its bibliography; Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, "Hurûfîlik ve Mîr-i ʿalam Celâl Bek'in bir mektubu" *TM*, 14 (1965), 93–110.] {See also Gölpınarlı's *Hurûfilik metinleri kataloğu* {Ankara, 1973); *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ḥurūfiyya" (A. Bausani); and Shahzad Bashir, "Enshrining Divinity: The Death and Memorialization of Faẓlallāh Astarābādī in Ḥurūfī Thought," *Muslim World*, 90 (2000), 289–308.}

63 Īqān is the name of a town in the vicinity of Yasī (see Chapter 3, p. 69). Kamāl Shaikh would have taken the byname {*laqab*, rather *nisba*} Īqānī probably because he was from there. This byname Īqānī has no relationship to the word *īqān*, whose meaning – certain knowledge, knowing without doubt – is well known.

64 See above (Chapter 3, pp. 58–61) for all the details corroborating this. According to the information provided by legendary accounts and history books, which are unanimous in this respect {this is not the case}, Shaikh Yūsuf Hamadānī was a *murīd* of Shaikh Abū ʿAlī Farmadī, so that he was an associate of the same shaikh as the famous al-Ghazālī {d. 1111}, the author of *Iḥyā' ʿulūm al-dīn*. Just as the Ṣūfism of Imām al-Ghazālī was based completely on the Koran and the *sunna*, the opinions about Ṣūfism of Yūsuf Hamadānī, who was brought up under the instruction of the same shaikh, are essentially no different. In order to see clearly and categorically the fundamental points of similarity between numerous ideas and teachings of Shaikh Yūsuf Hamadānī, who felt great reverence toward Abū Ḥanīfa, and the ideas of Aḥmad Yasawī, see Chapter 5 below.

65 {Most of this is Köprülü's invention.}

66 "Of the two forms of Ṣūfism, the 'Western = Arab' and 'Eastern = Irano-Indian,' the latter is more original. Central Asian Ṣūfism is connected to this second form of Ṣūfism, the creation of which was owed to Arians or Indo-Iranians. Both forms of Ṣūfism were propagated in the Middle Ages by profound and elegant philosophers like Aḥmad Yasawī (sixth/twelfth century) and Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband (eighth/fourteenth century). The *murīd* was slowly made cognizant of absolute wisdom {*ḥikmat-i muṭlaq*} as he went from the *Sharīʿa* to the *ṭarīqa*, to spiritual knowledge {*maʿrifa*}, and finally reached the spiritual vision of God {*ḥaqīqa*}" (Pierre Kouznietsov, *La Lutte des civilizations et des langues dans l'Asie Centrale* [Paris, 1912], pp. 131–2). These superficial observations on Central Asian Ṣūfism and Aḥmad Yasawī, which are found in this

work – the historical sections of which are generally quite weak although based on numerous Russian sources – are not at all trustworthy.

67 All historians who have specialized in Turkish history have recognized that the Turks generally remained faithful to the basic principles of the religions that they adopted and did not participate in sectarian {*Mu'tazilī*} movements. The explanations given above clarify to some extent the reasons for this{!}.

68 For the main details on this subject, see Howorth's *History of the Mongols* (vol. 2, k. 2, first note of section 4); and Reclus's *Nouvelle géographie universelle*, vol. on Russian Asia, p. 556.

69 Grenard, in his important book *Le Turkestan et le Tibet*, says that certain things that are vestiges of the ancient primitive religions have become mixed with Buddhist legends (p. 240). Certain phenomena like this, which are immediately noticeable and worthy of attention, were alluded to in the second chapter of the present book. As studies on Turkish ethnography and history gradually increase, it will be possible to do serious research on such phenomena.

70 [Köprülü stated for the first time in his *Les Origines de l'Empire Ottoman* (Paris, 1935), pp. 118 ff, Turkish trans., *Osmanlı devleti'nin kuruluşu* (Ankara, 1959), pp. 98 ff, 2nd edn (Ankara, 1972), based on his recent research, that it was necessary to change his opinion according to which he had described the Naqshbandiyya and Yasawiyya as having the same basis {Köprülü mentions only the Qalandariyya, cf. the English trans., pp. 104–5}. Later, in his article "Ahmet Yesevî" in *İA*, he pointed out, based especially on the research he had done on the origins of the Bektashiyya and new documents that he had acquired, that the Bābā'ī, Ḥaidarī, and Bektashī traditions and the stories about Aḥmad Yasawī were much closer to historical reality than the way he had described both the Ṣūfī personality of Aḥmad Yasawī and the character of the Yasawī *ṭarīqa* in *Early Mystics*. For more extensive bibliographic information on Aḥmad Yasawī than that found in *Early Mystics*, see the aforesaid article in *İA*.] {Köprülü's newer views have been followed by Irène Mélikoff, Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, and most other Turkish writers. See, for example, Ocak's collected studies *Türk sufiliğine bakışlar* (Istanbul, 1996). Nevertheless, these views do not reflect Central Asian sources.}

71 {Köprülü's account of the spread of the Yasawīyya in Central Asia is pure fantasy.}

72 {Köprülü does not prove any of this. He only insists on it. The historical Yasawī order is found above all in the Persophone parts of Central Asia, and its literary legacy is almost entirely in Persian.}

73 'Ālī, *Kunh al-akhbār, rukn-i thālith, juz'-i thālith*, p. 11.

74 {Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, biography of Sayyid Manṣūr.

75 It suffices to take a quick glance at {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt* in order to understand this obvious fact. A long and separate study is required in order to explain the importance of the Naqshbandiyya in Central Asia, especially in the ninth/fifteenth and tenth/sixteenth centuries. In order to give a general idea about this, let me simply say that not only did the Tīmūrid family give great importance to the Naqshbandī shaikhs in the ninth/fifteenth century (see {Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*; *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans.; Jāmī's biographical dictionary {*sic*, i.e. *Nafaḥāt*} and other works {such as *Tuḥfat al-aḥrār*}), but during the reign of the Shibānids in the tenth/sixteenth century – thanks to the fact that all members of the ruling family were *murīds* of Naqshbandī shaikhs – the Naqshbandiyya also gained very great importance throughout Transoxiana (see the descriptions given of the Shibānid rulers in {Nithārī Bukhārī's} *Mudhakkir al-aḥbāb*). {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Naḳshband" (H. Algar) and "Naḳshbanidyya" (H. Algar *et al.*}

76 The *dhikr-i arra*, for example, constituted one of the chief characteristics of the Yasawiyya. We can see clearly in this *dhikr* the vestiges of certain types of behavior that were peculiar to the Qazaq *bakhshis* {saint, sorcerer, popular poet}. {Köprülü is certain that something in the "behavior" of Qazaq *bakhshis* shaped the Yasawī *dhikr-i*

arra; even assuming that what he meant to say was that the Qazaq *bakhshis* continued a tradition that went back to earlier Turks whom Aḥmad Yasawī wanted to reach by adjusting the *dhikr* to suit their tastes. Köprülü seems intent on seeing the *bakhshis* as more Turkic than Muslim, and never seems to have considered that perhaps the *bakhshis'* chants resemble the *dhikr* because the Qazaqs adopted the latter.} The information given by the author of *Risāla-i Bāburiyya*, one Aḥmad b. Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn al-Kāsānī, is very worthy of note in this regard: *Sâdât-ı Nakşbendîye zikr-i hafîyi ihtiyâr buyurmuşlardır; fakat bâzıları muktezâ-yı hâl olarak zikr-i cehrî de yaparlar. Nasıl ki Hoca Ahmed Yesevî Türkistan cânibine azîmetle me'mûr oldukta gördüler ki ora ahâlîsi zikr-i hafî ile yola gelmiyorlar, derhâl zikr-i cehrî tarîkını tuttu ve bundan zikr-i erre vücûde geldi. Birçok kimseler bu saâdetle müşerref oldular* {the Naqshbandī *sayyids* preferred the *dhikr-i khafiyya*, but some of them did the *dhikr-i jahrī* when required. In fact, on being authorized to depart for Turkistan, Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī saw that the people there did not think much of the *dhikr-i khafī* and he immediately took the way of the *dhikr-i jahrī* and from this the *dhikr-i arra* was created. Many people were honored by this good fortune} (from the unique MS in the Bağdadlı Vehbî Library {in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul}). Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī states, in fact, that the shaikhs were in great demand among, and were shown great respect by, the Turks in the fifth/eleventh century (*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 1, p. 294). It would be quite natural that a *ṭarīqa* founded by a Turk among the Turks would acquire the imprint of the environment in which it developed. {The manuscript of the *Risāla-i Bāburiyya* is not unique, but it was no doubt the only copy known to Köprülü. He was unfamiliar with the substantial body of hagiographical literature produced in Central Asia within Ṣūfī circles linked to the Naqshbandī, Yasawī, and Kubrawī traditions. Work on the Naqshbandiyya has expanded dramatically in the past thirty years. For Central Asian developments, see, for example, Hamid Algar, "The Naqshbandi Order: A Preliminary Survey of Its History and Significance," *Studia Islamica*, 44 (1976), 123–52; *idem*, "A brief history of the Naqshbandî order," in Marc Gaborieau, Alexandre Popovic, and Thierry Zarcone (eds), *Naqshbandîs: Cheminements et situation actuelle d'un ordre mystique musulman* (Istanbul, 1990), pp. 3–44; Jo-Ann Gross, "Multiple Roles and Perceptions of a Sufi Shaikh: Symbolic Statements of Political and Religious Authority," in *Naqshbandîs: Cheminements et situation actuelle*, pp. 109–21; Paul, *Die politische und soziale Bedeutung der Naqšbandiyya in Mittelasien im 15. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1991); Babadžanov, "On the History of the Naqšbandīya Muğaddidīya"; and von Kügelgen, "Die Entfaltung der Naqšbandīya Muğaddidīya im mittleren Transoxanien vom 18. bis zum 19. Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts: Ein Stück Detektivarbeit," in von Kügelgen, Michael Kemper, and Allen J. Frank (eds), *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries* (Berlin, 1998), vol. 2, pp. 101–51.}

5

THE WORK OF AḤMAD YASAWĪ

A The *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*

The famous work that contains the Ṣūfī poems {*manẓūmas*} of Aḥmad Yasawī is called the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* {Anthology of *ḥikmats*} because each poem is a distinct *ḥikmat*. Among the Turks of Anatolia, these kinds of Ṣūfī poems were known as hymns {*ilāhī*}, but among the Eastern Turks the works of Aḥmad Yasawī and those of other dervishes who wrote this kind of poetry were usually called *ḥikmats*. *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was not, therefore, a title that was used exclusively for the collection of Aḥmad Yasawī's poetry. In fact, we can presume, with a high degree of likelihood, that this title was given to it later. We know for certain that this type of poetry was called *ḥikmat* at least since the fourth/tenth century, given that we do not have any clear documentation of the term before then.[1]

The *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* has great importance among the literary works produced by the Turks in several respects. First, because Aḥmad Yasawī died in the sixth/twelfth century, this work is the oldest example of Muslim Turkish literature {to come down to us} after {Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib's} *Kutadgu Bilig*. Such a work, belonging to a period for which we have few linguistic and literary products, naturally has very great linguistic as well as literary historical value.[2] Second, because the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was the first work to take many elements of the old folk literature and express the spirit of Islam through them, i.e. by means of the ancient national forms and meters, we must consider it to be the oldest and most important monument of Turkish Ṣūfī literature. It is for this reason that the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* has long attracted the attention of Orientalists and, although the proper study of it could not be undertaken until now, some piecemeal research has been done on it and some sections have even been published and translated into Western languages.[3]

Because the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* circulated for centuries, especially among the Eastern and Northern Turks – the Uzbeks, Qazaqs, and Volga Tatars – virtually as a sacred text, we can find innumerable manuscripts of it and, more recently, even some printed editions. Unfortunately, my analysis of many of the manuscripts has not yielded any positive result with regard to linguistic and literary history, i.e. it has been impossible to find an early manuscript of this important work.[4]

With respect to the printed editions, as far as I know, this work was published once in Istanbul, four times in Kazan, and once in Tashkent in a lithographic edition.[5] However, all these editions were based on recent manuscripts that are by no means trustworthy, so we currently possess no edition derived from an early accurate manuscript on which reliable research can be done.[6]

It is immediately obvious {for example} that the present Istanbul edition of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, even when examined superficially, consists of a hodgepodge of pieces written by very different authors at different times; for one thing, pen names of the poets suffice to show this. In the Istanbul edition, there are works of different poets like Shams, Shāh-Mashrab, and Ḥakīm Sulaimān Ata, while in the Kazan editions there are also two pieces by another poet with the pen name Qūl Gharīb (*ḥikmats* number 102 and 126 in the fourth Kazan edition). With the exception of these five or six pieces in the Istanbul edition and the others in the Kazan editions, all the remaining sections belong to poets who used several very closely related pen names, like Qūl Khwāja Aḥmad, Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, Yasawī, and Aḥmad Miskīn; or, much more likely, to a single poet who used all these closely related names. Indeed, according to the current general view, the person who used all these pen names was Aḥmad Yasawī and all of these poems were very early products of sixth/twelfth-century Turkish. This view, which is not based on definitive proof, has been so pervasive up to the present as to have been accepted as an absolute fact in both popular and scholarly circles.

I do not hesitate, even if it at first seems strange, to assert my opposition to this general view. For one thing, we possess historical and literary evidence to show that all the works written under the pen names mentioned above, i.e. Qūl Khwāja Aḥmad, Aḥmad Miskīn, etc., cannot be attributed to Aḥmad Yasawī. Unfortunately, in one of these many poems (*ḥikmat* number 88 in the fourth edition), the famous poet and Ṣūfī Nesīmī is mentioned! A poet who died in 562/1166–7 would not, of course, be able to mention a Ṣūfī poet who appeared two centuries later, even with his miraculous power![7] In two other poems in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* in our possession, two famous disciples of Aḥmad Yasawī, Bābā Māchīn (*ḥikmat* number 47 in the Kazan edition and number 131 in the Istanbul edition), and Sulaimān Ḥakīm Ata (*ḥikmat* number 77), about both of whom we spoke at length above, are mentioned, whereas the likelihood is so remote as to be virtually impossible that Aḥmad Yasawī himself would speak of his disciples. In addition to this varied historical evidence, which is categorical and incontrovertible, there are also a number of linguistic and literary considerations that strongly support my previous assertion. Among the poems that constitute the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, there are some very well composed {*muntaẓam*} poems written in the various *ʿarūḍ* meters, which, for those who have studied even a little the development of the literary language, are impossible to accept as products of the sixth/twelfth century.[8]

What can we deduce from all these considerations? Given the present extent of our knowledge and the fact that we do not possess a manuscript of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* from the sixth/twelfth, seventh/thirteenth, or eighth/fourteenth centuries, it is not possible to reach a definite judgment in this matter. Did this *dīwān*,

which we today attribute to Aḥmad Yasawī, actually belong to another poet named Aḥmad who was a Yasawī dervish? Based on what we have said above, we would surely have to attribute an important part of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, especially the poems written in the *ʿarūḍ* meters to such a person. Because he mentions Nesīmī, this poet must not be from a time prior to the ninth/fifteenth century, but neither could he be much later. In order to be able later to attribute the *ḥikmats* that he wrote to Aḥmad Yasawī, this poet would surely have had to have lived in the ninth/fifteenth century or early tenth/sixteenth century.

Would it not be correct to attribute the entire *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* to a poet other than Aḥmad Yasawī and, because of a similarity in name, to conclude that he was later confused with Aḥmad Yasawī? In my view, this possibility cannot be wholly rejected. We know for certain that Aḥmad Yasawī wrote *ḥikmats* in forms taken from popular literature[9] and that subsequently the writing of poems in this style actually became a tradition among the Yasawī dervishes. It is very likely, however, that the *ḥikmats* that Aḥmad Yasawī wrote have been lost over the centuries and that the works of a poet of the same name who appeared later have been attributed to him because of his fame and spiritual influence among the people. Indeed, in the manuscripts presently in our possession, it is stated in several places that this work is the *Daftar-i thānī* {the Second Notebook}.[10] Perhaps the Yasawī poet who compiled this *dīwān* considered the work of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī to be the "first *daftar*," and because his own work was composed of *ḥikmats* in the same form and style and was given the same name, i.e. *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, he regarded it as the "second *daftar*." If the names of both *dīwāns* and both authors were the same, and if there was a profound and genuine similarity in the poems of both poets with respect to form, style, and spirit, the work of the more recent poet could quite easily have been later attributed to the famous older Ṣūfī.

Still, we might conclude that even if the *ḥikmats* presently in our possession do not belong to Aḥmad Yasawī, they are completely indistinguishable in form and spirit from those that did belong to him, because, as will become quite apparent when we discuss the followers of Aḥmad Yasawī, even centuries after him *ḥikmats* of the same kind were written in the same form, style, and spirit. Nevertheless, we should not think that this was something peculiar to Aḥmad Yasawī and his followers. This uniformity sometimes continued for centuries in the Ṣūfī literature written in the popular meters and forms. The reason for this is not only that the products of popular literature continued for centuries to be indistinguishable from each other, but also that later writers tried to imitate their predecessors, and that the followers of the great *pīrs* ascribed a virtual sanctity to the forms that they had established. Nevertheless, despite all these considerations, there also exists the strong possibility that the text of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* in our possession is a mixed product composed of works belonging to both Aḥmad Yasawī and to a Yasawī dervish named Aḥmad who lived in the ninth/fifteenth or tenth/sixteenth century. In any case, no matter which of the various possibilities that we have considered is preferred or accepted, the literary personality of Aḥmad

Yasawī and the early unknown stages of Turkish Ṣūfī literature can be illuminated by studying the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* in our possession.[11]

B Linguistic character

I have briefly recounted above the very rapid spread, via Iran, of Islam to Central Asia, to the Syr Darya region, and even to countries further east, such as Kāshghar and its environs. I also described how Transoxiana became completely Muslim in the Sāmānid period and how the people of Isfījāb[12] adopted Islam under the very first Sāmānid ruler (Chapter 1, pp. 5–6). Because we do not possess an early reliable copy of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, it is necessary to study in particular some linguistic history and provide some brief information on the geographic areas of the Turkish dialects in the fifth/eleventh and sixth/twelfth centuries in order to place the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* in its proper linguistic sphere. In addition, by clarifying the meaning of "Chaghatay" and "Uighur" {as adjectives describing languages} – terms that have been used continuously up to the present – it will also be useful to show the extent to which the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* justifies its appraisal, with respect to its linguistic and literary features, as the earliest work of Chaghatay literature. Until now, Turkish linguistic history has been almost completely neglected in scholarly studies, and so there has been no serious research on these questions to which one can refer. At the same time, because linguistics is outside my area of expertise, I expect that the information that I will present on this matter, and some of the ideas that I will advance, will {later} have to be re-examined and criticized by specialists in this field.

Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī provides information in his *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, compiled in the years during which the *Kutadgu Bilig* was being written in Kāshghar, on the contemporary dialects and geographical locations of the various branches of the Turks. According to him, the Turks were distributed from west to east in the fifth/eleventh century in the following manner: first came the Pechenegs, who were closest to the Byzantine lands, and then the Qipchaqs, Oghuz, Yimak, Bashqird, Basmıl, Qay, Yabaqu, Tatars, and Qirghiz. From north to south, they were distributed as follows: Chigil, Tokhsı, Yaghma, Ughraq, Charuq, Chomul, and Uighur. After all of these, {further east} came the Tangut, Khiṭāy, and Machin.[13] According to al-Kāshgharī, who knew all these branches and their languages very well, the most eloquent form of Turkish was that used by those who knew only one language, who did not mix with the Persians, and who did not settle in the cities, whereas the languages of those, like the Sughdaq, Ganjak, and Arghu, who knew a second language and lived with city people, became enfeebled.[14] According to al-Kāshgharī, nomads like the Chomul, Qay, Yabaqu, Basmıl, and Tatars had separate languages, but they also knew Turkish well. As I explain at length in the note below,[15] I believe it is necessary to interpret and clarify this report to mean "they did not have separate languages but their own distinct dialects that could be included within the general Turkish linguistic sphere and, in addition, they knew the common Eastern Turkish that was called

Khāqāniyya Turkish." As for the other branches of the Turks whom al-Kāshgharī discusses, the Qirghiz, Qipchaqs, Oghuz, Tokhsı, Yaghma, Chigil, Ughraq, and Charuq had a common language that was pure Turkish;[16] the language of the Yimak and Bashqird/Bashghırd was also close to theirs; the language of the Bulghars, Suwars, and Pechenegs, who extended toward the west, was uniformly Turkish but had a slightly different pronunciation {*takhfīf*}.[17] Among these various dialects, that of the Oghuz was the most *khafīf* {lightest}; that of the Yaghma, Tokhsı, and those who lived along the banks of the Ila, Irtish, Yamār, and Volga rivers in the direction of Uighuristan was the most correct; and that of the Mulūk-i Khāqāniyya {Khāqānī kings} and those who lived with them was the most eloquent.[18]

These brief characterizations by al-Kāshgharī, as obscure as they are important, {at least} give us a fairly clear and concise idea of the number of Turkish dialects in the fifth/eleventh century and their relationships and resemblances to each other. It seems quite clear that Turkish was divided into two major linguistic groups in that period, Eastern and Western. Eastern Turkish, which the author calls Khāqāniyya Turkish or Turkish in general, was the literary dialect that was spoken in Kāshghar in particular and was used throughout that region. It was very close to the Chigil, Yaghma, Arghu, Tokhsı, and Uighur dialects. As for Western Turkish, which constituted the second major group, it was the dialect of the Oghuz, which was extremely close to the dialects of the Qipchaqs and Yimak, and also close to those of the Pechenegs and Bulghars. It is quite clear from the *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* that by the fifth/eleventh century, there were a number of specific and significant differences between these two great groups, i.e. Khāqāniyya Turkish and Oghuz Turkish, with regard to grammar and phonology.[19]

Among these two dialects, the Eastern dialect, i.e. the language of Kāshghar, had especially great importance in the fifth/eleventh century. The languages of the other Eastern Turks who lived further to the east and who had not entered the milieu of Islam were naturally also very close to the language of Kāshghar with respect to grammar and phonology. Al-Kāshgharī mentions them under the name "Uighur" and states clearly that their languages were pure Turkish and that they used the Uighur script. Only because they had not entered the Muslim milieu was there no discernible Arabic or Muslim Persian influence among them.[20] Both the Oghuz and the Khāqāniyya Turks employed the Uighur script; but because the level of civilization of the Oghuz at that time was lower than that of the Khāqāniyya Turks, the literary language in the Oghuz region was Khāqāniyya Turkish, i.e. the dialect spoken in Kāshghar and its vicinity. While discussing the Uighur script, al-Kāshgharī says, "All the Turkish countries from Kāshghar to Upper China have used this script, from the most ancient times up to today (i.e. around the end of the fifth/eleventh century), in the correspondence of their *khāqāns* and sultans and in their books." This brief passage shows that much was written in Khāqāniyya Turkish since rather early times and that the Uighur script was used for it.[21] Al-Kāshgharī adds that the same spelling system was used for all documents written in this script.[22]

According to the Russian scholar V. Grigor'ev and the French Orientalist Grenard, who relied on him, the language of Kāshghar, i.e. Khāqāniyya Turkish, was Qarluq Turkish,[23] because the founders of the Kāshghar Khāqānate, according to their research, were not Uighurs, i.e. Toquz Oghuz, but Qarluqs. These Qarluqs, who lived among the Göktürk tribes north of the T'ien-Shan Range, migrated to the west of Issik-Kul with some other Göktürk tribes who would not accept Uighur rule after the collapse of the Göktürk state in the second/eighth century and occupied Tashkent and Farghāna. The descendants of their chiefs expanded {their authority} like the Göktürks as far as China, i.e. as far as the Wolf clan.[24] Supplementing the information provided by al-Masʿūdī, but from another point of view, Istakhrī states unequivocally that these Qarluqs, who were referred to as Turks, had spread toward the east and that it took a month's journey, starting at Farghāna and passing through the Qarluqs, to reach the country of the Toquz Oghuz.[25] This report, which shows that the Khāqāniyya Turks in {al-Kāshgārī's} *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* were Qarluqs and that we must consider them to be a Turkish tribe separate from the Uighurs but related to the old Göktürk social structure, also clearly indicates that the *Kutadgu Bilig* is linguistically related to the Orkhon Inscriptions, which belong to these same Göktürks.[26] This clear connection, which was first proposed by Thomsen and later confirmed by Radloff, can also be considered as linguistic evidence to support the historical analysis that I have been giving here.[27]

In the fifth/eleventh century, while Kāshghar Turkish, i.e. Eastern Turkish, prevailed in the eastern areas where the Qarluqs lived – from Kāshghar to the environs of Farghāna, Tashkent, and Samarqand – Oghuz Turkish, i.e. Western Turkish, which constituted the other great linguistic domain, had spread to a wide area in the west, especially from the Syr Darya region south as far as Khurāsān. According to al-Kāshgharī, in the fifth/eleventh century the principal cities of the Oghuz were along the Syr Darya and the nomads among them also lived on both banks of this river.[28] According to the accounts of the other Arab historians and geographers, these Western Oghuz, who had separated from the Eastern Toquz Oghuz, had spread to the Syr Darya region from Gurgān {*sic*} to Fārāb and Isfījāb. There were Khazar and Bulghar Turks to the west of them, Qarluqs to the east, and Kimeks to the north.[29] Also, during this century, some of the Oghuz migrated to Mangıshlak and settled there.[30] Some of these Oghuz Turkmen who had already entered the Islamic realm in the fourth/tenth century also descended upon the area around Bukhārā toward the end of the fourth/tenth century. Among them appeared the Seljuk dynasty that founded a powerful sultanate in Asia. During the period of their sultanate, Asia Minor and Azerbaijan were strongly Turkified by this Oghuz migration. After this, no great movement of the Oghuz who remained in the East has been recorded. We only know that in 548/1153–4, the Oghuz who lived around Balkh revolted against Sultan Sanjar and wreaked havoc on Khurāsān and the surrounding area, but this was neither ethnographically nor linguistically significant. The places that were abandoned by the Oghuz north of the Caspian and Aral seas in the Syr Darya

area were filled by the Qipchaqs, who were a large branch of the Kimeks. By 421/1030–1, we find the Qipchaqs adjacent to Khwārazm.[31]

This then was the linguistic situation in the Kāshghar and Syr Darya areas of Central Asia in the fourth/tenth and fifth/eleventh centuries, i.e. before the Mongol invasion. Given the paucity of contemporary historical and linguistic documents and the confusing and obscure references of the early historians and geographers, this summary {of the available material} that I have presented is certainly not very clear. Nevertheless, despite this vagueness, in light of the analysis given above, I think the linguistic character that must be ascribed to Aḥmad Yasawī's *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* is fairly clear. Aḥmad Yasawī was born in the city of Sairām/Isfījāb in the vicinity of Isfījāb {*sic*}, which early on had adopted Islam.[32] If we consider that al-Kāshgharī regarded the places that stretched from Isfījāb to Balāsāghūn to be the Arghu region,[33] then it would appear that Aḥmad Yasawī was also an Arghu Turk. The same writer adds that the people of Balāsāghūn, Ṭarāz, and Madīnat al-Baiḍā, i.e. Sairām, spoke both Soghdian and Turkish and hence – because of foreign influence – the language of the inhabitants of the Arghu region had to some degree lost its vigor.[34] Because the Arghu dialect can be included in the same linguistic domain as that of the Khāqāniyya Turks, it is certain that Aḥmad Yasawī's mother tongue was not the Oghuz dialect.[35] To be sure, he might have encountered Oghuz in places where he subsequently traveled, in Bukhārā, for example. We do not know the extent to which the Oghuz, after they descended from the Syr Darya region, mingled with the local people in Central Asia and Khurāsān and, at the same time, with other branches of the Turks and whether they had any linguistic influences on each other.[36] We can only say for certain that when Aḥmad Yasawī later went to Yasī a significant number of Oghuz had already migrated from that region, and those who had remained had mixed with Qipchaqs who had come down from the north and with other Turks who had come from various directions. Therefore, even if there might have been some Oghuz influence on his language, we cannot include it in the Oghuz linguistic sphere generally. In other words, we must definitely accept his work as a product of Eastern Turkish. If we possessed an early and trustworthy copy of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, it would surely show a number of linguistic features very similar to those in {Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib's} *Kutadgu Bilig*; although it was under much stronger Arab and Persian influence – and even perhaps a bit under the influence of the old Oghuz dialect – it would belong, broadly speaking, to the same language domain as the *Kutadgu Bilig*. However, even if the copies that we currently possess contain some genuine pieces of Aḥmad Yasawī's work, they will have been corrupted as they passed through the hands of various copyists over the centuries and will have lost almost all their original character. Such pieces, if they exist, would thus have no serious value for linguistic history.[37]

Some researchers – including, first of all, Vambéry and then Thúry – jumped to conclusions about the linguistic character of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, although they did not make a proper analysis of it and were ignorant of the historical personality

of Aḥmad Yasawī. They claimed that the language of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was the dialect of the Khānate of Khokand.[38] Later, certain other researchers – Thúry also among them – considered it to be, along with Rabghūzī's *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā'*, one of the early works in the Chaghatay dialect, and regarded it as an intermediate work between the *Kutadgu Bilig* and the language of Nawā'ī.[39] Prof. Hartmann also considers the work of Aḥmad Yasawī to be in Chaghatay, {defined as} the literary language of the area extending from the Caspian Sea to Kansu, and states that even later poets, like Chimyanlı Hüveyda, remained linguistically faithful to it as much as possible.[40] In light of the thorough description that I have given above of the copies of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* in our possession (section A of this chapter), however, I hope it is clear that in order to truly determine the linguistic character of this important work, we must not study the printed editions or recent manuscripts, but must find a very early manuscript or, if this is not possible, investigate the milieu in which Aḥmad Yasawī lived and wrote his *ḥikmats* and the linguistic area to which it belonged. I reported briefly in the previous paragraph the results of my research in this respect and said that we must consider the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* as belonging to the same linguistic domain as the *Kutadgu Bilig*, i.e. to be a work in the Eastern dialect connected with the Qarluqs. Until the appearance of an early and trustworthy copy of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* written before the Mongol invasion, the current state of our knowledge will not allow us to state categorically the linguistic area to which it belonged. The fact that the recent unreliable copies currently in our possession belong completely to the dialect that we call Chaghatay means nothing. Nevertheless, despite the continuing lack of an early and accurate copy of the text and the rather astounding primitive character of the current research on Turkish linguistic history, I am of the opinion that the hypothesis that I have advanced on this question is based on a rather strong foundation.[41]

C Literary character

In order to explain properly the literary nature of the collection of poetry that we possess today under the general title of *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, we must subject it to a minute analysis with respect to both subject and form. The subject matter in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* is very simple and limited: countless eulogies of the virtues of dervishes and the dervish life; the most famous Muslim legends, from which, finally, ethical and religious morals are inevitably drawn; various pieces on the life and miracles of the Prophet Muḥammad; anecdotes; complaints about the state of the world and ascetic complaints written to remind {the reader} that the Day of Judgment is near; and finally simple and primitive, yet lively, accounts told with a simple-hearted appeal about conditions in heaven and hell, the demons of hell, and the female and male denizens of paradise {s. *ḥūrī* and *ghulām*}, and the gardens of paradise. At a time when Islam was just beginning to spread among the Turks, it was quite natural that works written by a Ṣūfī for a mass of people with simple and primitive tastes – and who had not yet succeeded

in completely escaping from the customs and beliefs of the ancient pagan period – would not go beyond these subjects.

Aḥmad Yasawī was by no means a stranger to the Islamic sciences and Persian literature. Much of his education and religious training took place in Muslim Persian intellectual centers, so he knew very well the mystical works of the great early Persian Ṣūfī poets. However, given the need to address the Turks, who had sincerely but still superficially adopted Islam, and who would not easily abandon their national culture, it was necessary, willy-nilly, to conform to their tastes and customs and to address them in a simple language whose meaning they would understand and in a meter to whose music they were accustomed. It was simply under the influence of such powerful factors as these that Aḥmad Yasawī adopted the national syllabic meter, which the people loved and the popular poets had used for centuries, rather than the harmonious *ʿarūḍ* meters cultivated by the Persians. He wrote all his *ḥikmats* in this meter and in the old national forms that were also taken from popular literature. In this regard, it is not pertinent to claim that the language had not been cultivated to an extent that it was comfortable with the *ʿarūḍ* meters, because the *Kutadgu Bilig* clearly demonstrates that the *ʿarūḍ* metrical system had been employed in Turkish literature some sixty or seventy years earlier. The single reason for this phenomenon was, as I stated above, the desire of the poet to address the mass of the people directly.[42] Nevertheless, if we had an early copy of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, it is almost certain that its language, despite the author's desire to compose it in a very plain manner so that it could be understood by the greatest possible number, would contain a much greater mixture of Arabic and Persian words than the *Kutadgu Bilig*, which was bound to the Persian meter.[43]

Aḥmad Yasawī wrote most of his *ḥikmats* in the seven- or twelve-syllable meters long used and much beloved among the people of Central Asia. These meters, which have a strange somewhat monotone harmony, and, at the same time, a somewhat primitive and crude but "original" flavor, do not reveal anything extraordinary in his hands. Even in passages requiring the greatest display of emotion, he is very cool and calm. The plodding nature of his admonitions, the simple and monotonous expression of his narratives, and the calm and dignified manner of his prayers almost never change. The staid and rigid personality of this Central Asian Turk, usually indifferent to the rapture and excitement of the inner life, but outwardly completely faithful to the fundamental principles of the *Sharīʿa*, is immediately apparent in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*. In order to provide some movement and excitement in the heavy monotonous harmony of the seven- and twelve-syllable meters, an artistic and emotional soul would have had to breathe life into it. In the meters that he selected, Aḥmad Yasawī conformed to the common taste of the period and completely avoided any personal innovations.

With regard to rhyme as well, he had no attachment to Arabic and Persian and remained completely faithful to the national literary tradition. Rather than use full rhymes, he followed popular literature and used half rhymes, usually composing them from the inflections of the verbs, and for the most part stuck to

the old *radīf* {repetition of the word at the end of each couplet} method.[44] His interest in respecting the early folk literary tradition fully reveals itself in his form of versification. Aḥmad Yasawī, who said

Üçyüzaltmış hikmet aytıb dâstân aytı
Dâstân aytı bûstân içra oymak ucun

{He uttered 360 *ḥikmats* and *dastāns*
in order to penetrate (?) in the garden}

arranged all of his *ḥikmats* according to this ancient and thoroughly national form. In these *dastāns*, composed of four-verse stanzas or quatrains, the last verse of the first stanza is sometimes repeated in all the stanzas like a refrain. The first three verses of each stanza rhyme, while the last verse rhymes with the last verses of all the stanzas. Usually the first stanza differs from the others with the first verse rhyming with the third and the second with the fourth {thus: abab cccb dddb etc.}. This form of versification, which is very limited and primitive, is apparently the native form and completely devoid of foreign influence. The repetition at the end of each stanza, either of an entire verse or of a rhyme, shows that it was written not for the purpose of being read privately like works belonging to later periods of development, but in order to be recited publicly in religious gatherings. In other words, Aḥmad Yasawī's work was in this respect no different from the products of the early folk literature.[45]

D Yasawī, Ṣūfī

In the chapters above, I have discussed the time when Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī lived, his milieu, the various influences under which he developed, and the basic characteristics of the *ṭarīqa* that he established. If readers will recall these descriptions, they will easily grasp the extent to which Aḥmad Yasawī can be called a "Ṣūfī poet" and the degree to which this title, when applied to him, is comprehensive and all encompassing. This great Turkish shaikh, who, from childhood until his last years, lived a vigorous and sincere Ṣūfī life, wrote poetry for the enlightenment of the Turks who could not understand the Ṣūfī works in Arabic and Persian and for the purpose of confirming the mystical truths and instilling them in his disciples. It was therefore quite natural that the mystical character of his poetry should come to the fore. As I explained above (section A of this chapter), even a superficial analysis of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* – which, even if it does not belong to Aḥmad Yasawī, we naturally concluded that in form and spirit it would be identical with those works that did belong to him – proves this point sufficiently. This Ṣūfī, who had a very simple imagination and was almost completely unfamiliar with literary art, was, like all other Ṣūfīs, indifferent to the external world and its manifestations. Engrossed as he was in the world of monism, he could, in the end, liken this world and the next world "to two poppy

seeds."[46] The only thing that preoccupied him was the thought of guiding the people and encouraging them along the right path. The religious legends that he recounted, the prayers, pleas for God's help, and requests for God's forgiveness, were all written with this noble thought in mind. In the various poems that he wrote about the Prophet and in the *ḥikmats* that deal with eschatological subjects, he called upon everyone to follow the right path and begged God's forgiveness for his own shortcomings and sins. His most common recommendations were to listen to the words of the saints, to conform to the stipulations of the Koran and *Ḥadīth*, to combine *Sharī'a* with *ṭarīqa*, to abandon this world of vanity, and to turn to the path of asceticism and religious striving {*mujāhada*}. Like all the Ṣūfīs, he complained of the condition of this world. With a very sincere and consuming passion he bemoaned the fact that no one heeded the words of the true saints and that everyone was a captive of his own base desire {*nafs-i ammāra*}.

Because he was of the Ḥanafī *madhhab*, he always venerated and praised the "Imām Aʿẓam" {the most magnificent *imām*, i.e. Abū Ḥanīfa} and the founders of the other Sunnī *madhhabs*. Indeed, there is a long and noteworthy legend in the *Dīwān* about how Abū Ḥanīfa had miraculously solved a number of complicated problems of Islamic law at the age of six and how he received his title. On the other hand, there is absolutely nothing in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* to suggest Shīʿism or any form of Muʿtazilism, even to the extent found, for example, in Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār.[47] Indeed, as I have also explained above, this {i.e. strict Sunnism} was one of his governing ideas. Even when he discoursed on the passion of Manṣūr al-Ḥallāj and the mystery of *anā 'l-ḥaqq* {al-Ḥallāj's utterance, "I am the Divine Truth"} and when he said that the mullās did not understand the mysteries of the *ṭarīqa* {i.e. of mysticism}, he would never go beyond a certain point. He strongly promoted renunciation and ascetical exercises as steps on the Ṣūfī path. Asceticism, piety, mortification of the flesh, and spiritual striving were all most necessary in order to reach the level of truth. It was not easy to follow the path to Divine Truth {*Ḥaqq*}. The path of {ecstatic or spiritual} love of God was very blessed, but it was full of endless difficulties. "The {psychological and physical} state of one who enters these tortuous paths is desperate. Many a lover has become dust on these paths . . ."[48] "In order to become a devotee, one must enter the garden of love. For its sake, however, one must first kill the self. One must endure many long torments and great tribulations in order that this be possible. He who wants to find the pearl of love should be content with one drop. The true lover who burns with the fire of love loses his own color. His soul is bewildered, his heart is desolate and his eyes are flooded with tears. As the Prophet said, الدنيا جيفة وطلابها كلاب {The world is carrion and those who hanker after it are dogs}. The true lovers are those who give up their own souls and seek the beloved, union with God. Oh, Khwāja Aḥmad, always think of God and weep. Pray morning and night and keep the fast, so that you may reach your goal." Asceticism and spiritual striving, which occur in this sense in most of the *ḥikmats*, indicate the need to withdraw from all worldly matters. For the Ṣūfī, in fact, this is the meaning of the Koranic verse (2:278) يا ايها الذين امنوا اتقو الله

{Oh you who believe, fear God!}. If not, one's heart cannot become "the place of divine manifestation" {*nazar-gāh-i ilāhī*}.[49] And although Aḥmad Yasawī tells us that after all these hardships "he drank the wine of union, received precedence {*sabq*} from God, and was aware of the mystery of *anā 'l-ḥaqq*," he still did not reveal the mystery.[50]

In addition to many poems on such themes in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, there are a number of *ḥikmats* on the life of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī. This Turkish shaikh recounted the important events of his life in simple and artless language: how he had become a friend of Khaḍir, in what manner he received blessings from Arslan Bābā, and how he had been seized by the love of God since childhood. Stating that he wandered about as an exile in Khurāsān, Iraq, and Syria for a long time, and then, missing Arslan Bābā, that he returned to his own city of Turkistan {Yasī} and wanted to die there, he mentions his birthplace with great ardor: "Fastening a stone to my heart, I left that blessed Turkistan where I was born." Just as his shaikh, Khwāja Yūsuf Hamadānī, became homesick whenever he thought of Hamadān, so too did Aḥmad Yasawī harbor a great affection for his hometown. The *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* also clearly relates that, after passing through various cycles {*dawra*, of religious learning} up to age sixty-three and reaching various spiritual stages {*maqām*} in the mystic path, he realized that he had become a great "sultan" in the eyes of his disciples and, attributing this to the dictates of the carnal soul {*nafs-i ammāra*}, he went underground – i.e. entered the *chilla-khāne* – and wrote his *ḥikmats* in isolation from the people.[51]

Now that we have analyzed the contents of the poems in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, we can broach the topic of the extent to which it would be suitable to call Aḥmad Yasawī a Ṣūfī poet. He cannot be regarded as one of the *'āshuq* Ṣūfīs who tried to record the candid outcries that burst from their souls and did not pause to consider whether these outbursts were reconcilable with the external ordinances of Islamic law. To the contrary, he always took into consideration the mentality and spiritual state of the community he was addressing. He communicated to them not the subtleties of Ṣūfī philosophy, which they could not understand, but rather a number of legal and ethical principles in a hortatory manner, urging them to follow these principles faithfully in order to achieve happiness in the next world. His lengthy eulogies of the first four caliphs, his ascetic exhortations to the dervishes to follow the *ṭarīqa*, and his bemoaning the evils at the end of time do not reveal Aḥmad Yasawī to us as a true Ṣūfī poet. Yūnus Emre said, "He who does not regard the seventy-two sects with the same eye {i.e. as indistinguishable} rebels against truth even if he is a *madrasa* instructor." One can find nothing at all in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* that recalls this broadmindedness and nothing of the pantheist philosophy of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī.[52] In this respect, rather than being a profound poetical Ṣūfī work, the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* can be better characterized as a simple work composed of religious and ethical sermons and narratives as well as didactic poems concerning the principles of the *ṭarīqa* and the rules of the mystical discipline. Aḥmad Yasawī had many Ṣūfī ideas, but despite this he was a dry moralist who lacked true poetic ability or lyrical gift.

We can get a clearer idea about this if we compare Aḥmad Yasawī to the moralist Ṣūfī poets of Iran who had diverse abilities and talents. In the sixth/twelfth century, when the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was written, the magnificent Ṣūfī literature of Iran was still in the process of formation. After epic literature, epitomized by Firdawsī, it was the turn of moralistic Ṣūfī literature to develop and become refined. Among the Ṣūfīs who had thrived up to that time, there were some who wrote a few quatrains or *ghazals* from time to time. The famous Ṣūfī Shaikh Abū Saʿīd b. Abī ʿl-Khair, who died after the age of eighty in 440/1049 – the admiration that he and Ibn Sīnā expressed for each other from the moment of their first meeting is well known – recited beautiful quatrains with a lofty and sincere Ṣūfī feeling. In the poetry of this great Ṣūfī, who says in a famous quatrain

تاروی ترا بدیدم ای شمع طراز　　نه کار کنم نه روزه دارم نه نماز

چون باتو بدم مجاز من جمله نماز　　چون بی تو بدم نماز من جمله مجاز

{Since I beheld you, my candle of Ṭarāz,
I have ceased all work, keep not the fast, nor pray.
With you my figurative speech becomes prayer.
Apart from you my prayer becomes a mere figure,}[53]

there is a vague pantheistic streak and a free and candid expression of mystical love, in short, a divine breath.[54] Although subsequent Ṣūfīs wrote innumerable commentaries on some of his quatrains,[55] Shaikh Abū Saʿīd was generally known much more as a Ṣūfī than as a poet. Thus, we can say that great poets who were directly inspired by Ṣūfism had not yet appeared.

Ḥakīm Sanā'ī and Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār opened the period of great Ṣūfīs in Persian literature in the sixth/twelfth century. Following them, Saʿdī, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, Jāmī, and numerous other such poets extended this period. I have examined the moralistic Ṣūfī works of Ḥakīm Sanā'ī (d. 545/1150–1 {probably d. 525/1131} and Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, who are virtual contemporaries of Aḥmad Yasawī, and I do not believe they had any influence on him.[56] Apart from such common elements as encouraging people to join the *ṭarīqa* or abandoning {the affairs of} this world, there is no connection whatsoever in form or style between his *ḥikmats* and the Ṣūfī works of these great Persian poets. Ḥakīm Sanā'ī and ʿAṭṭār were not merely Ṣūfīs. They were at the same time great poets, possessing refined language and a rich imagination. Aḥmad Yasawī, on the other hand, was not a great poet, only a Ṣūfī. Unlike the Persian poets who were his contemporaries, he addressed not an audience that was prepared to understand all the subtleties of Ṣūfism, but rather an audience of simple and primitive folk. Yet neither Ḥakīm Sanā'ī nor Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, despite all their artistic power, can be regarded as consummate Ṣūfī poets. It is not possible to deny the value of their works and the importance they have had among the Ṣūfīs, but we must

admit, nevertheless, that they were not able to reach the sublime level of pantheist philosophy found in the work of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī.[57] Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, who in his *Pandnāme* was a moralist – exactly like Saʿdī – can also be regarded as a moralist poet in his famous *Manṭiq al-ṭair*, because this work is, above all, a collection of Ṣūfī ethics. The same is true for ʿAṭṭār's other works as well as those of Sanā'ī. Even as moralists, however, they were superior to Aḥmad Yasawī and taught a much more systematic system of Ṣūfī ethics. But the unsystematic character of the Ṣūfī ethics taught by Aḥmad Yasawī is not due to the weakness of his doctrines. If we take into consideration not only his lack of artistry but also the simplicity and primitiveness of the community that he was addressing, then his excuse in this respect is obvious. Otherwise, Aḥmad Yasawī was an important figure who fully grasped the entire mystical world-view of his age. Because he fully believed in the need to reveal Ṣūfī realities, but tailored to the ability and comprehension of his audience, he avoided pantheistic teachings, even to the extent found in the *Manṭiq al-ṭair*.[58]

If we compare the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* to other famous Turkish works of a didactic nature that were written before or a short time after it – for example, to the *Kutadgu Bilig* – we find a significant difference with respect to their ethical views. The *Kutadgu Bilig* resembles the Persian mirrors-for-princes in giving attention mainly to social ethics, while the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* is a Ṣūfī digest of personal ethics. As for {Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd's} *ʿAtabat al-ḥaqā'iq*, which is reminiscent above all of ʿAṭṭār's *Pandnāme*, it does not have even as much Ṣūfī character as the *Pandnāme*. In very dry language, it expounds on the merits of patience and contentment; teaches that this world has no value other than as a place to sow and reap for the next world; enumerates the terrible consequences of miserliness, talkativeness, joking, keeping bad company, covetousness, and greed; and states that the world is full of evil men and evil deeds. The poet, who was always bound to the text of the Koran and *Ḥadīth*, saw no need to give an allegorical sense to the "taverns,"[59] for which all the Ṣūfīs felt the most sincere and ardent reverence, and related with profound chagrin that while the mosques were empty the taverns were full. The only point that reveals a slight Ṣūfī influence in all these moralistic views is his insistence on not hankering after the transitory world but, instead, being resigned to fate – obviously such teachings could only derive from a mystical system.[60] It is clear, therefore, that there is no connection or similarity between the Ṣūfī ethics propounded in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* and either the *Kutadgu Bilig* or the *ʿAtabat al-ḥaqā'iq*. Aḥmad Yasawī was by no means influenced by the *Kutadgu Bilig*, which was written earlier; by the same token, he did not influence the poet of the *ʿAtabat al-ḥaqā'iq*.

NOTES

1 {Ḥazīnī,} *J̌awāhir*, p. 53. {The fact that Köprülü assumes that Aḥmad Yasawī's authorship of the *Dīwan-i Ḥikmat* is a given colors the rest of his discussion. It is especially remarkable that he should cite Ḥazīnī as evidence on the late fourth/tenth-century

currency of the term *ḥikmat*, and that he ignores non-Turkic Ṣūfī *ḥikam*. In the next paragraph in the narrative, Köprülü goes on to use Aḥmad Yasawī's death date, which he never seriously examined, as the basis for declaring the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* to be the oldest example of Muslim Turkic literature after the *Kutadgu Bilig*!}

2 The problem of the date of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* and the personality of Aḥmad Yasawī have long been the cause of many protracted disputes among Orientalists. When Vambéry published certain selections from this work for the first time in *Čagataische Sprachstudien* {Leipzig, 1867}, he provided no information on its date or the personality of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī. Russian Orientalists, including Melioransky, have carried out some more or less critical studies on the Khwāja based on the editions of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* printed in Russia. They know that he died in 562/1166–7 and thus realize the early date of this work with respect to the history of the Turkish language. Prof. Brockelmann, in an important study entitled *Ali's Qissai Jusuf, der älteste Vorläufer der osmanischen Litteratur*, recently published in the journal of the Prussian Academy {*Abhandlungen der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, no. 5} (Berlin, 1917), states, based on Melioransky, that the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* is a sixth/twelfth-century Turkish work. In his critique of Brockelmann, *Túrán*, 2 (1918), 111–18, J. Németh, professor of Turkish linguistics at the University of Budapest, discusses the late Hungarian Orientalist Jozef Thúry's great knowledge of the literature of the Eastern Turks and, based on this, strongly criticizes Melioransky and Brockelmann's opinion that Aḥmad Yasawī belonged to the sixth/twelfth century. Because Thúry's article, which includes his observations on Aḥmad Yasawī, has been translated into Turkish, as "Ondördüncü ʿasır sonlarına kadar Türk dili yâdıgârları," {trans. from the Hungarian by Râgıp Hulûsî,} *MTM*, 2 {1331/1913}, pp. 81–133, we are able to refute the ideas advanced by Prof. Németh that are based on it. According to Thúry, "Aḥmad Yasawī was a shaikh of the Naqshbandī *ṭarīqa*. We do not know when he died, but it is well known that the founder of the Naqshbandiyya, Pīr Muḥammad {better known as Bahā' al-Dīn} Naqshband, died in 719/1319 and that Tīmūr had a magnificent building erected over the tomb of Aḥmad Yasawī in 799/1397. Therefore, Aḥmad Yasawī must have died between 719/1319 and 799/1397 and consequently the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* is a work of the eighth/fourteenth century" (*MTM*, pp. 97–8). Thúry cites {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., as a source on this subject. If he had properly studied the information about Aḥmad Yasawī given by Ṣafī, however, he would have realized that Khwāja Yūsuf Hamadānī's third *murīd* could not have belonged to the eighth/fourteenth century. It is evident that, just as he made a poor analysis of the *Rashaḥāt*, academician Thúry also completely ignored all the sources on Aḥmad Yasawī. Indeed, the most curious thing is that he was not even aware that this work had been printed in several editions. Vambéry too claims that it was unpublished except for 310 lines of verse found in Shaikh Süleyman's Chaghatay lexicon {*Lughat-i Chaghatay ve Türkī-yī ʿOsmānī* (Istanbul, 1298/1882)} and also in French Orientalist Abel Pavet de Courteille's dictionary {*Dictionnaire turc-oriental* (Paris, 1870)}. In light of these remarks, Prof. Németh should understand how ignorant the late Hungarian Orientalist {i.e. Thúry} was of the sources on this subject. {Köprülü's critique of Németh's and Thúry's ideas about the dates of Aḥmad Yasawī was in some respects correct. The fullest discussion of the issues here, and of Thúry's error-filled arguments, came in a series of brief notes published in *Der Islam*: Franz Babinger, "Zur Frügeschichte des Naqschbendi-Ordens," 13 (1923), 105–7; Brockelmann's note in the same volume, 282–3; and the notes of Barthold and Babinger, 14 (1925), 112–14.}

3 The first Orientalist to mention the existence of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* and, in fact, to publish and translate selections from it was Vambéry (*Čagataische Sprachstudien*, pp. 115–23). However, in the introduction to his work, he is not able to give any

historical information apart from citing a few lines from Levshin, {*Description des hordes*}, pp. 36–7.

4 I found no manuscripts of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* in the *waqf* libraries of Istanbul. One of the two manuscripts that I personally was able to study in Istanbul is today found among the books acquired from N. Katanov. This copy, which was made in 1290/1873–4, is composed of 331 pages. Each page has an average of eleven lines and there are ninety-nine *ḥikmats* altogether. This copy, which is full of mistakes and is corrupt in every sense, cannot be used as the basis of scholarly study – even less so than the printed texts. The other copy, which is among the books acquired by the Ministry of Education from Hâlis Efendi, was made in 1260/1844–5. It contains much poetry that does not belong to Aḥmad Yasawī, even Nawā'ī's famous *Tarjī'-i bend*, which was included in the *Kharābāt* {or *Harâbât*, i.e. a famous anthology published by Ziyâ Pasha (Istanbul, 1291–2/1874)}. Melioransky writes that there are four different manuscripts, all with number 239, in the Asia Museum in Saint Petersburg, but that they are all recent and that no trustworthy early copy of this work can be found. I was not able to find copies of it among the Turkish works in the Berlin, Vienna, or Gotha libraries or in the British Museum. (I have depended on the {manuscript} catalogues of G. Flügel, W. Pertsch, and Ch. Rieu. It is possible that the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* might be found among the recent acquisitions of these libraries, i.e. since those catalogues were published.) A manuscript of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* is known to be in the Library of the Hungarian Academy, but we do not possess sufficient information about it. Because the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was very famous in Central Asia and among the Northern Turks, it is certain that other copies will be found in other libraries or in private hands. Nevertheless, most will undoubtedly belong to recent times. Strong evidence for this opinion is that the Russian Orientalists, who have the best chance of finding an early copy of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, have so far had no success. As far as I know, the oldest copy was formerly in the Vefik Pasha Library {not further identified}. According to the catalogue, it (number 1039) is composed of 148 folios, is four inches thick, is written in a plain but beautiful hand, has headings in red, and was made in 1105/1693–4. Unfortunately, I was not able to find it. Pavet de Courteille says that there is a manuscript of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* in his private library, but he gives no information on whether it is old or new (*Mirâdj-Nâme*: *Récit de l'ascension de Mahomet au ciel* {Paris, 1882; reprinted Amsterdam, 1975}, in the course of the notes, p. 33). It is obvious, therefore, that there are no happy results to be reported from this long recital. {For comprehensive information on manuscripts of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, see H. F. Hofman, *Turkish Literature, a Bio-bibliographical Survey. Section III. Moslim Central Asian Turkish Literature Being in the Main a List of "Chaghatayan" Authors and Works in "Chaghatay" as Registered in Professor M. F. Köprülü's Article: "Çagatay edebiyatı," İA, Vol. 2 (270–) (with some additions, Navā'īāna, however, excepted)* (Utrecht, 1969–), vol. 6, pp. 119–28. The earliest dated manuscript of something like the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* comes only from the early eighteenth century. The most extensive survey of manuscript copies of this work preserved in Tashkent, the largest repository of Central Asian manuscripts, has been done by M. M. Ishmukhamedova. See the summary of her dissertation "'Devani hikmät'ning qolyazmäläri," Filologiyä fänläri namzadi ilmiy däräjäsini alish uchun yazilgän dissertatsiyä Ävtoreferäti (Tashkent, 1995).}

5 {There were many. See Hofman, *Turkish Literature*, vol. 6, p. 121.}

6 The *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was published for the first time in 1295/1878–9 in Kazan as a booklet of 125 pages containing sixty-seven *ḥikmats* and one *munājāt* {supplication} under the title *Ḥikam-i ḥaḍrat-i sulṭān al-'ārifīn Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī*. I was not able to see a copy of the second edition, so I do not know when it was published or the nature of the edition. The third edition was published by the Kazan University Press in 1311/1893–4 under the title *Dīwān-i ḥikmet-i sulṭān al-'ārifīn Khwāja Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd*

b. Iftikhār-i Yasawī. It contains on the first page a brief biography taken from the famous biographical dictionary of saints by Ghulām Muḥammad Lāhawrī entitled *Khazīnat al-asfiyā'*, a prose introduction of seventeen pages and 134 *ḥikmats* and one *munājāt.* We can state that this prose introduction, which describes the rules of the {Yasawī} order, has been extracted almost verbatim from {Ḥazīnī's} *Jawāhir.* The fourth edition, which was also published in Kazan in 1896, has 277 pages and, together with the same biography extracted from *Khazīnat al-asfiyā'* and the introduction on the rules of the order as in the third edition, contains 148 *ḥikmats*, fourteen more than in the third edition. The lithographic edition published in Tashkent in 1314/1896–7 has 154 pages containing the prose introduction called *Faqrnāme* and roughly the same *ḥikmats* and, at the end, the *munājāt* found in the third Kazan edition. It includes more *ḥikmats* than the other editions because of the addition, at the end, of *ḥikmats* in the same style belonging to a Yasawī dervish. The Istanbul edition, *Dīwān-i Balāghat-i ʿunwān-i sulṭān al-ʿārifīn Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī*, published in 1299/1881–2 by Ḥājjī Süleyman Efendi, the shaikh of the *dargāh* {dervish convent} of the Özbeks, has 276 pages with an average of twenty-six lines per page. This contains rather more material than the other published editions, and also includes, in addition to the poetry of Aḥmad Yasawī, that of many other well known Ṣūfī poets of Central Asia. This confusion is found in the other editions as well, but to a lesser degree. {Köprülü says that the prose introduction included in the 1311/1893–4 Kazan printing of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* describes the rules of the order and "has been extracted almost verbatim from (Ḥazīnī's) *Jawāhir*;" that the 1896 fourth edition includes the same introduction; and then that the 1314/1896–7 Tashkent publication includes "the prose introduction called *Faqrnāme.*" Depending on one's interpretation of the definite versus indefinite article, Köprülü's phrasing can imply that the prose introduction in the earlier versions might be the same one that is called *Faqrnāme.* In other words, it is not clear if he is implying that the prose introduction in the Tashkent printing is different from the pose introduction in the Kazan versions, or merely that the same prose introduction happens to be ascribed a title in the Tashkent printing. In any case, the *Faqrnāme* is not the same as anything from the *Jawāhir.*}

7 Sayyid ʿImād al-Dīn Nesīmī, who holds a large and important place in Ottoman literature and, according to a very strong tradition, was a disciple of Faḍl Allāh Ḥurūfī, was put to death, as is well known, in Aleppo in 820/1417–18 ({Kātib Chelebi,} *Kashf al-ẓunūn*, vol. 1, p. 401; Laṭīfī, *Tadhkira*, p. 332). His *Dīwān* and legends, which were quite renowned in Iraq, eastern Anatolia, and Azerbaijan, had spread to Khurāsān and Transoxiana during the ninth/fifteenth century. A *majlis* in the *Majālis al-ʿUshshāq* of Amīr Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusain {Tabasī Gāzurgāhī}, who was appointed grand vizier by Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā in 904/1489–99, is devoted to Nesīmī. (In order to understand the error in ascribing this work to Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā, beginning with Kātib Chelebi and continuing to the present, see {Khwāndamīr,} *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, vol. 3, part 3, p. 330, and especially {Bābur's} *Bāburnāme* – the section describing the leading figures of the reign of Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā. There are numerous manuscripts of the *Majālis al-ʿUshshāq* in Istanbul and the libraries of Europe, such as Ayasofya MS 4238). {There is a new edition of the *Majālis*, ed. Ghulām-riżā Ṭaṭāṭabā'ī Majd (Tehran, 1376/1997). Remarkably Köprülü cites this work on Nesīmī, but missed a very interesting story in it that mentions Aḥmad Yasawī (called Ata Yasawī, a form clear in manuscripts, but misread in the new edition). See DeWeese, "Dog Saints and Dog Shrines in Kubravī Tradition: Notes on a Hagiographical Motif from Khwārazm," in Denise Aigle (ed.), *Miracle et karāma: Hagiographies médiévales comparées* (Turnhout, Belgium, 2000), pp. 464–5.} Vambéry also states that Nesīmī's Ṣūfī poetry is esteemed and in demand in Central Asia and has long been recited there (*Čagataische Sprachstudien*, pp. 141–3). {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Nesīmī" (F. Babinger).}

8 For example, as the twenty-first *ḥikmat* there is a *mathnawī* beginning *İlâhî Kâdirâ Perverdigârâ / Rahm kıl bendenga ey Kirdigârâ*; as the twenty-third *ḥikmat* there is a poem praising the Prophet in very polished language beginning *Başımga tüşüb naʿra-i sevdâ-yi Muhammed / Men anı ucun gûyida şeydâ-yi Muhammed*; as the twelfth *ḥikmat* there is another such poem beginning *Bizdin dürûd bisyâr Yâ Mustafâ Muhammed*; as the thirty-third *ḥikmat* there is a smooth poem that ends with the line *Ehl-i dil bolgan kişi gamkîn göngülnü şâd iter*; as the fifty-third *ḥikmat* there is a *ghazal* beginning *Garîbligda garîb bolgan garîblar / Garîblar hâlini bilgen garîblar*; as the fifty-sixth *ḥikmat* there is a hymn with Arabic lines in a polished *fāʿilātun*, *fāʿilātun*, *fāʿilun* meter; as the fifty-seventh *ḥikmat* there is a *mathnawī*, beginning *Muhammed'ni biling zâtı Arab'dur / Tarîkatni yolu küll-i edebdür* about the Prophet and in *mathnawī* form; as the ninety-second *ḥikmat* there is a very smooth poem in the meter *mafʿūlu mafāʿīlu mafāʿīlu faʿūlun*; as the one hundredth *ḥikmat* there is a poem written in the meter of four *mafāʿīluns*; as the one hundred and second *ḥikmat* there is a very well composed five-line stanza with the refrain, *Sûfî-nakş oldun velî her giz müsülmân bolmadıng*; as the one hundred and seventh and one hundred and eleventh *ḥikmats* there are two poems written in the *fāʿilātun*, *fāʿilātun*, *fāʿilun* meter; as the one hundred and twenty-seventh *ḥikmat* there is a *ghazal* whose first verse is *Dem bu demdur özke dem nidem dime / Dünyâdin bî-gam ötärsin gam dime*; as the one hundred and thirty-fifth *ḥikmat* there is a *munājāt* whose first verse is *Ayâ şâhî du ʿâlem pâdişâhı / İrürsin bendeni puşt ü penâhî*; and finally there is a long and rather polished *munājāt* in the meter *mafāʿīlun*, *mafāʿīlun*, *faʿūlun*. In the sixth/twelfth century, however, it was impossible to write such polished poetry in so many different *ʿarūḍ* meters.

9 {It is difficult to determine how Köprülü knew this for certain.}

10 The *Daftar-i thānī* is mentioned in a number of places in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* (Istanbul edn, pp. 2, 17, 28, 74, 147):

Riyâzetni katıg tartıb kanlar yutub
Min defter-i sânî sözdin actım mana
{I suffered hard austerities, swallowed blood;
I began to utter the Second Notebook.}

Kul Hâca Ahmed men defter-i sânî aytım
İki âlem işretların meyga saydım
{I am the slave, Khwāja Aḥmad, I uttered the Second Notebook.
I reckoned the enjoyments of both worlds as wine.}

Min defter-i sânî aytım kani kulak
Kan-yaş tökülb yıglamaslar misl-i bulak
{I uttered the Second Notebook. Where are ears?
They weep not, pouring bloody tears like a fountain.}

Tâze tâze Ḥikmet'larım sânî defter
İsiz sözüm nâdânlarka kılur ebter
{My brand-new *ḥikmats*, the Second Notebook –
Alas! My words confound the foolish.}

Min defter-i sânî aytım sizka yâdigâr
Ervâhimdin meded tiläb okung zinhâr
{I uttered the Second Notebook to you as a memento.
Read them seeking help from my spirits, take heed!}

11 {After coming close to acknowledging problems in the attribution of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* to Aḥmad Yasawī – if this work includes a mix of Aḥmad Yasawī's verse with that of a later "Aḥmad," then the latter's contribution could presumably be close to

100 per cent – Köprülü backs away, saying even the extant *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* shows us the "literary personality" of Aḥmad Yasawī.}

12 For additional information on Ispījāb or Isfījāb, see {Yāqūt,} *Mu'jam al-buldān* (vol. 1, p. 230). Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī says that the city of Sairām, which was well known with the nickname Madīnat al-Baiḍā' {"White City"}, was also called Ispījāb (*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 3, p. 133). Extensive and explicit information on Ispījāb can be found in all the Arab geographers. {See Barthold, *Turkestan Down to the Mongol Invasion*, pp. 169–79; *EIr*, s.v. "Asfījāb" (C. E. Bosworth); *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Sayrām" (P. B. Golden).}

13 *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 1, pp. 27–8. Abū Dulaf, who made a long journey from Bukhārā to China during the time of the Sāmānid ruler Naṣr II b. Aḥmad {301–31/914–43} presents the Turkish tribes along the routes that he took as follows: "First the خرکه (Charuq: جرق), a month later the طحطاح (Tatars?), twenty days later the بخا/بجا (?), then the Pechenegs, after traveling twelve days among them the Chigil, after traveling forty days the Bughraj (Ughraq?), a month later the Tübet (تبت), forty days later the Kimek/Mimak, after traveling a month among them the Ghuz/Oghuz, after traveling a month among them the Toghuz-ghuz/Toquz Oghuz, after traveling twenty days among them the Qirghiz, after traveling a month among them the Kharlukh/Qarluq, after traveling twenty-five days among them the خطلخ (Halaj), and then the ختیان (Khiṭāy?)." Abū Dulaf mentions that among these tribes the Kimek and Qirghiz had their own special writings {*yazılar*}, indeed, that the Qirghiz had verse compositions to be recited at prayer times. (This traveler's account, the Arabic text of which was published with a Latin translation in Berlin in 1845, is found in full in {Yāqūt's} *Mu'jam al-buldān* under "al-Ṣīn"; the Turkish trans. is in Şerefeddin, "Eski Türk memleketlerinde," *YM*, no. 59, {29 August, 1918, pp. 134–6}). In any case, the information given by these sources urgently needs to be critically analyzed and expanded upon. {Köprülü's notes on Abū Dulaf no longer have any scholarly value. The basic edition is V. Minorsky, *Abū Dulaf Mis'ar ibn Muhalhil's Travels in Iran (circa AD 950): Arabic Text with an English Translation and Commentary* (Cairo, 1955). Cf. Peter Golden, *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*, pp. 194–211.} Géza Kuun, while translating {into Hungarian} the information that Gardīzī gives {in Persian} on the Turks in the *Hungarian Journal of Oriental Studies* {*Keleti Szemle*}, also collects with it, in the form of additional notes to the text, the information that the Arab geographers give on them and thus, by compiling all this information, makes a simple attempt to describe this subject ({"Gurdēzī a törökökről,"} *Keleti Szemle*, 2 (1901), 1–5; 3 (1902), 32–44, 81–94, 253–61; 4 (1903), 17–40, 129–41, 257–83; 5 (1904), 130–52). However, because it was not possible to compile properly the information given by all the Muslim and Chinese historians on this subject, this attempt comes across as rudimentary. This being said, these articles were not written, in fact, with this purpose in mind. Because it would take us very far from our subject and, indeed, require a separate study, I cannot give here a detailed description of the relationship of these different tribes to each other and their geographical areas. In any case, it should not be forgotten that in subsequent periods they moved to other locations.

14 Soghdia, which already constituted an Iranian satrapy between the Amu Darya and Syr Darya at the time of the Achaemenids, had its capital at Samarqand. The Arab geographers placed this region, which they named Sughd, between Bukhārā and Samarqand and included Samarqand within it. Indeed, Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Muqaddasī states that it had twelve cities, six in the north and six in the south ({Yāqūt,} *Mu'jam al-buldān*, vol. 5, p. 86). The Turks began to play an important role in this area around the middle of the sixth century CE. At that time or a little later, expanding their empire toward the west, they conquered the Hepthalites and then took control of Soghdia. This brought them into close contact with Iranian peoples and civilization (V. Thomsen, "Inscriptions de l'Orkhon {déchiffrées}," {*Mémoires de*

la Société Finno-ougrienne,} Helsinki, 5 [1896], p. 54). Campaigns against the Sughdaqs around the Iron Gate are mentioned in the Orkhon Inscriptions. In connection with this, Prof. Thomsen says, citing {the sixth-century Byzantine historian} Menander Protektor and J. De Guignes {*Histoire général des huns, des turcs, des mongols et des autres tartares occidentaux* (Paris, 1756–8)}, that this country had been subject to the Turks since the time of Mūqān Khān (*ibid.*, p. 154, no. 38). As a result of recent research on the Soghdian language, we have learned that it was a dialect of old Persian. Al-Kāshgharī, however, not only indicates that the Sughdaqs, i.e. the Soghdians, knew both Turkish and Soghdian, but adds that the people of Balāsāghūn, Ṭarāz, and Sairām also spoke both languages (on Persian words found in Turkish, see n.20 below). The explanation that the same writer gives of the word Sughdaq clarifies this point somewhat. According to him, the Sughdaqs who had come to Balāsāghūn had, in fact, come from Soghdia – the area between Bukhārā and Samarqand; they dressed like the Turks and adopted their habits ({*Dīwān lughāt al-turk,*} vol. 1, p. 391). Evidently a group of Soghdians migrated from Soghdia to the northeast, the region of Ṭarāz, Balāsāghūn, and Sairām, where, although mixing with the Turks and becoming Turkified, they were able to preserve their old language to some degree. It is likely that this partial migration occurred around the time that the armies of Islam arrived in Transoxiana – because the Tukiyu Turks, having previously passed through the Iron Gate to Soghdia and reaching as far as the Indus, had had close relations with the Soghdians for a long time {"Tukiyu" in Western books usually appears as T'u-chüeh, the Chinese designation for the Turk steppe empire of the sixth to eighth centuries. This is probably a transcription of *Türk*, though some think it stands for *Türküt*. Below in n.15, for example, Köprülü calls them the Göktürk, which is the usual designation for this empire in Turkey} – but for now we can say nothing definite about this. As for the Ganjāks, who are also described as knowing Turkish and Soghdian, there is not much information on them in the *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*. We only learn that the Ganjāk dialect was predominant in the area around Kāshghar, but in the city itself Khāqāniyya Turkish was spoken (vol. 1, p. 31); and that the letter *hā'* (ها), which did not exist in Turkish, was found among the Ganjāks in some words that were not of Turkish origin (vol. 3, p. 85). On the Arghu, see the details given below.

15 It is not possible to give here detailed information from Chinese and Arab sources on these different branches of the Turks. Let me just briefly present the information that al-Kāshgharī gives on them and their languages and compare it with that in various Chinese and Arabic sources.

The branches given by al-Kāshgharī that were named the Chomul, Qay, Yabaqu, Basmıl, and Tatar nomads and were situated on the eastern march of the Turkish area – namely, the Chomul between the Charuq and the Uighurs, and the other four tribes among the Yimak, Bashqird, and Qirghiz – were tribes, some of which were evidently not Turks but had become Turkish speaking as a result of mixing with the Turks, while others, who were Turks, had acquired a very peculiar dialect and had not completely lost it.

Yāqūt, citing al-Bīrūnī {d. *c.*442/1050}, indicates that the area of the Qay and Qun was to the east of the Qirghiz, Kimek, and Toquz Oghuz, thus approaching al-Kāshgharī's report (vol. 1, p. 31). Because nomadic tribes like these easily changed their location in those centuries, al-Kāshgharī's placement of the Qirghiz in a region to the east of them should be seen as natural. On the other hand, because there is no mention in his *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* of the type of Turkish that they spoke, they apparently were not as important as the other branches of the Turks. Based on Muḥammad 'Awfī's *Jāmi' al-ḥikāyāt*, Prof. Marquart has asserted the likelihood that the Qayı were in fact Mongols who were later Turkified, but he also adds that Rashīd al-Dīn reports that the Qayı were at the head of the Oghuz tribes (the bibliographical article written

by Dr F. Giese entitled "Kumanların kavmiyetine dâir" {this is part 2 of Giese's review article "Türk elsine ve tarihine dâir bazı yeni alman neşriyatı" in *Darülfünûn Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 1 [1332–4], pp. 290–3}). However, the Qayı whom Rashīd al-Dīn considers to be among the Oghuz clans, i.e. the clan whom al-Kāshgharī calls the Qayığ, and these Qay are completely separate from each other. The *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* clearly shows this, but, on the other hand, it also confirms ʿAwfī with respect to the suggestion that the Qay were in fact not Turks but had later been Turkified. {Köprülü later did additional work on the Qay, see his "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunun etnik menşei mes'eleleri," *Belleten*, 7 (1943), 219–313, and "Kay kabilesi hakkında yeni notlar," *Belleten*, 8 (1944), 421–52.}

The Turkified people whom al-Kāshgharī calls the Tatars are those whom the Chinese had called Tatars since the third/ninth century, so they are indeed Mongols (Thomsen citing Klaproth {*Asia polyglotta* (Paris, 1831)} and W. Schott {"Älteste Nachrichten von Mongolen un Tataren," *Philologische und historische Abhandlungen der König. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1845, pp. 445–74}, *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées*, p. 140). Al-Kāshgarī's statement in *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* about their having separate languages implies, however, that the Yabaqu, Chomul, and Basmıl were also not originally Turks but were later Turkified like the Tatars and Qay, whom we strongly believe were of Mongol origin. The historical information that we have on these peoples does not, however, support this.

I believe that the Yabaqu in the *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* were an Uighur tribe subject to the Göktürks and were the nomadic Turkish tribe mentioned by the Chinese as Pa-ye-ku and in the Kültigin inscriptions as the Yırbāyīrqu (Thomsen, *Inscriptions*, p. 109). If this is correct, we find them in the first half of the seventh century CE in the Yu-Tu-Kiyun {= Ötüken} mountains with the other Uighurs and as subjects of Hsien-pi Kaghan. In 716 CE, the Göktürk ruler Mo-ch'o carried out a punitive operation against them and defeated them near the Tula river. On his return, however, a number of Pa-ye-ku took advantage of his carelessness while passing through a forest, captured and beheaded him. In short, all information obtained from Chinese sources indicates they were related to the Uighurs and lived in the same areas as the Uighurs (Thomsen, *ibid.*, p. 72; Chavannes, *Documents*, pp. 88, 89, 91, 95). {Al-Kāshgarī's} *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* also states that they were with the Uighurs who had not yet adopted Islam and, indeed, that in the fifth/eleventh century a force composed of 40,000 Muslim Basmıl Turks under the command of Ghāzī Arslan Tigin, and with the help of the Prophet, defeated a force of 700,000 Yabaqu under the command of Büke (*Dīwān*, vol. 3, p. 173). There is a long poem in the *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* about this event {see Dankoff, "Three Turkic Verse Cycles Relating to Inner Asian Warfare," *Harvard Ukranian Studies*, 3–4 (1979–80), part 1, pp. 151–65}. Although the non-Muslim nomadic Yabaqu were actually a Turkish tribe ethnically related to the Uighurs, it is clear that they spoke a dialect that was quite different from the Turkish of Kāshghar because their population was undoubtedly significant – even if we consider the size of the army that they fielded to be an exaggeration. Al-Kāshgharī also states that the famous Yamār river was a great river in the area of the Yabaqu (*Dīwān*, vol. 3, p. 21), that the Yabaqu river rose in the Kāshghar mountains and flowed through Farghāna to Özjand (*ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 27), and that there was a Turkish tribe called the Edhgish in Özjand (*ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 89).

As for the Chomul, about whom al-Kāshgharī gives absolutely no information, they must be the tribe called Cho-mi/Tch'ou-mi in Chinese sources. During the time of the T'ang, this tribe lived on the banks of the Manas river west of Urumchi (Chavannes, *Documents*, p. 31).

The Basmıl were the Turkish tribe whom the Chinese called the Pa-si-mi, as Thomsen originally proposed. According to Chinese sources, they had ethnic ties to

the Turks and their chiefs were related to the A-shih-na family, as was the case with the Göktürks. They originally lived along the Hopog river in Tabargatay east of Choghujhaq (Tchougutchuk). In the second/eighth century, they migrated and occupied Beshbalıg. During this century, the Basmıl sometimes acted in unison with the Western Göktürks and Uighurs. Other times, they suffered from their attacks, or they united with the Toquz Uighurs and Qarluqs and became involved in political activities by creating a confederation of eleven tribes (Thomsen, *Inscriptions*, pp. 76, 178; Chavannes, *Documents*, pp. 29, 86, 94). This information, which very clearly shows the ethnic relationship of the Basmıl with the Qarluqs and T'u-chüeh, describes at the same time their political relations with the Uighurs. Al-Kāshgharī's account states that they were Muslims in the fifth/eleventh century, that they lived a nomadic life in a region near the non-Muslim Uighurs, Yabaqu, and Chomul, and that they fought with the Yabaqu. As for the question of their having a separate language like the others, we could attribute this to the nomadic Basmıl having a dialect that was different from Kāshghar Turkish.

It appears, then, that the Qay and Tatars, who were originally Mongols and later were Turkified, as well as the Chomul, Yabaqu, and Basmıl, who were true Turks, all spoke separate dialects in addition to Kāshghar Turkish, which had a firm hold on all the Eastern Turks in the fifth/eleventh century, and these dialects were rather different from it. It is not possible to interpret al-Kāshgharī's strange statement in any other way according to the form and degree of our current knowledge.

16 From this group, I see no need to go into great detail here on the Qirghiz, Qipchaqs, and Oghuz. Historical and linguistic information on the Qipchaqs and Oghuz will be given below to the extent that it concerns our subject. As for the Qirghiz, sufficient information can be found on them in almost all the Arab geographers and a summary of the information given by Chinese sources – based on the studies of such scholars as C. Visdelou {*Bibliothèque orientale* . . . (Maastricht, 1780)}, Schott, Radloff, and Klaproth – is found in Thomsen's work (*Inscriptions*, p. 140). This people, who extended across an area stretching from the banks of the upper Yenisey south to the Tang-nu mountains, lived separately and independently of the Göktürks. Although they were defeated by the Uighurs shortly after the first half of the eighth century CE, they later became powerful and in 840 overthrew the Uighur Empire (*ibid*.). According to Istakhrī, the Qirghiz were surrounded by the Toquz Oghuz, Kimek, the "sea," Qarluqs, and the lands of the Oghuz. According to Gardīzī, the Toquz Oghuz were to the south of them and the Kimek were to the west of them. Yāqūt, however, shows them to the east of the Kimek and the Toquz Oghuz. (See {Yāqūt,} *Mu'jam al-buldān* and {M. J. de Goeje (ed.),} *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum* {Leiden, 1870–94}). {This material has been collected by Ramazan Şeşen, *İslâm coğrafyacılarına göre Türkler ve Türk ülkeleri* (Ankara, 1985).} Muḥammad 'Awfī states that the Kimek were north of the Qirghiz (northwest) and the Yaghma and Qarluqs were to their west (Marquart, "Über das Volkstum der Komanan," {i.e. Chapter 2 of *Osttürkische Dialekstudien*,} p. 39, text).

Al-Kāshgharī gives no information on the Ughraq, but they were probably the same as the Arghu just as the Soghdians were called Sughdaqs (for more information on the Arghu, see below n.33). Among the various Turkish tribes mentioned in a Syriac text written in 569 CE are the Bulghars, Suwars, Avars, and Ughārs (Chavannes, *Documents*, p. 250). I believe that the latter were the Ughraqs. Based on his name, the famous Saif al-Dīn Ūghrāq, whom we see {in Juvainī} as one of the greatest commanders of Jalāl al-Dīn the Khwārazm-Shāh and the chief of the Khalaj and Turkmen, must have belonged to this tribe (Juvainī, *Jahān-Gushā*, vol. 2, p. 308).

As for the Charuq, they lived in the city of Bārjūq where, according to legend, Afrāsiyāb imprisoned Bīzhān ({al-Kāshgarī,} *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 1, p. 318).

It appears that these branches, about whose dialects virtually no details are found in al-Kāshgharī's book, did not have great importance in the Turkish world, but they are clearly listed among the Eastern Turks, namely the Qarluqs, Chigil, Tokhsı, and Yaghma. Information on the Chigil, Tokhsı, and Yaghma Turks will be given below while discussing the Qarluqs.

17 Information on the Yimak is given below. Because al-Kāshgharī gives no more information on the Bashqirds, Bulghars, Suwars, and Pechenegs than that known to date by the scholarly world, I will not go into further detail on them. In his *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, he only mentions, in addition to these Pechenegs who resided near Rūm {Anatolia}, another group, the Bejaneks, who were an Oghuz tribe (vol. 1, p. 404). For the dialect of the original Pechenegs, see below.

18 *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 1, pp. 29–31.

19 The details scattered throughout the *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* allow one to form a judgment on this matter. For example, while describing dialectical differences, the author says that words beginning with *yā'* (ى) among the Eastern Turks are changed to *alif* (ا) or *jīm* (ج) by the Oghuz and Qipchaqs; words beginning with *mīm* (م) among the Eastern Turks change to *bā'* (ب) among the Oghuz, Qipchaqs, and Suwars; words beginning with *dāl* (د) change to *tā'* (ت); and the three-dot *fā'* (ف), which is called the *fā-i türkīye* among the Eastern Turks and is pronounced between a *fā'* and a *bā'*, is replaced by *wāw* (و) among the Oghuz Turkmen (vol. 1, pp. 31–3, vol. 2, pp. 154, 253). The dialectal split is invariable in nouns of time and place and in verbal nouns. For instance, while the Khāqāniyya Turks, the Chigil, Yaghma, Tokhsı, Arghu, and Uighurs say *Bargu yir* (the place to go), the Oghuz, Qipchaqs, Pechenegs, and Bulghars say *barası yir*. In like manner, while these eastern branches say *bu turgu yir irmas* (this is not the place to stop), the western branches say *bu turasi yir tigil* (vol. 1, pp. 34–5; vol. 2, pp. 56–8). The same difference occurs in the names of instruments. Whereas the Khāqāniyya Turks say *yıgaç biçgu nang* (something to cut wood), the Oghuz say *yıgaç bicasi nang* (vol. 2, p. 58). In addition, we know that the Oghuz and Qipchaqs deleted the *ghain* (غ) from the middle of words – for example, while the other Turks say *tamgak* (palate), they use *tamak*, and in like manner they say *baran* instead of *bargan* (the one who goes) (vol. 1, p. 35). When al-Kāshgharī mentions various Turkish dialects, he not only describes their phonological characteristics, but sometimes also records certain lexical items that were of local significance; for instance, he reports that some words belonged only to the Chigil, or Arghu, or Qipchaqs. It is obvious, however, when his book is analyzed from beginning to end, that the primary subjects are Khāqāniyya Turkish and Oghuz, i.e. Eastern Turkish and Western Turkish. Among the terms given, there are many that were particular to the Oghuz or that were unknown to them and used by other Turks. Furthermore, al-Kāshgharī reports that because the Oghuz had mingled a lot with the Persians, they had forgotten many of their own words and had replaced them with Persian words (vol. 1, p. 73). A proverb from that period demonstrates, as much as any other historical document, that the Turks were then living cheek by jowl with the Persians: *Tatsız Türk bolmas / başsız börk bolmas* {No Turk without a Tat / no hat without a head}. Here the Persians are meant by *Tat*. Nevertheless, al-Kāshgharī says that the Yaghma and Tokhsı Turks also called the unbelieving Uighurs *Tat* because they considered them to be foreigners (vol. 2, p. 225). *Börk* was the famous red conical hat {*külâh*} that we also find among the Anatolian Turks up to the tenth/sixteenth century. We also learn from the same source that the Oghuz used the word *Sukak* to allude to the Persians (vol. 2, p. 229).

20 Persian words were also found in the Turkish language before the coming of Islam. Not only does one encounter New Persian terms like *dost* and *dushmān* in the copy of the Oghuz legend {but this is now believed to belong to the Mongol period!} written in the Uighur alphabet (Radloff, *Das Kudatku-Bilik*), but one also finds words deriving

from the Iranian Soghdian dialect in the Old Turkish works that have recently appeared in Eastern Turkistan (Thomsen, "Ein Blatt in türkischer 'Runen' Schrift aus Turfan," *Sitzungsberichte der (Berliner, d.h.) Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1910, {pp. 296–306}). On this subject, see the studies by F. C. Andreas {*The Book of Mainyo-i-khard* . . . (Kiel, 1882)}. According to al-Kāshgharī, the people of Balāsāghūn, Ṭarāz, and Sairām spoke both Soghdian and Turkish (*Dīwān*, vol. 1, p. 31). In any case, the reason for the appearance of Persian words in these Old Turkish works is either because this group of people were Turkified Soghdians or – much less likely – they were Turks who had been under Soghdian influence (see n.14 of this chapter). There is no need to describe here the strong influence that Islam later had on the Turkish language. Al-Kāshgharī, in fact, by clearly specifying in his introduction to his *Dīwān* that he recorded only pure Turkish words, acknowledges the adulteration of contemporary Turkish. One can also clearly deduce from al-Kāshgharī's work that the dialects of the Khāqāniyya Turks and of the still non-Muslim Uighurs were very similar. Barthold quite rightly attributes this influence {i.e. the influence of the Uighurs on the Khāqāniyya Turks} to the fact that the Turco-Muslim rulers who reigned in Kāshghar were more learned and civilized than the early Seljuk chiefs (Barthold, *Turkestan*, {English trans., p. 311}).

21 *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 1, p. 10. While discussing the Uighurs, al-Kāshgharī says, a bit obscurely: "Not only is their language pure Turkish, but they also have a separate language in which they converse among themselves and, as I explained at the beginning of the book, they have a script composed of twenty-four letters with which correspondence is written. In addition, the Uighurs and Chinese have another different writing system with which they write holy books and registers {*dawāwīn*}, and only the infidels can read them" (vol. 1, p. 30 {English trans. Dankoff and James Kelly, vol. 1, p. 83}). What could be the separate language that these Uighurs, whose language was pure Turkish, spoke among themselves? Even if we consider the script that the Uighurs shared with the Chinese, in addition to their own, to be the Buddhist {Chinese?}, the problem of this "separate language" still needs to be resolved. In certain respects, we find very clear Islamic influence in this Eastern Turkish of the fifth/eleventh century. For example, while the word *yalavac* at first corresponded to {the Arabic term} *rasūl* in the meaning of both "prophet" and "envoy," we know that under the influence of Islam, *rasūl* was appropriated exclusively as the equivalent of "prophet," and *yalavar* appeared as the equivalent of "envoy" (vol. 2, p. 231). We also know that at that time the secretaries who wrote the Turkish correspondence of the sultans – this must be the Seljuk Sultans – with the Turkish {i.e. Uighur} script were called *alımga* (vol. 1, p. 127) and that the pens used to write in the Turkish script were made from the *uc* tree (vol. 1, p. 38). These *alımgas* of the Oghuz were none other than the *bakhshis* of the Uighurs. (For general information on the writing system of the Uighurs and to learn the major sources on this subject, see my *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* {reprinted 1981, pp. 27–31}).

22 *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 1, pp. 7–9.

23 Al-Kāshgharī dubs Qarluqs "Turkmen" (*ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 139; vol. 3, p. 259). We know very well, however, that the Turkmen were Oghuz (*ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 304; {Yāqūt,} *Mu'jam al-buldān*, vol. 1, p. 41; an abundance of sources are unanimous on this point). Now, all the Arab geographers agree that the Qarluqs were distinct from the Oghuz; so how should one interpret al-Kāshgharī's statement? In my view, the reason for this discrepancy is very clear: the word "Turkmen" was a title – the etymology of which has not yet been determined for certain – that was given to the Oghuz, in particular after Islam. It is very likely that because al-Kāshgharī used this vague expression to mean Muslim Turk, he also applied it to the Qarluqs who, along with the Oghuz, had adopted Islam. In fact, the information given in his work on the Qarluqs and their

language clearly shows that they could not be considered Oghuz, i.e. Western Turks. Other sources corroborate this. There is one aspect of this matter that is especially noteworthy. While speaking at the beginning of his work about the regions to which the Turks spread and their dialects, al-Kāshgharī never mentions the name Qarluq; and in the area to which the other Arab geographers assign them, he indicates {only} the Chigil, Yaghma, and Tokhsı and especially that the Chigil were the most important among them. We learn from al-Kāshgharī's clear and explicit statement where the Chigil were found in the fifth/eleventh century. (1) The nomadic Chigil lived beyond Barsghān in Qayās – al-Kāshgharī gives three towns with that name, all of them belonging to the Tokhsı and Chigil (*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 3, p. 129). (2) There was a Chigil fortress near Ṭarāz, which was in the country of the Arghu. The Chigil were found there. Indeed, all the Arab geographers mention this city. (3) There was also a place with this name around Kāshghar. Because the country of the Oghuz adjoined that of the Chigil, they were always at war. Traces of this old hostility were found even as late as the fifth/eleventh century. The Oghuz gave this title to all the Turks who dressed like the Chigil – because they had a distinctive dress – and so they considered, erroneously of course, all the Turkish territories stretching from the Amu Darya to upper China to be Chigil (*ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 329–30). We gather that the Chigil had their own particular dress – even their tall felt caps {*börk*}, i.e. their conical hats {*külâh*}, were different from those of the other Turks (*ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 132). We also gather from a number of al-Kāshgharī's important descriptions of the Chigil dialect that it was Eastern Turkish – very close to the language of the Orkhon Inscriptions – and that it was extremely close to the Yaghma, Tokhsı, Arghu, and Uighur dialects. Thus, what al-Kāshgharī calls Khāqāniyya Turkish was the form of this dialect spoken in Kāshghar. In the Orkhon Inscriptions, there is the term İzgil. Thomsen considered this to be the name of an unknown people and quite rightly connected it to the term İçgil-İçgül, which Rashīd al-Dīn mentions as one of the ten rivers in the country of the Uighurs. İzgil is probably nothing but Chigil (*Inscriptions de l'Orkhon*, p. 160, no. 52). All of this linguistic and geographical evidence suggests that the Chigil were the largest and most important branch of the Qarluqs. It will be demonstrated below that Kāshghar Turkish was Qarluq Turkish, that the Qarluqs were ethnically related to the Göktürks, and that later, by seizing their summer pastures around the Chu and Talas rivers, they forced the Oghuz to withdraw to the northwest. When all of this is compared with the information that I have given about the Chigil, it seems indisputable that the Chigil were one of the most important branches of the Qarluqs. Nevertheless, in order to prove this decisively – and also the idea, weakly advanced below by Grenard and Grigor'ev, that it was the Qarluqs who established the Khānate of Kāshghar and that Kāshghar Turkish was Qarluq Turkish – let me cite the clear account of 'Awfī and Gardīzī (from Marquart's work, {"Über das Volkstum der Komanen,"} p. 39):

دیگر از ترکان خرلخ (قارلوق) اند ومسکن ایشان کوه یونس بوده است وآن کوه کوه زرست (التون طاغ) وایشان بندگان تغز غز (اویغور) بودند وبروی عاصی شدند وبزمین تورکستان بیرون آمدند وبعض در بلاد اسلام آمدند وایشان نه فرقند : سه چکلی وسه هسکی یکی ندا ویکی کوالین وتخسین

{Another branch of the Turks are the Kharlukh (Qarluq). Their homeland was Jonah's mountain, which was Golden Mountain (Altun Tagh). They were slaves of the

Toghuzghuz (Uighurs), against whom they rebelled. They emerged in the territory of Turkestan and the lands of Islam. They are nine groups: three Chigil, three Hsk(?), one Ndā(?), one Kwālīn(?), one Tukhsīn.} This account, which shows that the Chigil constituted an important branch of the Qarluqs and that the Tokhsı were also from the Qarluqs, definitely corroborates my assertion above and confirms the information that I will give below on the Qarluqs, which is cited from Thomsen and the studies of Chavannes and Visdelou. Gardīzī also says that all the Chigil were found on the road from Tumket (تمشكت?) to Kümberket, that the area around Issik-Kul, which al-Kāshgharī also mentions under the name Lake Barsghān (*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 3, p. 99), was completely inhabited by the Chigil, that it was five parasangs from Issik-Kul to Tangkut and from there a three-day trip to Barsghān, and that along the way there were nothing but the tents of the Chigil (Kuun, {"Gurdēzī,"} sixth article {*sic*}, *Keleti Szemle*, no. 4, 1902 {part 6 is in 4 (1903)}). These reports, which completely confirm the information given by al-Kāshgharī and the other Muslim geographers, tend to support and clarify my assertion.

24 Grenard, *Turkestan*, p. 48. It is readily apparent from the reports of Chinese historians that the Qarluqs, whom the Chinese called Ko-lo-lu, were in fact ethnically related to the Göktürks. They lived northwest of Pei-t'ing, i.e. Beshbalıg, and west of the Altun mountains. They were divided into three groups or clans. In 650 CE or a little later, they acquired authority over a province of China and their chiefs – according to Chinese accounts – took the name Tu-tu, i.e. Tudun. The Qarluqs, who were surrounded by the Göktürks on the east and west, would tailor their movements according to the strength or weakness of the Göktürks. They slowly advanced toward the south and their chiefs took the name Shih-hu. The Qarluqs were brave and warlike. After 742 CE they became subject to the Uighurs and migrated to the Ötüken mountains (Thomsen, who cites Visdelou, *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon*, p. 71, n.3. For more information, see Chavannes, *Documents*, pp. 85–6). The title *se-kin* that one comes across in Chinese sources is nothing but a form of the term *sagun*, which al-Kāshgharī says was given to high-ranking men of the Qarluqs ({*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*,} vol. 1, p. 337). In his article on the famous city of Balāsāghūn, Barthold states that this word did not exist in the Turkish dialects (*EI*[1], s.v. "Balāsāghūn," {cf. *EIr*, s.v. "Balāsāgūn" (C. E. Bosworth)}), but he is mistaken. Moreover, al-Kāshgharī records the term *ātāsāghūn*, meaning "physician."

25 Grenard, *Turkestan*, p. 94. Barthold also gives the same information based on Ibn Ḥawqal (*EI*[1], s.v. "Ghuzz"). In his article "Über das Volkstum der Komanen," Marquart writes that after the collapse of the state of the Western Turks, the summer pastures around the Chu and Talas rivers were seized by the Qarluqs; and the Western Turks, i.e. the Oghuz, being forced to withdraw toward the northwest, subsequently defeated the Pechenegs who lived at that time around the Aral Sea and in the valley of the Syr Darya (see Giese's bibliographical article "Kumanların kavmiyetine dâir" {i.e. his "Türk elsine ve tarihine dâir bazı yeni alman neşriyatı"}, p. 291).

26 Chavannes, in his valuable work on the Western Turks {*Documents*}, basically accepts this idea, which was proposed by Grenard in his article "La légende de Satok Boghra Khân et l'histoire." According to Chavannes, it is very likely that those who succeeded the Western Turks and constituted the lineage of the Bughrā Khāns in Balāsāghūn were Qarluqs. But he adds, "Even if it is not correct to consider the Bughrā Khāns to have originated from the Uighurs, it should not be forgotten that the Qarluqs were very frequently included in the Uighur confederation. This confederation, which took the name 'the Eleven Tribes,' was composed of the Toquz Oghuz, Basmıl, and also the Qarluqs. For this reason, one should not be surprised that the *Kutadgu Bilig* was written in Uighur. Because even if the Qarluqs were racially related to the Göktürks, they were politically bound to the Uighurs" (p. 86). It must be admitted that neither

Grenard's assertion about the linguistic character of the *Kutadgu Bilig* nor Chavannes's objection to it is based on scientific evidence. However, the information that I have been setting forth here on the distribution of the various Turkish dialects in Central Asia during the fifth/eleventh and sixth/twelfth centuries and their closeness to each other supports only Grenard's assertion. The work of a Turk born in the city of Balāsāghūn, which was inhabited by the Qarluqs or the Arghu who were one of their branches, and written in Kāshghar, which was also inhabited by the Qarluqs, could certainly not have had any other linguistic character. It can be seen from the most superficial analysis of al-Kāshgharī's *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* that Kāshghar Turkish, which the author calls Khāqāniyya Turkish, is the same as the language of the *Kutadgu Bilig*. Some information is given below concerning the relationship of this Qarluq Turkish to the language of the Orkhon Inscriptions. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that this Khāqāniyya Turkish was close to Uighur Turkish and that both fall within the sphere of Eastern Turkish.

27 In an important article entitled "Sur le système des consonnes dans la langue ouïgoure," {*Keleti Szemle*, 2 (1901), 241–59} Thomsen, while giving a very important criticism of the way in which Radloff read the *Kutadgu Bilig*, carefully noted that the language of the Orkhon Inscriptions was extremely close to that of the *Kutadgu Bilig* and, as a result of this study, categorically established that the vocalic {rather, consonantal} system in the *Kutadgu Bilig* and in the Orkhon Inscriptions were, with almost no exceptions, identical ("Sur le système," pp. 244–7). Radloff also accepted this close relationship between the old Göktürk inscriptions and the *Kutadgu Bilig*.

Additionally, there is a point of morphology that is common to the language of these inscriptions, the *Kutadgu Bilig*, the old Kuman dialect, and the old Seljuk-Ottoman (i.e. Oghuz) dialect, which, although it has attracted great attention from European scholars who have specialized in Turkish linguistics and has been studied and explained quite well, also needs to be supplemented with the information provided by {al-Kāshgharī's} *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*. Focusing his attention on words in the Orkhon Inscriptions that end in *-daci/-deci*, e.g. *boldacı*, Thomsen asserted, in opposition to Radloff, that this form is found in the poem of Yūsuf and Zulaikhā published by Houtsma ({"Ein alttürkisches Gedicht: (eine vorislamische Bearbeitung des biblischen Romans von Joseph und Zulaika; aus der Dresdner Handschrift herausgegeben und überstetzt),"} *ZDMG*, 43 [1889], p. 74), in a glossary published in 1894 in Leiden by the same author (*Ein türkisch-arabisches Glossar*, p. 42) and in the *Codex Cumanicus* (ed. Kuun {Budapest, 1880; reprinted Budapest, 1981} p. 104) and that, as far as the tense usage was concerned, it expressed the future (*Inscriptions de l'Orkhon*, pp. 162–3). However, words in this form also exist in the *Kutadgu Bilig*, as Thúry ("Ondördüncü 'asır sonlarına kadar Türk dili yâdıgârları," p. 94) and then Brockelmann (*'Ali's Qissa'i Jusuf*, no. 51, p. 33) have previously reported. According to al-Kāshgharī, among the Eastern Turks, i.e. apart from the Oghuz and Qipchaqs, active participles are in the form *közetküci/* "one who watches, guard," *bititküci/* "one who writes, scribe," *sufgurguci/* "one who waters," *yükünküci/* "one who prostrates." Among the Oghuz and Qipchaqs, i.e. the Western Turks, the corresponding words are: *gözetici* from the assimilation of *közettaci*, *bititdaci*, *sufgurdaci*, *yükündaci* ({*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*,} vol. 2, pp. 131, 203, 239, 256; vol. 3, p. 232). We also clearly understand that this form, which, according to al-Kāshgharī, was unique to the Western Turks, expressed the future, as Houtsma and Thomsen have asserted. For example, *öldaci sicgan* meant "the mouse that is going to die" (*ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 366). Based on its frequent appearance in eighth/fourteenth-century Ottoman texts, this form clearly belongs to the Oghuz, i.e. the Western Turks, as al-Kāshgharī reported; thus it is worthy of study with respect to linguistic history, given its presence in the Orhon Inscriptions, and then in the *Kutadgu Bilig*, in the Kuman language, and in the *'Atabat al-ḥaqā'iq*, which I very strongly suspect

exhibits linguistic characteristics dating before the Mongol invasion (Necib Âsım (ed.), part 1, 1334, p. 103 {the reference is to Adīb Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd Yüknekī, *Hibetül'-haḳâyıḳ* (Istanbul, 1334/1918); this edition was superceded by R. R. Arat (ed.), *Atebetü'l-hakayık* (Istanbul, 1951)}). I know of no examples of this form in later works from Central Asia, i.e. works created after the linguistic changes that occurred subsequent to the Mongol invasion. It is quite surprising that despite the very clear statement of al-Kāshgharī, who was well aware of the characteristics of the Turkish dialects, this form occurs in works in early Eastern Turkish. For its existence in Qipchaq Turkish as well, see Abū Ḥayyān {al-Gharnāṭī's} *Kītāb al-idrāk {li-lisān al-atrāk* (Istanbul, 1309/1893)}, pp. 135–6, 188 {new ed. A. Melek Özyetgin as *Ebû Ḥayyân, Kitâbu'l-İdrâk li Lisâni'-Etrâk* (Ankara, 2001)}.

28 In various places in his work, al-Kāshgharī clearly indicates the locations and cities of the Oghuz in the fifth/eleventh century. While discussing the word *öküz* {i.e. *ögüz*}, for example, he states that this word, which generally means "river," among the Oghuz specifically referred to the Syr Darya, which was also given the name Banākat; and that the cities of the Oghuz were along this river, and the Oghuz nomads lived along its banks as well ({*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*,} vol. 1, p. 58). Ibn Ḥawqal also indicates that the Oghuz centers were primarily along the lower course of the Syr Darya ({*al-Masālik wa 'l-mamālik*, ed. de Goeje (Leiden, 1873),} p. 393 {superseded by J. H. Kramer's edn (Leiden, 1938–9)}). According to Ibn al-Athīr, these Oghuz had separated from the Tokuz-guz, i.e. the Uighurs, during the caliphate of al-Mahdī (158–69/774–85) (*al-Kāmil*, vol. 2, p. 117). The *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* also informs us of the primary Oghuz cities. (1) Sabrān. The author writes that this was the original name of this city, which was usually called Ṣabrān, because there was no ص in Turkish (vol. 1, p. 364). This city, which Yāqūt in his entry on Isfījāb places in the vicinity of Ṭarāz, Sānīkath, and Fārāb (Yāngīkend), and which he also describes in the entry on Ṣabrān as being the Oghuz capital on the Syr Darya and having a fortress (*Mu'jam al-buldān*, vol. 1, p. 230, vol. 5, p. 336), was the city of Savrān near Yasī, which I discussed above (Chapter 2, p. 27). (2) Sütkent (vol. 1, p. 369). It would be natural for this city to be in the same region, although this is not specified. (3) Sughnaq (vol. 1, p. 392). This city was Sığnak, which later became the capital of the White Horde (for more details, see Howorth, *History of the Mongols*) {*EI*^{2}, s.v. "Sıghnāḳ" (C. E. Bosworth)}. (4) Qarnaq (vol. 1, p. 393). There is no information on it apart from being an Oghuz city. (5) Qarajuq. Al-Kāshgharī gives the following description of it اسم الفاراب وهى اسم بلاد الغزية {it is the name of al-Fārāb, which is the name of the country of the Oghuz} (vol. 1, p. 304). We have seen above in one of the legends about Aḥmad Yasawī how he made Qaraj(ch)uq Mountain disappear miraculously (Chapter 2, pp. 21–2). We find Qarajuk Mountain, which was in the vicinity of this Oghuz city, whose name also appears frequently in the *Dede Korkut*, within the Oghuz region in the map in the *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*. There is much information on Fārāb (Otrar), which was far from Tashkent and close to Balāsāghūn, in *Mu'jam al-buldān* (vol. 6, p. 322) and Barthold (see *EI*^{1}, s.v. "Fārāb" {cf. *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Fārāb" (Barthold-[B. Spuler]}). As for the famous city called Tālās or Ṭarāz, al-Kāshgharī records two Ṭarāz in his book, one Ūlūgh-Tālās and the other Kiji-Tālās {Kümi-Tālās in the first edn of *Early Mystics*, which is correct} on the Islamic frontier ({*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*,} vol. 1, p. 306), but he does not specify whether it is an Oghuz city. However, when defining the lands of the Arghu Turks, he says that they extended "from Ṭarāz to Balāsāghūn," so it appears that Ṭarāz was not an Oghuz city (*ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 114). We also learn from the same work the names of a few other towns near Ṭarāz. One was a fortress named Qarghalıgh (*ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 433), another was the town of Yaghma, which belonged to the Qara-Yagma Turks (*ibid.*, vol. 3, p. 26), a third was Gencak Singir on the Qipchaq border (*ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 399), and a fourth was the town of Atluq

(*ibid.*, vol. 1, p. 90). I have given sufficient information on Ṭarāz above (Chapter 3, p. 72, n.6). For more information on old Ṭarāz and Awliyā Ata, which Howorth claims occupies its site, see Reclus, *Nouvelle géographie universelle*, vol. on Russian Asia, pp. 557–8. Although Barthold, like Howorth, asserts that old Ṭarāz is present-day Awliyā Ata (*EI*[1], s.v. "Balāsāghūn"), Chavannes categorically rejects this and says that it must be five parasangs to the south of Awliyā Ata (*Documents*, p. 304). {See *EI*[2], s.v. "Awliyā Ata (Barthold-[B. Spuler]), and "Ṭarāz" (C. E. Bosworth).}

29 Al-Kāshgharī says the Kimek/Yimak were Qıfchaqs, but the Qıfchaqs distinguished themselves from the Yimak by this name. His account conforms to those of the Arab geographers Ibn Ḥawqal ({*al-Masālik*,} p. 11) and Iṣṭakhrī ({*Masālik al-mamālik*, ed. de Goeje (Leiden, 1870; reprinted Leiden, 1927),} p. 222) in making the Qıfchaqs a branch of the Yimak, for it explains how these two branches were related to each other (*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 3, p. 22). Furthermore, Iṣṭakhrī says that the upper course of the Volga formed a natural border between the Oghuz and Yimak (*Masālik*). At the same time, al-Muqaddasī, while providing details on the seven fortresses of Savrān (Sabrān), which I indicated in n.28 above based on *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* was an Oghuz city, and on its other features, also says that this formed a border between the Oghuz and the Kimek ({*Aḥsan al-taqāsīm fī ma'rifat al-aqālīm*, ed. de Goeje, 2nd edn (Leiden, 1906),} p. 274 {English trans. Basil Anthony Collins as *The Best Divisions for Knowledge of the Regions* (Reading, UK, 2001), p. 226}). In addition, the author {Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadānī} of *Kitāb al-buldān* {ed. de Goeje (Leiden, 1885)}, while enumerating the branches of the Turks in the entry on Shāsh (Tashkent) {p. 329}, lists the most important branches as the Qarluqs, Tokuz-guz, Türgish, Kimek, and Oghuz ({*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*,} vol. 2, p. 394). The Qıpchaq dialect, which al-Kāshgharī considered to be closely related to the Oghuz dialect, was the same as the Kimek dialect. Indeed, we can consider these two names to be virtually synonymous despite any apparent difference between them.

30 According to the Arab geographers, this peninsula had not been previously inhabited. The Oghuz who were separated from their comrades went there and settled (Iṣṭakhrī, {*Masālik*,} p. 219). Al-Kāshgharī in fact records that Mangıshlak was "a place name in the Oghuz country" ({*Dīwān lughāt al-turk*,} vol. 1, p. 387, vol. 3, p. 118). {See *EI*[2], s.v. "Mangıshlak" (Yu. Bregel).}

31 See the details given by Barthold in *EI*[1], s.v. "Ghuzz."

32 Isfījāb is a very old Turkish city. During his journey, Hieuen-Thsang stopped in this city, "which was 200 *li*" southwest of Tālās (Ṭarāz) and which the Chinese called Pe-choei and the Turks called Aksu. Although its exact location is not given, it appears that it was a bit southeast of Chimkent. In 642 CE Tūlū Khāqān took refuge in this city, where he was attacked by the Nu-shih-pi. According to Chavannes, this was the place the Arabs called Ispījāb {*sic*, rather Isbījāb} (*Documents*, p. 195). According to the Arab geographers and {al-Kāshgharī's} *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, Ispījāb {*sic*} and Madīnat al-Baiḍā', i.e. Sairām, are the same city, but Chavannes claims that present-day Sairām is the city the Chinese called Kiu-p'i-lo (*Documents*, p. 8). Nevertheless, I believe, based on the Arab geographers, that this is a mistaken opinion. This region, which originally belonged to the T'u-chüeh Turks, was seized by the Qarluqs after their collapse, as I explained above, and very quickly entered the realm of Islam.

33 *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 1, p. 31. Nevertheless, the same author also shows the lands between Ṭarāz and Balāsāghūn as the country of the Arghu (vol. 1, p. 114). In his *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, a city of Qabus (vol. 1, p. 308) and a city of Belu (vol. 3, p. 176), the locations of which are not specified, are shown as Arghu locations. This second city appears in the works of the Arab geographers as Balu/Bahlu and is described as a city that was a distance of a half parasang from the town of Chigil and was larger than the town of Barsgan to the left of it (Kuun, "Gurdēzī," citing al-Muqaddasī).

These descriptions show that the Arghu area began at Ṭarāz. Considering that Ṭarāz/Tālās was not an Oghuz city, and that it shared a border with the Chigil on one side and the Arghu on the other, it is clear that the Arghu must be considered, like the Chigil, to be among the Eastern Turks. While enumerating the primary Turkish tribes at the beginning of his work, al-Kāshgharī does not mention the Arghu, but later he provides considerable information on their geographical area and the characteristics of their dialect. In the same passage, al-Kāshgharī does not mention, for example, the Qarluqs, who were a great and very well known Turkish people, under this general name, but he lists the Chigil and Tokhsı, who were Qarluq tribes. Perhaps the Arghu were the same as the Ughraq {see above, n.16}; or else Ughraq may be the general name for the Charuq and the Chomul. Whichever of these two hypotheses may be correct, we must still inquire whether the Arghu included the Qarluqs, or were they a separate Turkish tribe? The geographical area that al-Kāshgharī indicates as belonging to the Arghu matches that assigned to the Ughraq. Although the information at hand is still not sufficient to allow us to say anything definite on this matter, we consider the Arghu, like the Chigil, Yaghma, and Tokhsı, among the Qarluqs. The information that I will give below on the Arghu dialect will suffice to prove that it was an Eastern dialect, probably very close to the language of the Khāqāniyya Turks.

34 *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, vol. 1, p. 31. On this question, see n.14 of this chapter. Balāsāghūn, which al-Kāshgharī mentions as Qoz {i.e. Quz}-ülüş (vol. 1, p. 60), or as the Mongols called it Gubalıg, i.e. "beautiful city" ({Khwāndamīr,} *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, see the section on the Qara Khiṭāy), was like other cities in that region destroyed in the innumerable struggles for power in the eighth/fourteenth century. Consequently, nothing is heard of it during the events of the reign of Tīmūr (see Barthold, *EI*[1], s.v. "Balāsāghūn"). [Zeki Velidi Togan also confirms that this city had lost its importance before Tīmūr, *İA*, s.v. "Balasagun."] Barthold indicates its location as that of present-day Awliyā Ata, i.e. northeast of old Ṭarāz. A Persian couplet also corroborates this (Habîb Efendi, *Düstûr-i Suhan* {Istanbul, 1309/1891–2}, p. 126):

آفرین زان هنر مرکب فرخ پی تو که بیکشب ز بلاساغون آید بطراز

{Bravo! For the skill of that fortunate-footed donkey of yours, which in a single night can go from Balāsāgūn to Ṭarāz.} The German Orientalist Marquart claims that Gubalıg was Guzbalıg, which meant "Oghuz city," but this should probably be accepted with caution. Even if the Oghuz had previously been in that region, and therefore in Balāsāghūn, it is {still} true that the Arghu, whom we consider a branch of the Qarluqs, occupied their territory in the fifth/eleventh century. Niẓām al-Mulk states that he {i.e. the Sāmānid ruler Naṣr II b. Aḥmad (301–31/914–43)} was considering war against the non-Muslim Turks who had captured Balāsāghūn around 330–1/941–2, which tells us that this city was regarded as being within the sphere of Islamic influence at that time (*Siyāsatnāme*, Schefer edn, p. 189 and Barthold who cites it {see Darke trans., p. 215; Barthold, *Turkestan*, p. 243}). However, a little later these Turks became firmly converted to Islam, and the Ilek-Khāns {Qarakhānids} who appeared from among them subsequently invaded and conquered Transoxiana. The first Muslim ruler from this family was ʿAbd al-Karīm Sātūq Bughrā Khān (d. 334/945–6), whose legends are still famous in Central Asia. The Turks whom Ibn al-Athīr reported during the events of 349/960–1 as being a people of 200,000 tents who had adopted Islam ({*al-Kāmil*,} vol. 8, p. 176) were, according to the most likely probability, these Qarluq Turks (see above pp. 132ff. {of narrative}). Furthermore, Ibn al-Athīr writes that a Turkish tribe that had accepted Islam in Ṣafar 435/

September–October 1043 had its summer pastures around the city of Balāsāghūn, and the Bulghar Turks had their winter pastures in that area (*ibid*., vol. 9, p. 179); it is probable that that tribe was also a branch of the Qarluqs, namely the Arghu or Basmıl. In 524–5/1130, i.e. in the first quarter of the sixth/twelfth century, when Balāsāghūn passed into the hands of the pagan Qara Khiṭāy, we again find the Qarluqs and Qanglı in that region (Juvainī, *Jahān-Gushā*, vol. 2, p. 87).

35 Because the Oghuz had a common border with the Arghu, they adopted quite a few words from them. For example, taking *dag-ol* from the Arghu, they transformed it into *tekil/degül*, "not" ({al-Kāshgharī, *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*,} vol. 1, p. 329, vol. 3, p. 114), and in like manner adopted other words from them (vol. 1, p. 316). It appears from al-Kāshgharī's account that the Arghu themselves made some linguistic borrowings from the Persians (vol. 1, p. 360). In addition, the Arghu had numerous words in common with the Yaghma and Qarluqs and at the same time with the populace of the city of Uch and the Bulghar Turks. The descriptions of the Arghu dialect given in various places in the *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* definitely indicate that it was an Eastern dialect that was very close to that of the Qarluqs, i.e. to Khāqāniyya Turkish.

36 {See Peter Golden, "The Migrations of the Oğuz," *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 4 (1972), 45–84.}

37 {It is noteworthy that Köprülü can disallow the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* as a work with any value for linguistic history because of the long history of copying and recopying that he assumes to have occurred, yet he cannot imagine that this same long history could have rendered this work anything less than a key source on Aḥmad Yasawī's literary personality, Ṣūfī thought, etc.}

38 Vambéry, *Čagataische Sprachstudien* {there is no such statement in this work as cited below in this note; cf. his article "Muhammadanism (in Central Asia)," in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York, 1908–26), vol. 8, p. 887}; Thúry, "Ondördüncü ʿasır sonlarına kadar Türk dili yâdıgârları." Vambéry says that this work, which had great influence among the nomads, was widely read and was in the Khokand dialect even though it was poorly understood because it incorporated foreign – i.e. Arabic and Persian – words and phrases. Thúry also concludes that "According to the sections that have been published, one could definitely assert that the language of this work is in the dialect spoken in the Khānate of Khokand," {p. 98}.

39 Thúry, *ibid*.; Togan, *Türk-Tatar tarihi*. The scholarly meanings of the terms "Uighur" and "Chaghatay" {as designations for languages} are not crystal clear even today. Their sense is vague. Because research on Turkish linguistic and literary history is still at a very preliminary stage, it is easy for anyone to use these terms at random and – taking advantage of their vagueness – give them whatever meaning he likes.

Books that have been written up to now in the Uighur alphabet, like {Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib's} *Kutadgu Bilig*, {the anonymous} *Miʿrājnāme*, {the translation of ʿAṭṭār's} *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'*, and the translation of {Niẓāmī Ganjawī's} *Makhzan al-asrār*, were considered to be "Uighur" simply because the Uighur alphabet was used. The Russian Orientalist I. Berezin, for instance, in a short treatise that he published seventy years ago on the classification of the various Turkish dialects, puts forth this observation on Uighur: "This dialect no longer exists. We know it thanks to manuscripts like those of {the anonymous} *Bakhtiyārnāme*, *Miʿrājnāme*, and *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'* – the texts of these works in the old Uighur alphabet, the forms in which they were copied and their English translations are found in Arthur Lumley Davids's *A Grammar of the Turkish Language* (London, 1832) – the *Kutadgu Bilig* (published by the Orientalist {Amédée} Jaubert {rather, he was the first to bring it to the attention of the scholarly world and to translate a section of it in his 'Notice d'un manuscrit turc, en charactères ouigours, envoyé par M. de Hammer à M. Abel-Rémusat,' *JA*, 6 (1825), 39–52, 78–95; see *İA*, s.v. 'Kutadgu Bilig' (R. Rahmeti Arat)}), the Uighur–Chinese dictionary published by

Klaproth, and Toktamısh's edict to Jagiello published with Russian translation by Qāsim Bey. This dialect had a distinct script and literature. According to these works that I have studied, Uighur is the origin of Chaghatay. Not only are the basic writing systems of both dialects similar, but they also both contain certain forms that are not found in others" (Berezin, *Recherches sur les dialectes musulmans* [Kazan, 1848]). This mistaken and simplistic view is naturally also found in Davids's *Grammar* (French trans. Sarah Davids, *Grammaire turke* [London, 1836]). Léon Cahun, even though he came on the scene a half century after these researchers, still followed this old erroneous view and believed that works like the *Bakhtiyārnāme*, *Miʿrājnāme*, and *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'* were written in the Uighur dialect (E. Lavisse and A. Rambaud, {*Histoire général du IV^e siècle à nos jours* (Paris, 1893–1901),} vol. 3 {*Formation des grands états, 1270–1491*,} p. 967 – *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Asie*, p. 508). Because these various works, which were copied in the tenth/sixteenth century, are also found in manuscripts written in Arabic script, I see no need to expound on the superficial error of this approach.

Scholars who have done somewhat more research on the Turkish language understand this error and realize the necessity of turning to history and linguistic history for information on this subject. Vambéry and Radloff, on the basis of such observations, thus consider the *Kutadgu Bilig* to be an Uighur work – because it was written in Eastern Turkistan, which was inhabited by Uighurs, and because it has certain linguistic characteristics different from later Central Asian works (see the introduction to Radloff's edition of the *Kutadgu Bilig*). Agreeing with them, Thúry and many others have also applied the name Uighur to the linguistic products from the area of Eastern Turkistan. The information that I have given above, however, on the number of Turkish dialects in the fifth/eleventh and sixth/twelfth centuries and their relationship to each other and their geographical areas, shows clearly that those who lived in the city of Balāsāghūn, where the author {Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib} of the *Kutadgu Bilig* was born, and Kāshghar were not Uighurs but Qarluqs, whom al-Kāshgharī calls Khāqāniyya Turks. Indeed, the author of the *Kutadgu Bilig* specifically states that his work was not in Uighur but in Turkish. That Turkish was the Eastern dialect, which al-Kāshgharī calls "Turkish," without qualification, or "Khāqāniyya Turkish." With respect to its general linguistic features, the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was also written in this dialect.

As for "Chaghatay," the banner term for the literary language of Central Asia, it derives from the name of Chingiz Khān's son Chaghatay, who ruled that region at one time, and was applied to the Turkish language of Central Asia. Thus, Central Asian and to some degree Qipchaq works, which have been written under the influence of Islamic civilization since the eighth/fourteenth century, can be subsumed under this name. Describing both the ethnographic and linguistic consequences of the Mongol invasion on the entire Turkish world is a separate and important subject requiring more lengthy research than can be presented here in even a brief outline (for details, see my article "Çagatay edebiyatı"). The simplest and most accurate definition of this Chaghatay – which includes the works of all Central Asian poets and writers, beginning with the *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* of Rabghūzī (which includes a number of linguistic features reminiscent of the language of the *Kutadgu Bilig* that are not found in Chaghatay works from subsequent periods) and even comprising the followers of Nawā'ī – is as follows: "It is the Eastern Turkish literary dialect that was established under the influence of Islamic civilization after the Mongol invasion." The linguistic and historical analyses given above suffice to prove that the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* – not the current copy but the original version that would have displayed the linguistic characteristics of the time and milieu in which it was written – could by no means be included in this linguistic domain. {In this note Köprülü claims to know the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat's* general linguistic features without having access to early manuscripts and with the acknowledgment

that existing manuscripts are just in Chaghatay. The note culminates with his "proof" that the phantom *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* should not be considered a Chaghatay work.}

40 {"Der čaghataische Diwan Huwedas herausgegeben und übersetzt von M. Hartmann," in} *Berlin Universität, Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, Mitteilungen,* {*Westasiatische Studien*}, 5 (1902), p. 133. The author {Kouznietsov} of the Russian work entitled *La Lutte des civilizations et des langues dans l'asie centrale* is also among those who consider Aḥmad Yasawī to be a Chaghatay poet (p. 76).

41 {Here Köprülü's analysis becomes extremely convoluted, highlighting the untested (and untestable) assumptions that shaped his discussion of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat.* First he criticizes those, quite rightly, who declared the language of this work to be Chaghatay, and especially those who found its language to be quite similar to the version of Chaghatay known from nineteenth-century Qoqand. Then he insists that, failing the appearance of an old copy of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, the way to study its language is to study the literary and lingustic milieu in which (he is sure, but without any real justification) Aḥmad Yasawī lived and wrote. Finally, he admits that all known copies of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* do reflect Chaghatay, but that this means nothing. In other words, the imaginary early copies of a work, and the linguistic features of other works written in the time and place we imagine the work's author to have lived, are better sources on the work's inguistic features (but not on its literary or intellectual features) than existing copies of the work!}

42 I believe that even before the *Kutadgu Bilig* an attempt was made to adapt the *ʿarūḍ* system to Turkish and that some works were produced in this meter, and that, especially after the *Kutadgu Bilig,* many Turkish works were written in those regions in imitation of the Persians. {Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd's} *ʿAtabat al-ḥaqāʾiq* provides some idea on this matter. However, while these works, which used the *ʿarūḍ* meter in imitation of Persian works, were dedicated to various rulers – i.e. were written in a court milieu, naturally subject to strong Muslim Iranian influence – the fact that works that directly addressed the great mass of the people, such as the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, were faithful to popular taste and understanding should not be regarded as a coincidence. We can only explain this important phenomenon in the history of our literature by the influence of this milieu. It was possible to exhibit great skill and excellence in the Turkish palaces, which were full of men of state and scholars who knew Persian literature very well and had received a classical {Islamic} education, by writing in Persian, or at least by writing things that were comparable to what the Persians wrote. Whether or not the people understood such things, whether or not they considered them suitable to their own taste, was of absolutely no importance to the poet who only expected to be appreciated and rewarded by the ruler and palace officials. In contrast, the highly spiritual, idealistic Ṣūfīs, such as Aḥmad Yasawī, who labored for the satisfaction of God and did not expect any reward from rulers and men of state, and who were trying to convey religious and mystical truths to the people, considered it their primary duty to conform to popular taste and sensibility. We can clearly and definitely see this state of affairs in virtually every period of Turkish literature. The Ṣūfīs sang not for the purpose of displaying their art to prominent figures and earning material rewards, but in a state of ecstasy and animated by the ideal of inspiring others with the sacred feelings overflowing from their souls and quenching {other} thirsty souls from the sublime springs of divinity. We should not forget how important this factor was in making them – the Ṣūfīs – a much better representative of the national taste than any other group.

43 Although no research has yet been done on the history of the development of the Turkish language, I can try to explain the reasons for this in general outline. First, because he took his subjects wholly from the realms of religion and mysticism, Aḥmad Yasawī had to use their specific and established terminology. In general, the Turks

were only able to extract the new concepts pertaining to sacred law and mysticism of a religion they had newly adopted from the language of the Koran {i.e. Arabic} and also from the works of Persian scholars, who had appropriated those concepts via Arabic. Second, loanwords from Arabic and Persian had gradually increased among the Turks after they entered the milieu of Islam and the people had become somewhat accustomed to them. Thus, even Aḥmad Yasawī, taking this into consideration, was not reluctant to use words from foreign languages while addressing the mass of the people. I have shown above – based on {al-Kāshgharī's} *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* – that even in the fifth/eleventh century a number of Arabic and Persian words had entered the language of both the Eastern and Western Turks, i.e. of both the Qarluqs and Oghuz.

44 The most commonly used meters in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* are seven-syllable and twelve-syllable. The oldest examples of Turkish folk literature that have come down to us were also, for the most part, written in these meters. Indeed, in these early works, the caesuras of the twelves are usually in the form 4 + 4 + 4. In this respect too the passages in twelves in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* conform to the folk literary tradition. As for rhyme, the views that I have advanced in another work concerning rhyme in the oldest examples of our folk literature can be applied to the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*: "The rules of rhyme that our earliest poetry followed were, naturally, of a simple and primitive character. Instead of 'rhyme' in the modern sense, it would be more accurate to call them half rhyme (assonance), because rhyme in our early poetry does not consist of the syllables at the end of the verses having the identical sound. This poetry is far from being constricted by such a narrow rule. For the existence of rhyme there suffices to be a minimal similarity in sound among the final syllables. Rhymes can be formed by a partial resemblance in sound, such as *deşildi/koşuldu*, *kuşlatmak/dişletmek/taşlatmak*. Sometimes *radīf* is found along with rhyme, i.e. the last element is fixed and the rhyme pertains to the elements preceding it. Sometimes – to be sure as a random effect – one also comes across passages that rhyme according to the modern view. In any case, we find this old view of rhyme flourishing in some of the folk poetry that we can consider to be a continuation of our ancient pre-Islamic folk literature. The poets of this early period usually achieved half rhymes very easily from inflections of the verb" (*Türk edebiyatı tarihi*, Chapter 4, "İlk şiirler ve ilk şâirler"). In some of the quatrains in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, the fourth verse sometimes falls one syllable short. We also find this feature in our earliest popular poetry.

45 The following information, which I have given in another work on the forms of versification used in our earliest folk poetry, fully applies to Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī's *ḥikmats*: "The *sagus*, or elegies, composed about great heroes, consist of four-verse stanzas or quatrains, each verse of which has seven or eight syllables. Sometimes the four verses of the first quatrain all rhyme together, sometimes all but the third verse rhyme. The first three verses of the subsequent quatrains rhyme among themselves, with a different rhyme from the other quatrains. But all of the quatrains are linked together because they have the same rhyme in the fourth verse. These *sagus*, which undoubtedly represented a rich and most valuable form of our early Turkish folk poetry, were generally long. In the early forms of Turkish poetry, two major points are worthy of note. First, the forms are few in number and well defined. This is because it was not possible for the literary personalities to develop freely in these early periods, and every poet had to respect the existing forms as virtually sacred. Second, in the quatrains constituting elegies, the fourth verse always rhymes. This indicates that the elegies were written in order to be sung and that the fourth lines naturally always preserved the same rhymes because they constituted a virtual folk-song refrain'" *Türk edebiyatı tarihi*, Chapter 4, "İlk şiirler ve ilk şâirler"). This type of verse, which evolved from the *koşma* and *dastān* of popular literature to our classical literature

in the *murabbaʿ* and *şarkı* forms under Arab–Persian influence, is wholly national. In this form, which was a vestige of the early periods when there was no separation between literature and music, i.e. between words and melody, the first three verses were to be recited by the poet-composer alone, while the refrain, which was the fourth verse, was to be sung chorus-like by the entire community. The author {Ḥazīnī} of the *Jawāhir* states that the *ḥikmats* of Aḥmad Yasawī were recited with special melodies in the tenth/sixteenth century {he does not, in fact say this}; and we know very well that today there are special melodies for the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* among both the Qazaqs in Turkistan and the Turks along the Volga. In exactly the same fashion, as we will see in detail in the second part of this book, the *ilâhîs* {hymns} of Ottoman literature, and also a number of popular works, which acquired a religious value among the people and were much read, had specific melodies attached to them. {Note: section C in the narrative is all Köprülü offers as a "minute analysis" of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, giving only one example of a poem he believes can be traced to Aḥmad Yasawī, whose work he characterizes broadly as primitive.}

46 One can come across this simile (*tashbīh*) or other such unusual similies in almost all the Ṣūfīs. We find the following lines from Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, for example:

بپیش دیده دو عالم چو دانه پیش خروس

چنین بود نظر پاك کبریا دیده

.....

کار جهان بوزن دو خشخاش دانه گیر

{Before my eye the two worlds are like a seed before a rooster.
Thus is the pure vision of one who has seen divine majesty.

. . .

Consider the business of this world as the weight of two poppy-seeds.}

47 There are no traces of Shīʿism in any form in the early famous works of Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, such as the *Pandnāme*. Around the end of his life, however, he praised ʿAlī and the Twelve Imāms with great enthusiasm in the poem *Mazhar al-ʿajā'ib* {again, this poem is no longer considered to be an authentic work of ʿAṭṭār}, which he wrote and dedicated to ʿAlī, and declared that he believed in the occultation {*gaybet*, in 1st edn of *Early Mystics*; *aleyhdarlık*, opposition, in 3rd edn} of the *mahdī*. I mentioned above that as a result of this he was banished from Samarqand as a *rāfiḍī* (Chapter 2, p. 43, n.28). Later, Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār related this incident in his poem *Lisān al-ghaib*, which he wrote in Mecca, and then could not resist writing these lines:

شیعهٔ پاکست عطار ای پسر　　جنس این شیعه بجان خود بخر

ماز فاروق التجا بر کنده ایم　　پی ز نورین شما ببریده ایم

بو حنیفه را زدست بگذار تو　　خود برو اندر پی کرار تو

{ʿAṭṭār is a pure Shīʿī, O my son. Embrace this kind of Shīʿism wholeheartedly.
We have rooted out any refuge in Fārūq (i.e. ʿUmar). We have stopped following your "Two Lights" (i.e. ʿUthmān).
And you: give up Abū Ḥanīfa, and follow after Karrār (i.e. ʿAlī).}

(from the detailed introduction that Mīrzā Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Qazwīnī wrote to the *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'* published by Nicholson). Although some respect is given to Shāh Ḥusain and Shahr Bānū {the mother of the fourth Shīʿī *imām* ʿAlī Zain al-ʿĀbidīn} in the Istanbul edition of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, (p. 205), this is by no means something that could be interpreted as Shīʿism, for it is common among all Muslims. Furthermore, it is highly likely that this short passage does not belong to Aḥmad Yasawī but was written later. Moreover, it should not be forgotten that even Aḥmad Yasawī, according to tradition, was descended from ʿAlī. Because Hartmann did not know how the Bektashī *ṭarīqa* was connected with Aḥmad Yasawī, he thought that the "Aḥmad Yasawī b. Muḥammad al-Ḥanafī" in the Bektashī tradition was a completely different person ("Der čaghataische Diwan Huwedas," p. 133). The accounts given above demonstrate that this is completely erroneous and that even in the Central Asian version of the legend of Aḥmad Yasawī, which was the basis of the version that spread in Anatolia, he was considered to be a descendant of ʿAlī.

48 *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat.* The meaning of love {*ʿishq*} here is, of course, not "metaphorical" {i.e. earthly} love, but "true" love, i.e. the love of God. Only through love is it possible to be saved from non-existence and to exalt the human soul and return it to the original place of its descent. The sole reason why a number of Ṣūfīs had a strong interest in "the beauties of earthly form" {*maḥāsin-i suwariyya*} was because it was only possible to attain "true" love via "metaphorical" love, according to the saying المجاز قنطرة الحقيقة {metaphor is the bridge to truth}. However, the long, hair-fine bridge leading from human love to divine love is very dangerous. Many on this path fall into the whirlpool of human passions and are drowned. But once this bridge is crossed, non-existence is itself obliterated. The lover sees divine beauty in everything. This is what our popular Ṣūfīs call "becoming God with God" {*Hak ile Hak olmak*}. The endless laments of true lovers result from their desperate longing for divinity, which is the soul's original source. The moving laments that fill the *Dīwān-i kabīr* of Mawlānā, the poet of the famous couplet

مرغ دلم می طپید هیچ سکونی نداشت مسکن اصلیش دید یافت در وساکنی

{The bird of my heart fluttered and had no rest
It saw its place of origin and found rest there}

and many latitudinarian views, which were considered impossible to adapt to the external meaning of the *Sharīʿa*, were all a product of such a mad, infinite, divine love. In Aḥmad Yasawī, however, such laments are very feeble – indeed, they hardly exist.

49 Mawlānā describes this mystical reality in the following manner:

آن دلی کو عاشق مالست وجاه یا زبون این گل وآب سیاه
یا خیالاتی که در ظلمات او میپر ستد شان برای گفت وگو
دل نباشد غیر آن دریای نور دل نظرگاه خدا ونگاه کور

{Is that (pure heart) the heart that is enamoured of riches and power, or is submissive to this black earth and water (the body),
Or to vain fancies which it worships in the darkness for the sake of fame,
The heart is naught but the Sea of Light: is the heart the place for vision of God – and then blind? (Nicholson trans., *Mathnawī*, vol. 3, 2267–9.)}

50 According to the great Ṣūfīs, the common people cannot understand the realities of divine unity. The realities that were reserved for the select few could by no means be disclosed to them. Ṣūfīs are not heedless of the noble *Ḥadīths* "Relate and convey matters to your interlocutors in a way that they will be able to understand, because you do not wish them to give the lie to God and the Prophet" (in al-Bukhārī, {*Ṣaḥīḥ*,} citing ʿAlī) and "Your relating and conveying matters to a people in a way that they will not understand will leave some of them in a state of discord" (in {al-Shaybānī's} *Jāmiʿ al-ṣaghīr*, citing Ibn ʿAbbās in comparison with Ibn ʿAsākir). Qāḍī Yūnus ʿAbd al-Mālikī says on this matter, "When hearing such expressions as سبحانی or انا الحق or انا هو {respectively, "Glory be to me," "I am the Divine Truth," and "I am He"; see Carl W. Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy in Sufism* (Albany, NY, 1985)} from a saint, do not imagine this to be a form of self-expression, because the reference in such cases is not to one's self; instead, the 'I' that he announces is the 'I' of God. As for the 'I' of the slave {i.e. man}, the proponent of this has no comprehension because this form of 'I' does not exist in the mind and in the domain of the senses; and how can something that cannot be known be announced? As for the utterance that issues from his tongue, it is the divine creation of God, Who endows everything with the ability to speak, informing us of His lofty and sublime essence" ({Mehmed Alî Aynî,} *Hüccetü'l-islâm*, pp. 334–45). Ibn Khaldūn writes in his famous *Muqaddima* that the jurists and great Ṣūfīs gave the order {*fatwā*} for the killing of al-Ḥallāj because he spoke as in command of his senses {*ḥusn*, which is erroneous for *ḥiss*; cf. Franz Rosenthal's trans. of Ibn Khaldūn's *Muqaddimah* (Princeton, NJ, 1967), vol. 3, p. 102} when ecstasy and the mystical state had not come to him ({Turkish} trans. {Pirî-Zâde Mehmed Sâhib Efendi, Chapters 1–5 (Cairo, 1275/1858–9), Ahmet Cevdet, Chapter 6 (Istanbul, 1277/1860–1),} book 1, Chapter 6, p. 96). "The great Ṣūfīs" here evidently refers to the traditional account according to which Junaid al-Baghdādī gave the *fatwā* for this. In fact, Junaid had previously warned him that he had strayed to the wrong path and, according to tradition, when they wanted him to sign the *fatwā* for his execution, he only signed it in the attire of the *'ulamā'* ({ʿAṭṭār,} *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'*, Nicholson edn, vol. 2, pp. 12, 137). However, the following lines from the *Mathnawī* {Nicholson edn, vol. 2, 1398–9}

چون قلم در دست غداری بود بیگمان منصور برداری بود

چون سفیهانراست این کار وکیا لازم آمد یقتلون الانبیا

{When the pen is in the hand of a traitor, without doubt Manṣūr will be on the gibbet;
When matters of state belong to fools, then certainly "they kill the prophets" (Koran 3:112)}

show that Mawlānā did not believe this and he further expounded on his appreciation of al-Ḥallāj as follows, thus agreeing with the statement of Qāḍī Yūnus ʿAbd al-Mālikī,

آن انا گفت وزخود برباد شد واین انا گفت وزخود آزاد شد

این انا هو بود در سرای فضول ز اتحاد نور نه از راه حلول

{That one (i.e. Pharaoh) said "I" and went to ruin; this one (i.e. al-Ḥallāj) said "I" and was free of self.
This "I am He" was in its secret meaning, O meddlesome one, from union with the Light, not from transmigration of souls (*Mathnawī*, Nicholson edn, vol. 5, 2035, 2038).}

All the great Ṣūfīs, in fact, recognized al-Ḥallāj's greatness. The famous Ṣūfī Shaikh Shiblī {d. 334/945} said, "al-Ḥallāj and I were the same, but they considered me to be mad and thanks to this I was saved. {They thought} he was rational and this destroyed him." According to another tradition cited from Shaikh Shiblī, the great calamity that befell al-Ḥallāj simply resulted from his revealing to others the mystery of God {*sirr-i Ḥaqq*} (*Tadhkirat al-awliyā'*, vol. 2, pp. 136, 145). In like manner, there is a noteworthy legend in {Muḥammad Pārsā's} *Faṣl al-khiṭāb* on why al-Ḥallāj suffered this sentence. The legends about this great Ṣūfī, whose biography is also found in Ibn Khallikān ({*Wafayāt,*} vol. 1, p. 183), are well known in the Muslim world and, because they spread among the people, works were written about him, including the *Ḥallājnāme* by the early Ottoman poet Mürīdī. For those who want a better understanding of al-Ḥallāj's ideas and beliefs about Ṣūfism, they can refer to *Kītāb al-Ṭawāsīn* (ed. L. Massignon [Paris, 1913], {French trans. Massignon in vol. 3 of his *La Passion d'al-Ḥusayn-ibn-Manṣour al-Ḥallāj* (Paris, 1922), English trans. Herbert Mason as *The Passion of al-Hallāj* (Princeton, NJ, 1982)}). Shaikh Maḥmūd Shabistarī {d. *c.*718–20/1318–21} gives sufficient details in *Gulshan-i rāz* on the subject of this انا الحق:

انا الحق کشف اسرارست مطلق　　بجز حق چیست تا گوید انا الحق
همه ذرات عالم همچو منصور　　تو خواهی مست گیر و خواه مخمور
درین تسبیح و تهلیلند دایم　　بدین معنی همه باشند قایم
اگر خواهی که بر توگردد آسان　　و ان من شئ را یکره فرو خوان
چوکردی خویشتن را پنبه کاری　　توهم حلاج و ار این دم بر آری
بر آور پنبهٔ پندارت از گوش　　ندای واحد قهار بنیوش
ندا می آید از حق بر دوامت　　چرا گشتی تو موقوف قیامت
در آدر وادیٔ ایمن که ناگاه　　درختی گویدت انی انا اللّٰه
روا باشد انا الحق از درختی　　چرا نبود روا از نیکبختی
بدان کس را که اندر دل شکی نیست　　یقین داند که هستی جز یکی نیست
من و ما و تو و او هست یك چیز　　که در وحدت نباشد هیچ تمییز

{Verily "*I am The Truth*" is a revelation of absolute mystery,
Save "The Truth," who can say "*I am The Truth*?"
All the atoms of the world, like Mansur,
You will take to be drunken and heavy with wine;
Continually are they singing this song of praise,
Continually dwelling on this mystic verity.
If you desire that its meaning may be clear to you,
Then read the text, "*All praise Allah*,"
When you have carded "self" as cotton,
You, like the "wool carder," will raise this cry.
Take out the cotton of your illusion from your ears,
Hearken to the call of *The One, The Almighty*.

This call is ever coming to you from "The Truth,"
Why are you tarrying for the last day?
Come into the "valley of peace," for straightaway
The bush (allusion to Moses and the burning bush at Mt Sinai, Koran 20:9)
will say to you, 'Verily I am Allah' (Koran 20:14).
The saying "I am 'The Truth'" was lawful for the bush,
Why is it unlawful in the mouth of the good man?
Every man whose heart is pure from doubt,
Knows for a surety that there is no being but 'One.'
'I,' 'We,' 'Thou' and 'He' are all one thing,
For in Unity there is no distinction of persons.

Ed. and English trans. E. H. Whinfield as *Gulshan I Raz: The Mystic Rose Garden of Sa'd Ud Din Mahmud Shabistari* (London, 1880; reprinted Lahore, 1978), pp. 45–6. Note: *ḥallāj* means "wool-carder" in Arabic.}

51 {Köprülü accepts that these passages from the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, giving a year-by-year "account" of Aḥmad Yasawī's life, are the "autobiographical" work of Aḥmad Yasawī himself. It is worth noting that the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* never mentions Yūsuf Hamadānī.}

52 For the differences between the great popular Ṣūfī of the Western Turks, Yūnus Emre, and Aḥmad Yasawī, see the second part of this work. In Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, there is a strong tendency toward pantheism under the influence of Neoplatonic mysticism. The *Dīwān-i Shams al-ḥaqā'iq* of this Ṣūfī poet, who expressed ecstatic and passionate outbursts with a sublime and ardent love, is the finest indication of what sublime and divine poetry this form of inspiration could produce; indeed, people of taste and critical sensitivity are unanimous in regarding it as one of the major summits of Ṣūfī literature. For example, referring to *Bazm-i alast* {the primordial covenant between man and God}, which formed a perpetual subject for Ottoman poets, the following lines of Mawlānā are very suggestive and poetic:

پیش ازان کاندر جهان باغ ورز وانگور بود از شراب لایزالی جان ما مخمور بود

ما ببغداد ازل لاف انا الحق میزدیم پیش ازان کاین دارو گیرو نکتهٔ منصور بود

پیش ازان کاین نقش دل بر آب وگل معمار شد در خرابات حقایق عیش ما معمور بود

{Before vineyard and vine and grapes were created, our soul was drunk on the wine of everlastingness.
In the Baghdad of eternity, we uttered "I am Divine Truth" before Manṣūr's utterance and arrest and hanging.
Before this heart was moulded of water and clay, our life thrived in the tavern of Reality.}

Mawlānā, who openly confessed "I am Divine Truth" {*anā al-ḥaqq*} like Manṣūr {al-Ḥallāj} in the Baghdad of eternity, does not refrain from declaring and revealing the mystical truths with a most candid ecstasy and exuberance in his *Dīwān-i kabīr* {i.e. *Dīwān-i Shams al-ḥaqā'iq*}. Mawlānā, who says,

مرد خدا زان سوی کفرست و دین مرد خدا را چه خطا و صواب

{The man of God is beyond infidelity and religion. To the man of God right and wrong are alike.

(R. A. Nicholson (trans.), *Selected Poems from the Dīvāni Shamsi Tabrīz* [Cambridge, 1898; reprinted Cambridge, 1952], p. 30)} clearly shows his Ṣūfī character in his very lively *ghazals*:

هر نفس آواز عشق میرسد از چپ و راست ما بفلك میرویم عزم تماشا كراست
ما بفلك بوده ایم یار ملك بوده ایم باز همانجا رویم خواجه كه آن شهر ماست
خود ز فلك برتریم وز ملك افزونتریم زین دو چرا نگذریم منزل ما كبریاست
عالم خاك از كجا گوهر پاك از كجا گرچه فرود آمدیم باز دویم این چه جاست

{Every moment the voice of Love is coming from the left and right.
We are bound for heaven: who has a mind to sight-seeing?
We have been in heaven, we have been friends of the angels;
Thither, sire, let us return, for that is our country.
We are even higher than heaven and more than the angels;
Why pass we not beyond these twain? Our goal is majesty supreme.
How different a source have the world of dust and the pure substance!
Tho' we came down, let us haste back – what place is this!

(Nicholson, trans., p. 33.)} As for the *Mathnawī*, this is a work of a much more pedagogic nature (see the second part of this book for more on Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī).

53 {See John O'Kane's trans. of Muḥammad b. al-Munawwar's *Asrār al-tawḥīd* as *The Secrets of God's Mystical Oneness or The Spiritual Stations of Shaikh Abu Sa'id* (Costa Mesa, CA, 1992), p. 514.}

54 J. Darmesteter, in *Les Origines de la poésie persane* (Paris, 1887), advanced the following view, which is worthy of note, on this matter: "The orthodoxy of Baghdad could not long satisfy Iran's mythological and philosophical instincts. Among the people, Islam was quickly transformed by receiving to its bosom all the old popular mythology that was galvanized around the heroic figure of ʿAlī. The new religion that arose from it, Shīʿism, which combined in itself the inferior elements of these two parent religions, the mythological excess of ancient Iran and the dogmatic intolerance of Islam, and which became such a factor in the moral decline of Iran, was fine for the populace and most of their priests. But it was insufficient for the souls of the elite. Some of them left Islam more or less openly through science and lack of faith. Others left by means of mysticism. At the time of Firdawsī, two poets represented these two opposite currents. One was the physician Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā) and the other was the dervish Abū Saʿīd" (pp. 59–60). {Darmesteter goes on to say} "Abū Saʿīd's pantheism was not as definite and clear as in subsequent poets and it was because of this that he was such a great poet. *Knowledge* (i.e. *ʿilm*), as one calls the Ṣūfī intuition, was not for him, as it would be for his successors, a frozen and unchanging belief, a tradition they had acquired from their masters, a matter to be put in verse. This knowledge – he created it, nourished it with his blood and tears, with the pain, doubt and contradictions in his heart" (pp. 81–2). Although not clearly stated in Darmesteter's book, we find this idea at least a quarter century earlier in J. A. Gobineau (*Les Religions et les philosophies dans l'asie centrale* [Paris, 1866 {reissued, Paris, 1953}], p. 79). On the lyric poetry of Ibn Sīnā, see the work of the Orientalist Carra de Vaux (*Avicenne* {Paris, 1900; reprinted Amsterdam, 1974}, p. 155).

55 {Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 344. On this shaikh, see also ʿAṭṭār, *Tadhkira*, vol. 2, pp. 322–37, and *Nāmah-i Dānishvarān* {Tehran, 1338/1959–60}, vol. 1,

pp. 608–15. A number of special functions have been attributed to individual quatrains of Abū Saʿīd. For example, there are some quatrains that were read in order to attain various goals, {namely} to find a perfect guide, to atone for one's sins, to be delivered from illness, to make it rain, to improve one's means of livelihood, and so forth (see the collected quatrains (*Rubaʿiyāt*) published with Khwāja ʿAbd Allāh Anṣārī {al-Harawī's} *Munājāt* [Istanbul, 1301/1883–4].) {The latter has been translated by Lawrence Morris and Rustam Sarfeh as *Munājāt: The Intimate Prayers of Khwajih ʿAbd Allāh Anṣārī* (New York, 1975). See also Fritz Meier, *Abū Saʿīd-i Abū l-Ḫayr 9357–440/967–1049): Wirklichkeit und Legende* (Leiden, 1976); and *EIr*, s.v. "Abū Saʿīd . . . Abī'l-Kayr" (G. Böwering).}

56 Ḥakīm Sanā'ī was for a time in the *tekke* of Khwāja Yūsuf Hamadānī and toward the end of his life spoke only of *tawḥīd* {proclaiming the unity of God}, *maʿārif* {knowledge of God}, and *ḥaqā'iq* {reality of God}. The religious scholars {*ʿulamā'*} of Ghazna found his book *Ḥadīqat al-ḥaqā'iq* to be contrary to the stipulations of the *Sharīʿa* and sent it on to Baghdad, but the *ʿulamā'* there saw nothing objectionable in it. Mawlānā glorified him in the couplet

عطار روح بود وسنائی دو چشم او ماازپی سنائی وعطار آمدیم

{ʿAṭṭār was spirit and Sanā'ī was his two eyes. We have followed in the traces of Sanā'ī and ʿAṭṭār,} and Dawlat-Shāh described the works of this great poet as follows:

دیوان حکیم سنائی سی هزار بیت زیاده است مجموع حقایق ومعارف وترك دنیا ومذمت این

خاکدان تحریص تمام میکند

{The *dīwān* of Ḥakīm Sanā'ī, consisting of over 30,000 couplets, is a gathering of *ḥaqā'iq* and *maʿārif*, urging renunciation of the world and reproaching this dust-heap of desires} (Dawlat-Shāh, *Tadhkira*, pp. 95–9). As for Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, who gained even greater fame than Sanā'ī, the historical sources differ considerably on the date of his death, but Muḥammad b. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb Qazwīnī rightly claims that he must have lived until the year 617/1220 ({ʿAṭṭār,} *Tadhkira*, introduction. {His death date moves back and forth. Cf. *EI*^{2}, s.v. "ʿAṭṭār" (H. Ritter).} We possess considerable information on the mystical life of this great poet. Dawlat-Shāh, who regarded him very highly, states ({*Tadhkira*,} p. 188):

در نهایت کمال بحری بود زاخر و همت او مصروف بود بر نفی خاطر، در گوشهٔ نشسته ودر بر روی

غیر بسته، هزاران ابکار اسرار در خلوت سرای او جلوه ساز بودند و در شبستان او عروسان حقایق

ودقایق محرم راز

{In the extreme of perfection he was a swelling sea. His ambition was directed to the banishing of self-will. He withdrew into a corner and shut the door to others. Thousands of virgin mysteries were revealed to him in seculsion, and in his bed-chamber the brides of spiritual realities lifted their veils.} In any case, if we take into consideration the time in which they lived, we can definitely assert that Aḥmad Yasawī was not influenced by either Ḥakīm Sanā'ī or, in particular, Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, even though he may have been familiar with the poetry of earlier Ṣūfīs, such as Abū Saʿīd.

Based on Dawlat-Shāh, the death date of Ḥakīm Sanā'ī is given as 576/1180–1, but this is not correct. Hüseyin Dâniş says in *Ser-Âmedân-ı Suhan* {Istanbul, 1327/1909}, p. 219, that Sanā'ī was a disciple of Yūsuf Hamadānī and that according to one tradition he died in 576 and according to another in 690/1291, but this is also mistaken. I have stated above that this Ṣūfī poet was for a while in the dervish convent of Yūsuf Hamadānī. Based on H. Ethé's catalogue {*Catalogue of Persian, Turkish, Hindustani and Pushtu Manuscripts* [in the Bodleian] (Oxford, 1889)}, the work of G. Ouseley {*Biographical Notices of Persian Poets* (London, 1846)}, and {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, Prof. Nicholson has lowered his death date to 545/1150–1 (*Selected Poems from the Dīvāni Shamsi Tabrīz*, p. 259). There are many details on this in the entry on Sanā'ī in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. {His death date is given as probably 525/1131 in *İA*, s.v. "Senâ'î" (Ahmed Ateş) and *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Sanā'ī" (J. T. P. de Bruijn).}

57 The works of both Ḥakīm Sanā'ī and Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār were of a pedagogic nature, written to teach ethics and Ṣūfī rules of conduct to the people. In the famous poem *Manṭiq al-ṭair*, which is the most renowned work of ʿAṭṭār, expounding as it does the tenets of Ṣūfism in an allegorical form, and which was translated and extensively commented upon by Garcin de Tassy, who considered it to be one of the most important monuments of Ṣūfī doctrine (*La Poésie philosophique et religieuse chez les persians {d'après le Mantic uttair . . .}* [Paris, 1860], p. 6), there are a few rare points that could be interpreted according to only the strictist pantheistic beliefs, but they are not sufficient for us to regard him as a "pantheistic Ṣūfī poet" (Chapter 10 of Carra de Vaux's *Gazali*, in which he discusses the Persian Ṣūfī poets, p. 289). ʿAṭṭār, certainly one of the most prolific of the early Persian poets, did compose much mystical verse, such as

ای روی در نهفته ببازار آمده　　خلقی بدین طلسم گرفتار آمده

یك پرتو اوفکنده جهان گشته پر چراغ　　یك تخم کشته این همه دربار آمده

{He came to the market place with his face covered; the people were seized by this talisman. He sent out one ray and the world became a torch; he sowed one seed and the universe produced all these fruits,} but it is impossible to find in it the divine ecstasy and exuberance of Mawlānā and his intense pantheism. Sayyid ʿIzz al-Dīn Āmilī wrote numerous commentaries on these mystical odes (Dawlat-Shāh, {*Tadhkira*,} p. 190). Nevertheless, it would be more correct to regard the poet of the *Pandnāme* and *Manṭiq al-ṭair* as a moralist just like Saʿdī. Carra de Vaux states that one must consider both of these poets as moralists and even that the *Manṭiq al-ṭair* is a didactic work expounding the fundamental tenets of Ṣūfism (*Gazali*, pp. 281, 283). This is completely in accord with my view. On the subject of Saʿdī, everyone agrees that he was not a Ṣūfī poet but a great moralist (Carra de Vaux, *ibid.*). Barbier de Meynard, who translated the *Būstān* into French, says that Saʿdī had little inclination toward Ṣūfism, but that he had to give a slight Ṣūfī color to his work because of the general tendency of his time; that he was never a Ṣūfī poet comparable to Mawlānā or even Ḥāfiẓ Shīrāzī; and that one must view Saʿdī as one of the most charming and humane moralists to appear in the Muslim East. This view is quite correct (introduction to his trans. of *Būstān* {as *Le Boustan, or Verger*; *poem persan de Saadi; traduit pour la premièr fois en français . . .* (Paris, 1880)}, p. 26; *İran'da şiir* {Poetry in Iran, not further indentified}, p. 47).

58 The one poem in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* that reveals a relatively broad-minded and unconstrained Ṣūfī doctrine is not in the published editions currently in our possession. It is found in {Ḥazīnī's} *Jawāhir*, and so we must recognize it as the oldest piece of

poetry attributed to Aḥmad Yasawī. I thus cite it here verbatim, although the text has been corrupted by copyists:

خالقمی ایسترم دون کون جهان ایچنده دورت یانندن یولندم کون و مکان ایچنده
دورتدن یتی که یتیم طقوزی بر بر اتم ایکی دن اونه یتدم چرخ کیوان ایچنده
اوچیوز آلتمش صو کچدم درتیوز قرق درت طاغ آشدم وحدت شرابن ایچدم دوشدم میدان ایچنده
چونکه دوشدم میدانه میدانی طولو بولدم یوزبیک عارفی کوردم بارجه جولان ایچنده
مین آلرده یورودم ایسته جوکوم نی صوردم بارجه ایتور سینده دور قالدم حیران ایچنده
اوزمی درده قودم چومدم تنکیز ایچنده دری صدفده کوردم کوهرنی کان ایچنده
مسکین خواجه احمد جانی هم کوهر درهم کانی بارجه آنک مکانی اول لامکان ایچنده

{I seek my Creator night and day in the world.
I am freed from the four directions in the realm of being and becoming.
From four I reached seven, I did nine one by one,
From two I reached ten in the sphere of Saturn.
I crossed 360 rivers, I crossed 444 mountains,
I drank the wine of Unity, I entered the battlefield.
When I entered the battlefield, I found the field full.
I saw 100,000 gnostics, all prancing in the field.
I ran among them and asked what I was seeking.
They all said: "It is in you." I was lost in amazement.
I submitted to pain, I plunged in the sea,
I saw the pearl in the shell, the jewel in the ore.
Poor Khwāja Aḥmad's soul is both the jewel and the ore.
All of his place is in no-place.

Cf. the transcription in M. Orhan Soysal (ed.), *Eski Türk edebiyatı metinleri* (Ankara, 1978), p. 114, although it is missing the second verse,

Törtdin yetige yetdim / tokuzu bir bir etdim
İkidin onga yetdim / çarh-ı keyvan içinde.}

The poem given by Ḥazīnī actually does appear in a published version that should have been available to Köprülü, namely the 1299 Istanbul printing, pp. 234–5, where the poem differs considerably in wording and in the order of lines. It also appears in the recent Bice edn, pp. 82–3. The text does not, in fact, explicitly state that the poem belongs to Aḥmad Yasawī, but that seems to be the implication. Köprülü's claim that the text has been corrupted by copyists is interesting. The manuscript in which it is preserved in this form was copied in the same year the work was composed (1002/1593), and there is every reason to suppose that it reflects Ḥazīnī's intention. Perhaps Köprülü means that Ḥazīnī took it from a written version that had already been corrupted in transmission. But if so, what is remarkable is that he never draws attention to the most glaring "adjustment" in the text, namely the prevalence of "Oghuz" forms, orthographically and sometimes grammatically, over the Central Asian forms we might expect to find in an "original" *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*. The mostly Ottoman orthography, which is replaced by Chaghatay forms in the printed versions, should at least

remind us that what we have here is at best a poor reflection of the original Chaghatay form of the poem, no matter if it was written in the twelfth, thirteenth, or sixteenth century.}

59 E. J. W. Gibb, who has beautifully summarized their Ṣūfī beliefs in his magnum opus, says "The early Ṣūfī poets had taken the current phraseology of the contemporary singers of love and wine, and by imparting a mystic signification to the terms thus adopted, they had constructed a species of symbolic language in which, for example, 'wine' represents the mystic love, 'the vintner' the teacher thereof, 'the tavern' {i.e. the *kharābāt*} the place where it is taught, just as the 'Beloved' stands for God, and the 'lover' for man" (*A History of Ottoman Poetry* {London, 1900–9}, vol. 1, p. 23 {Köprülü used a Turkish trans. by Fuad Raif of five folios of the first volume as *Eṣ'âr-i osmânîye tarihi*}). The poet {Maḥmūd Shabistarī} of *Gulshan-i rāz* explains the "tavern" of the Ṣūfīs in the following couplets:

خراباتی شدن از خود رهایست خودی کفرست اگر خود پارسایست

خرابات از جهان بی مثالیست مقام عاشقانرا لا ابالیست

خرابات آشیان مرغ جانست خرابات آستان لا مکانست

{To be a haunter of taverns is to be freed from self,
Self-regard is paganism, even if it be in righteousness.
The tavern is of the world that has no similtude,
It is the place of lovers that reck not.
The tavern is the nest of the bird of the soul,
The tavern is the sanctuary that has no place.
(Whinfield trans., p. 81.)}

This then is the *kharābāt* that Mawlānā meant in the couplet:

همرنگ جماعت شو تالذت جان بینی درکوی خرابات آ تا دردکشان بینی

{Be of like color with the congregation, so that you may see the soul's pleasure.
Come to the alley of the tavern, so that you may see those who swallow dregs,}

and that Ḥāfiẓ meant in the couplet:

قدم منه بخرابات جز بشرط ادب که ساکنان درش محرمان پادشهند

{Do not set foot in the tavern except by the rule of good manners.
For those who dwell at its gate are the confidants of the king.}

One should not confuse the *kharābāt* of the Ṣūfīs with the usual *kharābāt* of the poets (for details, see my article "Harâbât," *YM*, {1 (1917), 186–8}).

60 Many European researchers attribute the fatalism in the Muslim countries to the lack of the notion of free will in Islam, which is completely mistaken. On this subject, see Gobineau's famous work *Les religions*, p. 72.

6

AḤMAD YASAWĪ'S LITERARY INFLUENCE

A The influence of Aḥmad Yasawī

The work of Aḥmad Yasawī, who had no interest whatsoever in artistic expression and who viewed poetry as simply a means of religio-Ṣūfī propaganda, was, as described above, an ordinary product greatly lacking in intrinsic aesthetic value. If we leave aside its historical features and examine the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* merely with respect to its aesthetic significance, we cannot accord it any great value according to the literary taste of today, indeed, even according to the literary taste of the past. However, when we study it from a historical point of view, i.e. with respect to its extrinsic value and influence, we must acknowledge the greatness and power of this work, which has endured for centuries. A literary work which, for almost eight {now nine – if not actually four or five} centuries, has weathered all kinds of {social} transformations and changes in taste, which has been the primary model to be imitated by a great many poets over these centuries,[1] and which has served the purpose of providing verse to the taste of the popular masses for centuries, is unquestionably worthy of special attention with regard to literary history.[2] Let me try to shed light on the reasons for this very important phenomenon so that the fact that the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* has had such a great extrinsic influence despite its fundamental lack of any significant aesthetic value will not remain a mystery.

As was previously explained, two fundamental elements in the work of Aḥmad Yasawī are immediately apparent: the Islamic, i.e. the religio-Ṣūfī element, and the national, i.e. the element taken from folk literature. The Islamic element is especially strong in the subject matter, i.e. in the substance of the work, while the national element, in contrast to this, is noticeable above all in its form and meter. The Turks, who had recently entered the realm of Islam and who exhibited a great desire to understand the bases of this new religion, naturally appreciated this work, which, with regard to form, seemed to them not at all unfamiliar. And because, with regard to subject matter, the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* aroused their very great and sincere interest, it immediately acquired a sacred character among the mass of the people.[3] Furthermore, the fact that Aḥmad Yasawī was also the founder of a *ṭarīqa*, and its *pīr*, and that his *ṭarīqa* spread to many different and

extensive regions, was perhaps the most important factor in this process. For those who joined his *ṭarīqa*, reading and memorizing the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* and, for those who were able, writing the same kind of poetry, i.e. *ḥikmats*, were virtually considered to be requirements {of membership}. The *ḥikmats* that were recited during the *dhikrs* could not, of course, simply be regarded as the work of an ordinary folk poet. They were endued with a sacred aura that overshadowed their aesthetic quality. The ability of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* to remain popular over the centuries, despite all changes in taste, derived from its indisputable sacred value among the dervishes. Otherwise, if this feeling of reverence for his verses had not had the character of an indisputable principle – even an article of faith – this work would have long been forgotten. In other words, the major factor that caused the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* to endure for centuries and caused numerous writers to adopt it as a model was the religio-Ṣūfī spiritual influence of Aḥmad Yasawī, which was described at length above, rather than the aesthetic value of the work.

A second factor in addition to this fundamental one was the fact that the regions in which the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* endured have remained under the same ruling principles {*hâkim esaslar*} for the past eight centuries and have not undergone an intellectual awakening. The religio-Ṣūfī objectives that Aḥmad Yasawī spread and instilled have not changed among the people since that time, but, to the contrary, have become more widespread and more deeply rooted. The Turkish and Persian poets, the Ṣūfīs, the religious scholars and philosophers, and the jurists who appeared since the sixth/twelfth century were not able to create anything great or original but, instead, preoccupied themselves with a multitude of insignificant details embroidering ancient established principles. Rather than extend the intellectual horizon, they narrowed it. Indeed, they limited and restricted it. The Mongol invasion brought, for a while, some new elements from the Far East to Central Asian Muslim civilization, but this had hardly any effect on religious and mystical ideas. After experiencing its most brilliant cultural flowering during the time of Tīmūr and his descendants, Central Asia was finally subjected to a state of continuous decline from the fall of the Shibānid dynasty {1500–99} to the Russian invasion and even up to recent years.

Moreover, despite the efflorescence during the Tīmūrid period in architecture, fine arts, music, secular literature, in short, all such manifestations of aesthetic life, in the final analysis it was still a time of the triumph of scholasticism and Ṣūfism.[4] In fact, the ninth/fifteenth century witnessed the flourishing of a number of great poets and Ṣūfīs like Jāmī and ʿUbaid Allāh Aḥrār. Jāmī, in turn, exercised a tremendous mystical influence on ʿAlī Shīr Nawā'ī, his contemporaries and followers. As Ẓahīr al-Dīn Bābur Shāh, the conqueror of India, perceived very clearly with his customary insight, the Ṣūfism of the men who gathered around ʿAlī Shīr Nawā'ī at the court of Sultan Ḥusain Bāiqarā in Herat was mainly philosophical and literary in character and was naturally very unconstrained and dissolute {*rindāne*}.[5] A bit later, however, at the time of the Shibānid dynasty, and in subsequent centuries, this powerful Ṣūfī current swept through all of Central Asia and, as was explained above, assumed a religious form that was

very ascetic and that rigorously conformed to fundamental Islamic dogmas under the name of Naqshbandism, which we can consider as a branch of Yasawism.[6] In other words, the social milieu gradually developed to the point at which it could accept the work of Aḥmad Yasawī with even greater enthusiasm.

Just as the first of the two elements that shaped the work of Aḥmad Yasawī, i.e. the religio-Ṣūfī element, thus remained unchanging in the social milieu for centuries and conformed each day a bit more to the common {religious} inclination, so the national element, which is so striking in the meter derived from folk literature, also remained fixed in the social milieu. In other words, it did not deviate from the {literary} inclination of the age. Because the folk literature has remained virtually constant from the sixth/twelfth century to the present, the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* never went out of fashion with respect to popular taste. It endured with the same power – even with a quasi-sanctity – over the people of the steppes, the Qazaqs and Qipchaqs, who were completely unfamiliar with the classical Persian literature. Given these factors, it is no longer a mystery that the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, which essentially possesses no great aesthetic value, has endured so vigorously over such a wide area for eight centuries.

After Aḥmad Yasawī, it became de rigeur for the dervishes who belonged to the Yasawī *ṭarīqa* to write the same type of works that he did.[7] For the Yasawī dervishes who had a modicum of poetic skill, following the road opened by the *pīr* of the *ṭarīqa* acquired the character of a sacred duty. Thus, beginning with Sulaimān Bāqirghānī, i.e. the famous Ḥakīm Ata, numerous Yasawī and Naqshbandī shaikhs and dervishes wrote the same kinds of *ḥikmats*. These *ḥikmats* were virtually indistinguishable from each other with regard to subject, form, and style because the pattern established by the great *pīr* had acquired a virtual sanctity and it was felt that one should not deviate from it in any way. Only after many centuries had passed and the *ʿarūḍ* metrics had become thoroughly incorporated in literature did some Ṣūfī poets, no longer objecting to the use of a now familiar metrical system, begin to use it to write mystical poetry, prayers {*munājāt*}, and narratives. Still, the old type of *ḥikmat* continued to have a much stronger appeal than these other efforts and never conceded its place to the *ʿarūḍ* system. Although we do not have much definite information, we can deduce that the Ṣūfīs, i.e. the poets in the *tekkes*, finally began to write works in *ʿarūḍ* and that these types of works began to increase in the tenth/sixteenth century. In my view, *ʿarūḍ* could not have entered the *tekkes* and *khānqāhs* until after ʿAlī Shīr Nawāʾī. There had already been some occasional efforts in this direction before Nawāʾī, but it was not until the tenth/sixteenth century that they were able to go beyond random individual efforts and take the form of a vigorous general movement, and that the *ʿarūḍ* system assumed a more or less popular character. Still, these Ṣūfī poets, who saw nothing wrong with using *ʿarūḍ*, at the same time were always eager to write *ḥikmats* in the syllabic meters. Among the early products of our literature, the influence of Aḥmad Yasawī can also be clearly seen in the well known poem of *Yūsuf u Zulaikhā* written by a poet named ʿAlī in Central Asia in 630/1232–3.[8]

Thus, on the one hand, the followers of Aḥmad Yasawī, remaining faithful to his literary traditions, produced simple Ṣūfī works for the people. On the other hand, meanwhile, Persian influence gradually increased, and in the palaces of the Turkish rulers a number of Turkish works were composed in *ʿarūḍ* in imitation of the Persians. This trend, which had begun with {Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib's} *Kutadgu Bilig* and {Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd's} *ʿAtabat al-Ḥaqā'iq*, continued in the Seljuk period, and maintained its importance during the Mongol period. Later, in the Tīmūrid period, it began to develop with renewed vigor and, after producing poets like Amīr Saif al-Dīn, Mīr Ḥaidar, Luṭfī, and Sakkākī, reached its highest point with Nawā'ī.[9] These poets, who thought of nothing but skillfully imitating the perfect examples of the great Persian poets, and so gave no value to the popular language and taste and to the national meter and forms derived from folk literature, tried to display their talent in the courts by approaching those Persian models as closely as possible. It was quite natural, therefore, that Aḥmad Yasawī would have absolutely no influence on them. The influence of ʿAlī Shīr Nawā'ī was paramount throughout Central Asia until the collapse of the Shibānid dynasty. Only then did there begin to flourish, among groups of local poets who appeared in various regions of Central Asia, popular Ṣūfī poets who took Aḥmad Yasawī as a model alongside the classicizing court poets who imitated Nawā'ī. In this way, the influence of Aḥmad Yasawī, who had almost been forgotten in the literary world for about two or two and a half centuries, reasserted itself with a strength that was no doubt greater than it had been in the past. This important phenomenon can also explain, as I stated above, the rapidity and vigor with which the social milieu once again hankered after an ascetic Ṣūfism.

Thus, among the imitators of Aḥmad Yasawī, in addition to the popular Ṣūfī poets, i.e. the *tekke* poets, there also appeared a group of folk poets who cannot be regarded as Ṣūfīs in the full sense, although they took their basic literary notions mainly from the *tekkes*. These were the *ʿāshuqs* or minstrels who, with *saz* in hand, wandered from *tekke* to *tekke*, coffee house to coffee house, and city to city. These minstrel poets, who replaced the old Turkish *ozans* or *bakhshis* {*bāqshīs*, *bakhshīs*, *bakshıs*, and other forms},[10] for the most part had no *madrasa* education, but acquired whatever learning they had on their own. Therefore they were better acquainted with the popular taste and spirit and they made use of folk literature in great measure. This being the case, and because virtually all of them were connected with either the Yasawī or Naqshbandī *ṭarīqa*, they learned by ear a great deal about the principles of Ṣūfism and the rules of the order, and they naturally made abundant use of words and expressions related to such things in their works.[11] The works of these *ʿāshuqs* – who took their inspiration from Islamic tradition, the legends of famous saints, the old Iranian epics, or else from national subjects or contemporary events – were naturally more varied than those of the Ṣūfīs and generally were of a semi-religious or non-religious nature. Thus, they were more satisfying to the national taste. These works were far, however, from the sanctity that was accorded to the *ḥikmats* of the Ṣūfīs. Just as the *ʿāshuqs* among the Western Turks had begun to use *ʿarūḍ* after Nesīmī

{d. 820/1417–18} and especially after Fuḍūlī {d. 963/1556}, those among the Eastern Turks did so after Nawā'ī {d. 506/1501}. Nevertheless, while they did make some use of *'arūḍ* – like the poets who appeared after Nawā'ī – they still gave much more importance to the syllabic meter. This is the reason why Vambéry says that, in the books of minstrel poetry that he collected under the title *Bakhshi kitâbı*, he came across numerous works by various poets written in both *'arūḍ* and the syllabic meters.[12] In any case, it is quite clear that Aḥmad Yasawī exerted a very powerful influence on these popular *'āshıqs* as well as on all the poets of the Ṣūfī *tekkes* in Central Asia.

Among the Ṣūfī poets who imitated Aḥmad Yasawī and flourished in Central Asia – Qūl Shams al-Dīn, Khudāidād, Īqānī, Qūl 'Ubaidī, Faqīrī, Aḥmad Yasawī {sic}, Baiḍā, Bihbūdī, Shuhūdī, Qūl Sharafī, Gedā, Ghazzālī, Ṭufailī, Qāsim, Mashrab, Hüveydâ, etc. – there were many who differed not only in time but also in quality and fame. It would be outside the scope of this work to provide here even a very brief general account of all of them.[13] These poets, some of whom have *dīwāns* (published and unpublished) and some of whom have only a few scattered compositions, wrote some poems in *'arūḍ* as well as *ḥikmats* in the style of Aḥmad Yasawī. A poet of this type from Khokand wrote, under the pen name Güldeste, an important *dīwān* modeled after the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*.[14] In short, Aḥmad Yasawī was a very important poet who, with his powerful personality, influenced the Turkish literature of Central Asia for centuries and created his own unique type of poetry.

B Sulaimān Bāqirghānī {Ḥakīm Ata}

In the field of literature, the first and most famous follower of Aḥmad Yasawī was his third *khalīfa* Ḥakīm Sulaimān Ata {Bāqirghānī}. We know from {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt* that this Ṣūfī, whose life and legends I discussed at length above (Chapter 4, pp. 89–94), produced a number of Turkish works[15] and that they were very famous in Turkistan.[16] Indeed, legend states that from his early childhood he began to recite versified *ḥikmats* thanks to the spiritual power of Khaḍir. Thus, the first *ḥikmat* on the first page of the famous book of Ḥakīm Ata begins with the line *Hızır-İlyas atam bar* {I have a father Khaḍir-İlyās}. In any case, both history and dervish tradition show that Ḥakīm Sulaimān Ata was also a Ṣūfī poet like Aḥmad Yasawī.

The major works that have been attributed to Ḥakīm Sulaimān Ata, such as *Bâqirghân kitâbı*, *Âkhir zamân kitâbı*, and {*Ḥaḍrat-i*} *Maryam kitâbı*, are popular works that are still read with great rapture and excitement in Central Asia, especially in the region of the Volga. If we leave aside *Maryam kitâbı* and also *Âkhir zamân kitâbı* – which is a rather long but simple *dastān* put in the tongue of an ascetic about the portents of the end of time, Gog and Magog, the messiah {*mahdī*}, the *dābbat al-arḍ* (an animal that will appear with the *mahdī* on the Day of Judgment), and the events of the Day of Judgment – Sulaimān Ata's major work is a famous collection of poetry called *Bâqirghân kitâbı*. Glancing over this collection, which

has been published in several editions, it becomes quite clear that it comprises hymns and Ṣūfī poems belonging to various poets of different times – exactly like the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* – and that it definitely cannot be attributed to a single person. Not only the style and contents of the poems but even the pen names {of the various authors} suffice to show this.[17]

Much of the folk poetry in the syllabic meter written by Khwāja Sulaimān Bāqirghānī under different pen names, such as Qūl Sulaimān, Ḥakīm Sulaimān, Ḥakīm Khwāja Sulaimān, and Ḥakīm Ata, resembles the work of Aḥmad Yasawī in every respect: *dastāns* about the Ascension and death of the Prophet; dialogue of heaven and hell; the very famous legend about how only those who repent would be able to drink from the four rivers that flow through heaven while those who do not repent would be given instead the poison from the tree that grows in hell {*zakkum*}; events on the Day of Judgment; fear of God; Moses being a disciple of Khaḍir; the story of Ishmael and Abraham; some Ṣūfī thoughts on the virtues of dervishes and being a dervish and on the transitory nature of this world; eulogies about Aḥmad Yasawī; and so forth.

The basic spirit pervading all these things is exactly that of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*. The space devoted to mystical love in Sulaimān Ata, as in the work of Aḥmad Yasawī, is very little, and suitable for the religious training not of true lovers {*ʿāshuqs*} but rather of ascetics. "If the shadow of love touches someone, he should become a lover. For the lover, the nurse of love is pain and torment. The path of love is long and its night is terrifying. One should forfeit his soul and dive into the unfathomable sea of love." The love of this ascetic, who speaks of the sweetness of mentioning {*dhikr*} God just before dawn together with the birds, is evidently no different than that of his shaikh Aḥmad Yasawī. We see this identity not only in subject matter but also in form and style. For example, the meters and forms used in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, and their major characteristics, are found in exactly the same manner in the works of Ḥakīm Sulaimān Ata. Therefore, we can definitely say that Sulaimān Ata tried to conform completely to the personality of his shaikh rather than to exhibit an individual personality of his own, both artistically and doctrinally. He took great pains to imitate him fully in literature as well as in the rules of the order and mystical doctrines, for, as explained above, writing Ṣūfī *ḥikmats* like those of Aḥmad Yasawī was not an aesthetic or personal matter but was simply one of the protocols of Yasawism. Because Sulaimān Ata was the one who first established this tradition, he deserves to hold the most important place among the followers of Aḥmad Yasawī. It is precisely for this reason that his work, together with that of his shaikh, has vigorously endured among the people for eight centuries.[18]

C Conclusion

We have seen above what a powerful moral influence Aḥmad Yasawī has long exerted on the entire Turkish world. Therefore, after describing his influence on the corpus known collectively as Chaghatay literature and in Central Asia

generally, we should also show the scope and power of his influence in the other vast regions of the Turkish world. We may thus attain a clear and definite idea as to the extent of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat's* penetration and dissemination. In order to do this, we have to search for the influence of Aḥmad Yasawī in four main regions: the area of the Qipchaqs, i.e. the present-day Northern Turks; the area of the Turkmen; the area of the Azerīs; and the area of the Western Turks, i.e. Anatolia and Rumelia.

The literature of the earliest periods of the first of these different linguistic areas, i.e. the northern area, is almost entirely unknown. While a few texts of a linguistic character survive, there are hardly any of a literary character. Only a few rare and valuable works, like the *Maḥabbatnāme*,[19] reveal that a number of literary works imitating classical Persian literature appeared during the eighth/fourteenth century under the patronage of the Turkish rulers and princes within the realm of the Golden Horde. Consequently, these were written not in the local dialect but in the literary dialect that we call Chaghatay. Still, one wonders what kind of popular literary works were created in that region at that time. How much were the *ḥikmats* of Aḥmad Yasawī and Sulaimān Bāqirghānī read among the people and how much influence did they have? Given our current paucity of information, it is hardly possible to give precise answers to these difficult questions. All we know is that there endured among the people, in addition to literature like the *Maḥabbatnāme* that imitated Persian works, a number of works whose subjects were taken from early popular mythology, such as Ḥusām Kātib's famous story of Kesikbash entitled *Ǯumjuma sulṭān*,[20] and some other early stories and verse compositions of this sort.[21] It is highly likely that the *ḥikmats* of Aḥmad Yasawī and especially Sulaimān Bāqirghānī were among them, because we know that collective works like the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, *Bâqirghân kitâbı*, and *Âkhir zamân kitâbı*, which included the poetry of Yasawī dervishes, were very widespread and famous among the Northern Turks from an early period.[22] In recent years, i.e. during the early years of the twentieth century, a new literature began to take shape among the Northern Turks under the influence of European civilization. Yet it suffices to study the earlier literature only superficially in order to detect the clear and unquestionable influence of Aḥmad Yasawī and his followers and imitators.[23]

We can also see the influence of Aḥmad Yasawī on the Turkmen tribes, most of whom were nomads living in a vast area extending from Balkh and Herat to Astarābād between the Amu Darya and the Caspian Sea. These Turkmen, whose literature, given their social level, could be no more sophisticated than folk literature and whose primitive aesthetic needs were met by various kinds of folk poetry that was composed and sung by *bakhshis*, or minstrels {*saz* poets}, were long familiar with the Ṣūfī *ḥikmats* of Aḥmad Yasawī and his followers, as well as with the *Dede Korkut* stories. In the work of the folk poet Makhdūm Qulī {1733?–82?}, which they regard as quasi-sacred, the influence of Aḥmad Yasawī is readily apparent – as Vambéry has quite rightly pointed out. This Naqshbandī dervish, who lived about a century and a half ago and wandered about

Transoxiana and northern Iran with *saz* in hand, is considered even today to be the greatest Ṣūfī poet of the Turkmen. Like the *ʿāshuqs* of Azerbaijan and Anatolia, he composed poems of a very local character inspired from daily life. These described folk heroes and accounts of *alaman*, i.e. tribal warfare. In his Ṣūfī ethical poems, this poet shows exactly the same spirit and style as Aḥmad Yasawī. He says that the world is transitory, that believers should strive basically for the hereafter, that his heart pounds with the love of God, and that he wants to accompany true dervishes who sing for God's sake. He tries to instill the need to worship God, to be pious, to avoid evil deeds, to acquire good habits, and other ethical principles – exactly the same things that are stressed in the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*. It is quite evident, therefore, that Aḥmad Yasawī also exerted a strong influence on the folk poets of the Turkmen.[24]

Perhaps the least known linguistic and literary region of Turkish up to the present is that lying between Central Asia, where the great literary dialect that we call Chaghatay prevailed, and Asia Minor, where Seljuk Turkish was the dominant language. This middle region, which includes the area around Baghdad, Mosul, Diyarbakir, eastern Anatolia, and Caucasian and Iranian Azerbaijan, is where Azerī was used. This language very closely resembles the Anatolian, i.e. the Seljuk-Ottoman dialect. I believe that this later dialect came about as a result of the migrations caused by the Mongol invasion and the appearance of new ethnic groupings. We know that the earliest product of this dialect was the mystical poetry of the Ṣūfī Ḥasan-oğlu, who wrote before 700/1300 and won great fame not only in his own territory but also in Anatolia because of the dialectical similarity.[25] Unfortunately, almost nothing of his poetry has survived. One can surmise, however, that this Turkish poet, who was well known for writing Persian Ṣūfī poetry, must have been preoccupied with the subject of Ṣūfism and, given his wide fame, must have written many hymns in the Yasawī manner and in the syllabic meter. We can definitely conclude that the *türküs* of the famous Ḥasan-oğlu – if they in fact belong to him (we have no conclusive evidence if they can be attributed to him or not) – which the Ottoman biographers {*tezkireciler*} of the tenth/sixteenth century spoke of rather disparagingly, no doubt because they were written in the syllabic meter in imitation of folk poetry, reveal the contemporary influence of Aḥmad Yasawī.[26] This hypothesis gains even more credence if we take into account that the vestiges of folk literature and mythology maintained their vigor in this middle Azerī area from a very early period.[27]

I have expounded in detail above {Chapter 2, pp. 31–5} how and when the legends of Aḥmad Yasawī spread to Anatolia and how Yasawī dervishes went there without interruption. The second half of my book is devoted to analyzing the rise and development of popular Ṣūfī literature among the Turks of Anatolia. A comprehensive account of Aḥmad Yasawī's literary influence on the Western Turks is to be found there. Thus, there is no need to say anything about this subject here. When the history of the Ṣūfī movement among the Turks, i.e. the history of the *ṭarīqas*, is more carefully studied, when many aspects of Turkish folk

literature and Turkish ethnography that today are unknown become clarified through serious and detailed research, and when the history of Turkish literature, which even today is regarded as a virtual enigma by the scholarly world, is scientifically established and explained, then the widespread and long-lasting influence of this early Turkish Ṣūfī on the entire Turkish world will be much better understood.

NOTES

1 {It did not occur to Köprülü, or others, that the "imitations" were, in fact, the model, or even the stuff out of which the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was created.}

2 Prof. Hartmann, while speaking of the Chaghatay poet Chimyanlı Hüveydâ, says that Aḥmad Yasawī provided all of Turkistan with spiritual fulfillment through the *dīwān* that he created, and he states: "If one considers that the death of the author of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* occurred only a century after the composition of the *Kutadgu Bilig*, the importance of this book, which lives even today among his countrymen – almost 760 years after the death of the poet – is patently obvious" ({"Der čaghataische Diwan Huwedas,"} p. 133). In fact, all European scholars who have done research on Turkish history have more or less understood the importance of Aḥmad Yasawī. According to Cahun's famous history, for example, "In the time of Tīmūr, Turkish gained the upper hand over Persian. The men of Transoxiana awakened and no longer wrote in Persian but in Chaghatay. Before them, Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī of Turkistan wrote in the popular language, but as can be seen from the historical works written by Juvainī, Rashīd al-Dīn, and Vaṣṣāf on the order of Mongol princes, the language of the court and of science was Persian. However, after Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī in particular, Turkish gained such importance that books of religious propaganda and edification like *Mi'rājnāme*, 'Book of the Ascension' (1442), *Bakhtiyārnāme*, 'Book of Fortune' (1432), and *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'*, 'Attestation of the Saints' were written in the Uighur dialect and alphabet" ({*Introduction à l'histoire de l'asie,*} pp. 507–8). In like manner, Rambaud in the section that he wrote on the empire of Tīmūr for *Histoire général* {prepared with Lavisse} adds to this description the following view of Aḥmad Yasawī, "Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, who was the first and in my opinion the greatest of the Central Asian Turkish poets" (vol. 3, p. 967). For some reason, however, Cahun did not record this view in the history that he later published. Nevertheless, it will be well understood by readers of this book the extent to which, and the points on which, the information he gives is deserving of criticism. Kouznietsov tries to describe the status of Aḥmad Yasawī, citing Cahun and Vambéry, in the following manner: "After the conquest of Central Asia, Turkish civilization began to develop in confrontation with the Iranians and reached its zenith during the reign of Tīmūr. This development, by first asserting the idea of Turkish nationality, goaded the country's intellectual life onto this path. In this respect, the Uighurs were also of assistance in that their influence in Central Asia had already begun at the time of Chingiz Khān. Alphabets derived from Christian sources were also used in the empire of Tīmūr and it was only in the middle of the fifteenth century AD that the Arabic-Persian script was able to hold its own. According to what Vambéry states in his *History of Bokhara* {2nd edn (London, 1873; reprinted New York, 1973)} (Chapter 11), in the second half of the fourteenth century AD, the Turkish national feeling revealed itself especially when the national language called Chaghatay was used in place of Persian as the official language. Translations and imitations of Arabic and, especially Persian, works appeared and became widespread. Chaghatay writers appeared along with the Uighur author {Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib} of the *Kutadgu Bilig*. The most famous of them were Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, the *pīr* of

the city of Turkistan, Tīmūr himself, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ, ʿAlī Shīr Nawāʾī, the founder of classic Chaghatay, Bābur, and Abū ʾl-Ghāzī the Khān of Khiva" (*La Lutte des Civilizations*, pp. 75–6). It is quite natural that such general observations based on very superficial and rudimentary analyses would be for the most part erroneous. In fact, although the studies done on Aḥmad Yasawī in Europe have been so superficial and, in a great many respects, erroneous, the Orientalists still succeeded in vaguely perceiving this subject, even if they did not definitely and clearly grasp the extent of the importance of Aḥmad Yasawī, which neither our older nor younger historians and researchers have been able to understand. Barthold states that in addition to the studies and translations that have been done in Europe on Aḥmad Yasawī, a Russian researcher named N. Lykoshin has translated {into Russian}, with annotations, some of his *ḥikmats* {in "Premudrost' Khazrat-Sultana Arifin-Khodzh-Akhmada Iassavi (mogila ego v mecheti g. Turkestana)," *Sbornik materialov dlia statistiki Syr-Dar'inskoi oblasti*, 9 (1901), otd. II, in 76–105} ({mentioned in Barthold's} "Russische Arbeiten über Westasien: Jahresbericht für 1901," *Berlin Universität, Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, Mitteilungen, Westasiatische Studien*, 5 {1902}, p. 44).

3 There is an important point to be considered here. It is very likely that the *ḥikmats* of Aḥmad Yasawī were collected not by him himself but by his dervishes somewhat later. Because he recited his *ḥikmats* not to exhibit skill and artistic talent but to instruct and guide, it is hardly possible that he attempted to collect them in the form of a *dīwān*. Most probably, because of the sacred character attributed to these works {i.e. the *ḥikmats*}, individual *ḥikmats* were later collected and then arranged and compiled into a *dīwān*, and it is for this reason that we cannot find an old copy of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*. We shall see in the second part of this book that Yūnus Emre's *dīwān* was also created in this manner.

4 Cahun's view of this subject is worthy of note. According to him, "After cutting their ties with Chinese traditions . . . and firmly adopting the orthodox Transoxianan church, the Central Asian Turks began a new life. After about a century, they became so imbued with Islamic philosophy, literature, and art that they became strangers to their native soil, unable to communicate with other Turks (who had not entered the Islamic millieu). . . . In accepting Islam as the religion of state, the Turks of Turkistan, Transoxiana, and Khwārazm adopted it as a whole, without reflection, without discussion, militarily like a command. . . . Thus, the renaissance in Central Asia was nothing more than the beginning again of the Middle Ages. While Europeans, under the lash of Hellenism and bedazzled by the rediscovery of Antiquity, set off boldly toward the unknown, to independent research and to revolution, the Asians (i.e. Turks), who up to the fifteenth century had been their equals, let themselves be led docilely to school, such as it was conceived by the doctors and scholars of the orthodox caliphate. They discovered, as something of a novelty, Aristotelian philosophy, which the Arabs had distorted (as if they had found something unknown). They came back to the *Almagest* and immersed themselves in the ideas of Ibn Sīnā, their countryman, and they began to relive in Turkish the Sāmānid period and marched in place. They spent their intellectual activities, which were by no means inferior to those of others, on scholasticism, jurisprudence, and rhetoric. With great effort, they revived Euclid, Ptolemy, Galen, and Hippocrates, only barely daring to touch on Plato. Going any further would have meant getting lost. Little by little, with the help of the monks (i.e. mystics), they came to think of nothing more than their salvation and contented themselves with the Koran and the compendia that it inspired. . . . The Turk had abdicated spiritually to his pir and temporally to his sultan" ({*Introduction à l'histoire de l'asie*,} pp. 502–3). If we leave aside the numerous historical errors in these details, and the hasty generalizations, there is in fact a great amount of truth in what Cahun says. After the time of Tīmūr and his sons, the

Central Asian Turks went continuously backward in a regressive movement. This decline is obvious in all aspects of their lives (for more information on this subject, see my article "Çagatay edebiyatı," *İA*).

5 *Bāburnāme*, among the events of 911/1505–6 {see the Thackston trans., pp. 205–28}. Noteworthy information is found on this matter in my article "Çagatay edebiyatı," *İA*. {See also Jo-Ann Gross and Asom Urunbaev, *Letters of Khwājah ʿUbayd Allāh Aḥrār and His Associates* (Leiden, 2002).}

6 {Such a statement betrays Köprülü's ignorance of Ṣūfī history in Central Asia after the fifteenth century.}

7 {Köprülü provides no evidence of this.}

8 This important Turkish work, which was studied and published by Houtsma in 1889 based on the manuscripts in the Dresden and Berlin libraries {"Ein alttürkisches Gedicht"} and which was later published in a new edition prepared by Prof. Brockelmann, who made a thorough examination of it {*ʿAli's Qissa'i Jusuf*}, was written in a twelve-syllable meter with caesuras of 4 + 4 + 4, just like the *ḥikmats* of Aḥmad Yasawī, and *dastān*, i.e. quatrain, form just like his *dastāns* {See *EI*², s.v. "Yūsuf and Zulaykhā," part 2, Turkish Literature (Barbara Flemming)}. In this Islamic story, which was written to be recited among the people, it is quite natural that this important Ṣūfī poet remained faithful to the literary traditions that were so well suited to the popular taste. The syllabic meters, which were used by folk poets and Ṣūfīs until *ʿarūḍ* and works in imitation of Persian poetry became common in the Turkish palaces – and even after they had become common – were not employed by the poets of the upper class who composed artful poetry addressed to their peers. Among the Chaghatay poets of the ninth/fifteeth and tenth/sixteenth centuries, including ʿAlī Shīr Nawā'ī, who demonstrated in his *Muḥākamat al-lughatain* that he was a genuine nationalist, we find none who gave any value to the national meter, although the period can be considered one of national revival for the Eastern Turks. Only in the *Dīwān* of Ẓahīr al-Dīn Bābur {MS in Köprülü's private library and partly published by him in "Zahiruddin Muhammad Bâbur Şah'ın 'Risâle-i vâlidiyye," *MTM*, 1 (1331/1915), 113–24, 235–56, 464–80, and 2 (1331/1915), 308–26; ed. Bilâl Yüce as *Babür Dîvânı* (Ankara, 1995)}, do we find one *qiṭʿa* {piece, composition} and also one *ghazal*, with a syllabic stroph of 7 + 7 = 14 – thus, in the national meter. As I stated in another work, with the exception of the *tekke* poets and the folk poets, i.e. the *bakhshis* (*ʿāshıqs*), who wrote *ḥikmats* and hymns, the national meter and national forms had long been abandoned among the Eastern and Western Turks alike and were always met by the scorn and ridicule of the classical poets. It is not possible to explain even briefly here the reasons for this and how long this view persisted ("Türk edebiyatında âşık tarzının menşe' ve tekâmülü," p. 26). {Köprülü knows of the use of the *ʿarūḍ* system by the Chaghatay poets of Central Asia in the fifteenth century, before Nawā'ī, but he wants to evict it from the *tekkes* and *khānqāhs* until Nawā'ī somehow installs it there. Thus, he has to declare the Chaghatay poets to be slavish imitators of Persian. Then he can explain (implicitly: he doesn't call attention to the fact) why Aḥmad Yasawī is never mentioned as a poet, nor is verse by him cited, by these Chaghatay poets. An easier way to explain why those writers never mention verse by Aḥmad Yasawī, or his status as a poet, is to assume that neither verse nor that status were yet known. Perhaps more remarkable than Köprülü's views on literary history is his apparent assumption that Persian and Turkic poets lived and wrote in utter isolation from one another. Why was it normal for popular Ṣūfī poets in Persian to know and use the *ʿarūḍ* system, but not for popular Ṣūfī poets in Turkic? As for the poem written by a certain ʿAlī, Aḥmad Yasawī's influence is "clearly seen" only through a supposedly shared meter and Aḥmad Yasawī's presumed death prior to ʿAlī's work.}

9 For further information, see my article "Çagatay edebiyatı," *İA*.

10 For clear and detailed information on the *bakhshi-ozans* and their various functions in pre-Islamic Turkish life, see my "Türk edebiyatı'nın menşe'i," pp. 1–80. [See now Köprülü's "Bahşı," *İA*, in which he corrects some of the conclusions he reached in this earlier article.] {Actually, here in the narrative, Köprülü is projecting Anatolian circumstances onto Central Asia.}

11 This phenomenon is encountered in almost the same fashion in the histories of all literatures. In Europe, for example, the priest-poets of the pagan period maintained their religious aura with the establishment of Christianity. Whatever stage of European history is studied, one sees that the poets called *ménestrels* were regarded by the people as having a sacred nature, and even their clothing preserved the fashion of a religious dress. Virtually all the most famous troubadours, equivalent to the *'āshıqs*, of those periods spent their lives in monasteries (Herbert Spencer, *The Principles of Sociology*, {3rd rev. edn (New York, 1890)}, vol. 5, Chapter 4, pp. 48–68, which discusses professional institutions). While discussing the *bakhshi-ozans* in the work mentioned above, I demonstrated that the same phenomenon is also encountered in our literature. For more information on this, see my *XVI. asır sonuna kadar Türk sazşâirleri* (Istanbul, 1930), and *Türk sazşâirleri* (Ankara, 1962), vol. 1.

12 This collection of the works of *saz* poets, which was called *Bakhshi kitâbı* {the *bakhshi* book}, is very rich and varied: in addition to a number of popular pieces, which were mainly current among the Turkmen and Özbeks, it also includes several pieces selected from the poetry of secondary poets, and even a large section drawn from the *ghazals* of Nawā'ī, which were very poorly known and appreciated despite their simplicity (Vambéry, *Čagataische Sprachstudien*, pp. 33–4.) {This contains a small section from the *Bakhshi kitâbı*, pp. 132–43, and three of Nawā'ī's *ghazals*, pp. 177–80.} Such collections, which also included a great many pieces from Azerī poets like Fuḍūlī and Nesīmī, were indeed highly varied and were arranged according to the taste of the compiler. Because the literary relations between the Central Asian Turks and Azerī Turks had long been very strong and close, it is quite natural that these two great Azerī poets were so well known that they were regarded as native poets in Central Asia as well as in Anatolia. Considering that there were intellectual and literary relations of long standing among the different regions of the Turkish world – for example, the ties between Herat and Istanbul during the reign of Mehmet II and among the courts of Khurāsān, Iran, India, and Istanbul during the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent – it is quite evident that the history of Turkish literature can only be studied as a whole.

13 The research that has been done to date on these poets is, of course, very little and deficient. Hartmann's studies on Chimyanlı Huvaidā {"Der čaghataische Diwan Huwedas"} and {Bābā Raḥīm} Mashrab {this is a reference to Hartmann's article "Mešreb der weise Narr und fromme Ketzer: Ein zentralasiatisches Volksbuch," *Der islamische Orient*, vol. 5 (Berlin, 1902); Mashrab d. 1711}, for instance, are naturally very deficient, because some of their biographies have meanwhile unfortunately been completely forgotten. The studies on them done by certain Russian scholars, and especially the important research published by Prof. A. N. Samoilovich as "Materialy po sredneaziatsko-Turetskoi literature," {*ZVO*, 19 (1909), 1–30; 22 (1913–14), 127–53; *ZKV*, 2 (1927), 257–74} are inaccessible to me. It is therefore apparent that, given the scanty material that we currently possess, it is impossible to make critical analyses of the Central Asian poets in the post-Nawā'ī period. In order to do a proper study of these Central Asian Turkish poets who flourished after the Shibānids, it would be necessary to do research in Turkistan and to make use of Russian sources on this subject. The most extensive and reliable information on this subject was first collected in my article "Çagatay edebiyatı," *İA*, {now see H. F. Hofman, *Turkish Literature, a Bio-bibliographical Survey*. For discussion of some of the names to which poems found in

versions of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* are ascribed, see A. Saadi, "Novyi material po istorii tatarskoi literatury drevnei èpokhi," *Vestnik nauchnogo obshchestvo tatarovedeniia*, no. 7 (1927), p. 154; Borokov, "Ocherki," p. 236; Togan, Yesevîliğe dair bazı malûmat," in *Fuad Köprülü armağanı*, pp. 523–9; and Hofman, *Turkish Literature*, vol. 6, pp. 124–5.}

14 The historian Zeki Velidi Togan, who was sent by the Russian academic societies to Turkistan to carry out historical research about a year before the First World War, mentioned this important poet in a letter that he sent to me from there. Unfortunately, we know nothing apart from this about this poet and his work.

15 {The *Rashaḥāt* actually says he left "sayings," not works.}

16 The *Rashaḥāt* gives the following details on this matter: *Dervişler ahvâlinden Türkî dilde kelimât-ı ḥikmet-âmiz ve latâif-i ibret-engîzleri Türkistan vilâytinde maʿrûf ve meşhûrdur ve ânların fevâid-i enfâs-i kudsiyyelerindendir. Bu mesel ki halka hüsn-i zan ile hürmet ve her vakti ganîmet bilmek bâbında buyurmuşlardır ki: Her kimi görsen Hızır bil ve her geceyi Kadir bil ve bu mesel ânlara mensûptur ki 'kesr-i nefs' te buyurmuşlardır: Barca yahşı biz yaman / Barca buğday biz saman, yani Cümle yahşı biz yaman / Cümle buğday biz saman.* {His words mixed with wisdom and anecdotes pointing to lessons about the conditions of the dervishes are well known and famous in the Turkish language in the country of Turkistan and are among the beneficial products of his sacred breath. He uttered this pithy saying with respect to honoring the people highly and always regarding them as a Godsend: "Know that everyone you meet is Khaḍir, and every night is the Night of Power." And this pithy saying, which concerns mortification of the flesh, is also attributed to him: "All is good, we are bad / all is wheat, we are straw" (*Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 15–16).

17 The work that has long been known among the Northern Turks under the title *Bâqirghân kitâbı* was first published by the Kazan Academy in 1857. {Now edited by Ibrahim Häqqul and Säyfiddin Räf'iddin (Tashkent, 1991).} It is composed of eighty-six pages, each of which has a double column of text. On each page are an average of fifty lines of verse. As for the text that was published by the same press in 1301/1883–4, it is composed of 144 pages, each with an average of twenty-six lines of verse. There are also other editions of this work. At the end of the first edition, there are two rather long narratives written in the form of a *mathnawī* and in *ʿarūḍ*. The author of one is ʿUbaid Allāh and the other has the pen name Khaṭā'ī. In this collection, there are countless Ṣūfī poems in both the *ʿarūḍ* and syllabic meters belonging to a great many people. Those belonging to Sulaimān Bāqirghānī constitute the smallest portion. The others belong to various poets such as Rājī, Mashrab, Khwāja Aḥmad, Shams-i Özkendī, Qūl Sharīf, Khudāidād, Īqānī, ʿUbaidī, Faqīrī, Baiḍā, Bihbūdī, Shuhūdī, Qūl Sharafī, Gedā, Qūl Nasīmī, Ṭufailī, and Qāsim. The works of Shams-i Özkendī are perhaps the most numerous. It is thus quite obvious that the *Bâqirghân kitâbı*, like the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, is not the work of a single poet and is not an accurate and trustworthy text. The poems of Sulaimān Ata, like those of his shaikh, survived for a long time scattered in the anthologies of dervishes or in the popular memory, then were mixed with the works of a number of other popular Ṣūfīs, and finally this very confused material was attributed to Ḥakīm Sulaimān Ata and printed under the title of *Bâqirghân kitâbı*. It would have taken very little effort when the work was printed to distinguish and group together the works of the poets having various pen names. Just as the anthologies of *ʿāshıqs*, called *bakhshi kitâbı*, are a hodge-podge, so this book too mixes the works of several discrete Ṣūfī poets. {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ḥakīm Ata" (Günay Alpay). As mentioned earlier, the inescapable conclusion is that Ḥakīm Ata is ascribed poetry much earlier, and much more consistently, than is Aḥmad Yasawī. And we find verse attested to Ḥakīm Ata quite early on that is subsequently ascribed to Aḥmad Yasawī.}

18 Cemalü'd-Dîn Velidî Efendi, in his short treatise *Tatar edebiyatı'nın barışı*, briefly mentions *Bâqirghân kitâbı* as the oldest Tatar work, but the views that he advances are

completely subjective and the information that he gives is also very deficient and erroneous. For example, he is wholly ignorant of the information provided on Ḥakīm Sulaimān Ata in the famous {anonymous} *Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı* and also {Ṣafī's} *Rashaḥāt*, and he hardly even considers the fact that the works in *Bâqirghân kitâbı* were written by men with different pen names. Considering that the author lacks the most elementary notion of criticism, one cannot ascribe any scientific value to this simplistic book, which contains almost nothing of historical value ([Orenburg, 1912], pp. 87–9).

19 This work {MSS in the Ali Emiri Efendi Library, which is in the Fatih Millet Library in Istanbul, and in the British Museum}, and which was written in 754/1353–4 by a Turkish poet named Khwārazmī, in imitation of the Epistles {*nāmes*} in *mathnawī* style composed by poets like Ḥakīm Sanā'ī and ʿAṭṭār, is linguistically Chaghatay. It was dedicated to a certain Muḥammad Khwāja Big, who had an important position in the retinue of the famous Jānī Big, the ruler of the Golden Horde, and who was from the Quŋğrat tribe. Rieu states in his catalogue {of Turkish MSS in the British Museum} that this person was the ruler of Andkhūd, Shībirghān, and Balkh and that he was the Amīr Muḥammad Khwāja Apardī who was killed while fighting Malik Muʿizz al-Dīn Ḥusain Kart in 759/1357–8 ({Khwāndamīr,} *Ḥabīb al-siyar*, vol. 3, p. 75), but I cannot accept this opinion. In my view, if one considers his youth, his connection with Jānī Big and that he was from the Quŋğrat tribe, it is certain that this person was Khānizāde Muḥammad Khwāja Big (Mehmed Remzī, *Talfīq al-akhbār* . . . {Orenburg, 1325/1907}, vol. 1, pp. 555–6), who fled during the sultanate of Jānī Big's son Birdī Big Khān (758–62/1356–61), went to the court of Ivan the Terrible in Moscow and presented himself as though he had come on a special mission from the Khān (for more information on this matter, see my article "Osmanlı edebiyatının başlangıcı," *YM*, 3 [1918], 85–8). The *Maḥabbatnāme*, which was written in a period when one finds numerous Turkish works throughout the Turkish world, is of special importance because it shows that in the eighth/fourteenth century such works were created under the patronage of the Turkish *khāns* and princes in the realm of the Golden Horde, and that they were written in the Chaghatay dialect, which was accepted as a common literary language in the Turkish courts of Transoxiana, Khurāsān, ʿIrāq al-ʿAjam, Fars – in short, throughout Asia. The creation of a common literary language and its rapid development in the other areas of the Turkish world – except for Anatolia and Azerbaijan – already by the mid eighth/fourteenth century, is not such a mysterious event. While it is impossible to give even a brief explanation of this event here, we can consider it to be one of the many consequences of the Mongol invasion, which gave rise to massive migrations in Asia, unified the Turks in different regions under the same political rule, and established permanent bonds among them. One must also remember, however, that this literature appeared as a court literature in regions where the people had no connection with Turkishness and in a realm where only the rulers and military commanders were of Turkish origin. In a letter that he wrote to me shortly before the First World War, Togan informed me that Prof. Samoilovich had found and prepared for publication the poem *Khusraw-u Shīrīn*, written in "Uighur" by a poet with the pen name Quṭb in Egypt in the eighth/fourteenth century. What is meant here by "Uighur," since this work is a product of the eighth/fourteenth century, must be Chaghatay, which was the common literary language of that period. It is also possible that this Chaghatay work was written in the Uighur alphabet. When we take into consideration the fact that the rulers of Egypt had permanent ties and relations with the Golden Horde, this would not be surprising. In addition to this work, a great many others were also written in Egypt in the Anatolian dialect. On this subject, see my study *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (Istanbul, 1928), "Memlûklar devri'nde Türk lisan ve edebiyatı," pp. 366ff {= Chapter 13, Part 4 of the 1981 edn}. {Now see A. M. Shcherbak, *Oguz-nāme. Mukhabbat-nāme* (in Russian) (Moscow, 1959); Ananiasz

Zajaczkowski, *Najstarsza wersja turecka Ḫusräv u Šīrīn Quṭba* (Warsaw, 1958–61); and M. Necmettin Hacıeminoğlu, *Kutb'un Husrev ü Şirin'i ve dil hususiyetleri* (Istanbul, 1968).}

20 On the first folio of a small but important work entitled *Ḥikāyat-i jumjuma sulṭān*, which was translated into Turkish in 955/1548–9 on the order of Ṣāḥib Girāy b. Ḥājjī Girāy, it is written that this book was composed in the "Moghul" language by Ḥusām Kātib in 777 {1375–6} and that Ṣāḥib Girāy Khān found it in his library and had it translated into *Türkī*, i.e. Ottoman Turkish (from a unique copy in my private library). Unfortunately, for some reason, the name of the translator is not mentioned. In my view, what is meant here by "the Moghul language" must be the Chaghatay or the Qipchaq dialect because our Ottoman authors of the ninth/fifteenth and tenth/sixteenth centuries readily called Chaghatay by various names: "the language of Nawā'ī, the Tatar language, Türkī language, and Moghul language" (see "{Türk edebiyatında} âşık tarzının menşe' ve tekâmülü," *MT*, p. 7, n.1). We understand from a short poem about ʿAlī-Shīr Nawā'ī by the famous Ṣādiqī Kitābdār, author of the *Tadhkira* {no. 168 in Pertsch's catalogue of Turkish MSS}, that the Azerīs also called Chaghatay "Moghul." There is a possibility that the work of Ḥusām Kātib, or, to use the old expression, Ḥusām Bakhshi, was a popular work written in the Qipchaq dialect because of its vulgar nature, but it is much more likely that this is a poem in Chaghatay, perhaps written in the Uighur alphabet. {Now see Fevziye Abdullah Tansel, "Cümcüme Sultan: Ottoman Translations of the Fourteenth Century Qipchaq Turkic Story," *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 2 (1970), 252–69; Ia. S. Akhmetgaleeva, *Issledovanie tiurkoiazychnogo pamiatnika 'Kīsekbash kitaby'* (Moscow, 1979); Ahmed Yaşar Ocak, *Türk folklorunda Kesik Baş* (Ankara, 1989); and Michele Bernardini, "Solṭan Jomjome et Jesus le Paraclet" in Benjamin Lellouch and Stéphane Yerasimos (eds), *Les traditions apocalyptiques au tournant de la chute de Constantinople* (Paris, 1999), pp. 35–53.}

21 Ibn al-Dawādārī, in his very valuable work *Ta'rīkh-i mukhtaṣar*, states that the Mongols and Qipchaqs had a highly respected book entitled *Ulu Khān Ata Bitigcī*, and that it was of the nature of the *Oghuznāme* of the Oghuz, i.e. this book included a great many traditions and legends about them. Just as the *ozans* of the Oghuz sang, accompanied by the *kopuz*, of the legends of the *Oghuznāme* among the people, the *bakhshis* of the Qipchaqs also sang, with *kopuz* in hand, of the legends found in their own collections of traditions (Damad Ibrahim Pasha Library {in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul}, MS 913). {See U. Haarmann, "Turkish Legends in the Popular Historiography of Medieval Egypt," in *Proceedings of the VI Congress of Arabic and Islamic Studies . . . 1972* (Uppsala, 1975), 97–107.} The traveler Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who visited the country of the Golden Horde at the beginning of the eighth/fourteenth century, says that, after eating, verses from the Koran were read and there was singing in Arabic, then singing in Persian and Turkish was promptly begun and these were called *mulammaʿ* {"macaronics," half in one language and half in another} (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, {Turkish trans.,} vol. 1, p. 365 {Gibb trans., vol. 2, p. 477}), but as will be easily understood from this word, these *mulamma's* were not, of course, popular works. It is also possible, however, that what Ibn Baṭṭūṭa says were sung during the sultan's {i.e. Muḥammad Özbeg Khān of the Golden Horde} holiday celebrations were popular Mongol works (*ibid.*, {Turkish trans.,} p. 382 {Gibb trans., vol. 2, p. 496}).

22 Cemâlü'd-Dîn Velidî Efendi, *Tatar edebiyatının barşı*, p. 87. Because the history of the literature of the Northern Turks, and this area in general, is unknown, it is not possible to determine when this began.

23 Cemâlü'd-Dîn Velidî Efendi's aforesaid work, despite its non-scholarly nature, adequately conveys this conviction. Closer study of the literature of the Northern Turks only corroborates it.

24 Vambéry first mentioned the Turkmen poet Makhdūm Qulī in his famous travel book (*Voyages d'un faux derviche dans l'Asie centrale de Téhéran à Khiva, Bokhara et Samarkand*,

French trans., 2nd edn [Paris, 1873], p. 283 {English trans. as *Travels in Central Asia* (London, 1864; reprinted New York, 1970)}). Vambéry, who briefly discussed the poetry of this Turkmen poet in his *Čagataische Sprachstudien*, p. 36, later published selected passages from it with a German translation. Among Russian scholars, Ostroumov published some of his poetry and Samoilovich prepared an index {*fihrist*} of it. Togan informed me before the First World War that Samoilovich had prepared a complete edition of his *dīwān*. In any case, as is clear from all of this, Makhdūm Qulī is someone who has long been familiar to the Orientalist world. {See, *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Makhdūm Ḳulī" (H. F. Hofman); and Walter Feldman, "Interpreting the Poetry of Mäkhtumquli," in Jo-Ann Gross (ed.), *Muslims in Central Asia: Expressions of Identity and Change* (Durham, NC, 1992), pp. 167–89. The evidence that Köprülü gives for "influence" is so general as to ensure that Aḥmad Yasawī influenced anyone we wish.}

25 This Turkish poet named Ḥasan-oğlu is the famous Ṣūfī Shaikh ʿIzz al-Dīn Pūr-i Ḥasan Isfarā'inī. A brief extract from one of his *ghazals* is included in Dawlat-Shāh's *Tadhkira*

چون خدا در دو جهان روی نکو دارد دوست \ من که پور حسنم دوست ندارم چکنم

{Because God likes beautiful faces in both the worlds / No one likes me Pūr-i Ḥasan. What can I do?} This poet from Isfarā'in was one of the leading disciples of Shaikh Jamāl al-Dīn Aḥmad Dhākir {Gūrpānī}, who was a *khalīfa* of Raḍī 'l-Dīn ʿAlī Lālā. He wrote poetry in Turkish under the pen name Ḥasan-oğlu and in Persian under the pen name Pūr-i Ḥasan and, according to Dawlat-Shāh's account, won very great fame in Azerbaijan and Anatolia (Dawlat-Shāh, *Tadhkira*, p. 221). I provided some information above on the great Ṣūfī Shaikh Raḍī 'l-Dīn ʿAlī Lālā and stated that he died in 642/1244–5 (Chapter 3, p. 62). In light of this explanation, it would not be wrong to conclude that the poet Ḥasan-oğlu, who was a disciple of this shaikh, won fame during the end of the seventh/thirteenth century or the beginning of the eighth/fourteenth century. For some reason, this very early Azerī poet has not yet attracted anyone's attention. {See Hermann Landolt (ed.), Nûruddîn Abdurrahmân-i Isfarâyinî, *Le Révélateur des mystères* (*Kâshif al-Asrâr*) (Paris, 1986), pp. 19–21 (text), 147–9 (trans.); and one of his Turkic *ghazals* has been published by A. Bodrogligeti, "A Collection of Turkish Poems from the 14th Century," *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 16 (1963), pp. 256, 279, 291–2.}

26 ʿĀshıq Chelebi, the author of the *Tadhkira* {i.e. *Mashāʿir al-shuʿarā'*} explains, while mentioning the musician poets Maqāmī and Selmān Bursawī, that the *türküs* of Ḥasan-oğlu were very well known during his own {i.e. ʿĀshıq Chelebi's} lifetime. However, given the long gap in time between them, it certainly would be strange if the *türküs* of this Ḥasan-oğlu, whom ʿAshıq Chelebi mentions, belonged to Shaikh ʿIzz al-Dīn Pūr-i Ḥasan Isfarā'inī. {See Meredith-Owens's facsimile edn of ʿĀshıq Chelebi's *Mashāʿir al-shuʿarā'*, fos 126a.24, 161b.3.}

27 The people of the linguistic area that we term Azerī – i.e. the Turks of Azerbaijan and Eastern Anatolia – preserved their old traditions much more vigorously because new waves of Turks migrated there after the original Turks of Asia Minor, i.e. after the Mongol invasion. In the second part of this book, I will provide a comprehensive discussion of the Oghuz migrations to the West and the time, strength, and intensity of these migrations. Consequently, there is no need to go into further details here. Even before the appearance of the Seljuks, a number of Oghuz tribes migrated to those regions and some of the Oghuz whom Sultan Maḥmūd Ghaznawī sent from Transoxiana to Khurāsān later went there and joined them. Subsequently, in the period of the Seljuks and Khwārazm-Shāhs more groups of Turks again migrated to

those regions and settled there. When we recall that after the Mongol invasion, during the time of the Il-Khānids, still more Oghuz tribes migrated there and commingled, then we can begin to get an idea of the ethnographic nature of this Azerī region. Almost all the Turks who went to this area were from the Oghuz, i.e. of the Turkmen type. The fact that the locus of events in the *Book of Dede Korkut* (in the text currently in our possession) is Eastern Anatolia and Azerbaijan confirms the views asserted above. Moreover, a slight acquaintance with the folk literature of that area would also confirm this point. Indeed, in every respect, the folk literature of that region is much richer and more genuine than that of Western Anatolia and Rumelia. As ethnographic research progresses, these subjects will be better illuminated.

Part II

YŪNUS EMRE AND HIS INFLUENCE ON TURKISH LITERATURE

7

TURKISH LITERATURE IN ANATOLIA BEFORE YŪNUS EMRE

A The Turks in Anatolia

In the first part of this book (Chapter 1, pp. 5–6, through Chapter 5, pp. 131–3), I provided some information on the Oghuz, who constituted a large and important branch of the Turks, and their language. Coming out of the East like an inexhaustible human flood, the Turks, who thoroughly Turkified Anatolia within a few centuries under the resolute government of the Seljuk rulers, were composed entirely of Oghuz. Consequently, before we describe in broad outline the Seljuk political structure and civilization that were established in Anatolia, it is necessary to give a bit more historical background on the Oghuz.

By the time of the reign of the ʿAbbāsid Caliph al-Mahdī (158–69/775–85), the Oghuz Turks had separated from the Toquz Oghuz in Eastern Turkistan, and by the fourth/tenth century they were living in the Syr Darya region and had begun to convert to Islam.[1] Around the end of that century, as the Oghuz began to migrate into Muslim territory, they first settled near Bukhārā. It was among the Oghuz that the Seljuk dynasty appeared and quickly extended its influence into the vast areas ruled by the Ghaznavid state and various minor powers. Eventually, a huge and powerful Seljuk state arose that controlled the area stretching from Chinese Turkistan to Egypt and Byzantium. This great sultanate enjoyed its most brilliant period between the reigns of Toghrıl Bey (d. 455/1063) and Malik-Shāh (d. 485/1092). Subsequently, it dissolved into a number of independent states in Khurāsān, ʿIrāq al-ʿAjam, Kirmān, Aleppo and Damascus, and Anatolia. During the reign of Sultan Sanjar (d. 552/1157), some of the brilliance reminiscent of the earlier period returned, but it lasted only a short time. The branch of the dynasty that survived the longest was that of the Seljuks of Anatolia, because it was based on the true power of the state, the local people, while the other branches relied exclusively on the ruling family, the tribal chiefs, and the army. It is not that there were no Oghuz Turks in Khurāsān, ʿIrāq al-ʿAjam or Aleppo, but in Khurāsān and ʿIrāq al-ʿAjam in particular they were fated to assimilate gradually with the local people, or, at the very least, to assume their culture. Anatolia and Azerbaijan, on the other hand, became Turkish countries as a result of large and continuous migrations of the Oghuz tribes and

Map 2 Anatolia in the late thirteenth century (modern Turkish place names).

thus, despite all the political turmoil that took place, these regions became a new center of civilization for the Turks, and the Oghuz settled there permanently.[2]

Even before the appearance of the Seljuks, i.e. in the early years of the fifth/eleventh century, some Oghuz tribes from Transoxiana had moved to Azerbaijan and the southern Caucasus and settled as a rather powerful presence on the frontier of the Byzantine Empire. Reinforced by some of the Oghuz whom Maḥmūd of Ghazna had transferred from Transoxiana to Khurāsān, this quarrelsome mass of Turkmen did not hesitate to attack Byzantium on occasion. Finally, just when the Seljuk state was establishing itself in Iran, Toghrıl Bey received a request from these Turkmen for assistance and so sent Qutalmısh, one of his kinsmen, with an army against the Byzantines. Later, in order to rid himself of some Oghuz tribes who had come to Khurāsān, Toghrıl Bey also sent them, under the leadership of his brother İnal, toward the interior of Anatolia to confront the Byzantine Empire.

During the sultanate of Alp Arslan (455–65/1063–73), the Seljuks took more effective action in Anatolia. By capturing the fortresses of Ani and Kars and seizing an important part of Georgia, this ruler put an end to Byzantine rule in Armenia and Georgia. He then decisively defeated the Byzantine Emperor Romanus Diogenes at the Battle of Malāzgird {1071} and took him prisoner, thus firmly establishing Turkish sovereignty in Anatolia. Afterward, he granted, as *tamlīks* {state-owned land as freehold property} and *iqṭā's* {estates, land grants}, all the lands of eastern Anatolia as far as the Kızıl Irmak to the leaders of the Turkmen tribes that had long been guarding the Byzantine borders. In this way, the first Turkish states were established in Anatolia, those of the Saltuqids, Mengüchekids, and Dānishmendids. They were followed by those of the Seljuks of Anatolia during the reign of Malik-Shāh, and of the Akhlāṭ-Shāhs during the reign of Berk-Yaruq. The most powerful and enduring of all these Turkish states was that of the Seljuks of Anatolia, which played the greatest role in the Turkification of Anatolia.[3]

The independent state of the Seljuks of Anatolia, which arose in Asia Minor during the dissolution of the Great Seljuk Empire after the death of Malik-Shāh, was based on a fairly sound foundation. While migrating westward in a continuous human flood from their homeland, the Oghuz Turks had come into close contact with Persian and Arab civilization, and then, mainly after the Battle of Malāzgird, settled down in Anatolia. Spreading their language, their religion, in a word their culture, they posed a constant threat to the Armenian and Byzantine rulers. Despite the attacks of the Crusaders and endless harrassments by the Greeks and Armenians, Anatolia continued to be Turkified. Thanks to a powerful army, the state of the Seljuks of Anatolia, which drew its strength mainly from the Oghuz clans, caused its neighboring Muslim and Christian states to live in a constant state of fear. Around the end of the sixth/twelfth century, however, Qılıj Arslan II divided his kingdom among all of his sons according to the old Seljuk custom. This division of a great power into eleven petty and mutually hostile principalities precipitated a civil war. Eventually, Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Qāhir {i.e. Sulaimān II

(592–600/1196–1204)} succeeded in re-establishing political unity after devoting his life and all his resources to this endeavor. Still, the constraints of the political system and the vagueness of the law of succession were permanent obstacles to the attainment of long-lasting prosperity and well-being for the Turks of Anatolia. The endless struggles for succession and the rumbles of independence provided opportunities for the Greeks and Armenians to rebel. They would drive out the Turks from a neighboring region, but shortly thereafter, confronting a Seljuk sultan who had established his authority over that region, they would be utterly defeated and make peace under harsh terms. In short, despite all these internal disorders, Turkish sovereignty in Anatolia proved enduring.[4]

During the reign of ʻAlāʼ al-Dīn Kai-Qubād I (616–34/1220–37), which we can consider to be the high point, in every respect, of the era of the Seljuks of Anatolia, all of the minor principalities that were {theoretically} subject to the Seljuks were forced into obedience and submission. Nevertheless, this wise ruler realized that he could not resist the power of the Mongols, who just at that time were coming from the east like a terrible whirlwind. He formally recognized the authority of the Great Il-Khān and then made a great effort to suppress internal troubles and repel several attacks by Jalāl al-Dīn the Khwārazm-Shāh. During the reign of this prudent ruler, who brought all of Anatolia under his well ordered government, repulsed attacks from abroad, and also took political measures against the danger of the Mongol invasion, the Turks of Anatolia enjoyed great prosperity. Strong walls were erected around the great cultural centers of Konya, Sivas, and Erzincan. Mosques, *türbes*, *madrasas*, *khāns*, and caravansaries were built throughout Anatolia. Thanks to the correct and far-sighted policy of ʻAlāʼ al-Dīn, the people, who, up to that time, had not been able to escape from domestic turmoil and whose lives and property were continuously threatened by aggressive armies, finally enjoyed security and prosperity. As a result, life in the great cities became refined. Aesthetic sensibility and the fine arts, which are its natural product, developed. Not content with creating a just, strong, and well ordered political structure, ʻAlāʼ al-Dīn also gathered around him scholars and men of letters. Altogether, he was an intelligent, prudent, and skillful ruler and patron of the arts.[5]

ʻAlāʼ al-Dīn was killed by his son Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kai-Khusraw {634–44/1237–46} when the latter realized that the sultanate of Anatolia was going to be given to his younger brother. Upon his ascent to the throne, the previous prosperity and well-being in Anatolia abruptly disappeared. The Great Il-Khān did not approve of the murder of ʻAlāʼ al-Dīn and dispatched Bayju Noyon, with a powerful army, ostensibly in order to administer the provinces of Anatolia. Domestic affairs were again thrown into confusion. As if the struggle for succession, the uprising of Bābā Isḥāq, the disgraceful actions of a majordomo named Saʻd al-Dīn Köpek, the intrigues of the rulers of Egypt, and the provocations of the Byzantines and Armenians were not enough, the Mongol invaders captured Erzurum, Tokat, and Kayseri, and repeatedly defeated the armies of Ghiyāth al-Dīn. These continuous military operations violently disrupted the peace and

tranquility of the people, and oppression and poverty prevailed in place of prosperity and well-being. After Ghiyāth al-Dīn, life in Anatolia became almost unbearable for the people. His three sons sometimes ruled individually, or sometimes two or three ruled together. Amidst domestic troubles and Mongol and Byzantine incursions, the country soon fell into confusion and ruin. The people groaned under the hands of oppressive and tyrannical officials. The need to obtain the taxes that had to be given to the Great Il-Khān seemed to license every abuse. There appeared to be almost nothing left of the central government. Finally, after the execution of 'Alā' al-Dīn Kai-Qubād III on the order of Ghazan Khān, the political unity of Anatolia was completely destroyed. Upon the collapse of the Seljuk state, which had lasted from 470/1077 to 707/1307, ten small principalities arose in its place and anarchy prevailed. Not until one of these principalities, that of the Ottomans, united the Western Turks around a {new} political center did a new era of peace and prosperity return to Anatolia.[6]

B Seljuk civilization

{As they emigrated to the west,} the Oghuz Turks who settled in Anatolia came into contact with Arab and Muslim Persian civilization and then, in the new region to which they had come, encountered remnants of ancient and non-Muslim civilizations. In the large and old cities of Anatolia, which were gradually Turkified, the Turks not only encountered earlier Byzantine and Armenian works of art and architecture, but also, as a result of living side by side with Christians, naturally participated in a cultural exchange with them. The nomadic Turks {i.e. Turkmen}, who maintained a tribal existence and clung to the way of life they had led for centuries, remained impervious to all such influences. Those who settled in the large cities, however, unavoidably fell under these alien influences.

At the same time, among the city people, those whose lives and livelihoods were refined and elevated usually had extensive *madrasa* educations and harbored a profound and genuine infatuation with Arab and Persian learning and literature. Thus, they cultivated a somewhat contemptuous indifference to this Christian civilization, which they regarded as materially and morally inferior to Islamic civilization. As a result, the influence of this non-Muslim civilization on the Turks was chiefly visible, and then only partially, in those arts, such as architecture, in which the external and material elements are more obvious. The main result of this influence was that life in general assumed a more worldly quality.

If we wish to sketch, in broad outline, the civilization created by the Seljuks of Anatolia, we must recognize that the local, i.e. non-Muslim, element was fairly insignificant compared to the Turkish and Arab-Persian elements, and that the Persian element was paramount.[7] The Seljuk rulers, to be sure, who were in contact with not only Muslim Persian civilization, but also with the Arab civilizations in al-Jazīra and Syria – indeed, with all Muslim peoples as far as India – also had connections with {various} Byzantine courts. Some of these rulers, like

the great ʻAlāʾ al-Dīn Kai-Qubād I himself, who married Byzantine princesses and thus strengthened relations with their neighbors to the west, lived for many years in Byzantium and became very familiar with the customs and ceremonial at the Byzantine court. Still, this close contact with the ancient Greco-Roman and Christian traditions only resulted in their adoption of a policy of tolerance toward art, aesthetic life, painting, music, independent thought – in short, toward those things that were frowned upon by the narrow and piously ascetic views {of their subjects}. The contact of the common people with the Greeks and Armenians had basically the same result.[8]

{Before coming to Anatolia,} the Turks had been in contact with many nations and had long shown their ability to synthesize the artistic elements that they had adopted from these nations. When they settled in Anatolia, they encountered peoples with whom they had not yet been in contact and immediately established relations with them as well. ʻAlāʾ al-Dīn Kai-Qubād I established ties with the Genoese and, especially, the Venetians at the ports of Sinop and Antalya, which belonged to him, and granted them commercial and legal concessions.[9] Meanwhile, the Mongol invasion, which caused a great number of scholars and artisans to flee from Turkistan, Iran, and Khwārazm and settle within the Empire of the Seljuks of Anatolia, resulted in a reinforcing of Persian influence on the Anatolian Turks.[10] Indeed, despite all claims to the contrary, there is no question that Persian influence was paramount among the Seljuks of Anatolia. This is clearly revealed by the fact that the sultans who ascended the throne after Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kai-Khusraw I assumed titles taken from ancient Persian mythology, like Kai-Khusraw, Kai-Kāʾūs, and Kai-Qubād; and that ʻAlāʾ al-Dīn Kai-Qubād I had some passages from the *Shāhnāme* inscribed on the walls of Konya and Sivas. When we take into consideration domestic life in the Konya courts and the sincerity of the favor and attachment of the rulers to Persian poets and Persian literature, then this fact {i.e. the importance of Persian influence} is undeniable.[11] With regard to the private lives of the rulers, their amusements, and palace ceremonial, the most definite influence was also that of Iran, mixed with the early Turkish traditions, and not that of Byzantium.[12]

The cultural production that most clearly and forcefully represents Seljuk civilization for us even today is architecture. In the sixth/twelfth and, especially, the seventh/thirteenth centuries, Seljuk art was the sole art prevailing in Asia Minor. Various ideas have been advanced about the sources and characteristics of this important art that embellished the cities of Anatolia with *madrasas*, mosques, *türbes*, and palaces, and its highways with caravansaries. We do not possess sufficiently strong evidence to show that Seljuk art, which synthesized elements of Arab, Persian, Syrian, Armenian, Byzantine, and early Turkish art and unified them with a skill reflecting the Turkish genius, was an original art. While some older investigators, like Gustave Mendel, called into question the originality of this art,[13] more recent investigators, like Heinrich Glück, are of the opinion that Seljuk art, while composed of various elements, is a high art that does reveal the Turkish spirit.[14]

C The Ṣūfī movement

Steadily increasing in strength and spreading in all directions, the Ṣūfī movement preoccupied and engulfed all the countries in the Muslim world. In the sixth/twelfth and seventh/thirteenth centuries, this movement, which, after al-Ghazālī {d. 505/1111}, was well harmonized with Sunnī beliefs, led to the creation of numerous *tekkes* in Iran, Central Asia, Syria, Egypt, and Anatolia, in short, in all Muslim lands.[15] Although the actual personalities of the Ṣūfīs who lived in these *tekkes* are obscured by dense clouds of legend, we can still glimpse quite a few figures behind the clouds, including important poets, profound and independent-minded thinkers, and men obsessed with divine love. We frequently encounter, especially after Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī (560–638/1165–1240), Ṣūfīs who embraced the concept of *waḥda* {unity (of being)} in the broadest sense.[16] As the moral and material influence of the 'Abbāsid caliphs in Baghdad waned and sovereignty in various regions passed into the hands of local *amīrs*, the caliphs, for certain material reasons, began to favor and patronize *tekkes* and Ṣūfīs.[17] Meanwhile, the absence of a single center of political power, and anarchy in the realm, i.e. the breakdown of the basis of the social system, also created a need for mysticism in spiritual life. Later, in the places that were exposed to momentous events like the Crusades and the Mongol invasion, the influence of the *tekkes* and their shaikhs naturally became stronger, because they promised – and indeed provided – anxious people with what they needed most: spiritual and moral tranquility.

The spread of Ṣūfism in all directions as a result of many material and, especially, spiritual factors, the quasi-official recognition granted by {the Muslim} states to the *tekkes* and *ṭarīqas*, and the fact that many statesmen and notables, even sultans, became disciples of the great shaikhs all gave enormous spiritual influence to the Ṣūfī shaikhs. The Ṣūfīs had such moral authority over the corporeal dominions of the rulers that they sometimes even intimidated powerful states and forced them to adopt certain important measures. During the period of the Seljuks and Khwārazm-Shāhs, the Ṣūfī movement became firmly established throughout virtually all the Muslim-Turkish countries and, especially, in the large cultured cities where Muslim-Persian influence was paramount. At that time, when the Islamic world was shaken by continuous and large-scale disorders and anarchy, the great shaikhs, who had thousands of disciples who obeyed them blindly, were able to play important political roles. Consequently, the rulers found it necessary either to use force and threats against them or to treat them with kindness according to circumstances. The legend of Khwāja 'Azīzān,[18] for example, and then the fact that the Khwārazm-Shāh was compelled to ask his shaikh Najm al-Dīn Kubrā for forgiveness for doing away with the famous Majd al-Dīn Baghdādī[19] are certainly significant points in this respect.

After the death of Aḥmad Yasawī, the resurgence of political confusion over all of Asia on the one hand and, on the other, the establishment of Ṣūfism as a philosophical system by mystics like Ibn al-'Arabī, who held broad and

independent views that considered "the essence of God" to be "absolute being," gradually caused the number of Ṣūfīs to multiply. Moreover, under the rubric of Ṣūfism, all sorts of people assembled. Even in the time of al-Ghazālī, there were those who spread and popularized *bāṭinī* beliefs under the screen of Ṣūfism,[20] but as time went on their number increased.

This then was the character of the Ṣūfī movement in the Muslim world when the Oghuz Turks settled in Anatolia. As the Seljuk state in Anatolia became strong and several Muslim-Turkish cities were established, *tekkes* also appeared in those places, in conformity with the usual pattern in Islamic countries. The dervishes and shaikhs who came to Anatolia from other countries or who grew up there succeeded in awakening a powerful Ṣūfī movement within the Anatolian milieu. Among them were a number of Ṣūfīs who came from Iran, Egypt, Iraq, and Syria. There were also a large number of dervishes who had flourished among the Turks of Khurāsān and Transoxiana. There were even some who were members of the *ṭarīqa* of Aḥmad Yasawī. Particularly after the Mongol invasion, as many Ṣūfīs and scholars in Turkistan, Iran, and Khwārazm fled before this great pagan influx to Muslim countries in the West, quite a few went to Anatolia and settled there.[21] The Seljuk rulers, like all Muslim rulers, had long shown great respect and favor to Ṣūfīs and scholars[22] and so naturally greeted the newcomers in the same cordial fashion. Anatolia, especially in the first half of the seventh/thirteenth century, had become a place of settlement for a number of famous Ṣūfīs, the most illustrious of whom was Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī.

Among the Ṣūfīs who endeavored to propagate *ṭarīqas* in Anatolia in the seventh/thirteenth century, we can mention such well known personalities as Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī in Konya;[23] Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī,[24] the author of *Lamaʿāt*, in Tokat, for whom his disciple and follower Muʿīn al-Dīn Parwāna built a *tekke*;[25] Shaikh Najm al-Dīn Dāya, the author of *Mirṣād al-ʿibād*, in Kayseri and Sivas;[26] Ibn al-ʿArabī, also in Konya, and Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Isḥāq al-Qūnawī, who, by writing many commentaries on Ibn al-ʿArabī's works, spread his philosophy of the unity of being {*waḥdat al-wujūd*} throughout that region;[27] and also Muʾayyad al-Dīn al-Jandī, one of his disciples who also wrote commentaries on some of the works of Ibn al-ʿArabī,[28] and Saʿd al-Dīn Farghānī, who wrote a commentary on the *Qaṣīda al-tāʾiyya* {Ode on the letter T} of Ibn al-Fāriḍ.[29] We can also include Ḥājjī Bektash Veli among the Ṣūfīs who flourished in Anatolia in the seventh/thirteenth century. He was not able to win as much fame and influence as these others during his lifetime, but later, as a cycle of legends took shape around his name, he was regarded by the people as the founder of a *ṭarīqa*.[30]

Among the *ṭarīqas* that spread in Anatolia between the end of the seventh/thirteenth century and the early years of the eighth/fourteenth century, we find the Rifāʿiyya, to which Ibn Baṭṭūṭa also gives the name Aḥmadiyya. This writer came across Rifāʿī *tekkes* and members of the Rifāʿī *ṭarīqa* in Izmir and Bergama, in Sonisa {Sūnusā} near Amasya, and even as far afield as Majar in the territory of the Golden Horde. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa says that the *ṭarīqa* of the famous Shaikh Abū

'l-'Abbās Aḥmad al-Rifā'ī, whose tomb he visited in the village of Umm 'Ubaida, a day's journey from Wāsiṭ, had spread throughout Iraq and to some degree in the cities of Anatolia, which had very close political and commercial relations with Iraq. Indeed, he adds that at that time a descendant of Aḥmad al-Rifā'ī was the head of the religious order in Sonisa, which belonged to the ruler of Iraq. They sometimes went to visit the grave of the *pīr*, taking with them hundreds of dervishes. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa encountered such a group and wrote that they would enter a blazing fire while dancing, eat fire, and exhibit other very strange behavior.[31]

In that period, the conditions of life in Anatolia ensured the propagation and general acceptance of the Ṣūfī movement at all levels of society. As I related above while discussing political life in Anatolia at that time, central government had completely collapsed after 'Alā' al-Dīn Kai-Qubād I. Domestic struggles over the succession, the Mongol invasion, and wars with the Byzantines and Armenians had destroyed the prosperity and security of the country. Observing an absence of social order and reeling from these continuous troubles, the people had no other recourse than the *tekkes* and the shaikhs in order at least to ensure for themselves in the next world the happiness that eluded them in the present. Conforming to this general tendency of the people, the *beys* {tribal chiefs, lords}, who were trying to establish temporary local authority, built *tekkes* and *zāwiyas* everywhere and set aside rich endowments for them in order to take advantage of the material and moral influence of the shaikhs. Under such social conditions, one can easily understand how Anatolia became such fertile ground for producing shaikhs and *bābās*. Indeed, a number of works written about the legends of the saints who lived during that period, as well as other historical sources, corroborate this point.[32]

In the first half of this book, I dwelt on the fact that there were many members of the Yasawī *ṭarīqa* among the dervishes who migrated to Anatolia from Turkistan, Khwārazm, Khurāsān, Syria, and Iraq. For various reasons, however, these ascetics who were sincerely attached to Sunnī beliefs were not able to achieve spiritual authority in the intellectual and religious environment of Anatolia. In the first place, this environment, which included remnants of the old Greco-Roman and Christian intellectual traditions, was capable of accepting, as I mentioned above, broad-minded philosophical views in addition to those that were narrowly ascetic. Second, under the influence of Ibn al-'Arabī, who lived for a rather long time in Konya, and the many important disciples who followed him, the unconstrained intellectual atmosphere of Anatolia became permeated with the philosophy of the unity of being. It was inevitable, therefore, that the ascetic and pious views of the Yasawī dervishes who had come there from Turkistan and Khwārazm would assume a more unconstrained and philosophical character.[33] Third, *bāṭinī* beliefs had taken deep root at that time throughout the Muslim world and especially in Syria, which had very close material and spiritual ties with Anatolia.[34] The matter did not, therefore, end here. Under the screen of Ṣūfism, and taking advantage of favorable times, all kinds of games were played.

In the history of Anatolia, the earliest and most important of these heretical and schismatic movements, which were generally accompanied by political objectives and ambitions, was the famous Bābā'ī incident. In the reign of Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kai-Khusraw II, Bābā Isḥāq, a disciple of Bābā Ilyās of Khurāsān, collected numerous supporters in the region of Amasya, Tokat, and Sivas, outwardly in the name of his shaikh – but in reality much more for his own sake – and rebelled against the Seljuk state. Benefiting from the current weakness of the Seljuks, he gained considerable power. Indeed, faced with these Bābā'īs, Ghiyāth al-Dīn was forced to abandon Konya and retire to the fortress of Qubādiyya with his family and treasure. Bābā Isḥāq, while propagating what was virtually a new religion, was able to attract true believers who were ready to sacrifice themselves for his sake, thus causing great turmoil in the Seljuk state and straining its resources. Finally, Mubāriz al-Dīn Armaghān Shāh took him prisoner, after laying siege to Amasya, and executed him (638/1240).[35]

Despite the important place of the Bābā'ī uprising in the intellectual history of Anatolia, we do not have much clear information about it, so we can only gauge it rather vaguely. Neverthless, I believe it would not be a mistake to regard the Bābā'ī incident as an important precursor of the heretical and schismatic movements that challenged Sunnīsm in Anatolia, and subsequently of the formation of groups like the Qızılbash and Bektashīs that appeared as a result of various events beginning with the incident of Badr al-Dīn Samāwnāwī and continuing up to recent times.[36] In analyzing similar later phenomena, one would naturally regard the seeds of heresy and schism surviving from this period to have sprouted under the influence of new factors, even novel ideas coming from abroad; still, the significance of this initial incident can by no means be denied. Indeed, it should not be forgotten that during the seventh/thirteenth century a number of well known Turkish Ṣūfīs like Barāq Bābā[37] and Sulaimān Turkmānī[38] also spread many wild ideas and beliefs under the screen of Ṣūfism.

Furthermore, based on both historical sources and the reports of the traveler Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, we know that in the same century in Anatolia, as in some of the other Turkish countries, there was an important and widespread corporation of unmarried Ṣūfī craftsmen known as the *akhīs* and that they played a significant role in the early history of the Ottomans.[39] These *akhīs* followed the way of the *futuwwa*, traced their roots back to the Prophet Muḥammad via ʿAlī, and wore the trousers {*shalwār*} of the *futuwwa*, which distinguished them from the other Ṣūfīs, who wore patched woolen jackets {*khirqa*}. The *akhī* organization, which also included many *qāḍīs* and *madrasa* instructors, was not simply a professional grouping or guild. Instead, it should be considered a *ṭarīqa* that relied on, and spread its beliefs through, this guild structure.[40]

Ibn Baṭṭūṭa says that a significant number of the *akhīs* were members of the knife-maker guild and that they carried knives on their persons in a very visible manner, but he also says that they included more than knife makers. Indeed, there were artisans of all types among them. According to Tashköprü-Zāde, the tanners' guild considered Akhī Evren to be the *pīr* of their *ṭarīqa*, and there are

details about this in the *manāqibnāmes* concerning him.[41] By the early Ottoman period, one encounters quite a few other dervishes with the title *akhī* and, of course, they too were members of the same organization.[42]

Apparently these *akhīs* were organized in a hierarchy, like those of the present-day Freemasons, and truths were disclosed to the adepts according to their rank. From this point of view, the *akhīs* can definitely be considered to have originated from bāṭinism.[43] In fact, the great Turkish poet Gülshehrī, who flourished in the first half of the eighth/fourteenth century – almost a quarter century before Ibn Baṭṭūṭa – describes the *akhīs* saying that they were generally ignorant and heedless of the rules of the *futuwwa*, and thus he implies that contemporary Sunnī scholars and Ṣūfīs took a dim view of them and more or less regarded akhism as tainted with bāṭinism.[44] After 762/1361, the year in which Ankara was taken by the Ottomans, the term *akhī* rarely appears in the sources. But this should not be interpreted to mean that the political importance of the *akhīs* had disappeared. After the Ottoman Empire established a strong political base in Anatolia, the *akhīs* could not maintain any political significance. Subsequently, the establishment of *ṭarīqas* like the Bektashiyya left akhism in the form of an ordinary guild organization, and its *bāṭinī* character, which was concealed in its foundation, also passed to *ṭarīqas* like the Bektashiyya.[45]

It is quite natural that a century that produced Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī and Sulṭān Walad would also produce a great Ṣūfī poet like Yūnus Emre. Some brief information will be provided below on the personality and work of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, who, beginning with Yūnus during that century, and long afterwards, had an enormous influence on Turkish Ṣūfī life and Turkish literature in general – just as he did on the entire Muslim world and especially on Persian literature. Following this, an outline, in the most general fashion, of the Turkish language and literature of that period will be given. Yūnus Emre's spiritual personality will thereby reveal itself, because every personality – even a genius like Yūnus Emre who endowed a raw and uncultivated language with a divine quality that could profoundly bring to life the emotional subtleties of the human spirit – is unquestionably a product of his social environment. After all these analyses, the distinctions between Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre or, more correctly, between Central Asian Turkish Ṣūfism and the Ṣūfism that developed in Anatolia, and the various factors that gave rise to those distinctions, will become clear.

D Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī

Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, whom we can consider as perhaps the greatest and most influential representative of pantheism in Persian Ṣūfī literature, was born in Balkh in 604/1207. His father, Muḥammad Bahā' al-Dīn Walad b. Ḥusain al-Bakrī, who was dubbed Sulṭān al-'Ulamā', was one of the most famous Ṣūfī scholars of Khwārazm. He devoted himself to preaching and teaching; and all the leading personalities and notables of the time, sometimes even the ruler himself, attended his *majlis*. Forced to leave Balkh – according to one story on

the instigation of Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī because of rivalry and jealousy between them, and according to another because Muḥammad Quṭb al-Dīn the Khwārazm-Shāh feared his spiritual influence – he took his family and fled to Nīshāpūr. Shaikh Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār, who was still alive at that time, gave his blessing to the young Jalāl al-Dīn and gave him a copy of his *Asrārnāme* as a gift. From Nīshāpūr, Bahā' al-Dīn went on to Baghdad, Mecca, Damascus, Malatya, Erzincan, and then to Akşehir where he remained for a while in a *tekke* built by the wife of Malik Fakhr al-Dīn. Later, he went to Laranda, where he stayed for seven years. While in Laranda, Jalāl al-Dīn married Jawhar, the daughter of Lālā Sharaf al-Dīn Samarqandī (622/1225–6). Finally, as a result of repeated and very warm invitations from ʿAlā' al-Dīn Kai-Qubād, they all settled in Konya (626/1228). Sulṭān al-ʿUlamā', to whom the ruler showed great favor, devoted himself to learning and teaching until his final days. He died in 628/1231. According to Aflākī, Mawlānā took his father's post.[46]

One of the important and fundamental factors in shaping Mawlānā's Ṣūfī and poetic personality after his father's death was the period of about nine years that he spent with the Sayyid Burhān al-Dīn Tirmidhī. Acquiring fame under the title Muḥaqqiq {"the Verifier"}, the Sayyid Burhān al-Dīn was one of the leading *khalīfas* of Sulṭān al-ʿUlamā'. After his shaikh's death, he went to Konya and took upon himself the spiritual education of the young Jalāl al-Dīn, who, by that time, had mastered the exoteric sciences, i.e. the canonical {*sharʿī*} and literary sciences. The Sayyid Burhān al-Dīn, who had met with Shaikh Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī and won his respect, later retired to Kayseri where he died.[47]

From both his father and the Sayyid Burhān al-Dīn, Jalāl al-Dīn had acquired strictly ascetic and pious views. Thus, he occupied himself, on the one hand, with teaching and, on the other, with the principles of Ṣūfism that al-Ghazālī had reconciled with the provisions of the *Sharīʿa*. During this time, however, a dervish named Shams {al-Dīn Muḥammad} Tabrīzī arrived in Konya. His meeting with Mawlānā (according to Aflākī and Jāmī on 26 Jumādā II 642/November 29, 1244) had a profound and transformative influence on the latter's spiritual outlook.[48] According to one account, Shams was the son of a venerable family that belonged to the Ismāʿīlī *madhhab*.[49] He had wandered from country to country and had been in the service of various Ṣūfīs.[50] It is reported that he was a disciple of Bābā Kamāl Jandī and that he even met in his *tekke* with Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī.[51] In any case, no matter who the shaikh or shaikhs of this great Ṣūfī might have been, it is certain that he was a man with the character of a *rind* or *kalandar* {both are terms for unconventional dervishes} who could experience very intense mystical ecstacy, and that he was a very forceful personality who entertained the most broad-minded mystical notions because of the genuine needs of his spirit.[52]

There are a variety of reports in different sources about the nature and closeness of the relationship between Shams (who according to one story died in 645/1247, but according to other, more reliable, reports left Konya in that year) and Mawlānā.[53] With respect to the extent and significance of his influence on

Mawlānā, the material in Sipahsālār is especially worthy of note. Even if we leave aside those aspects of this material that are of a purely legendary nature, those that remain appear to be very significant. These two Ṣūfīs first had friendly discussions for six months in the cell of Shaikh Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Zarkūb and then departed. Following the path of his father and of the Sayyid Burhān al-Dīn, Mawlānā initially had no liking at all for *samā'*, but because Shams made him like it he could no longer live without it.[54] Shams realized, however, that those in Mawlānā's circle had become hostile to him and so, without notice, he departed for Damascus. Overwhelmed with grief, Mawlānā stopped writing poetry and conducting *samā'*. When a letter arrived one day from Shams informing him that he was in Damascus, Mawlānā was so happy that he recited a number of *ghazals* and began a *samā'*. He also sent his oldest son Sulṭān Walad with some of his companions to Damascus specifically to invite Shams back.[55]

When he returned, Mawlānā was overjoyed. Shortly thereafter, in fact, at Shams's request, Mawlānā married him to a young girl named Kīmyā who had been raised in the women's section of his apartment. Because it was winter, they set aside a small place for the new husband and wife in the anteroom of the kitchen. Shams spent the winter there, but during that time a mutual aversion developed between him and Mawlānā's middle son Chelebi 'Alā' al-Dīn. At the latter's instigation, Shams's former enemies and their allies again began to plot against him. Shams said nothing to Mawlānā of what was going on, but he did express his resentment to Sulṭān Walad and added that this time he would disappear without a trace. And so it happened. One morning when Mawlānā went to his *madrasa*, Shams was nowhere to be seen. Mawlānā, who recited many *ghazals* expressing the pain of this separation, eventually went to Damascus to search for him again. When no trace of Shams could be found, however, he was obliged to return to Konya.[56]

Mawlānā wrote poems with an exuberant passion and sublime inspiration. He dedicated them to the spiritual ideals of Shams Tabrīzī, and they were later known collectively as the *Dīwān-i Shams al-ḥaqā'iq*.[57] His ability to reach perhaps the highest degree of pantheism {in this poetry} and his profound attraction to *samā'*, dance, and music can be attributed above all to the teachings of Shams. With respect to language and versification, these lyrics can be considered quite faulty. With regard to capturing and demonstrating the most profound and exuberant moments of a mystical soul, however, each poem is a living document of the most immediate kind for properly understanding Mawlānā's emotional life. For Mawlānā, who mixed the basic ideas of the ancient Alexandrian school {i.e. Neoplatonism} with certain Indian, Persian, and Arab concepts, Ṣūfism was not an inert collection of rules and beliefs but something to be felt and lived. Thus, it could be apprehended not by mental and sensory discernment but by intuitive discovery, i.e. by inspiration and love.[58] The divine lyricism in these poems reveals Mawlānā's spirit in all its immediacy, profundity, and nakedness and is sufficient to suggest that he is Persia's greatest mystical poet. It would be a mistake, however, not to recognize Shams Tabrīzī as the largest single factor in

the origin and development of this lyricism. We have no clear and certain information about the life and personality of Shams, but it is certainly possible to grasp his mystical ideas and views from the *Dīwān-i Shams al-ḥaqā'iq*. This work would prove even more useful than the *Mathnawī* in shedding light on Mawlānā's mystical path, because it displays points that are clearly reminiscent of his Neoplatonist beliefs. In order to remain within the bounds of my subject, however, it is not possible to go into further details on this matter.[59]

After Shams's disappearance, Jalāl al-Dīn adopted as his companion one of his former disciples, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Farīdūn of Konya, who was known under the byname Zarkūb (goldsmith).[60] Long known for his asceticism and piety, this person had been one of the leading disciples of Burhān al-Dīn Muḥaqqiq. Early on, he had taken up the profession of goldsmith in Konya and later attached himself to Shams. Adopting such a man, who had virtually no understanding of the religious and literary sciences, as a companion aroused the enmity of a number of other disciples. They spoke out about his lack of knowledge, but Mawlānā, paying no attention to this gossip, increased his favors to, and respect for, this man. Indeed, in order to strengthen his esoteric attachment with an exoteric bond, he married Sulṭān Walad to Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn's daughter. In this manner, a sincere attachment lasted for ten years until Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn became ill and died. In despair and full of grief, Jalāl al-Dīn composed a number of *ghazals*.[61] To be sure, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn had had no influence over Mawlānā, as Dawlat-Shāh supposed; on the contrary, he was very much under Mawlānā's influence.[62] The fact that Mawlānā mentions him with respect and affection in a number of poems in the *Dīwān* does not constitute a reason to claim otherwise.

Subsequently, Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn became Mawlānā's *khalīfa* and companion. According to Mawlawī tradition, Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥasan b. Muḥammad b. Ḥasan b. Akhī Turk was one of the children of Shaikh Abū 'l-Wafā' of Baghdad.[63] He was bound and devoted to his shaikh through great respect and affection and, in turn, received the same kind treatment from Mawlānā. Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn played a significant role in Mawlānā's composition of the *Mathnawī*. Realizing that didactic works of the type of {'Aṭṭār's} *Ilāhīnāme*, *Manṭiq al-ṭair*, and *Muṣībatnāme* were well liked and widely circulated among the dervishes, Chelebi asked his shaikh to create a *mathnawī* that could teach the dervishes the rules of the order and the mystical truths. Also, because Mawlānā had already written a rather large number of *ghazals*, Chelebi hoped that he would now take up writing *mathnawī*. Then, taking out a piece of paper on which were written eighteen couplets from the introduction to the *Mathnawī*, Mawlānā said that he too had thought of doing this. At that point, the composition of the *Mathnawī* began. Mawlānā spoke and Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn recorded his shaikh's inspired recitations. After the first volume was finished, there was about a two-year delay in this project because of the death of Chelebi's wife. Subsequently, however, Chelebi implored his shaikh to continue his compositon and convinced him to do so. Therefore, over a period of at least seven or eight years, this monumental work of six volumes came into being.[64]

An enormous work of more than 26,000 couplets, the *Mathnawī* is the most famous product not only of Mawlānā, but perhaps also of all Ṣūfī literature.[65] Its influence, which has been very great throughout the Islamic world, especially in India and Iran, was exceptionally powerful on the Anatolian Turks from the time it was written.[66] Nevertheless, one cannot find in the *Mathnawī* dazzling flashes of brilliance and clear and profound reflections that sweep aside all obstacles and boundaries like those in the *Dīwān-i Shams al-haqā'iq*. This is a didactic work of Ṣūfī ethics written strictly to provide guidance to those on the mystical path. It was written, quite naturally, with mid-level adepts in mind. With respect to language and meter, this work is again quite faulty. Its structure can also be very easily criticized. Adhering to the format of earlier Ṣūfī poets, Mawlānā expounds every idea, every bit of advice, and every theory with an appropriate story. When he wants to explain, for example, that trusting in providence can be both positive and negative, he begins with a few verses of admonition and then adds a story. Usually, however, before finishing one story, he interrupts it and inserts a second story, and may even insert a third into the second; and after they are completed, the first story is resumed.

The lack of importance given to both the structure and the correctness of language and meter are evidence that Mawlānā was by no means a formalist. In the *Dīwān-i Shams al-ḥaqā'iq*, Mawlānā had used poetry as a means of communicating the most profound needs of his spirit, and in the *Mathnawī* used it as an instrument to guide adepts on the mystical path and to expound the principles of the *ṭarīqa* that he had founded. He never regarded himself as a poet or an artist.[67] Yet, despite his reluctance to speak with absolute clarity and precision about the realities of the unity of being in the *Mathnawī*, he was obliged in many passages to make unintended revelations. Because he himself was aware of this, he also says in the *Mathnawī*, "If you look at only the form of the expressions, this work seems to lead astray, whereas in reality it guides the right way," and in order to confirm this he relates the following couplet {vol. 6, 656}:

در نبی فرمود کین قرأن زدل \ هادئ بعضی وبعضی را مضل

{In the revelation God says that this Koran / Guides some and leads others astray (cf. Koran 2:26).}

Strongly influenced by Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār and Sanā'ī,[68] as he frequently stated and acknowledged, Mawlānā not only quotes from *Kalīla wa Dimna* {on this Indian mirror for princes, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Kalīla wa-Dimna" (C. Brockelmann)}, the legends of Juḥā {on this personage of the popular imagination, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Djuḥā" {Ch. Pellat)}, the stories of *Maḥmūd Ghaznawī wa Āyāz* {by Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī Ṣafī, the son of Ḥusain Wāʿiẓ Kāshifī}, from Arab stories like *Layla wa Majnūn* {see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Madjnūn Laylā" (Ch. Pellat *et al.*)}, and from the *qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* {stories of the prophets} and *manāqib al-awliyā'* {legends of the saints, in the generic sense}, but he also portrays, in various passages of his work, life in the palace, or scenes of public life, such as the ceremonial mourning of the Shīʿīs

of Aleppo at the Antakya Gate. Indeed, Mawlānā is perhaps too realistic in describing some obscene aspects of life, but this is no reason to criticize him when we take into consideration his personality and the purpose for which he wrote the *Mathnawī*. In any case, the influence of the *Mathnawī* is overwhelmingly obvious in the earliest Turkish works written in Anatolia.

During his last months, Jalāl al-Dīn wrote a number of moving *ghazals* indicating that the time had come for him to leave this world. In fact, shortly after composing them he became ill. Two well known physicians named Mawlānā Akmal al-Dīn and Mawlānā Ghaḍanfarī attended him, but his illness could not be diagnosed. At sunset on Monday 6 Jumādā II 672/December 18, 1273, Mawlānā died. The next day, after the necessary arrangements, which had been made in advance, for washing and shrouding the corpse were completed, virtually the entire population of Konya participated in the funeral prayer, while Qāḍī Sirāj al-Dīn acted as *imām*. Mawlānā was then buried in the tomb where he now rests. With the express wish and approval of his oldest son Sulṭān Walad, his *khalīfa* Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn succeeded him.[69]

Mawlānā, whose important followers include such Persian poets as Qiwām al-Dīn Sanjānī, Niʿmat Allāh Kūhistānī {i.e. Sayyid Niʿmat Allāh Veli}, and the Sayyid Qāsim al-Anwār,[70] and who influenced many other poets of the same caliber, and who was long very highly respected and honored by historians, biographers, and Ṣūfīs,[71] wrote an important prose treatise entitled *Fīhi mā fīh*,[72] which he dedicated to Muʿīn al-Dīn Parwāna, and has quite a few other sayings and utterances, but we cannot discuss them here. It is also beyond our subject to discuss Mawlānā as a Persian poet or his influence on Persian literature. Suffice it to say that Mawlānā flourished in an environment that was conducive to unconstrained thought and that appreciated music, art, and literature. With his poetry and mystical ideas, he easily won over the Anatolian cultural scene, pervaded as it was with the philosophy of the unity of being that had been propagated by Ibn al-ʿArabī. If the cultural milieu had not been prepared, Jalāl al-Dīn would not have won such great fame while he was still alive and the *ṭarīqa* that he established would not have spread and developed so readily. But as I made abundantly clear above, the ground had been fully prepared for such a movement. Consequently, Mawlānā's *ṭarīqa*, as well as legends about him, began to take shape while he was still alive. Below, we will see how Mawlānā's influence was felt on the earliest Turkish works created in Anatolia. While discussing the works and Ṣūfī ideas of Yūnus Emre, and drawing many comparisons, we will see how this influence spread in a very short time and what important traces it left even on popular Ṣūfī literature. One fact is incontrovertible: that without a thorough knowledge of Mawlānā, one cannot understand the earliest Turkish works in Anatolia.

E The national {*millī*} language and literature

The language of the Turks who settled in Anatolia, as adumbrated above, was Western Turkish, which we call the Oghuz or Turkmen dialect. This dialect had

become the local language of the regions invaded by the Oghuz tribes, especially Anatolia. The Oghuz literary language, which had taken form and developed even before the Oghuz settled in Anatolia, i.e. while they were still living in the Syr Darya area, retained its basic features, although it quite naturally underwent some minor changes in Anatolia. Thus, Western or Southern Turkish, which is known as Seljuk Turkish until the founding of the Ottoman state and Ottoman Turkish thereafter, is simply a developed form of the old Oghuz dialect.[73]

After the establishment of the Seljuk state in Anatolia, Turkish became a written language, but we cannot determine exactly when. Oghuz Turkish had been used for written correspondence even before the Seljuks settled in Anatolia. Like Eastern Turkish, this dialect too had ceased being simply a spoken language. It is quite natural, therefore, that Turkish works began to be written down from the earliest period of the Seljuks, but it is also true that they were very few in number and quite elementary in scope. These works include simple religious tracts meant to expound the principles of Islam, as well as a number of Islamic popular stories like the legends of Baṭṭāl Ghāzī that could satisfy the warlike leanings of the people of Anatolia, which was then an actual field for *jihād* {struggle for the faith}.[74] For various historical reasons, virtually nothing has come down to us from the literary creations of this period, but thanks to works that were written later on these subjects, and parts of which have survived, we can get a fairly clear idea about them, because most of these later works are merely updated, embellished, and expanded versions of the earlier ones. The lack of early texts has caused a major gap in linguistic history, but with respect to literary history it is not of such great importance. Such texts, which could not have had much literary value in themselves, could at least have served as a means to help us to understand the intellectual and emotional life of that period as well as its tastes and biases. Although we no longer possess these texts, it is possible to make such an analysis through various other means. {Köprülü's hypothesizing about non-existent Turkish literature is problematic. On the history of Turkish literature, see, for example, Alessio Bombaci, *Storia della letteratura turca* (Milan, 1956).}

If we take into consideration the general features of the civilization created by the Seljuks of Anatolia, and the intellectual and emotional life of that period, we will immediately understand the extent to which the national language was neglected. The *madrasas* and *tekkes* that were built with great elan in almost every corner of Anatolia after the establishment of the Seljuk state were so many hearths that radiated Arabic religious science and, above all, Persian literature. While the nomadic Turkmen satisfied their aesthetic needs with their own folk literature and with remnants of the old *Oghuz Destanı*, Persian literature prevailed in the cities that welcomed scholars, jurists, and vagabond dervishes who arrived from throughout the Muslim world. At the courts of the learned and artistic rulers who were attracted to the venerable Persian traditions, this foreign language became so influential that it supplanted the national language.

Furthermore, the inclination on the part of the educated class, beginning with the rulers, to pride itself on being distinguished from the common people and

everything related to them, also kept Turkish far from the courts, belittled works written in Turkish and caused them to be viewed with contempt[75] – instead creating in Anatolia the most brilliant works of Persian Ṣūfī literature of this period, such as the *Mathnawī* {of Rūmī} and *Lamaʿāt* {of ʿIrāqī}. Because the only institutions for training the intellectuals who were going to enter government service were the *madrasas*, the officials who received their training there under the influence of Persian culture also used Persian in state affairs. This overwhelming domination of Persian as the official language lasted until the ruler of Qaramān, Muḥammad Bey, captured Konya.[76] If the Seljuks had given value and importance to Turkish and tried to develop it, there might have been a rich literature in that language in Anatolia long before the formation of the Ottoman state.

Nevertheless, despite all this neglect and indifference, a Turkish literature – aside from popular religious and heroic works – did develop in Anatolia in the seventh/thirteenth century, partly under the influence of Persian Ṣūfī literature and partly under the influence of early Turkish popular Ṣūfī works, such as those of Aḥmad Yasawī and his followers. In addition to an early work entitled the *Story of Shaikh Sanʿān*, whose author and date are unknown,[77] we also have the Ṣūfī poetry of Shayyād Ḥamza and Sulṭān Walad, written quite a bit earlier than that of Yūnus Emre. As for Gülshehrī's {Turkish} translation of *Manṭiq al-ṭair*, the poetry of ʿĀshıq Pasha and various compositions of Ṭūrsūn Faqīh, Naqīb-Oghlu, Muʿarrif Lāziqī, and Maʿādh-Oghlu Ḥasan of Baypazar, they were contemporary with, or slightly later than, the works of Yūnus Emre.

Among the Turkish poets who preceded Yūnus Emre – leaving aside Mawlānā,[78] whose Turkish work consists of about eight or ten lines of poetry, and Shayyād Ḥamza,[79] whose Ṣūfī poems and fame were quickly forgotten – the earliest to produce a noteworthy amount of work was Sulṭān Walad. This great Ṣūfī was born in 623/1226 and died in 712/1312 at the age of almost ninety. In Konya and Damascus, he studied the religious sciences with various scholars, especially his father, and also received lessons in spirituality from leading personalities like the Sayyid Burhān Tirmidhī, Shams Tabrīzī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Zarkūb, Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn, and Shaikh Karīm al-Dīn. Sulṭān Walad, who, according to sources like {Ibn Qutlūbughā's} *Tāj al-tarājim* and {ʿAbd al-Qādir b. Muḥammad's} *al-Durra al-muḍīʾa* {i.e. *al-Ǧawāhir al-muḍīʾa*}, was, like his father, a great Ḥanafī *faqīh*, was also a fairly noteworthy Ṣūfī poet in Persian. He has left us three *mathnawī* works, *Ibtidāʾnāme*, *Intihāʾnāme*, and *Rabābnāme*, a large anthology of poetry {*Dīwān*}, and a prose work called *Maʿārif*.

In the *Ibtidāʾnāme* and *Rabābnāme*, and in the *Dīwān*, there are Turkish poems of a quantity and quality to allow us to consider Sulṭān Walad as an early Turkish poet.[80] I will not go into a lengthy description here of these poems, which were written in a very crude and primitive language and with a very defective and rudimentary versification replete with *ziḥāf* {pronouncing a long vowel short} and *imāla* {pronouncing a short vowel long}. This work, which has still not received the study it deserves, although it has attracted the attention of European scholars for some time,[81] requires a separate, detailed, linguistic and literary

analysis. Here I will only make a few brief and general comments about Sulṭān Walad and his Turkish poetry in order to indicate his actual place in the general development of Turkish literature in Anatolia.

Sulṭān Walad, who desired nothing more than to propagate the Ṣūfī principles that his father had put forward, and whose personality therefore never emerges as distinct from that of his father, tried to compose in Turkish according to the examples of Persian Ṣūfī literature. Mawlānā's influence on Turkish literature thus begins with him. Sulṭān Walad's motivation in writing Turkish poetry, just as it was in composing and reciting Persian poetry, was to raise the religious consciousness of the people of Anatolia, to guide them, and instill in them a sense of the greatness of Mawlānā. The fact that he wrote most of his works in Persian is a consequence of the literary traditions of the period. The fact that he occasionally resorted to Turkish derives from his fear that a large majority, who did not understand Persian, would be deprived of these teachings.[82] If we set aside the understandably primitive stage of the language and versification, we can say that there is no difference in form, meter, and style between the Turkish poetry of Sulṭān Walad and the Persian poetry of Mawlānā. Although there was no widespread use of Turkish as a written language at that time, it is almost certain that Ṣūfī poems in *ʿarūḍ*, as well as legends and stories, had been written in Turkish in Anatolia even before Sulṭān Walad.[83] But Sulṭān Walad, thanks to his influence as a great Ṣūfī and spiritual teacher, succeeded in establishing *ʿarūḍ* meters and *mathnawī* form as the absolute rule for Ṣūfī-moralistic didactic works. At the same time, however, despite the influence of Sulṭān Walad and the importance of the Persian *ʿarūḍ* system, Ṣūfī poetry written in the syllabic meter, which began with Aḥmad Yasawī and continued with popular Ṣūfīs like Shayyād Ḥamza, continued to flourish and finally found its greatest representative in Yūnus Emre.

Sulṭān Walad's first imitator, and a contemporary of Yūnus Emre, was Shaikh Gülshehrī, who expanded upon ʿAṭṭār's *Manṭiq al-ṭair* with stories taken from various sources, especially the *Mathnawī*, and with quite a few discussions and complaints relating to his own time. In this great work, to which he gave a somewhat personal touch, he proved a fine versifier and a very talented artist.[84] The fame of this poet, who considered himself the direct successor of such great Persian poets as Sanāʾī, ʿAṭṭār, Niẓāmī, Saʿdī, Mawlānā, and Sulṭān Walad, lasted until the tenth/sixteenth century, after which time he was virtually forgotten, so he was not included in later biographical dictionaries. Nevertheless, many passages from his work are of such excellent literary quality that they can be read with pleasure even today. The work of this poet, who, for his time, had a superb command of the language and a rich imagination – in short, a great artistic sensibility – not only surpasses the *Mathnawī*, for example, in its composition, but also stands out among contemporary works with regard to its internal aesthetic quality.[85]

After Gülshehrī, the most significant work to appear under the influence of Persian Ṣūfī literature and of Mawlānā and Sulṭān Walad was the *Gharībnāme* of

'Ashıq Pasha, whose shorter poems, written under the influence of Yūnus Emre, I will discuss briefly below.[86] Summing up, in Anatolia before Yūnus Emre, the pervasive influence of Persian culture was present in language and literature as it was in all other aspects of civilization. Indeed, this influence was strong and deep not only with respect to ideas, but also regarding language, form, style, and versification.

F Folk literature

While the elite who received a *madrasa* education in the great civilized centers of Anatolia cultivated a taste for the refined products of Persian literature and tried to write works of the same kind, the great mass of the people remained almost total strangers to it. Not only the nomadic Turkmen tribes and the march tribes who guarded the frontiers with Byzantium, Armenia, and Georgia, but also a large part of the urban population could take no pleasure in the literature of a language that they did not understand. Consequently, a number of simple and rudimentary Turkish works of a religious or heroic nature, as well as heroic poems, were written for them. The wandering *ozans* {minstrels},[87] who for centuries had, with *kopuz*[88] in hand, satisfied the aesthetic needs of the people, kept the old Turkish traditions alive throughout Anatolia in a vigorous and devoted manner.

Beneath a veneer apparently borrowed from Arabic and Persian culture, Turkish life in Anatolia in the Seljuk period was perhaps a bit primitive, but it was completely national, genuine, and widespread. After leaving the banks of the Syr Darya and experiencing a long career of migration filled with adventures and crowned with continuous victories and booty, the Turkmen, who, fighting for their national-religious ideals, settled in Anatolia, saw this as a period of *alps* {heroes}, i.e. as a heroic era. The old national and warlike traditions, which even exerted an influence on the official ceremonies and institutions of the {Seljuk} state, developed further among the Anatolian Turks as a natural consequence of unremitting conflict with the Byzantines, Armenians, Georgians, and other Christian peoples. The march tribes in particular, who lived along the frontiers, maintained their customs and pastoral existence and, in their traditions, the harsh and heroic spirit of the early migratory Turkish hordes.

The basic organization of the Seljuk state also had a military cast. Landed estates were parcelled out to the *sipāhīs*. Officials who possessed large and rich *timars* were legally bound to raise up a specific number of soldiers. It was a kind of dynastic rule that the rank of *sipāhī* pass from father to son. In order for any son to take his father's place, however, he had to prove that he had the qualifications and warlike attributes to be a *sipāhī*. Gold-embroiderd *kutases* {ornaments of yak or horsehair} were placed on the necks of the horses of the *alps* who had exhibited great self-sacrifice; tiger tails were attached to the wrists of those who shot a tiger while hunting with a bow and arrow; those who killed a bird with a single shot were allowed to wear its plume.[89] *Alp* was a title of very high honor. 'Āshıq Pasha {1272–1333}, who knew the period of the *alps* very well, describes

at length in plain and charming language what was required for one to become an *alp*.[90] In this period, Anatolia was so permeated with an atmosphere of heroism that even the Seljuk rulers who were under the demoralizing influence of Persian culture could not give up their attachment to Oghuz customary law {*töre*}[91] and the old warlike traditions in their own palaces. The sultans' practices of going out to hunt, playing polo with the Oghuz *beys*, and providing training in hand-to-hand combat and archery were all required by Oghuz "custom."[92]

The primary native singers of the era of heroes were the *ozans*. These minstrels, who, from time immemorial, had played the *kopuz* and sung the old Oghuz legends, i.e. the national epics of the Oghuz Turks, were found without fail in the armies, in the large nomadic tents, in short, wherever there was a gathering. There was never a Seljuk army that was without its minstrels and *kopuz* players. In the joyful evenings following military victories, *kopuz* in hand, they would recite heroic poems that would bring to life that day's gestes.[93] It is a pity that almost nothing from these epics has come down to us. The products of this wonderful era of *alps*, which certainly included a valuable epic literature, disappeared during subsequent centuries, perhaps because they remained in oral form. Fortunately, we can get an idea of the basic and genuine features of this period, even the completely heroic views of love and women, so different from those of later periods, from the *Kitāb-ı Dede Korkut* {Book of Dede Korkut}.[94]

In addition to the ethno-religious didactic works and narratives that were written to expound the principles of Islam, and all of these epic works, the Anatolian Turks also possessed a large body of love poems and folk songs {s. *türkü*} of a purely lyrical nature. These short poems, which merely expressed individual needs rather than collective feelings and social ideals, were usually couched in the national meters and the traditional forms that had survived from the early ethnic/folk {*kavmi*} literary period. They had names like *türkü*,[95] *türkmānī*,[96] and *varsağı*,[97] which reveal their ethnic origin, or *koşma*,[98] *deyiş*,[99] or *kayabaşı*,[100] which convey their rustic nature or the requirement of musical accompaniment. Unfortunately, nothing has come down to us of these poems. Moreover, because of the lack of historical documents from this period, the disparagement of, and indifference to, this kind of literary work by the early *tezkirecis*,[101] we do not even know the name of a single writer of such poems. Nevertheless, this gap in knowledge is, as I stated above, by no means an obstacle to gaining a clear and definitive idea of the basic features of our literature at that time.

G *Oghuznāme*

Like many other peoples in history, the Oghuz Turks had their national epic, the origin of which is lost in time. This epic, which had existed not only as an oral tradition but had also been established in written form, very likely even before the appearance of Islam,[102] was subsequently called the *Oghuznāme* because it concerned the Oghuz. Seeing that the early history of every people takes the form of myths and legends, Rashīd al-Dīn {d. 718/1318} used this written epic

for details on the origins of the Oghuz in his famous universal history.[103] Thus, positive history and myths were mixed together. We also know that this error, which was inescapable for that time, has been continued by our most recent researchers and historians, who still believe that there existed a work describing the early history of the Oghuz under the vague title of *Oghuznāme* and even search for it.[104] Although the existence of the *Oghuznāme* is shown quite clearly and unequivocally in certain historical documents from the ninth/fifteenth and tenth/sixteenth centuries,[105] and passages from it are even cited in works like the *Jām-i jam āyīn* and *Saljūqnāme*,[106] this evidence is not sufficient to reject the idea that the *Oghuznāme* was a collective work constituting a national epic that also comprised certain legends relating to the individual Oghuz lineages, and thus was not an early history as has been believed or conjectured. The very clear and detailed discussion of this subject by, above all, Abū Bakr Ibn ʿAbd Allāh b. Aybak al-Dawādārī (himself a scion of the Seljuk dynasty {d. 713/1313}), who saw an old copy of the *Oghuznāme*, shows quite definitely that it was not a history as has been believed.[107] The famous work that we possess today entitled *Kitāb-ı Dede Korkut*, if not the complete original *Oghuznāme*, is, without any doubt, an important and fundamental portion of it.[108]

We cannot give here even a brief account of the Oghuz epic and *Kitāb-ı Dede Korkut*, both of which need a thorough analysis. Let me simply state, in order to present, as far as possible, a full and accurate picture of life in Anatolia before Yūnus Emre, that the Dede Korkut legends were very widespread among the people at that time and that the Oghuz minstrels recited them with *kopuz* in hand.[109] These shared legends of the early heroic periods of the Turks naturally had a special appeal to the unsophisticated and marvel-loving people of those times, when the *alp* spirit prevailed in Anatolia. The old themes, which had lasted for centuries, did not change, but certain unavoidable novelties appeared in the legends regarding time and place, which aroused even more interest, and had an even more positive influence, on the common people, who had already been enjoying them for a very long time. Compared with heroic legends like those of Baṭṭāl Ghāzī and stories like those of the *Kitāb-ı Dede Korkut*, all the popular works, i.e. ethico-religious exhortations and stories, of that time were very dull and ineffective. If we were to summarize this in one sentence, we could say that one can see in this work, in a most striking fashion, all the aesthetic and ethical features of the *alp* period of Anatolia. Some of the stories that were told under the title of *Oghuznāme*, such as the famous legend of Tepegöz, which has attracted the most attention – and which has been seen by various European scholars as having a strong connection with the cyclops in the Greek myths – still survive in some Anatolian villages.

H Conclusion

Having provided this long summary showing the general but distinct features of the spiritual and literary life in Anatolia before Yūnus Emre in order to

characterize the milieu in which he flourished, I can now lay out the issue to my readers in a briefer and more synthetic manner. It is obvious from the above sketch that the primary sentiments that animated the Turks of Anatolia were those of religion and heroism. The religious feelings, which were chiefly manifest in mystical form, were not of the type that would paralyze the social structure by confining the Turks of Anatolia to *tekkes* or mosques, because the Turks, who frequently endured the campaigns of the Crusaders and were continuously on guard against them, had long possessed the warlike qualities that the geo-political conditions of Anatolia demanded of them. Because warfare was essentially a religious command, religious feelings and feelings of heroism coalesced, indeed complemented each other, among the Turks as they did among other nations who fought religious wars in the Middle Ages. If the Ṣūfī legends that flourished in this era of *alps* were analyzed even superficially, the following point would become quite obvious: There is an enormous difference between the warlike Turkish Ṣūfīs in these legends – who battle against unbelievers with wooden swords, crush huge enemy armies with a handful of disciples, capture fortresses, and spread Islam to the lands of the infidels by the power of the sword[110] – and the Arab and Persian Ṣūfīs who spent tranquil lives in the *tekkes*. The *erens* {saints, Ṣūfī spiritual leaders} of the era of *alps* were, as ʿAshıq Pasha quiet rightly stated, "hero saints" {*alp erenler*}.

In light of these cursory remarks, the aesthetic elements that constituted Anatolian literature at that time should be readily apparent. The works that were to satisfy the needs of this religio-heroic life were naturally to arise as a result of the coalescence of two kinds of sentiments, i.e. from a combination of religious and heroic feelings. And this is, in fact, what happened. The literary works of this period comprise legends of religious heroes who had acquired a national character or national heroes who had taken on an Islamic hue; didactic works devoted to religious etiquette; and, to some extent, Ṣūfī poetry. After the frontier had slowly advanced toward the west, and the eastern areas of Anatolia ceased to be a battlefield and were made secure, scholars who were preoccupied with translating and imitating Persian literature, and contemplative Ṣūfīs who lived in a deep state of mystic rapture in their *tekkes*, began to flourish there. But on the frontiers, the *alp erens*, i.e. dervishes engaged in *jihād*, still flourished. Indeed, even the collapse of political centralization, the lapse of Anatolia into widespread anarchy, and the outbreak of heretical uprisings under the screen of Ṣūfism in the midst of these disorders could not prevent this. It is during the early period of the foundation of the Ottoman state that the legendary memory of the *alp erens*, who conquered fortresses with wooden swords and provided leadership to the armies, is attested in our histories.[111]

In addition to the old religio-national heroic legends, Ṣūfī poetry, treating such subjects as the transitoriness of the world and the philosophy of the unity of being, also began to increase during the seventh/thirteenth century. The Ṣūfīs who wrote this poetry wanted to spread their beliefs among the common people and thus usually tried to introduce the philosophical element, which was foreign

to them, in a manner that suited their taste. Consequently, they endeavored to clothe their ideas in a national garment with respect to language, style, form, and meter. This task was relatively easy, because the *ʿarūḍ* metrical system, i.e. Persian influence, had not yet penetrated very deeply and was unable to make much progress among the mass of the people. Also, those early poets had before them, as a model, the *ḥikmats* of Aḥmad Yasawī and his imitators.

It is quite natural, therefore, that while the *madrasa*-educated class, who had been captivated by Persian literature, were busy translating the classical Persian works, many Ṣūfīs, who were closer to the popular taste, wanted to spread their own beliefs among the people in a national form. Among those who undertook this task was, for example, Shayyād Ḥamza. The milieu necessary for success, and the elements from which the new artistic form would be created, were essentially present, but they still lacked a genius who would bring them together. It was Yūnus Emre who combined this foreign philosophical element with the national element, according to the peculiar genius of the Turkish aesthetic, and created a Turkish Ṣūfī literature that accorded with popular taste and, aesthetically speaking, was completely different from that of Persian Ṣūfī works. The role of Yūnus Emre in the birth of this distinctive literature, which flourished vigorously in the bosom of the nation for centuries and was rooted in it, was to understand with the genius of a national artist the need of the milieu and to combine and synthesize with overwhelming success a number of different elements that the centuries had brought forth. Thus, he was able to epitomize the national taste for centuries.

NOTES

1 Ibn al-Athīr {*al-Kāmil*}. The same historian states that these Oghuz had by that time already entered the milieu of Islam, but this began only in the fourth/tenth century as Barthold quite rightly claims. Furthermore, {Zakariyyā' b. Muḥammad} al-Qazwīnī's {d. 682/1283} report suggests that the Oghuz had accepted Christianity at an early date ({*Āthār al-bilād*,} ed. F. Wüstenfeld {Göttingen, 1848; reprinted Wiesbaden, 1967}, vol. 2, p. 394). Barthold states that these Oghuz were the people who had succeeded in unifying all the Turkish tribes from China to the Black Sea in a nomadic empire in the sixth century CE and that the Toquz Oghuz in the Orhon Inscriptions of the eighth century CE were, in fact, these people (see his article "Ghuzz" in *EI*[1]). The Orientalist Radloff had already understood this point quite well before these inscriptions were discovered (*Das Kudatku Bilik*, p. 78). G. Ramstedt had claimed that these Oghuz were related to the Mongol Oirats and in like manner B. Munkácsi had claimed that they were related to the Uighurs, but it is simply impossible to accept these claims from the linguistic point of view. Nevertheless, Thomsen, like the Orientalists Barthold and Radloff, also categorically states that the Toquz Oghuz and the ancient Uighurs were the same people and that they were the ones who founded the early Uighur empire (*Inscriptions de l'Orkhon*, pp. 147–8). In the early Arabic sources, the name Tokuz-Guz, i.e. Toquz Oghuz, is last found in al-Ṭabarī ({*Taʾrīkh* (Leiden, 1879–1901),} vol. 3, p. 1044; {English trans. under the general editorship of Ehsan Yarshater as *The History of al-Ṭabarī* (Albany, NY, 1985–), see vol. 32, trans. C. E. Bosworth as *The Reunification of the ʿAbbāsid Caliphate*

(1987), p. 107}) in connection with their conquest of the region of Ushrūsana in 205/820–1. Subsequently, in the Western regions only Oghuz are mentioned, and these Oghuz, after becoming Muslims, are usually called Turkmen, which had the meaning of Muslim Turk. I have given information above (Chapter 5, p. 150, n.23) on this title, which we found first in al-Muqaddasī (de Goeje edn, p. 274), then in {al-Kāshgarī's} *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* and {Niẓām al-Mulk's} *Siyāsatnāme*. In my view, the various etymological explanations of this word, which were first made by Arab and Persian historians and, afterwards, which have been proposed since Nashrī {d. before 926/1520} up to the present time in both the East and West, are completely unacceptable and have no scientific basis. {See Golden, "The Migrations of the Oğuz," and *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples.*}

2 The Syr Darya Oghuz had quickly accepted Islam because they had a common border with Muslim countries and were in continuous contact with Muslims, Khazar Turks, and Qipchaqs. They had already departed Transoxiana before the Seljuks as various tribes and appeared, after passing through northern Iran, in Azerbaijan and Arrān, i.e. along the frontier of the Byzantine Empire, and began to conduct raids. Nomadic Oghuz tribes were also frequently found in Transoxiana and Khurāsān in the fifth/eleventh century. Those in Khurāsān had been transferred there from Transoxiana as a skillful political expedient on the part of Sultan Maḥmūd of Ghazna. For various reasons, they also went to the Byzantine frontier and joined the other Oghuz who had established themselves there. However, neither Transoxiana nor Khurāsān remained completely free of Turks. A number of new Turkish tribes appeared from beyond the Syr Darya and descended upon those same regions. They mixed with the other Turks who were there and became a source of strength for the Seljuks. Transoxiana in particular, because of continuous migration up to that time, became rather Turkified and, to a considerable extent, lost its ancient Persian character {clearly a Turkish nationalist assertion}. While the most important ethnographic factor in this respect was the Qarluqs, the role of the Oghuz cannot be considered wholly without significance. In any case, within a short period of one or two centuries, under the command of the Seljuk rulers, the Oghuz who were established on the Byzantine frontier achieved the complete Turkification of Anatolia. Before the Mongol invasion, Oghuz tribes were found in the regions of Transoxiana, Khurāsān, northern Iran, the southern Caucasus, Azerbaijan, Kurdistan, and al-Jazīra. The Mongol invasion drove them toward the west and encouraged a renewed Oghuz migration into Anatolia in the Il-Khānid period. They later formed the states of the Aq Qoyunlu and Qara Qoyunlu. Even the Turks who later returned to the east and formed the basis of power of the Ṣafavid state were all Oghuz. After the Mongol invasion, we no longer find the Oghuz in Transoxiana and Khurāsān. Let me simply add, as I mentioned briefly above (pp. 177–8), that the tribes presently living in the broad Turkmen area encompassed by the Caspian Sea, Iran, Khīva, and Bukhārā are the descendants of the Oghuz who had originally gone there and of the other Oghuz who joined them as a consequence of the Mongol invasion. Even this brief summary clearly demonstrates the huge extent of the ethnographic region that the Oghuz Turks had occupied before the founding of the Ottoman state in Anatolia.

3 The capital of the Saltuqid state, which was founded by ʿAlī b. Abū ʾl-Qāsim, a Turkmen *bey*, was Erzurum. This state, which often struggled against the Georgians, came to an end in 598/1202, after first coming under the protection of the Seljuks of Anatolia and then becoming directly subject to them. The Mengüchekid state, which was also founded by a Turkmen *amīr* {synonymous with *bey*}, Mengüj Ghāzī, possessed Erzincan, Kemah, Konya, Sharkī Karahisar, and Divriği, and their surrounding regions. Erzincan was the capital. The Mengüchekids fought for a long

time against the Georgians, Abkhāzians, and Byzantines. In 625/1227–8, after the collapse of the Dānishmendid state, they handed the territory over to the Seljuks of Anatolia. The date of the end of the Divriği branch is not entirely clear. As for the Dānishmendid state, which was established by the famous Malik Aḥmad Dānishmend Ghāzī, it took control of the entire region of Cappadocia by conquering Sivas, Amasya, Tokat, Niksar, Osmancık, Çorum and their surrounding areas and then expanded across the Kızıl Irmak and incorporated Kangırı and Kastamonu and their environs. This state showed a great capacity for expansion at the time of its foundation, but the subsequent struggles over succession and disputes with the Seljuks of Anatolia served only to postpone somewhat the Turkification of Anatolia. With the collapse of the Sivas branch of the Dānishmendids in 569/1174 and the Malatya branch in 573/1178, their territory passed to the Seljuks of Anatolia. The Akhlāṭ-Shāhs, who founded a state in 486/1093–4 and were extinguished by the Ayyūbids in 604/1207, often struggled against the Georgians. Akhlāṭ passed from the Ayyūbids to Jalāl al-Dīn the Khwārazm-Shāh and then back to the Ayyūbids. The Mongols later completely destroyed this city and massacred its population. Nevertheless, with the help of the Seljuk ruler 'Alā' al-Dīn Kai-Qubād I, it was revived to become one of the major eastern cities of the Seljuks of Anatolia. The Saltuqid, Mengüchekid, and Dānishmendid states were all founded by *amīrs* under the command of Alp Arslan after his great and decisive victory at Malāzgird. {For recent work on these states, see the references in their respective sections in Bosworth, *The New Islamic Dynasties* (New York, 1996).}

4 The political structures of the states established by Turks who had accepted Islam derived partly from the 'Abbāsids, i.e. from the old Sāsānid traditions, and partly from pre-Islamic Turkish traditions. The Seljuk state in Anatolia remained much more faithful to the old ethnic traditions than did the other Seljuk states. For example, it maintained such ancient institutions as the *şölen* (public banquets) and *sığır* (public hunts {more properly "royal battue"} in addition to a structure based on the twenty-four Oghuz clans and the clan *beys*, and even the *kurultay* {great assembly}. (For information on these subjects, see my article "Türk edebiyatı'nın menşe'i.") The reason for this, so it would appear, is that the Turks came to Anatolia in great masses, and these great masses allowed them to maintain the traditions and institutions that they brought with them. Anatolia was, in fact, already a "*dār al-jihād*" {abode of war} at the time of Toghrıl Bey and Alp Arslan. Not only large groups but also many individual adventurers hastened there (Niẓām al-Mulk, *Siyāsatnāme*). In short, Oghuz traditions, which were called the Oghuz *töre* among the Seljuks of Anatolia, remained strong until the end of the dynasty and had a great influence on political and administrative structures. When the government organization of the Seljuks of Anatolia is studied historically in a comparative manner, the nature of their view of the state can be very clearly understood. The ancient Göktürk state was a compound structure composed of *ils* {territories}, and the ruler possessed a kind of patrimonial guardianship over them {allusion to Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (New York, 1947), pp. 346–54}. Among the Qarakhānids, who suceeded the Sāmānids, the country was considered to be the property not just of the ruler but of the entire ruling family. Consequently, it was divided into many parts that were governed separately. Some of them in fact were independent of the central authority. The same state of affairs is encountered in the early Seljuk period. Because the ruler alone did not represent the state, in some cities of Khurāsān the *khuṭba* {Friday sermon} was recited in the name of Toghrıl Bey, while in other cities it was recited in the name of Dā'ūd {i.e. his brother Chaghrı Bey}. The concept of state advanced {i.e. became more rational in the Weberian sense} during the reigns of the successors of Toghrıl Bey and the

Seljuks of Anatolia, who definitely did not tolerate sharing such things as the *khuṭba* or coinage, which were perquisites of sovereignty. Even some neighboring states that were subordinate to the Seljuks were forced to mention on their coinage the name of the Seljuk sultan to whom they were subject. Nevertheless, the Seljuks still regarded it as legitimate for the ruler to divide the country among his children, so it is obvious that the concept of the indivisability of the state had not yet taken hold. In light of all this, it should now be clear that, among the Seljuks of Anatolia, there was another form of guardianship distinct from the ruler's patrimonial guardianship and that the state of the Seljuks of Anatolia had already abandoned, from its inception, the {notion of} an *il-khānate*, i.e. a composite entity in which the ruler possessed a patrimonial guardianship, and had become a sultanate. Still, it should not be forgotten that this sultanate could not be considered complete and perfect in every aspect of its formation and that a number of institutions, such as the twenty-four clans, *şölen*, and division of the territory among the individual family members, which dated from the early period of the Il-Khānate, survived until the end of the dynasty. As more research is done on the political structures of the Turkish states that were formed up to that time, these points will be elucidated. {Cf. Köprülü's "Selçukiler zamanında Anadoluda Türk medeniyyeti," Leiser trans. pp. 48–9.}

5 The military and political organization of the Seljuks of Anatolia reached its most developed form during the reign of ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn Kai-Qubād I. Not only was the machinery of centralized government properly established, but the administrative apparatus in the provinces was also clearly defined and regularized. There were *qāḍīs*, *muftīs*, *subaşıs* {police chief, constable}, and tax collectors everywhere. The fundamental organization of the Seljuk state, as of all the other Turkish states, was of a military nature. The land was parcelled out to the *sipāhīs* {cavalry soldiers}, and high officials possessing large and rich *timars* {military land grants} maintained a set number of troops. The officials of the central government, *ʿulamāʾ*, *sayyids*, and *muqarrabs* {court favorites} also had *timars* that provided them with set incomes. On the frontiers, however, the *timars* were given mainly to *ghāzīs* {warriors, warriors for the faith} and *alps* {heroes}. Being a *sipāhī* was a kind of dynastic right that passed from father to son. But the son first had to prove that he was a warrior in order to take his father's place. Indeed, all folk traditions had a war-like quality. The *alps* held a very important place among the people. On all the frontiers, there were usually march {*uc*} *beys* who were charged with protecting the border. In the capital, the Seljuks of Anatolia had substantial standing military forces; and extensive training quarters were established, in the capital in particular, in order to prepare them for war. (For rather more detailed information on the political relations, civil and military organization, palace life, and many other special features of the Seljuks of Anatolia, and comparisons with similar institutions of the other Turkish states, see my article "Selçukiler zamaninda Anadoluda Türk medeniyyeti." {Currently the most authoritative work on the Seljuks of Anatolia is Osman Turan, *Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye tarihi*, 2nd edn (Istanbul, 1984); still useful is Cl. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey* (New York, 1968). See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Saldjūkids" (C. E. Bosworth), section III, part 5, "The Saldjūks of Rūm."}

6 Some of the sources that were consulted for this brief summary about the Turks in Anatolia were mentioned above. The major sources that were not mentioned are the following: Müneccim-başı's history {*Jāmiʿ al-duwal*, Turkish trans. Ahmad Nedim as *Ṣaḥāʾif al-akhbār* (Istanbul, 1285/1868–9); the original Arabic section on the Ottomans has been published with a modern Turkish trans. by Ahmed Agirakça (Istanbul, 1995)}, Hayrullâh Efendi's history {*Tarih-i âl-i osmân* (Istanbul, 1271–92/1854–75), ʿĀlīʾs *Kunh al-akhbār*, {Ḥusain} Hezārfenn's *Tanqīḥ tawārīkh* {*al-mulūk*} {in MS in Köprülü's private library, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ḥusayn Hezarfenn" (V. L. Ménage)}, {Diyarbekirli} Saʿīd Pasha's *Mirʾāt al-ʿibar* {Istanbul, 1304/1886–7}, Ibn al-Athīr

{*al-Kāmil*}, {Mīrkhwānd's} *Rawḍat al-ṣafā*, Juvainī's *Jahān-Gushā* (vol. 2), Hammer's translation {*Geschichte der Ilchane* (Darmstadt, 1842–3)}, the {Turkish} translation of {Ibn Niẓām al-Ḥusainī's} *al-'Urāḍa* {*fī al-ḥikāya al-saljūqiyya*, ed. K. Süssheim as *Das Geschenk aus der Seldschukengeschichte* (Leiden, 1909), partial Turkish trans. Şerefeddin Yaltkaya, *MTM*, 1 (1331/1915), 257–304, 481–96}, the text on the history of the Seljuks published by Houtsma {he published both Ibn Bībī's *al-Awāmir al-'alā'iyya* and Yazıcı-oğlu's Turkish translation (Leiden, 1889–1902)}, Ph. Le Bas' *Asie mineure* {Paris, 1864}, İsmail Galip's *Takvîm-i meskûkât-i selçûkiyye* {Istanbul, 1309/1891}, Ahmed Tevhid's *Meskûkât-i kadîme-i islâmiyye kataloğu* {Istanbul, 1321/1903–4} (vol. 4), Necib Âsım and Mehmed Ârif's *Osmanlı tarihi*, and the various articles published in *TOEM* by Halil Edhem and Ahmed Tevhid.

7 With regard to all the elements constituting their civilization, the most conspicuous influence on the Seljuks of Anatolia was primarily that of Iran. We will see this great influence more clearly below while discussing the Ṣūfī movement, Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, and the disaffection exhibited toward the national language and literature in Anatolia before the Ottomans. The Anatolian Turks did not undergo a great intellectual transformation as a result of their contact with Greeks and Armenians and saw no need to change their old views regarding science, philosophy, and art. Greco-Roman and Christian civilization was bound to have no effect on the Turks of Anatolia as long as their world-views remained unchanged. Moreover, the Muslim Turks did not see the civilization of these defeated {Christian} nations as superior to Islamic civilization. To the contrary, they considered it to be inferior in every respect. It was thus impossible for the Turks to escape the influence of Islamic civilization, which was a unified structure embracing every aspect of life. This civilization was not inferior to Western civilization in all of its particulars; rather, it was superior to it in many respects. Based on such considerations, I am of the opinion that Byzantine influence on the Anatolian Turks was very slight and superficial and that the contrary view cannot be defended historically. {Köprülü later returned to this subject in his "Bizans müesseselerinin osmanlı müesseselerine te'siri hakkında bâzı mülâhazalar," *Türk Hukuk ve İktisat Tarihi Mecmuası*, 1 (1931), 165–313, English trans. Leiser as *Some Observations on the Influence of Byzantine Institutions on Ottoman Institutions* (Ankara, 1999). There was much greater cultural exchange between the Turks and Christians in Anatolia than Köprülü allows here. Indeed, he later qualified his views in the aforesaid work. See now in particular Speros Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley, CA, 1971).}

8 The Anatolian Seljuk rulers Kılıch Arslan II, and then Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kai-Khusraw I and 'Alā' al-Dīn Kai-Qubād I, had very close relations with the Byzantines. Indeed, they were familiar with their traditions from living in Byzantium. The famous *qāḍī* al-Tirmidhī issued a strong *fatwā* saying that Kai-Khusraw was not suitable to be sultan because he had taken refuge with the Byzantine ruler and had done various things that were religiously prohibited. Later, when the sultan assumed the throne in Konya, he took revenge by putting him to death. Nevertheless, we know that in order to calm public opinion, which had been agitated over this incident – for the execution of a *qāḍī* was an unheard of event – the sultan granted a large number of favors to his heirs. Ibn Bībī interprets public opinion quite well by writing that, simply because of the inauspiciousness of this unjustified shedding of blood, the vineyards and gardens of Konya produced no crops for three years (Ibn Bībī, {Yazıcı-oğlu's} trans., p. 80). Now, this rather unconstrained behavior of the Seljuks of Anatolia was not, of course, condoned in the fanatical milieu of the neighboring courts. It was asked whether the Seljuks had returned to the old idolatry or Zoroastrianism. Indeed, the ruler of Aleppo, the famous Nūr al-Dīn al-Zangī, who, in the

early books of ethics, such as {Kınalı-Zâde ʻAli Chelebi's} *Akhlāq-i ʻalā'i* {Būlāq, 1248/1833}, is presented as a model ruler with respect to his Muslim zeal, justice and integrity, wanted Kılıch Arslan II, whom he did not think was a true Muslim, to renew his faith in the presence of his envoy (Huart, *Konia* {*La Ville des derviches tourneurs*} [Paris, 1897], p. 215). Because the Seljuks of Anatolia used images of living things as decoration on public buildings, had figures and scenes carved in relief on the walls of fortresses, saw no harm in having three-dimensional statues made, and even had a cavalryman in the shape and person of Saint George on some of their coins, used the falcon and double-headed eagle on their weapons and coats of arms, and had images carved on their tombstones – practices that were never regarded as {religiously} lawful by the Sunnīs – it is easy to understand how such doubts could arise about them. Yet the Seljuks of Anatolia were true Muslim-Turkish rulers, far removed from every kind of fanaticism. The religious zeal that they showed in response to the attacks of the Crusaders and the effort they expended to turn Anatolia into a Muslim country clearly demonstrate this. Indeed, the Turkish tribes that came to Anatolia were also free of every kind of fanaticism.

9 Gustave Mendel, "Les Monuments Seldjoukides en asie mineure," {*La Révue de l'Art Ancien et Moderne*, 23 (1908), 9–24, 113–27,}, Turkish trans. Vahid as "Anadolu'da selçuk âbîdeleri," in *YM*, {1917}, no. 19, {369–74}; no. 20, {389–91}; no. 21, {409–15}.

10 Even before this, however, Persian influence was already clearly evident in all elements of Seljuk civilization in Anatolia. The Mongol invasion also brought to the courts of the Seljuks of Anatolia – as was the case in the other courts of Western Asia that were saved from that onslaught – some poets, Ṣūfīs, and artisans who no longer found it possible to live in Iran, Khwārazm, and Turkistan. As a consequence of this great invasion, some powerful new tribes of the Oghuz also migrated to Anatolia or the Seljuk frontier. It should not be forgotten, however, that even before the Mongol invasion, the ethnographic character and cultural composition of Western Anatolia were in a state of formation and development.

11 The Seljuk rulers who, like all enlightened men of the age, received a literary education and thoroughly knew Persian literature, were also poets in their own right and continuously showered their fellow poets with favors. Indeed, no other kind of behavior could have been expected from such rulers as Sultan Rukn al-Dīn Qāhir (Sulaimān II}, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kai-Khusraw I, ʻIzz al-Dīn Kai-Kā'ūs I, and ʻAlā' al-Dīn Kai-Qubād I, who were well known for their patronage of literature. When the famous poet Ẓahīr Fāryābī sent to Sultan Rukn al-Dīn a *qaṣīda*, the first verse of which reads

زلف سر مستش چو در مجلس پریشانی کند \ جان اگر جان در نیندازد گران جانی کند

{When he lets his drunken locks loose in the company / The soul would be sluggish if it did not sacrifice itself for him,} he received a reward of "five slaves, five slave girls, 2000 pieces of gold, five camels, three horses, and fifty pieces of valuable whole cloth." In like manner, because Niẓāmī Ganjawī composed his famous *Makhzan al-asrār* for Sultan Rukn al-Dīn and presented it to him, the sultan sent one of his companions to him with "5000 pieces of gold, five horses, sumptuous robes of honor and other gifts," and said that if it had been possible, he would have also given him {other} treasures by way of thanks in return for this work that would immortalize his name throughout the world. This information is extracted from my article, only part of which was published, entitled "Selçukîler zamanında Anadolu'da Türk medeniyyeti" {not in the published part}. Some critical material on this subject is found in that study. Sultans Rukn al-Dīn Qāhir, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kai-Khusraw I, and ʻIzz al-Dīn

Kai-Kā'ūs I always discussed and debated issues with the scholars and poets in their councils and granted them royal favors. 'Alā' al-Dīn Kai-Qubād I, who was well versed in various branches of the fine arts, composed some quatrains, mostly in Persian, and took great pleasure in reciting them at wine drinking parties. According to a story of the translator {Yazıcı-oğlu} of Ibn Bībī, his palace was truly a place of science and culture, *Huzûrunda kasâid ve gazeller okunup, neyler vurulup, sazlar çalınıp, pişrevler pâre edilse, eş'âirin meânîsi ve nükteleri ve san'atları ve evzânından bahis olunurdu ve makâmât ve durûb ve buhûr tahkîkinden söylenirdi. Turrehât ve mâlâya'ni söz söylemezdi ve mecmû' nedimleri fuzalâ ve üdebâ ve ehl ve şîrîn-zebân kişilerdi* {Whenever *qaṣīdas* and *ghazals* were recited, *neys* and *saz'* were played, and *peşrevs* were performed in his presence, the meanings, subtle points, artistry and meters of the poetry were discussed and the modes and rhythmic structures of the music were analyzed. There was no idle talk. All his boon companions were men of culture, letters, and eloquence.} One sees Persian influence, of course, in all of this.

12 As was explained in my study of the institutions of the Seljuks of Anatolia {see previous note}, Persian influence was very strong in their court life as well as in their administrative organization. As in the old Sāsānid courts, the famous ball and stick {polo} game and, as in the oldest Turkish palaces, the battues that were held twice a year – and that were originally religious in character – were very well known in the Seljuk palaces. I hope to publish soon a special study on these public hunts that had great social value in early Iran and among various Turkish dynasties {never published}.

13 According to Mendel, Seljuk art was not a completely original art because a number of different influences acted upon it. Thus, building plans were Arab or Persian. In architecture, Syrian and Armenian forms mixed with Persian. The columns, capitals, and meanders bear witness to definite Byzantine influence, but limited to certain decorative details and without a significant effect on construction methods. In coverings of multicolored faience, Persian influence is again revealed. Geometric designs, i.e. the manner in which they are treated, and likewise vegetal designs and the arabesque belonged wholly to Islamic art. Finally, the use of depictions of living things in place of {geometric} decoration was not unknown to these artisans. Sometimes such different influences existed side by side without mixing and sometimes they blended together more profoundly. In order for a completely original art form to have arisen out of all these elements, the Seljuks of Anatolia would have had to persist under prosperous conditions for a much longer time than that which fate allowed them. As for the Ottomans, their successors, they appreciated beauty that was simple and imposing and for this reason did not especially like the ornamental and flowery motifs that the Seljuk sultans had loved so much in Konya. The real heirs of Kai-Khusraw I and Kai-Qubād I in art were the Qaramānids and Aydınids. The Qaramānid mosques in Qaramān and Konya and the Aydınid mosque of 'Īsā Bey in Ayasuluk {Ephesus} still bear witness to the fact that Seljuk motifs and forms of ornamentation survived until the beginning of the ninth/fifteenth century (Gustave Mendel, "Les Monuments seldjoukides en Asie mineure," {pp. 126–7}. The author {Saladin} of the famous work entitled *Manuel d'art musulman: l'architecture* essentially agrees with Mendel on Seljuk art and its constituent elements.

14 Heinrich Glück, {*Türkische Kunst*, a published lecture (Budapest-Constantinople, 1917)}, Turkish trans. Ahmed Cemal as "Türk san'atı," *YM*, {1918}, no. 59 {129–32}; no. 60 {149–52}; no. 61 {168–72}. An assistant of the famous Prof. J. Strzygowski, the director of the Vienna Institute of Art History, he wrote an important work on Seljuk sculpture in Anatolia that was published in Istanbul in 1917 as the fourth publication of the Müze-i Humâyun {Imperial Museum}. The ideas that Prof. Strzygowski first advanced about early Turkish art in his recent and very

important work *Altai-Iran und Völkerwanderung* {Leipzig, 1917} and {now} the studies of Glück challenge everything known to date about Turkish art. The archeologists who have studied Turkish art comprehensively from the earliest times to the present, just as I have done with literature, have quite rightly asserted that early Turkish elements are also found in Seljuk art. This wholly scientific approach, which allows one to analyze an entire series of events successively from beginning to end, has rescued the history of Turkish literature from obscurity during the past six or seven years, and will no doubt be equally productive for the history of art. {On Turkish art, now see, for example, Oktay Aslanapa, *Turkish Art and Architecture* (New York, 1971), and Esin Atil (ed.), *Turkish Art* (Washington, DC, 1980).}

15 During the time of Saladin {564–89/1169–93}, *tekkes* and *ṭarīqas* multiplied in Egypt and Syria to such an extent that he found it necessary to create some structure for them in order to maintain order and to prevent discord and confusion. Thus, he established the *tekke* of Sa'īd al-Su'adā', which he called the "Duwairat al-Ṣūfīyya" {Ṣūfī cell}, and then gave the shaikh who was appointed to it a right of supervision over the other shaikhs ({Zaydān,} *Medeniyyet-i islâmiyye tarihi*, vol. 1, p. 239). {On this facility, see al-Maqrīzī, *al-Khiṭaṭ* (Būlāq, 1870), vol. 2, p. 415; and Leonore Fernandes, *The Evolution of a Sufi Institution in Mamluk Egypt: the Khanqah* (Berlin, 1988).}

16 The biographies and commentaries, both important and trivial, that have been written in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish about the famous Ibn al-'Arabī, who is considered to be one of the most important and greatest Ṣūfīs to flourish in the Muslim world and who acquired the title the "Greatest Shaikh" and had a powerful influence for centuries on Islamic mysticism through his important works like the *Fuṣūṣ* and *al-Futūḥāt*, are too numerous to list here even briefly. The fact that no serious and detailed study has yet been produced on the life, works, career, and influence of Ibn al-'Arabī truly constitutes a very great shortcoming for the {study} of the history of Ṣūfism. [For the most concise information on the research that has been done on Ibn al-'Arabī in the years since this was written, one should see *İA*, s.v. "Muhyi-d-Din Arabî" (Ahmed Ateş) {abridged in his article "Ibn al-'Arabī" in *EI*^{2}; now see, above all, William Chittick's works on Ibn al-'Arabī, notably those in the bibliography}.] By the seventh/thirteenth century, there had already developed among Muslim mystics large and powerful movements both for and against Ibn al-'Arabī. On the one hand were proponents of *waḥdat al-wujūd* {unity of being} who believed that he had reached the highest stage of Ṣūfism. On the other there appeared extremist opponents who went so far as to accuse him of unbelief and heresy. {See Alexander D. Knysh, *Ibn 'Arabi in the Later Islamic Tradition: The Making of a Polemical Image in Medieval Islam* (Albany, NY, 1999).} The famous Shaikh Kamāl al-Dīn 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Kāshī, who wrote valuable commentaries on the *Fuṣūṣ* and *Manāzil al-sā'irīn* {of al-Harawī}, considered deeming *dhāt-i bārī* {the essence of God} to be *wujūd-i muṭlaq* {absolute being} to be the most advanced level of his knowledge, but his contemporary Shaikh Rukn al-Dīn 'Alā' al-Dawla {al-Simnānī} found this completely unacceptable. Indeed, this issue alone resulted in some correspondence between them ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 537–47). According to the commentator on the *Manāzil al-sā'irīn*, the last of all the stages was *tawḥīd*. Shaikh Rukn al-Dīn 'Alā' al-Dawla, however, considered *tawḥīd* to be only the eighth stage and replaced it with devotion to God (*'ubūdiyya*) as the ultimate, i.e. the hundredth stage. According to him, Devotion to God from the point of view of sanctity means returning to one's initial condition. Indeed, when Sayyid al-Ṭā'ifa al-Junaid al-Baghdādī was asked "What is the end of this business?" he answered, الرجوع الى البداية {Returning to the beginning}. Shaikh 'Alā' al-Dawla, who had written many quatrains on the theme of *tawḥīd*, said that after placing *qidam* {eternal pre-existence of God} at the end of the stage of *tawḥīd*, he realized that these quatrains were in sheer error

and that to return to God was much better than remaining in falsehood (*Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 547).

17 When the influence of the caliphs of Baghdad declined and sovereignty passed into the hands of various Turkish, Dailamī, Kurdish, and Persian *amīrs* and sultans, these new rulers needed a means of attracting the affection of the people in order to appropriate the religious aura of the caliphs. The easiest way to do this was to favor the poor and honor and respect the *'ulamā'* and Ṣūfīs. Consequently, when a clever and prudent sultan or *amīr* won sovereignty over a city, he first tried to win over its *'ulamā'*, *faqīhs*, and Ṣūfīs, to construct mosques, caravansaries, *tekkes*, and soup kitchens, and to provide for the salaries {of their employees} and income {for their maintenance}. Niẓām al-Mulk showed great skill and energy in this regard. Another reason why such institutions multiplied in a short time was that the *amīrs* and the wealthy people wanted to leave a means of livelihood to their heirs. Anyone who feared that upon his death the ruler would confiscate his wealth would build, for example, a *tekke* or *madrasa*, endow it with all his property and then place his children in charge of the administration of the endowment {*waqf*} and set aside for them an amount that he specified from its income ({Zaydān,} *Medeniyyet-i islâmiyye tarihi*, vol. 3, pp. 397–9). It would be completely incorrect, however, to attribute the creation of such charitable institutions merely to material motives, such as, in particular, the desire of the founder of a *waqf* to ensure an income for his children. Spiritual and altruistic factors also played a role in this. {There is a growing literature on *waqf* in Anatolia. See, for example, Mehmet Köymen, "Selçuklu devri kaynakları olarak vakfiyeler," in *Studi preottomani e ottomani* (Naples, 1976), pp. 153–63, and S. Bayram, "Selçuklu vakfiyeleri üzerine bazı düşünceler," in *IV. Milli Selçuklu kültür ve medeniyeti semineri bildirileri* (Konya, 1995), pp. 135–47.}

18 The famous Ṣūfī Khwāja ʿAzīzān {more properly known as Khwāja ʿAlī ʿAzīzān Rāmītanī}, to whom Mawlānā showed reverence in the couplet

گر نه علم حال فوق قال بودی کی بدی \ بنده اعیان بخارا خواجهٔ نساج را

{If the science of mystical states (*ḥāl*) were not superior to standard religious knowledge (*qāl*), why would the notable men of Bukhārā be subservient to Khwāja-i Nassāj (the weaver)}, left Bukhārā and went to Khwārazm. When he arrived he sent two of his dervishes to the ruler specifically requesting a written permit to reside there. Attributing this to the shaikh's naiveté, the ruler cheerfully granted permission. A short time later, however, so many *murīds* had collected around the shaikh that the ruler became frightened of this large assemblage and, for political reasons, decided to expel the shaikh from the country. But when Khwāja ʿAzīzān showed the permit that he had received, the ruler was very embarrassed and, together with the leading state officials, joined the ranks of the shaikh's *murīds* ({Ṣafī,} *Rashaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 48–9). This curious incident, which was perhaps altered in transmission, should probably not be viewed as an isolated occurrence. {The story about Rāmītanī's arrival in Khwārazm, from the *Rashaḥāt*, seems to have been a floating anecdote, since much the same story is found about other Ṣūfīs in Central Asia (and Köprülü left out the interesting part where Rāmītanī is said to have paid people money to become his followers). As for Rūmī knowing about him, according to the *Rashaḥāt* Rūmī died nearly a half century before Rāmītanī. The "Khwāja-i Nassāj" referred to in the couplet might be one of two much earlier figures: a Muḥammad al-Nassāj of Baghdad, a contemporary of Junaid, or Abū Bakr al-Nassāj of Ṭūs (d. 487/1094). The link with Bukhārā, however, suggests that it might refer to ʿAbd al-Khāliq Ghujduwānī, who is also referred to as "a weaver" in some accounts, and is linked in

several stories with one of the famous *ṣadrs* of Bukhārā. There may be something significant about the term "weaver" being applied to several early Khwājagānī saints. In any case, the term used for both Rāmītanī and Ghujduwānī is the Persian one, *bāfandah*, rather than *nassāj*.} Let me mention another important incident from an earlier time in order to show the influence of the shaikhs on the rulers: when Sultan Sanjar went to war against the Khwārazm-Shāh Atsız and entered Khwārazm, the famous Ṣūfī Zāhid-i Āhū-Pūsh, who was there – and about whom it is reported that he ate deer meat and wore deer skin – "presented himself before Sanjar and after delivering a goodly sermon interceded for the people of the town" (Juvainī, *Jahān-Gushā*, vol. 2, p. 10 {Boyle trans., vol. 1, pp. 283–4}). Such efforts on the part of Ṣūfīs were generally productive and influential with rulers who were aware of "the Ṣūfī truths." One can find many such incidents in the history of this period.

19 *Birgün Şeyh Mecdü'd-Dîn, dervişlerinden bir cemâatla oturmuştu. Üzerine sekr gâlib oldu, ayıttı: Biz bir kaz yumurtası idik, deryâ kenarında Şeyh Mecdü'd-Dîn* {error for Necmü'd-Dîn} *bir murg idi; termiyet kanadımı üzerimize örttü; tâ kim biz yumurtadan çıktık; bir kaz yavrusu gibi deryâya gittik ve şeyh kenarda kaldı. Şeyh Mecdü'd-Dîn* {same error as above} *nûr-i kerâmetle ol sözü ma'lûm edindi; zebanlarından bu sâdır oldu ki: Deryâda olsun* {rather, *ölsün*}. *Şeyh Mecdü'd-Dîn ânı işitib havf eyledi. Şeyh Sa'de'd-Dîn-i Hamevî'nin önüne geldi ve çok tezarru' eyledi ve ayıttı: Birgün Şeyh hoş-hâl ola, haber eyle, tâ kim hazretine varıb özür dileyim. Bir vakitte sema'da Şeyh hoş-hâl oldu. Şeyh Sa'de'd-Dîn haber eyledi. Şeyh Mecdü'd-Dîn yalınayak geldi ve bir leğeni ateşle doldurub ve başı üzerine koyup paşmak çıkardıkları yerde durdu. Şeyh Mecdü'd-Dîn âna nazar edib ayıttı: Çün dervişler tarîkince kelâm-ı perîşân özrün dilersin, îmân ve dîni selâmete ilettin, ammâ başın verirsin ve deryâda olursun* {rather, *ölürsün*} *ve biz dahî senin ucundan gideriz ve nice serdârların başları ve mülk-i Hârizm senin ucundan gider ve âlem harabolur. Şeyh Mecdü'd-Dîn, Şeyh'in kademine düştü, az müddet sonra Şeyh'in dediği zuhûra geldi. Şeyh Mecdü'd-Dîn, Hârizm'de va'z ederdi ve Sultân Muhammed'in anası ânın* {instead of *ânın*, the original has *begâyet cemîle bir hatun idi, Şeyh Mecdü'd-Dînin*} *va'zına gelir, ahyânen ziyâretine varırdı. Müddetler fırsat gözlediler, tâ bir gece ki Sultân begâyet mest idi, arzeylediler ki ananız İmâm Ebû Hanîfe mezhebince Şeyh Mecdü'd-Dîn'in nikâhına girmiştir. Sultân ziyâde bî-huzur oldu ve buyurdu ki, Şeyh'i suya* {*Dicleye*} *atın, attılar. Şeyh Necme'd-Dîn'e haber erişti, mütagayyir oldu,* {in the original followed by *ve eyitti: innâ lillâhi ve innâ ileyhi râji'ûn. Oğlum Mecdü'd-Dîni suya attilar, öldü. Pes*} *başını secdeye koydu, bur hayli zamân sonra kaldırıp dedi ki: Hazret-i İzzet'ten istedim ki oğlum Mecdü'd-Dîn'in hûn-bahâsı için mülkü Sultân Muhammed'den ala, icâbet buyurdu. Sultân'a bundan haber verdiler, begâyet peşiman oldu, piyâde Hazret-i Şeyh'e geldi ve bir leğen dolusu altun getirdi. Üzerine bir kılıç ve kefen koydu ve başını yalın eyledi ve saff-ı ni'alde durdu ve ayıttı: Eğer diyet gerek işte altun, eğer kısas eyler isen işte kılıç ve baş . . . Şeyh cevâbında buyurdu ki, ânın diyeti senin mülkündür, senin başın gider ve çok halkın dahî başı gider, biz dahî sizin ucunuzdan gideriz. Sultân Muhammed nevmîd olup geri döndü ve 'an-karîb Cengiz Han hurûc eyledi.* (One day Shaikh Majd al-Dīn was sitting with a group of his dervishes. A sense of intoxication overcame him and he said, "I was a goose egg on the seashore and Shaikh Najm al-Dīn was a bird. He spread over me the wing of training, and I emerged from the egg. I took to the sea like a gosling, while the shaikh remained on the shore." Shaikh Najm al-Dīn, through the light of grace, learned of this remark and the following emerged from his mouth: "Let him die in the sea." Shaikh Majd al-Dīn heard this and was frightened. He came before Shaikh Sa'd al-Dīn al-Ḥammūyī, very obsequiously humbled himself and said, "One day when the shaikh is in good humor, inform me so that I can go and beg his pardon." Once during a *samā'* the shaikh was in a good humor. Shaikh Sa'd al-Dīn informed him. Shaikh Majd al-Dīn came barefoot and filled a large bowl with fire, placed it on his head and stood where they took off their shoes. Shaikh Najm al-Dīn looked at him and said, "Since you ask forgiveness with distraught speech according to the way of the dervishes, you have secured your faith and religion, but you will lose your life and

die in the sea, and we will also die because of you and many a military commander will die because of you and the dominion of Khwārazm will be lost and the world will go to ruin." Shaikh Majd al-Dīn fell before the foot of the Shaikh and a short time later what the Shaikh said came to pass. Shaikh Majd al-Dīn used to preach in Khwārazm and Sultan Muḥammad's mother (who was a very beautiful woman) used to hear him and on occasion she used to visit him. Gossipers watched for an opportunity. One night the sultan was extremely drunk. They said to him "Your mother has married Majd al-Dīn according to the *madhhab* of Abū Ḥanīfa." The sultan was very upset and ordered that the shaikh be cast into the water and they cast him in. Word of this reached Shaikh Najm al-Dīn Kubrā and he became very upset. (He said: "We belong to God and to Him we return. My son Majd al-Dīn has been cast into the water and has died." Then) he placed his head on his prayer rug and some time later raised it and said, "I prayed that God take the kingdom away from Sultan Muḥammad as the blood-price of my son Majd al-Dīn. And my prayer has been answered." They told the sultan about this and he became extremely remorseful. He went on foot to his excellency the shaikh and he brought a large bowl full of gold. Over it he placed a sword and shroud and he bared his head. He stood by the door where shoes are left on entering and said, "If it is blood money you want, here is the gold. If it is revenge you want, here is the sword and head." The shaikh answered, saying, "The blood money is your kingdom. Your life will be lost and the lives of many people, and I too will lose my life because of you." Sultan Muḥammad was in despair. He returned and soon Chingiz Khān burst forth} ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 481–2). This curious legend is recorded in all the sources {this is not the case} and is very famous. Dawlat-Shāh attributes the appearance of Chingiz Khān to a similar cause, especially noteworthy in showing the great spiritual influence attributed to the shaikhs: Because there was a great loathing between Sultan Muḥammad the Khwārazm-Shāh, who was very proud of his greatness and power, and the ʿAbbāsid caliph al-Nāṣir, the sultan obtained *fatwās* from the *ʿulamā'* and *imāms* to the effect that the ʿAbbāsids did not deserve the caliphate and that it was reserved for the descendants of ʿAlī. His intention was to depose and expel the caliph and install in his place one of the *sayyids* of Tirmidh, Khānizāde ʿAlā' al-Mulk, and with this intention he marched on Baghdad. Caliph al-Nāṣir sent the famous Shaikh Shihāb al-Dīn ʿUmar al-Suhrawardī with an embassy to the sultan in order to seek a reconciliation. The shaikh met the sultan's army at Nihāwand. When the shaikh entered the sultan's tent, the sultan kept him standing and did not offer him a seat. While on his feet, he told the sultan of the dignity and high rank of the ʿAbbāsids and of the harm of becoming the object of their malediction. After a cool exchange of views, the shaikh returned empty handed. Numerous maledictions befell the sultan. Dawlat-Shāh is certain that these imprecations were answered. The same writer reports that whenever Sultan Muḥammad the Khwārazm-Shāh met the Mongols {in battle} he heard a voice from among the men of the unseen world say, "Oh, unbelievers! Kill the sinners!" and, being struck with terror, fled. He adds the following anecdote in the same vein: It is reported from the people of unveiling {saints} and the great men of religion that they saw a great many men of God as well as Khaḍir provide guidance at the front of the Mongol army. In the face of this divine wisdom, the discernment of the *ʿulamā'* and the wisdom of the sages are weak and bewildered. But God is the Almighty and does what He wishes. As a result of this, Shaikh Najm al-Dīn Kubrā recited the following quatrain:

أی رازق مور ومار وزاغ وبلبل \ گشتند هلاك بندگان تویکل

مشتی سگ را بهانه ساختهٔ \ ازتست وتو میکنی ته تاتار ومغول

{O! You who provide sustenance to ant and snake and crow and nightingale: All of your servants (= creatures) have been destroyed / You have made a band of dogs the pretext. It is You: You have done it, not the Tatars and the Mongols} (Dawlat-Shāh, *Tadhkira*, pp. 133–5). {See Deweese, "Dog Saints and Dog Shrines," p. 465.} These curious anecdotes, which go to show that Chingiz Khān was "supported by God" (*mu'ayyad min ṭaraf Allāh*) and a "great conqueror" (*ṣāḥib-khurūj*), are obviously later fabrications – the work of politically shrewd Persian historians. Juvainī, who had the best and most intimate knowledge of the history of the Khwārazm-Shāhs, also reports that Sultan Muḥammad the Khwārazm-Shāh's behavior toward the caliphs of Baghdad did not bring him good luck (*Jahān-Gushā*, vol. 2, p. 122). The biography of Shihāb al-Dīn 'Umar al-Suhrawardī and extensive accounts of his exalted position are found in all the Arab and Persian biographical dictionaries and collections of Ṣūfī legends. It is also known from these works that he wrote a book of travels called *al-Risāla al-'āṣimiyya* (C. Fraehn, *Indications Bibliographiques {relatives pour la plupart à la littérature historico-géographique des arabs, des persans et des turcs . . .* (St Petersburg, 1845)}, p. 45, n.149). Descriptions of the Khwārazm-Shāhs' relations with the caliphs of Baghdad can also be found in Barthold {*Turkestan*}, Nasawī {*Sīrat al-Sulṭān Jalāl al-Dīn Mingīrnī*}, Ibn al-Athīr {*al-Kāmil*}, and {Mīrkhwānd} *Rawḍat al-ṣafā*.

20 Imām al-Ghazālī, in his work *al-Tafriqa bain al-islām wa 'l-zandaqa*, mentions certain false Ṣūfīs who claimed they were in a state of divine ecstasy and had no need for the obligations of this world, such as prayer and worship, and he wanted to have them arrested (see Huart, "Les Zindîqs en droit musulman," {*Actes du 11^e^ Congrès International des Orientalistes (1897)*, 3rd section, pp. 69–92,} citing the MS in the Ayasofya Library, and Jacob, *Die Bektaschijje*, p. 44 {there is an English trans. of *al-Tafriqa* in R. J. McCarthy, *Deliverance from Error . . . and Other Works of al-Ghazali* (Louisville, n.d.; reprint of Twayne, 1980), pp. 125–49}.

21 When the Mongols turned toward Khwārazm, Shaikh Najm al-Dīn Kubrā collected his followers. Their number was more than 600. He said to some of them, such as Shaikh Sa'd al-Dīn al-Ḥammūyī and Raḍī 'l-Dīn 'Alī Lālā, "Arise quickly! A conflagration has appeared from the East and will burn all the way to the West." Some of his followers asked him to pray in order to repel it. "It is not possible," he said. "In that case, you come with us. Let us go to Khurāsān," they said. "I will be a martyr here. I am not permitted to leave the country," he replied. Thereupon a large number of *murīds* set out for Khurāsān. When the Mongols came to Khwārazm, the shaikh and his remaining *murīds* went out to meet them. He wore a patched cloak {*khirqa*} open in front and had filled his arms with stones. Finally, the stones in his hand ran out. An arrow struck his chest. He plucked it out and fell dead (617/1220). Shaikh Najm al-Dīn, who is considered the founder of the Kubrāwiyya *ṭarīqa*, was a great Ṣūfī. There is a tradition that Mawlānā Bahā' al-Dīn Walad {Rūmī's father} was one of his *murīds*. His other leading *khalīfas* were shaikhs such as Majd al-Dīn Baghdādī, Sa'd al-Dīn al-Ḥammūyī, Bābā Kamāl Jandī, Raḍī 'l-Dīn 'Alī Lālā, Saif al-Dīn Bākharzī, Najm al-Dīn Rāzī, and Jamāl al-Dīn Gīlī, all of whom held high positions in the Ṣūfī world. In the famous poem by Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī that begins with the line ما ازان محتشمانیم که ساغر گیرند {O! We are of the noble band who grasp the cup of wine, . . . (thus in Afzal Iqbal, *The Life and Work of Jalal-ud-din Rumi*, 3rd rev. edn [Lahore, 1974], p. 46; but in Rūmī's *Kulliyāt-i Shams-i Tabrīz*, ed. B. Furūzānfar as *Kulliyāt-i Shams, ya Dīvān-i kabīr* [Tehran, 1977], no. 785, the first words are ما نه زان محتشمانیم [we are *not* of the noble band who grasp the cup of wine])}, there is an allusion to the martyrdom of Najm al-Dīn Kubrā ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 480). {See *EI*[2], s.v. "Kubrā" (Hamid Algar).}

22 Sultan 'Izz al-Dīn Kai-Kā'ūs I's attachment to his shaikh Majd al-Dīn Isḥāq, and later 'Alā' al-Dīn Kai-Qubād I's and his *amīrs*' respect and reverence for Shaikh

Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī, who was sent by Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh, and, as will be seen below, the respect and kindness shown to Sulṭān al-'Ulamā' Bahā' al-Dīn Walad and a number of other Ṣūfīs are all evidence of this.

23 Ibn al-'Arabī, who spoke with him, says that this occurred in 602/1205–6 ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 409). As a result of this encounter, Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī {d. 635/1238}, who was associated with Shaikh Abū 'l-Najīb al-Suhrawardī {d. 563/1168}, was one of the Ṣūfīs who *şuhûd-i hakîkate mezâhir-i suverî ile tevessül eden ve Cemâl-i Mutlak'ı suver-i mukayyedatta gören* {approached the witnessing of Truth by means of the manifestations of form, and saw Absolute Beauty in earth-bound forms}. Because of this, Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī called him an "innovator" (*ibid.*, p. 660). In meetings with Shams Tabrīzī, Shams would ask him what he had done and he would reply, "I saw a bear in the water basin." Shams then alluded to the error into which he had fallen by asking, "If a boil did not erupt on your head, why don't you see it in the sky?" (*ibid.*, p. 520). There are many stories about Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī's being overly attracted to divine beauty in earthly form {*ḥuṣn-i zāhirī*}. Mawlānā had great respect for Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī, who composed the following quatrain:

زان می نگرم بچشم سردر صورت \ زیرا که زمعنی است اثر در صورت

این عالم صورتست مادر صوریم \ معني نتوان دید مگر در صورت

{I look at the forms with the eyes of my head,
Because in the forms there is a trace of meaning.
This is the world of forms, and we are in the forms:
One canot see meaning except in the forms.}

The author of the *Nafaḥāt* describes the attraction of the great Ṣūfīs like Shaikh Aḥmad al-Ghazālī, Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī, and Fakhr al-Dīn 'Irāqī to earthly beauty as follows: *Ekâbirden bâzı cemâat ki cemâl-i mezâhir-i sûrî ve hissî mütâlâasına iştigâl göstermişlerdir; Hüsn-ı zan belki sıdk-ı i'tikâd evlâdır ki, onların ol mezâhirde Hak Sübhânehu ve Té'âlâ'nın Cemâl-i Mutlak'ını müşâhede etmişlerdir ve suver-i hüsn ile mukayyed olmamışlardır ve eğer bâzı küberâdan onlara nisbet inkâr vâkı' olduysa ondan maksud oldur ki mahcuplar onu düstur bilmeyeler ve hâllerini onların hâllerine kıyâs etmeyeler* {With regard to some of the great men who were preoccupied with observing formal, perceptible, outward beauty, it is correct opinion, or rather true belief, that they did witness God's absolute beauty in those manifestations and they were not confined to the (outward) forms of beauty. If certain scholars have repudiated them, their motivation in doing so was to prevent the modest from considering those men as models and judging their own condition by theirs} (p. 662). Mawlānā's warning کار پاکانرا قیاس از خود مگیر {Do not judge the deeds of the pure by your own (*Mathnawī*, vol. 1, 263)} thus applies to such conditions. One should not confuse Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī, who wrote an imitatio to the famous orthodox {*muwaḥḥidāne*, confessing the unity of God} poem of Sanā'ī, which begins with the verse

طلب أی عاشقان خوش رفتار \ طرب أی شاهدان شیرین کار

{Longing, oh lovely-walking lovers! / Joy, oh sweet-behaving beauties!} (Dawlat-Shāh, *Tadhkira*, p. 98), and who also wrote a number of orthodox quatrains (p. 210), with his *murīd* and disciple Awḥad al-Dīn Marāghī. In his section on the famous Ṣūfī Amīr Sayyid Ḥusainī (d. 718/1318–19), Dawlat-Shāh says that this Ṣūfī {apparently

Ḥusainī}, who was a *murīd* of Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī, retired for religious devotions with Shaikh Fakhr al-Dīn ʿIrāqī and Shaikh Awḥad al-Dīn {Marāghī} (d. 697/1297–8) {d. 738/1337–8 in *EI*^{2}} in the *tekke* of Shaikh Awḥad al-Dīn in Kirmān and that during this time ʿIrāqī wrote his *Lamaʿāt*, Sayyid Ḥusainī wrote his *Zād al-musāfirīn*, and Shaikh Awḥad wrote his famous *Tarjīʿ* and they presented these works to Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī (p. 233). Dawlat-Shāh's statement (p. 210), in his section on Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī, that he was a *murīd* of Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī is an error that derives from his being associated with Shaikh Abū al-Najīb al-Suhrawardī in this way. {See Badīʿ al-Zamān Furūzānfar (ed.), *Manāqib-i Awḥad al-Dīn Ḥamīd b. Abī ʾl-Fakhr Kirmānī* (Tehran, 1347/1969); and *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Kirmānī" (B. M. Weischer).}

24 Shaikh Fakhr al-Dīn Ibn Ibrāhīm ʿIrāqī, who died in Damascus in 709/1309–10, according to Dawlat-Shāh, or in 688/1289 according to {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, holds an important place among the Persian Ṣūfī poets because of his *Lamaʿāt* and *Dīwān*. Dawlat-Shāh says that he was associated with Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī who sent him to India to Shaikh Bahāʾ al-Dīn Zakariyyāʾ al-Multānī {cf. *EI*^{2}, s.v. "ʿIrāqī" (H. Massé), versus errors of Dawlat-Shāh}, whose daughter he married (pp. 215–16). In the *Nafaḥāt*, it is related that after he returned from India, he visited Mecca and Medina. From there he went to Anatolia and had conversations with Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī. He listened to al-Qūnawī's lectures on {Ibn al-ʿArabī's} *Fuṣūṣ* and wrote the *Lamaʿāt* under its influence. We also know that the famous Muʿīn al-Dīn Parwāna was one of his *murīds* and firmly believed in him and had a *tekke* built for him in Tokat (*Nafaḥāt*, pp. 671ff.). This also confirms that the report deriving from Dawlat-Shāh according to which the *Lamaʿāt* was written in Kirmān and presented to Shaikh Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī, as mentioned in n.23 above, is not correct. The legendary deeds of this shaikh, who was known for contemplating divine beauty in earthly forms exactly like Awḥad al-Dīn Kirmānī, are recorded in the *Nafaḥāt*. It seems clear that this shaikh was under the influence of Ibn al-ʿArabī and Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī. The *Lamaʿāt* is a well known work written in the style of Aḥmad al-Ghazālī's *Risāla-i Sawāniḥ*. The famous sultan Abū ʾl-Qāsim Bābur enjoyed reading it very much. The shaikh of shaikhs Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Rawāsī, in response to one of his {apparently Bābur's} questions on this work, described the religious works of Shaikh ʿIrāqī as "*maḥḍ-i īqān wāṣil-i ʿirfān*" {pure certainty, a means of attaining spiritual knowledge} (Dawlat-Shāh, *Tadhkira*, p. 233 {the *Lamaʿāt* has been translated by William Chittick and Peter Lamborn Wilson as *Divine Flashes* (New York, 1982)}).

25 There is extensive information on Muʿīn al-Dīn Sulaimān Parwāna's political life in all the works on the Seljuks of Anatolia. He corresponded with al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Baibars, the ruler of Egypt who sent this correspondence to Abaqa Khān, and on Abaqa's order he was executed in 676/1277. There is also information on his relations with Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī in the books of {Ṣūfī} legends. {See Carole Hillenbrand, "Muʿīn al-Dīn Parwāna: the Servant of Two Masters?" in F. de Jong (ed.), *Miscellanea Arabica et Islamica: Dissertationes in Academia Ultrajectina prolatae anno MCMXC* (Leuven, 1993), 267–74.}

26 Najm al-Dīn Rāzī, who had the byname Najm al-Dīn Dāya, was a follower of Najm al-Dīn Kubrā. His training was assigned to Shaikh Majd al-Dīn {Baghdādī}. He met both Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī and Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, who had gone to Anatolia from Khwārazm during the Mongol invasion. This shaikh, who was the author of *Mirṣād al-ʿibād* and *Tafsīr-i baḥr al-ḥaqāʾiq*, died in 654/1256, but his place of death is not known for sure. Some assign a grave in Baghdad to him, but it has not been proven to be his. In the second section of the first chapter of *Mirṣād al-ʿibād*, it is stated that he left Hamadān with some dervishes at the onset of the Mongol invasion in 617/1220–1, that he went to the land of Anatolia {Rūm} via Irbīl the following year, that he resided in Kayseri, which was one of the flourishing Anatolian cities thanks

to the justice of the Seljuk rulers, that he began to write the *Mirṣād al-ʿibād* there, and that he finished it in Sivas in 628/1230–1 ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 491–2) {on the date cf. *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Naǧm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya" (Hamid Algar); see also William Shpall, "A Note on Najm al-Dīn al-Rāzī and the *Baḥr al-Ḥaqā'iq*," *Folia Orientalia*, 22 (1981–4), 69–80, important for his life and chronology}. *Mirṣād al-ʿibād* was translated into Turkish under the title *Irshād al-murīd ilā 'l-murād* by Qāsim b. Muḥammad of Karahisar in 825/1421–2 for Sultan Murad II (MSS in the Istanbul University Library, Königlichen Bibliothek in Berlin, and elsewhere {English trans. by Hamid Algar as *The Path of God's Bondsmen from Origin to Return* (Delmar, NY, 1982)}).

27 Shaikh Ṣadr al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Isḥāq al-Qūnawī was born in Konya. After Ibn al-ʿArabī had come to Konya, Ṣadr al-Dīn's father died and his mother was widowed. Ibn al-ʿArabī married this widow and thus Ṣadr al-Dīn grew up under his spiritual instruction and was instrumental in spreading the doctrine of the "unity of being" in Anatolia {cf. *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Ḳūnawī" (W. C. Chittick), and s.v. "Waḥdat al-Shuhūd" (W. C. Chittick)}. Indeed, most of his works are devoted to explaining and criticizing the ideas and beliefs of Ibn al-ʿArabī. According to {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, *Kelâm-ı Şeyh'in nakkâdıdır. Şeyh'in maksûdunu Vahdet-i Vücûd mese'lesinde ve bir vechile ki akl-ü serʿe mutâbık ola, onun tahkîkâtını tetebbuʿ etmeksizin kemâyenbagî fehmetmek müyesser değildir ve bunlardan dahî musannifâtı vardır. Tefsîr-i Fâtiha, Mefâtihü'l-Gayb ve Fusûs ve Fükûk ve Şerh-i Hadîs ve Kitâb-ı Nefahât-ı Ilâhî gibi* {He was a critic of the words of the Shaikh. Without studying al-Qūnawī, it is not easy to get a proper understanding of the Shaikh's intention, with regard to the unity of being, in a way that accords with reason and the *Sharīʿa*. He wrote other works in addition to this, such as *Tafsīr-i Fātiḥa*, *Mafātiḥ al-ghaib*, *Fuṣūṣ*, *al-Fukūk*, *Sharḥ-i ḥadīth*, and *Kitāb-ı Nafaḥāt-i Ilāhī*} (*Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 632). Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī met the chief *khalīfas* of Najm al-Dīn Kubrā, like Saʿd al-Dīn al-Ḥammūyī and Najm al-Dīn Dāya, and had a cordial relationship with Mawlānā. His death was after that of Mawlānā. According to one report, Mawlānā enjoined him to perform his funeral prayer, but according to another, when it came time for him to serve as *imām*, he was struck by a loud cry and fainted and *qāḍī* Sirāj al-Dīn served as *imām* ({Farīdūn b. Aḥmad} Sipahsālār, {*Manāqib-i ḥadrat-i Khudāwandikār*, Turkish} trans. {Midhat Bahârî Hüsâmî (Istanbul, 1331/1913),} p. 156). By interpreting the works of Ibn al-ʿArabī for his disciples and *murīds*, and devoting his own works to these issues, this great Ṣūfī, some of whose works are extant in our libraries, performed a great service in spreading the doctrine of the unity of being in Anatolia.

28 Mu'ayyad al-Dīn al-Jandī, whose Arabic Ṣūfī poetry was in the style of Ibn al-Fāriḍ, and two couplets of which are even mentioned in the *Lamaʿāt* of Shaikh ʿIrāqī, under the influence of Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī, wrote commentaries on the *Fuṣūṣ*, the *Mawāqiʿ al-nujūm* and other works of Ibn al-ʿArabī. The main source of virtually every subsequent commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ* was that of Mu'ayyad al-Dīn ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 634–5). {Al-Jandī's Arabic *Sharḥ Fuṣūs al-ḥikam* has been edited by Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Āshtiyānī (Mashhad, 1361/1982) and his Persian *Nafḥat al-rūḥ va tuḥfat al-futūḥ* by Najīb Māyil Haravī (Tehran, 1362/1403/1983).}

29 Saʿd al-Dīn Farghānī presented Ibn al-Fāriḍ's *Qaṣīda al-tāʾiyya* with Persian commentary to his shaikh Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī. He also wrote important works on the questions of worship according to the four *madhhabs*, like *Manāhij al-ʿibād ilā 'l-maʿād*, which al-Qūnawī liked very much, and on the rules of the order ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 635–6).

30 See the extensive discussions on this matter in the first section of this book (Chapter 2, section H, "The Bektashī Tradition," and Chapter 4, section E, "The *Ṭarīqas* that Derived from the Yasawiyya"). According to oral information provided by

Ḥusām al-Dīn of Amasya, where the endowed properties in the endowment document {*waqfiyya*} of Shaikh Sulaimān b. Ḥusain of Kırşehir dated 691/1291–2 are specified, one finds the passage في ناحية المرحوم الحاج بكتاش قدس سره {In the district of the late Ḥājjī Bektash, may (God) sanctify his secret (a pious phrase used when mentioning a deceased Muslim saint)!}. This document, which shows that Ḥājjī Bektash died before this date, corroborates the information that I gave above on the period in which he lived. It would be a major fault not to mention the great Anatolian Ṣūfīs like Sayyid Maḥmūd Ḥairānī and Ḥājjī Ibrāhīm in this connection, but I must admit that little is found on them in the written sources at my disposal and that in order to study them properly it would be necessary to carry out local research based on the *Sharī'a* records and registers in Anatolia.

31 Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, {*al-Riḥla*, Turkish} trans., vol. 1, pp. 197, 327, 335, 338, 360 {see Gibb trans., vol. 2, pp. 273, 436}. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa encountered an old Rifā'ī shaikh from Iraq in the city of Majar on the Kuma River; and sixty or seventy dervishes, married and unmarried, Arabs, Persians, Turks and Greeks, were living in his *zāwiya* on alms.

32 There are a number of such reports, legendary in part, in the *Karaman tarihi*, which was originally written in Persian in the style of a *shāhnāme* and was later translated into Turkish prose by Shikārī of Laranda. Shikārī writes, for example, that when Nūr al-Dīn Bey, one of the Qaramān *beys*, went to Sivas he paid homage to the famous Bābā Ilyās and that after spending seven years in caves as *hırka-pûş-i uzlet* {a dervish-cloak wearing recluse} he took the name Nūr al-Dīn Ṣūfī. Judging by Shikārī's account, shaikhs were definitely present in the consultative councils of the *beys*, and they were asked to interpret dreams. The same writer also reports at length – with fantastic details appropriate to legend – that the Seljuk ruler always used to confer with Mawlānā; and later, when Qaramān Bey Muḥammad captured Konya, that he hastened to the same *tekke* to humble himself and show his devotion, and that, thanks to Mawlānā's authority, he gave up the plan to destroy the city and massacre the populace (from the copy belonging to Bursalı Tâhir). [This work, which Shikārī translated into Turkish in the tenth/sixteenth century, was published by Mesut Koman (*Şikârî tarihi* [Konya, 1946]), but it is not a good edition. {On Shikārī and his work, see Rudi Lindner, *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia* (Bloomington, IN, 1983), pp. 145–7.}] There are similar reports in the various legendary works about Mawlānā. It is recorded in Sipahsālār {*Manāqib*} that Shāhzāde Gaykhātū ordered the massacre of the people of Konya after becoming furious over the murder of the ambassador he had sent to Konya by some unruly persons, but after seeing Mawlānā, who had died by that time, in a dream he changed his mind, personally went to Mawlānā's tomb, and made sacrifices and distributed alms (pp. 140ff.).

33 When comparing the Turkish Ṣūfism of Central Asia with that of Anatolia, these factors should never be lost from view. The constraints of the social environment would naturally have influenced the *ṭarīqas* that developed in those places. We shall refer to Mawlānā's own statements in order to demonstrate this influence of the environment on the Ṣūfīs. While discussing his preoccupation with poetry in Konya, Mawlānā reveals that the reason for this is the requirements of the social milieu, thus: "I want to please people so much that when friends arrive, for example, I recite poetry, so that they will not be bored. For a while I stopped reciting poetry, but they wanted me to recite again. Otherwise, what business do I have with poetry! By God, I am disgusted with poetry. In my opinion there is nothing worse than poetry . . . A person should see what merchandise is current in a city and immediately buy and sell it, even if it is the most insignificant thing . . . How much time have I spent acquiring knowledge! How much hardship have I suffered! The reason: in order to offer sublime subjects to the excellent and the learned. God, however, has collected all of that knowledge and brought all of that toil here so that I would be busy with

this work. He wanted it this way, so what can I do about it? In our country and among our people – i.e. in Khwārazm and among the Khwārazmians {Köprülü's gloss} – nothing gives as much shame as being a poet. If I had remained in our own country, I would have lived in accordance with their norms and we would have worked in a manner that they wanted – for example, lecturing, writing and giving sermons and advice" (Sipahsālār, {*Manāqib*, Turkish} trans. citing *Fīhi mā fīh*, pp. 96–7 {English trans. A. J. Arberry as *Discourses of Rumi* (London, 1961), pp. 85–6; and W. Thackston as *Signs of the Unseen: The Discourses of Jalaluddin Rumi* (Putney, VT, 1994), pp. 77–8}). {In the narrative, we learn that the Yasawī dervishes streaming into Anatolia from Central Asia (a fantasy) were not very committed to their piety and asceticism and dropped them quickly under the influence of Anatolia broad-mindedness (another fantasy). Later Köprülü will project this broad-mindedness back onto Central Asia and onto Aḥmad Yasawī's shoulders.}

The traveler Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, in fact, describes in the following manner the great interest the people of Khwārazm, which was then subect to the state of the Golden Horde, had in religious matters ({*al-Riḥla*, Turkish trans.,} p. 405 {Gibb trans., vol. 3, p. 542}): "They have a praiseworthy custom with regard to [the observance of] prayer services which I have not seen elsewhere, namely that each of the muezzins in their mosques goes around the houses of those persons neighboring his mosque, giving them notice of the approaching hour of prayer. Any person who absents himself from the communal prayers is beaten by the imām [who leads the prayers] in the presence of the congregation, and in every mosque there is a whip hung up for this purpose. He is also fined five dinars, which go toward the expenses of upkeep of the mosque, or of supplying food to the poor and destitute. They say that this custom has been an uninterrupted tradition among them from ancient times." This last sentence shows that this interest in religious matters was nothing new, that it had continued since ancient times. Thus we can infer that such customs were already found in Khwārazm during the period of the Khwārazm-Shāhs, and Mawlānā's account corroborates this. Such Islamic traditions could not have been formed under the national {*sic*} and very unconstrained government of the Golden Horde, which had not even dispensed with the *yargu* {a kind of court of interrogation} (*ibid.*, {Turkish trans.,} p. 408 {Gibb trans., vol. 3, p. 545}).

34 By taking on a thousand different outward guises, Ismāʿīlism and other *bāṭinī* ideologies, such as Qarmatianism, which was a branch of it, tried in fact to eliminate all Muslim articles of faith and take over political rule. Whenever one of these ideologies was deemed evil by the people and subjected to severe persecution, the *bāṭinīs* who escaped from this persecution would reappear under another name and try to propagate their beliefs in completely new guises. It was thus quite natural for certain men who, in fact, subscribed to *bāṭinī* beliefs to conceal themselves under the veil of Ṣūfism and even pantheism in order to play their role skillfully and successfully. Most of the *bāṭinīs* in Anatolia came from Syria, which had very close intellectual and commercial ties with Anatolia and which had long been a haven for *bāṭinī* beliefs. As will be seen below, we know that there were, indeed, a number of *bāṭinīs* in Syria disguised as Ṣūfīs. After Hūlāgū captured the fortress of Alamūt and annihilated the Ismāʿīlīs there, a number of *bāṭinīs* who had escaped went to Anatolia where they initiated provocations and sedition, naturally under the veil of Ṣūfism. As will be clear from the explanations given above, the social environment of Anatolia was very conducive to such activity. In this respect, we can consider the Bābāʾī uprising, the institution of the *akhīs*, the Ḥurūfī and Bektashī movements and the religious movements that followed them essentially to have originated from bāṭinism. It should not be forgotten, however, that various secondary factors also combined with this basic factor in each of these movements. We shall discuss later some of the

movements that *bāṭinī* beliefs spawned in Azerbaijan and Khurāsān and some of the poets associated with this ideology.

35 Necib Âsım and Mehmed Ârif, *Osmanlı tarihi*, p. 444. Hammer, citing the historian Janābī, says that Bābā Ilyās and his companion Isḥāq were taken captive, but the conquered beguiled the conqueror, and Jalāl al-Dīn and the other Mawlawī shaikhs who were his friends withdrew from the court ({*Geschichte des osmanischen Reichs*, Turkish trans.,} vol. 1, pp. 80–1). According to Şâkir Pasha, "At this time a vagabond shaikh named Bābā Ilyās Khurāsānī appeared claiming to be a prophet or to be charged with reforming the world. His followers took the name Bābā'ī and organized in the area around Amasya. They covered the territory in which they were found with blood and fire. Out of fear, therefore, Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kai-Khusraw II ordered Ertughrul to drive them out and punish them. Ertughrul raided them at a place called Chat near Amasya and routed them completely" (*Yeni osmanlı tarihi* {Istanbul, 1911–12}, vol. 1, p. 139). Şâkir Pasha does not, however, clearly state his source for this information. This is reason for not regarding his account as plausible. Indeed, there is nothing in the primary sources to link Ertughrul with this matter. In the {Turkish} translation of {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq*, this shaikh, under the name Bābā Ilyās 'Ajam, and this incident are discussed in the following manner: *Amasya'da sâkin idi. Cenâb-ı me'âlî nisâbı mazhar-ı kerâmât-ı semiyye olmağın çok kimesne âna irâdet getürüb dervişleri Babalı demekle meşhûr oldu; Sultân Gıyâsü'd-Dîn b. Alâe'd-Dîn, ol tâifenin hurûcunu ihtimâl verib, sûfilerini katl-i 'âm eyledi. Kendi dahî çok zamân geçmeden kullarının elinden kuşte olub, nesilleri munkatı' oldu. Şeyh Muhlis Baba, Yunan'da altı ay padişah olduktan sonra, Baba İlyasın sûfilerinden Nure'd-Dîn ismindeki sûfînin Karaman adlı beş yaşında bir oğlunu Yunan tahtına iclâs eyledi* {He lived in Amasya. He performed sublime miracles that were the prerogative of God and attracted many disciples. His dervishes became known as Bābā'īs. Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn Ibn 'Alā' al-Dīn deemed it likely that the group would rebel, so he massacred all of his Ṣūfīs. Within a short time he was killed at the hands of his slaves and his descendants were cut off. Shaikh Mukhliṣ Bābā was ruler (*padişah*) in Yunan [according to Shikārī, *Karaman tarihi*, p. 4, Yunan = Konya, Larende, and Aksaray; also Tarsus] for six months. Then he placed on the throne of Yunan a five-year-old boy named Qaramān son of Nūr al-Dīn who was one of the Ṣūfīs of Bābā Ilyās} (p. 23). This report, derived from Janābī's account of the origin of the Qaramānids, is not, in fact, credible. In the same work, in the description of Shaikh Mukhliṣ Bābā, it is also mentioned in a marginal note that he went to Anatolia during the Mongol troubles and that he was the son of Bābā Ilyās of Khurāsān who settled near Amasya (p. 22). We know that the famous Geyikli Bābā, a shaikh from the period of Sultan Orhan, was a member of the *ṭarīqa* of Sayyid Abū 'l-Wafā' – according to *al-Shaqā'iq*, Sayyid Abū 'l-Wafā-yi Baghdādī – and a *murīd* of Bābā Ilyās (*al-Shaqā'iq*, {Turkish} trans., p. 32; 'Āshıq Pasha-Zāde, {*Tawārīkh*,} p. 46). In my view, the most reliable information on this matter was collected in {Müneccim-başı's} *Ṣaḥā'if al-akhbār*: *637 senesi erişdikde Şumeyşad a'mâlinden Kefersud nâhiyesinde Baba İshâk nâm bir müfsit zuhûra gelib, hurûc eyledi. Bu habis, aslında izhâr-ı zühd ve riyâz ve dünyâdan i'râz sûretinde görünüb Türkman tâifesinden vesâir ehl-i kurâ sâde-dillerinden kendiye vâfir mürîd ve mu'tekid peydâ eyledi ve bir mikdar hokkabazlık dahî bilüb ol şu'bedeleri kerâmet olmak üzre halka satardı. Sonra Amasya taraflarına varıb ol nevâhîde dağ başında bir mağarada mekân tuttu ve kendi has mürîdlerinden gayri yanına kimseyi getirmez oldu. Bir müddet bu minval üzerine hareket eyleyib âkıbet mürîdlerini irsâl ve halkı igvâ eyleyib, bir gün alem-i şikâk ref'eyledi ve gûya taraf-ı Hak'tan bu hususa me'mûr olmak üzre kıldı ve başına cem' olan evbâş ile hareket eyleyip Amasya ve Tokad nevâhîsine îsâl-i dest-i tearruz' eylediler ver erişdikleri memâliki gâret ve mülâkî oldukları ümerâyı münhezim kıldılar. Bu haber sem'-i pâdişaha vüsûl buldukda, Mubârizü'd-Dîn nâm bir müte'ayyin Bey'ini irsâl eyledi. Varıb şakî-i merkûmu ahz ve mürîdleri ile salb eyledi. Livâ-yi şekâveti altına cem' olan gürûh-i müfsidîn kaziyyeden haberdâr olduklarında*

müteferrik ve perîşan olub şer-ü şûrları rûy-i arzdan bertaraf oldu. Ol melâʿîn hâşâ sümme hâşâ Baba İshâk hakkında Peygamber'dir diye iʿtikâd ederlerdi {At the beginning of the year 637, a mischief-maker named Bābā Isḥāq appeared in the region of Kafarsūd, a dependency of Sumaisāṭ and rebelled. This scoundrel pretended to be someone who practiced asceticism and turning away from the world. He attracted many *murīds* and followers from the Turkmens, villagers, and other simple-minded people. Many believed (his) trickery. He pretended to the people that his deceptions were miracles. Later he arrived in the vicinity of Amasya and established himself in a cave at the top of a mountain in that area. He allowed no one except his special *murīds* to approach him. For a while, he acted in this manner. Finally, he sent out his *murīds* and led the people astray. One day he raised the banner of rebellion, pretending that this had been demanded by God. He went into action with the rabble who had gathered around him. They made depredations in the areas of Amasya and Tokat. They plundered the country in which they appeared and defeated the *beys* who met them. When news of this came to the attention of the Sultan, he sent against them a distinguished *bey* named Mubāriz al-Dīn. He arrived and captured the aforesaid outlaw and hanged him and his *murīds*. When the gang of mischief-makers who had gathered under the banner of villainy learned what had happened, they were in a state of disorder and confusion and the evil of their sedition was erased from the face of the earth. Those cursed ones believed, God forbid, that Bābā Isḥāq was a prophet} (*Ṣaḥā'if al-akhbār* {= Turkish trans. of Müneccim-başı's *Jāmiʿ al-duwal* (Istanbul, 1285/1868–9)}, vol. 2, p. 568). This report, derived from various sources, shows that Bābā Ilyās was a Ṣūfī who had left Khurāsān in the wake of the Mongol invasion and was a *murīd* of Sayyid Abū 'l-Wafā', and that after Sultan Ghiyāth al-Dīn crushed the uprising of the Bābā'īs, which had been incited by Bābā Isḥāq, the shaikh was pardoned and had to recognize Mukhliṣ Pasha as his son. Hüseyin Hüsâmeddin provides an extensive and important account of this subject in *Amasya tarihi*, but unfortunately he does not clearly specify his sources. According to him, Bābā Isḥāq Kafarsūdī, who prepared the ground for the Bābā'ī uprising, was originally a Greek convert to Islam. He learned Shīʿism and bāṭinism from the *qāḍī* of Sivas Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad, and after his death he became associated with Bābā Ilyās. This man, who prepared the way for his emergence through various intrigues, appeared in 637/1239–40 and declared that he was *amīr al-mu'minīn* {"Commander of the Faithful," a title of the caliphs}. He marched on Konya. At that time, Saʿd al-Dīn Köpek, a Greek convert and intimate of the Seljuk sultan, had great influence over the sultan. Meanwhile, the king of Trebizond also attacked Seljuk territory. Finally, after the execution of Saʿd al-Dīn, Mubāriz al-Dīn Armaghan-Shāh defeated this false prophet who had invaded the regions of Amasya, Tokat, and Sivas, apprehended him, and put him to death at Amasya. As for Bābā Ilyās, he was, according to {Şükrullâh's} *Bahjat al-tawārīkh* {MS 3059 in the Nuruosmaniye Library in Istanbul} one of the shaikhs of the Masʿūdī Khānqāh that was built by the Seljuk Sultan Masʿūd in 545/1150–1, viz. Shujāʿ al-Dīn Ilyās b. ʿAlī Khurāsānī who won fame after 628/1230–1 and, although he had a hand in the Bābā Isḥāq incident, was pardoned and was sent to his estate near Amasya (*Amasya tarihi*, vols 1 and 2). The manner in which this information was derived and the quality of the sources are unknown, however, so this description is not very credible. In any case, the religio-political nature of this uprising shows that it was a *bāṭinī* uprising. {Now see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *La Revolte de Baba Resul . . .* (Ankara, 1989); and cf. Mertol Tulum's study of Elvan Chelebi's *Menâkibü'l-Kudsiyye, Tarihi metin çalışmalarında usul* (Istanbul, 2000), which is a study of Ocak's primary source.}

36 Ibn Baṭṭūṭa states that all the people in the places that he visited in Anatolia were Ḥanafīs, that there were no Qādirīs, Rāfiḍīs, Muʿtazilīs, Khārijīs, or innovators

among them and that this was a virtue by which God had distinguished them ({*al-Riḥla*, Turkish trans.,} p. 310, {see Gibb trans., vol. 2, pp. 416–17}). This claim is absolutely true with regard to Ḥanafism in the cities, but it is patently impossible to believe the assertion that there were no members of the Muʿtazilī sects in Anatolia, given our knowledge of the important *bāṭinī* uprisings in the seventh/thirteenth century. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa writes that when they were in Sinop, the sultan's deputy suspected that the people of that town were Rāfiḍīs and sent them a rabbit to see if this were true. After he saw that they ate it, his suspicion disappeared ({Turkish trans.,} p. 357, {Gibb trans., vol. 2, p. 468}). The testimony of a foreigner who spent three to five days in the major cities of Anatolia, the language of which he did not understand, can only be so reliable. Bāṭinism took various Ṣūfī guises in order to escape the attacks of the Ḥanafīs in the cities, and disguised its true nature not only from foreigners, but also from followers who had even been present at the founding of the *ṭarīqa*. It was quite common and widespread among the nomadic Turkmen in particular, because it sanctioned many of their pre-Islamic customs and traditions. At all events, the urban populace of Anatolia, who were of the Ḥanafī school, were aware at that time of the existence of certain Rāfiḍīs who would not eat rabbit. The spread of bāṭinism was facilitated by the fact that some of the Mongol rulers who maintained political control of Anatolia encouraged, for various reasons, Muʿtazilī movements or else, by observing an old tradition of respect for religious freedom, tolerated, and were indifferent to, those who spread beliefs in opposition to Sunnī tenets. Conceivably, the reign of Sultan Muḥammad Khudābanda {Öljeitü, 703–16/1304–16} had great influence in this respect. Aside from that, there were all kinds of *bāṭinī* sects in various countries that had relations with the Turks. During the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries, when the environs of Latikiyya and Aleppo and the ʿĀmiq Plain were almost completely inhabited by Turkmen, there were in those areas, like Sarmīn, *ahl-i sabb* {"people of the curse"} who cursed the *ʿashara-i mubashshara* and thus the number ten. Later {in this region} there were members of many other sects, like the Ismāʿīlīs and Nuṣairīs, who lived in various fortresses. The Turkmen residing in ʿIrāq al-ʿArab and ʿIrāq al-ʿAjam were also, of course, affected by external influences (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, {Turkish} trans., pp. 65, 74, 76, 79, 81, 84). One should by no means overlook these points in examining the religious history of Anatolia, the Qızılbash movement, and the beliefs of the present-day Turkmen. As for the Bektashiyya, this *ṭarīqa* did not later become corrupted by the infiltration of the Ḥurūfiyya or lose its original character. Indeed, it came into existence from the appearance, under a new name, of some *bāṭinīs*, perhaps including the Bābā'īs after the true origin of the *abdāls* and *akhīs*, who were very close to them, was for the most part forgotten, as I previously mentioned, and their doctrine was ascribed to Ḥājjī Bektash Veli, whose legends were widespread among the people. The views of Isḥāq Efendi on this subject, and those of all the European researchers who have relied on him, are mistaken.

37 According to the extensive information provided by Hüseyin Hüsâmeddin, citing {al-ʿAynī's} *ʿIqd al-jumān*, Barāq Bābā was in fact the *khalīfa* of Aybek Bābā, the shaikh of the Masʿūdī Khānqāh, who, while striving to propagate *bāṭinī* beliefs in Amasya, was forced to flee to Egypt in 670/1271–2. Because of his suspicious pronouncements in Egypt concerning the indewlling of God {*ḥulūl*, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ḥulūl" (L. Massignon-[G. C. Anawati])} and spiritual union with God {*ittiḥād*, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ittiḥād" (R. Nicholson/G. C. Anawati)}, he was interrogated by an assembly of religious scholars convened in the presence of the ruler al-Malik al-Ẓāhir Baibars al-Bunduqdārī and then chastised and flogged. He then left Egypt and joined Abaqa Khān (*Amasya tarihi*, pp. 405–8). Again citing *ʿIqd al-jumān*, Hüsâmeddin Efendi also says that Barāq Bābā was originally from Tokat, that he was born around 655/

1257–8, that he learned enlightenment in Amasya from Aybek Bābā and Aḥmad Bābā, that he had a large body and was very dirty and roamed from city to city. "He was completely naked above his waist. Below his waist he fastened an apron made of red cloth. He wrapped his head in muslin in the shape of a light-weight red turban. He fastened water buffalo horns to each side of it. In his hand was a very large and long trumpet and a large black begger's cup made from a gourd. He would dance like a bear and speak like a monkey. He was extremely filthy. He had eight or ten companions who dressed and behaved the same way. They carried tambourines with cymbals attached and wherever they went they would stand in a circle and play while Barāq Bābā danced. Barāq Bābā was an absolute heretic. He believed in *ḥulūl* and disbelieved in the hereafter. He considered all things forbidden by canon law to be permissible and claimed that God had first been incarnate {*ḥulūl*} in ʿAlī and afterwards was united spiritually {*ittiḥād*} with Sultan Khudābanda {Öljeitü}. He would be overcome by sexual desire, call beautiful women "god" and prostrate himself before them. When he went to Damascus, poets satirized this behavior. Nevertheless, despite this strange state of affairs, it is reported that he was an important Ṣūfī poet. When it became evident to the populace of Damascus that he belonged to the antinomian sect, he was subject to canonical punishment and died in Damascus toward the end of Dhū 'l-Qaʿda 706/May 1307 from the injuries suffered from flogging" (*Amasya tarihi*, pp. 460–4). Certain Ṣūfī sayings and some other traditions attributed to Barāq Bābā, and his Qalender life style, lead one to conjecture today that he was a popular poet, an *ozan*, who wrote Ṣūfī poetry in the popular meter. {See *EIr*, s.v. "Barāq Bābā" (H. Algar); Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda marjinal sûfîlik: Kalenderîler* (Ankara, 1992), index; and Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period 1200–1550* (Salt Lake City, 1994), index.}

38 Shaikh Sulaimān Turkmānī, who died in Damascus in 714/1314–15, is a personality strongly reminiscent of Barāq Bābā. This Turkmen Ṣūfī wore an old and tattered cloak, rarely stood up, said little, and would not fast during Ramaḍān or perform daily prayers, but he did exhibit miraculous powers. In order to explain this strange contradiction, Imām al-Yāfiʿī attributed his situation to *satr-i ḥāl* {concealing the (true) state} and claimed that he prayed when no one saw him and that what he ate in plain sight he did not swallow ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 652). In any case, it is highly likely that this Turkmen shaikh was an adherent of *bāṭinī* beliefs and perhaps was also an Anatolian Bābā'ī. Also in Damascus in the seventh/thirteenth century, we come across a *majdhūb* {one obsessed with divine love} named Shaikh ʿAlī Kurdī who behaved contrary to the *Sharīʿa* in several respects, usually even exposing his genitals. Nevertheless, by performing a number of miracles, he beguiled the people of Damascus. Shaikh Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī even went out of his way to visit him while on an embassy to Damascus (*ibid.*, pp. 652–3). All of these accounts go to show how strongly *bāṭinī* beliefs were entrenched in Anatolia and Syria in the seventh/thirteenth century. In addition to these leading *bāṭinīs* who are known to history, there were countless unknown *bābās* like them who carried out propaganda while wandering among the Turkmen from encampment to encampment. In Sipahsālār's *Manāqib*, it is recorded that the Seljuk ruler Rukn al-Dīn Qāhir {Sulaimān II}, whom Mawlānā used to address as "Child" {Awlād}, was goaded by one of his slaves to visit an old Ṣūfī named Buzāghū {"Calf"}, who had just then arrived in Konya and, it was said, every night was attended by *jinns*. When Buzāghū spoke to the sultan, he addressed him as "Child." Mawlānā was moved by this and said, "In that case, we have to find another Child" (*ibid.*, pp. 117–19). According to Sipahsālār, this old *bābā* named Buzāghū was from among the common people. In my view, this man was one of the *bāṭinīs* who were so ubiquitous in Anatolia at that

time. The story found in some histories, according to which Mawlānā, who was touched by this incident, adopted Osman Ghāzī as his spiritual son – and from that time Seljuk grandeur began to decline and the Ottoman dynasty began to rise – is a corruption of this tale and has no historical value. While discussing the Bābā'īs above, I stated that Janābī and Hammer wrote that "they beguiled the Seljuk ruler and as a result Mawlānā and the Mawlawīs withdrew from the court." Janābī's report may also be a corruption of the aforesaid incident.

39 The most detailed information on the *akhī* organization in Anatolia is in the book of travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, who traveled in that region in the first half of the eighth/fourteenth century. Only Turks were found in this mystical professional organization, which had the title *Akhiyya-i fityān*, i.e. "Youth Fraternity." Ibn Baṭṭūṭa encountered *akhī* lodges in various cities of Anatolia, first Antalya and then Burdur, Gölhisar, Ladik, Milas, Barçin, Konya, Niğde, Aksaray, Kayseri, Sivas, Gümüş, Erzincan, Erzurum, Birgi, Tire, Manisa, Balıkesir, Bursa, Görele, Geyve, Yenice, Mudurnu, Bolu, Kastamonu, and Sinop – and also in the port of Azov, which was subject to the Golden Horde – and he was their guest. He gives the following important information about the *akhīs* with whom he thus had very close contact (Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, {*al-Riḥla*, Turkish} trans., pp. 372–3, {Gibb trans., vol. 2, pp. 419–20}): "They exist in all the lands of the Turkmens of al-Rūm, in every district, city, and village. Nowhere in the world are there to be found any to compare with them in solicitude for strangers, and in ardour to serve food and satisfy wants, to restrain the hands of the tyrannous, and to kill the agents of police and those ruffians who joined with them. An Akhī, in their idiom, is a man whom the assembled members of his trade, together with others of the young unmarried men and those who have adopted the celibate life, choose to be their leader. That is [what is called] *al-futuwwa* also. The Akhī builds a hospice and furnishes it with rugs, lamps, and what other equipment it requires. His associates work during the day to gain their livelihood, and after the afternoon prayer they bring him their collective earnings; with this they buy fruit, food, and the other things needed for consumption in the hospice. If, during that day, a traveler alights at the town, they give him lodging with them; what they have purchased serves for their hospitality to him and he remains with them until his departure. If no newcomer arrives, they assemble themselves to partake of the food, and after eating they sing and dance. On the morrow they disperse to their occupations, and after the afternoon prayer they bring their collective earnings to their leader. The members are called *fityān*, and their leader, as we have said, is the Akhī. Nowhere in the world have I seen men more chivalrous in conduct than they are." Afterwards, Ibn Baṭṭūṭa describes the lodge in Antalya ({Turkish} trans., pp. 313–14, {Gibb trans., vol. 2, pp. 420–1}): "We found it to be a fine building, carpeted with beautiful Rūmī rugs, and with a large number of lustres of Iraqi glass. In the chamber there were five [candelabra of the kind called] *baisūs*; this resembles a column of brass, having three feet and on top of it a kind of lamp, also of brass, in the centre of which is a tube for the wick. It is filled with melted grease, and alongside it are vessels of brass also filled with grease, in which are placed scissors for trimming the wicks. One of their company is put in charge of them; he is called in their language the *jarājī* {*çıracı/çırağcı*?} Standing in rows in the chamber were a number of young men wearing long cloaks, and with boots on their feet. Each one of them had a knife about two cubits long attached to a girdle round his waist, and on their heads were white bonnets of wool with a piece of stuff about a cubit long and two fingers broad attached to a peak of each bonnet. When they take their places in the chamber, each one of them removes his bonnet and puts it down in front of him, but retains on his head another bonnet, an ornamental one, of silk taffeta or some other fabric. In the centre of their hall was a sort of platform placed there for visitors.

When we had taken our places among them, they brought in a great banquet, with fruits and sweetmeats, after which they began their singing and dancing. Everything about them filled us with admiration and we were greatly astonished at their generosity and innate nobility." When Ibn Baṭṭūṭa was in Ladik, there was some argument between the associates of Akhī Sinān and Akhī Ṭumān over which party he would lodge with first. Finally, it was decided to cast lots ({Turkish trans.,} p. 318, {Gibb trans., vol. 2, p. 426}). Describing a Ramaḍān procession of Sultan İnanç Bey in Ladik, this traveler gives the following information on the Akhī organization ({Turkish trans.,} p. 320, {Gibb trans., vol. 2, pp. 427–8}): "So we went out to the *muṣallā*; the sultan also came out with his troops and the Young *akhīs* too, all of them fully armed. The members of each trade carried flags, trumpets, drums and fifes, all aiming to rival and outdo one another in magnificence and in perfection of their weapons. Every group of these artisans would come out with cattle, sheep, and loads of bread, and after slaughtering the animals in the cemetery give them away in alms, along with the bread. On coming out they went first to the cemetery, and from there on to the *muṣallā*." Again the same traveler, telling us that he stayed in the lodge of Akhī Amīr ʿAlī in Kayseri and describing its importance and wealth, clarifies somewhat the political position of the *akhīs* ({Turkish trans.,} p. 326, {Gibb trans., vol. 2, pp. 434}): "It is one of the customs in this land that in any part of it where there is no sultan, it is the Akhī who acts as governor; it is he who gives horses and robes to the visitor and shows hospitality to him in the measure of his means, and his manner of command and prohibition and riding out {with a retinue} is the same as that of the princes." In like manner, he shows clearly the nature of the relations between Akhī Chelebi and Amīr ʿAlā' al-Dīn Eretna, and the importance of the *akhīs* of Sivas ({Turkish trans.,} p. 327, {Gibb trans., vol. 2, pp. 434–5}). The first to collect Ibn Baṭṭūṭa's information on the *akhīs* was the Orientalist C. Defrémery ({"Fragments de géographes et d'historiens arabes et persans inédits relatifs aux anciens peuples du Caucase et de la Russie méridionale,"} *JA*, 4th series, 16 [1850], 68–70). {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Akhī" (Fr. Taeschner); Neşet Çağatay, who tries to prove that the *akhī* organization was purely a Turkish institution, *Bir Türk kurumu olan ahilik* (Ankara, 1989).}

40 This path of the *futuwwa* that the *akhīs* followed was, according to tradition, traced back to ʿAlī and thus to the Prophet. The saying لا فتى الا علي لا سيف الا ذو الفقار {No *fatā* (youth) except ʿAlī, no sword except Dhū 'l-Faqār}, which was attributed to the Prophet (H. Zotenberg, trans. of {Persian version of} al-Ṭabarī, {as *Chronique d' Abou Djafer Mohammed b. Djarir Ṭabarī* (Paris, 1867–74),} vol. 3, p. 27 {*EIr*, "Dū'l-Faqār" (Jean Calmard)}), and the proclamation from on high of one of the angels on the day of Badr ({Muḥibb al-Dīn Aḥmad al-Ṭabarī,} *al-Riyāḍ al-naḍira* [Cairo, 1327/1909], vol. 2, p. 190) were reasons for deriving this *futuwwa* from the Prophet. Over time, this word eventually came to have the meaning of chivalry. The person who first turned the *futuwwa* into a code of behavior in this sense was the ʿAbbāsid caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (575–622/1180–1225), who according to {Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqā's} *Kītāb al-fakhrī* {published as *Ta'rīkh al-duwal al-islāmiyya* (Beirut, 1960), p. 322}, Abū 'l-Fidā' {*Mukhtaṣar ta'rīkh al-bashar* (Istanbul, 1286/1869–70), vol. 3, p. 142} and other sources was an Imāmī Shīʿī. {This claim is, to say the least, rather extreme. See Angelika Hartmann, *an-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (1180–1225): Politik, Religion, Kultur in der späten ʿAbbāsidenzeit* (Berlin, 1975) and *EI*^{2}, s.v. "al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh" (Angelika Hartmann)}. This man, whose relations with the Khwārazmians and Seljuks of Anatolia I mentioned above, had long been especially addicted to *fındık-endâzlık* {pellet shooting}, which was a custom that had been adopted from the Persians around the end of the caliphate of ʿUthmān (Ibn al-Athīr, {*al-Kāmil*,} vol. 3, p. 90). Around that time, {the practice of} this pellet shooting had spread considerably in

Baghdad and was considered a kind of bravado. Participants had their own special outfit and a distinctive kind of trousers. When al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh became caliph, he gave great importance to this. He personally wore *futuwwa* trousers. Thus – like the freemasons, for example – in order to establish sincere and strong bonds among the members of this professional fraternity, he ordered that those who did not wear the *futuwwa* trousers and who did not drink from the *futuwwa* bowl would not be able to do *ramy bunduq*, i.e. *fındık-endâzlık* {pellet shooting}. Having declared himself the patron saint of this *ṭarīqa*, he accepted whomever he wished. Those who attained this distinction were permitted to inscribe on their weapons the symbol of a bowl or a pair of trousers or both. In 607/1210–11, this caliph wrote to the princes and *amīrs* who recognized his caliphate and proposed that they wear the *futuwwa* trousers, drink from the *futuwwa* bowl, and consider him the *pīr* in pellet shooting. Those who accepted went to Baghdad where they received from him trousers to wear and *futuwwa* bowls from which to drink. The pellet shooters in Iraq and other places, like it or not, joined this *ṭarīqa* (Ibn al-Athīr, vol. 12, p. 202; Abū 'l-Fidā', vol. 3., pp. 119, 142; Ibn Khaldūn, {*Kitāb al-'ibar*, Turkish trans. Subhî Pasha as *Miftâh ül-iber* (Istanbul, 1276/1859–60),} vol. 2, p. 535). According to {Ibn 'Inaba,} *Kitāb 'umdat al-ṭālib*, after the death of al-Nāṣir the position of head of this *ṭarīqa* passed to another family, and al-Naqīb Tāj al-Dīn Muḥammad from that family began to wear the *khirqa-i taṣawwuf* {Ṣūfī patched cloak} at the same time ([Bombay, 1318/1900–1], p. 153). Ibn Jubair also mentions a group in Syria who firmly opposed the Rāfiḍīs and fully observed the *futuwwa* oath that they had sworn ({*al-Riḥla*, ed. de Goeje,} 2nd edn {Leiden, 1907}, p. 280). Ibn Baṭṭūṭa states ({*al-Riḥla*, Turkish trans.,} p. 322, {Gibb trans., vol. 2, p. 430}): "We lodged there {Konya} in the hospice of its *qāḍī*, who is known as Ibn Qalam Shāh; he is one of the *Fityān*, and his hospice is among the largest of its kind. He has a large body of disciples, and they have a chain of affiliation in the *Futuwwa* which goes back to the Commander of the Faithful 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib (God be pleased with him). The [distinctive] garment of the *Futuwwa* in their system is the trousers, just as the ṣūfīs wear the patched robe [as their distinctive dress]." Ahmed Âsım Efendi in {his Turkish trans. of Muḥammad Ḥusain Ibn Khalaf al-Tabrīzī's Persian lexicon} *Burhān-i qāṭi'* {Istanbul, 1214/1799–1800} defines *futuwwa* as follows: "It is used for anything worthy of admiration or admirable; it has wider application than word and deed. It is used for anyone who is generous {*mürüvvet*} and public spirited {*ehl-i hamiyyet*}. Its application to the chiefs of the craftsmen is derived from this usage" (p. 67). There are important details about *futuwwa* in the manuals on Ṣūfism – like al-Qushairī's *Risāla* and {al-Sayyid al-Sharīf al-Jurjānī's} *Ta'rīfāt* – and also in the *futuwwatnāmes*. The violent actions of the members of the *futuwwa* in Syria against the Rāfiḍīs should not be attributed to their excessive attachment to the doctrines of Sunnism. Hatred and antagonism were endemic among all the groups that sprang from bāṭinism, even among the various sub-branches. (For information on the *akhīs* and the *futuwwa*, see *EI*[1], s.v. "*Futuwwa*" [C. van Arendok] and especially the work entitled *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des islamischen Vereinswessens auf Grund von Madad-et-Taufiq* by H. Thorning as part 16 of the *Türkische Bibliothéque* {Berlin, 1913}). {Much has been done on the *futuwwa*. See, for example, Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, "Les organisations de la futuvvet dans les pays musulmans et turcs et ses origines," *Revue de la Faculté des Sciences Économiques de l'Université d'Istanbul*, 11 (1949–50), 5–49, and his longer, "İslâm ve Türk illerinde fütüvvet teşkilâtı ve kaynakları," *İstanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 11 (1949–50 [1953]), 3–354; *EI*[2], s.v. "Futuwwa" (Cl. Cahen *et al.*); and Franz Taeschner, *Zünfte und Bruderschaften im Islam: Texte zur Geschichte der Futuwwa* (Zurich, 1979). On al-Nāṣir's role, see P. Kahle, "Die Futuwwa-Bündnisse des Kalifen en-Nāṣir (d. 622/1225)," Theodor Menzel (ed.), *Festschrift Georg Jacob*

(Leipzig, 1932) pp. 112–27; and Cahen, "Note sur les débuts de la futuwwa d'an-Nāṣir," *Oriens*, 6 (1953), 18–22.}

41 *Al-Shaqā'iq*, {Turkish} trans., p. 33; ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde, *Tawārīkh*, p. 200. I think that this {name} is nothing other than *ören*, which is mentioned as an altered form of the word *viran* in {al-Kāshgharī's} *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*. Consequently, it is not quite correct to read it as *evren* with a *fatḥa* over the *alif*. According to all the early historical sources, Akhī Ören was a prominent figure during the reign of Sultan Orhan {724–61/1324–60}. [Fr. Taeschner, in his article "Akhī Ewrān" in *EI*^{2}, gives this name as "Akhī Evren" without commenting on any other pronunciation for it, but as is clear from the text above, Köprülü preferred to read it {incorrectly} as Akhī Ören.] {See Mikâil Bayram, *Ahi Evren ve ahi teşkilâtının kuruluşu* (Konya, 1991), who places his death between 658/1260 and 660/1262, pp. 97–101.}

42 Such as Akhī Ḥasan (pp. 29, 36), Akhī Qadam (p. 101), and Akhī Yaʿqūb (p. 101), for example, in ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde, {*Tawārīkh*}. Among them, we know that Akhī Ḥasan, who had participated in the conquest of Bursa, had a *tekke* near the Bey Sarayı inside the fortress of Bursa and held an important office at the time of Osman Ghāzī's death {724/1324}. Akhī Qadam and Akhī Yaʿqūb, who were *akhīs* in Bursa at the time of the Düzme Muṣṭafā incident, saved that city in an appropriate manner from his attack {1421}. These points demonstrate that the state organization was still very primitive at that time and that the Akhī organization fulfilled its function to some extent. We also learn from {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq* that Akhī Ḥasan had a *zāwiya* near the Dār al-Saʿāda in Bursa and that he was a devotee {of God} and an ascetic (*al-Shaqā'iq*, {Turkish} trans., vol. 1, p. 23). We also know that among the shaikhs having the title Akhī was ʿAlī Miṣrī, who was a *murīd* of Rukn al-Dīn ʿAlā' al-Dawla {al-Simnānī} and a notable figure in the eighth/fourteenth century among the shaikhs in Damascus and Anatolia ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 500).

43 The source that provides the best information on the etiquette and rules of conduct of the *akhīs*, and thus is most important for showing that they were *bāṭinīs*, is {Yaḥyā b. al-Khalīl's} *Futuwwatnāme* {MS in Köprülü's private library; ed. Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı as "Burgazi ve Fütüvvetnamesi," *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 15 (1953–5), 76–153; German trans. Fr. Taeschner in *Zünfte und Bruderschaften im Islam*, using Köprülü's MS}. The copy of the *Futuwwatnāme* that I studied with the assistance of Cevdet {the well-known Muallim Cevdet (Mehmet Cevdet İnançalp)}, a teacher in the Muallim Mektebi {Teachers' College}, belongs to Mehmed Ârif, a member of the Tarih Encümeni {Historical Society}, and was written – probably before Ibn Baṭṭūṭa – by Yaḥyā b. al-Khalīl b. al-Chubān al-Yaḥyā Fatā 'l-Burghāzī. He states that he was *jāhil* {unenlightened in faith} until age twenty-seven, and then took lessons for a short time from Mawlānā Khwāja Muṣliḥ al-Dīn of Antalya. When the Franks captured Alexandria, they brought the books that they had acquired there to Anatolia and sold them, including some books on *futuwwa*, which he bought {Alexandria was attacked several times during the Crusades, in 1154, 1167, and 1174. Louis IX occupied nearby Damietta in 1249 and Peter I of Cyprus sacked Alexandria in 1365}. He recommends that this work, which he wrote on akhism, not be shown to strangers. The author, who cites some passages from Mawlānā and Nāṣir-i Khusraw, also says that he quoted a number of works such as *Salwat al-ʿārifīn*, {Ilyās al-Khartaburtī's} *Tuḥfat al-waṣāyā*, *Musammā*, *Manāqib al-ʿārifīn*, *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'*, *Qalā'id*, and *Asrār al-ʿārifīn*. Citing the *Tuḥfat al-waṣāyā*, he states that the *futuwwa* doctrine began with Salmān Fārisī, then passed to the Caliph al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh, and from him to Saladin. This information {in this book}, which can very easily be accorded with the material that I provided in n.40 in this chapter, reveals quite well the nature of akhism. In this book, it is stated that akhism had 740 rules of etiquette that had been handed down from the time of Nūshīrwān {i.e. Anūshirwān,

the Sasanid ruler Khusraw I, 531–79 CE}, that the shaikhs knew them all, but it was necessary for the *akhī* to know only 124. In addition, citing the *Qalā'id*, it is explained that there were two paths of the *futuwwa* – one deriving from ʿAlī and the other from Abū Bakr – called Saifī and Qawlī. Then a lengthy description is given of their customs, ceremonies, and rules of conduct, their costume, the colors of their trousers, and their ranks. The members of the *futuwwa* were divided into {groups of} nine, six being *arkān* {pillars} of the *ṭarīqa* and three being *aṣḥāb* {companions} of the *ṭarīqa*. Every novitiate had to retain two "brothers of the path" and also a "father of the path." Many conditions had to be met in order to pass from one degree to another, and each degree held different secrets. All of this strongly suggests the *bāṭinī* character of akhism. With respect to ceremonies and rules of conduct, we find Bektashism and Qızılbashism, which differs very little from Bektashism, to be very similar to akhism. Consequently, in my view, it is not unlikely that around the end of the eighth/fourteenth century, the *akhīs* took the name Bektashī, ascribed their *silsila* to Ḥājjī Bektash Veli, and traced it back to him. Even if this is not accepted, the *bāṭinī* nature of akhism certainly cannot be denied. A thorough analysis of the various sources that I have mentioned above on the *futuwwa* would thus, I believe, tend to support these hypotheses.

44 The poet Gülsherī, in his translation of, and expansion upon, ʿAṭṭār's *Manṭiq al-ṭair*, which he completed in 717/1317, asks one of the birds a question about the *futuwwa* and akhism, and then answers from the mouth of the hoopoe. According to him, the first principle of the *akhīs* is that they should be blameless, the second is that their dining table should be open to all, and the third is that their doors should be open to all. Gülshehrī, who, in addition to these positive attributes, also lists a number of negative attributes, speaks of the need for *akhīs* to be very closely bound to the *Sharīʿa*, but he eventually complains at length that not even one in a thousand of his contemporary *akhīs* possessed these positive qualities (see the full description given below on Gülshehrī and his work).

45 [Köprülü planned to expound upon this idea of his in a separate monograph based on the notes that he had collected on akhism over many years, and he announced this in the second edition of *Early Mystics*, but his untimely death prevented it.] Ahmed Tevhid published a short article on these Ankara *akhīs* and on akhism in general ({"Ankarada ahiler hükûmeti,"} *TOEM*, no. 19 {1328/1910}, pp. 1200–4), but it is obvious that this study, which is based only on Ibn Baṭṭūṭa and {Ahmed Rifat's} *Lughât-i ta'rîkhiyya ve jughrâfiyya* {Istanbul, 1299/1881}, can have no great importance. However, the information on the Ankara *akhīs* that is cited from a scroll brought from the Mosque of Akhī Sharaf al-Dīn in Ankara is worthy of note. According to it, Ḥusām al-Dīn Ḥusain Efendi, the father of Akhī Sharaf al-Dīn Muḥammad, died in 695/1295–6 at the age of seventy and the *silsilanāme* of this man goes as far back as ʿAlī. This supports the idea that the *futuwwa* code of behavior derived from ʿAlī. Akhī Sharaf al-Dīn's three sons, Ḥusain, Ḥasan, and Yūsuf, and some of the children and grandchildren of the first two, are mentioned in this scroll, but there is no other biographical information. Tevhid says that in the Il-Khānid period the internal affairs of Ankara were probably in the hands of the *akhīs*, and he rejects the assertion that they were united against the Ottoman state, but he says nothing about the form of government of their {city} state. I think the information that I provided above on the *akhīs* of Anatolia can clarify these matters. The reports of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa and ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde definitely show that the *akhīs* of Ankara should not be viewed as constituting a state. The role they played in handing Ankara over to the Ottomans was the same as the one they played in Bursa during the Düzme Muṣṭafā affair, for they took upon themselves this task in places where there was no state organization.

46 This summary is derived primarily from the works on the legendary deeds of the saints by Sipahsālār {*Manāqib*} and Aflākī {*Manāqib al-'ārifīn*, French trans. Huart as *Les Saints des derviches tourneurs* (Paris, 1918–22), ed. Tahsin Yazıcı (Ankara, 1976–80), English trans. John O'Kane as *The Feats of the Knowers of God* (Leiden, 2002)} and from {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt* and Dawlat-Shāh's {*Tadhkira*}, but the information given by Dawlat-Shāh is for the most part contrary to that in the other primary sources and incorrect. The Orientalist Nicholson published some selections, with English translation, from {Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī's} *Dīvān-i Shamsi Tabrīz*, and in the introduction to this work provided some noteworthy information on the life and works of Mawlānā and the Ṣūfī path. Hüseyin Dâniş made a summary translation of this information for the section on Mawlānā in his *Ser-Âmedân-ı Suhan*. Unfortunately Nicholson made no use whatsoever of the most important sources, such as Sipahsālār, and he was completely ignorant of the *mathnawīs* of Sulṭān Walad, which contain many important details on his father, and other sources. Indeed, in his book Nicholson did not even touch on a great many important subjects that need thorough investigation, such as Mawlānā's great influence on Persian, Indian, and Turkish literature, the establishment and development of the Mawlawī *ṭarīqa*, the ideas of subsequent generations – i.e. poets, Ṣūfīs, and jurists – about Mawlānā and the imitators of Mawlānā in Persian and Turkish literature. In addition, because absolutely no research has been done to date on the spiritual climate of Anatolia in the period when Mawlānā flourished, it is not yet possible to depict clearly his personality and influence. The bibliography that Carra de Vaux gives for his article on Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī in *EI*[1] is quite deficient {cf. *EI*[2], s.v. "Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī" (A. Bausani)}. For example, he does not mention Nicholson's work at all, nor can he even give sufficient information on Mawlānā's works. Unfortunately, because this subject is beyond the scope of my book, I cannot provide here the Oriental sources concerning Mawlānā, nor the various works in manuscript about him that have not been studied, nor even the briefest account of his own works. [There is valuable information in *İA*, s.v. "Celâleddin Rumî" (H. Ritter) on the life and works of Mawlānā as well as on his bibliography.] {Publications on Rūmī have become something of a cottage industry. For an idea see M. Önder, *Mevlâna bibliografyasi* (Ankara, 1973); Annemarie Schimmel's study of him, *The Triumphal Sun* (London, 1978); and the recent guide to all things of Rūmī, Franklin Lewis, *Rumi, Past and Present, East and West, The Life, Teachings and Poetry of Jalâl al-Din Rumi* (Oxford, 2000).}

47 The information that Dawlat-Shāh provides on the Sayyid Burhān al-Dīn is completely erroneous. According to him, Mawlānā and his father were the Sayyid's *murīds*. The Sayyid accompanied them on their journeys to Damascus and the Ḥijāz, died in Damascus, and before his death advised them to go to the land of Rūm (Dawlat-Shāh, pp. 193–4). According to {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, however, the Sayyid was a *murīd* of Sulṭān Bahā' al-Dīn Walad, a descendant of Ḥusain and an inhabitant of Tirmidh. According to legend, he went to Konya on spiritual direction at the death of his shaikh and provided spiritual guidance to Mawlānā for nine years. He used to say, "I gave my mystical state (*ḥāl*) to Shaikh Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn and my teaching (*qāl*) to Mawlānā" {cf. Aflākī, *Manāqib*, O'Kane trans., p. 491}. His tomb is in Kayseri (*Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish trans.,} pp. 515–16). The passages on the Sayyid Burhān al-Dīn in Sipahsālār's book of legends {*Manāqib*} confirm the *Nafaḥāt*. According to that work, when the Sayyid learned of the death of his shaikh he spent a year in mourning. Afterwards, he saw Sulṭān al-'Ulamā' {Mawlānā's father} in a dream and on his direction went to Konya and took upon himself Mawlānā's spiritual training. This being the case, one could surmise that the Sayyid Burhān al-Dīn went to Konya around 629–30/1231–2 and was with Mawlānā until about 640/1242–3 (Sipahsālār, {Turkish} trans., pp. 159–64).

48 The accounts in {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt* and Sipahsālār's {*Manāqib*} on the manner and nature of this meeting are basically very similar. According to the *Nafaḥāt*, Shams stayed at the Sugar Sprinklers' Inn. Mawlānā left his *madrasa* accompanied by a group and, while passing that place, he {Shams} caught his donkey and asked "Who is greater, Bayezid {i.e. Abū Yazīd Bistāmī} or Muḥammad?" According to Sipahsālār, Shams stayed at the Rice Dealers' Inn. In the morning, as he sat on the bench in front of the inn, Mawlānā came by and sat opposite him. He then answered Shams's questions. There are lengthy accounts in both of these sources on these questions and answers (*Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish trans.,} p. 521; *Manāqib*, {Turkish trans.,} p. 170). Abū Yazīd, who said سبحانی ما اعظم شانی وانا سلطان السلاطین {"Glory be to me! How great is my majesty!" and "I am the Sultan of Sultans"}, quenched his thirst with one gulp; thus he spoke of being sated {cf. Aflākī, *Manāqib*, O'Kane trans., p. 425}. The Prophet, on the other hand, who said ما عرفناك حق معرفتك {"We have not known you as you ought to be known"}. His blessed heart, which was as vast as God's earth, had been expanded according to the Koranic verse الم نشرح لك صدرك {"Have we not expanded your heart for you?"}; thus he was never sated with water, and so {he spoke of being thirsty, and} every day he wished to come closer to God. Discussing the meeting of these two lovers of God, Sulṭān Walad compared them to two seas embracing each other between pounding waves.

49 Neither {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt* nor Sipahsālār's {*Manāqib*} say anything about Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. 'Alī b. Malik-dād al-Tabrīzī. Only Dawlat-Shāh provides some information on this subject, which he took from different sources. According to him, Shams Tabrīzī was the son of Khwānd Jalāl al-Dīn, a descendant of Kiyā Buzurg Umīd, an Ismā'īlī *dā'ī* {propagandist} – he was no ordinary *dā'ī*, however, but the successor of Ḥasan al-Ṣabāḥ (Dozy, *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*, Turkish trans., vol. 2, p. 403; Hammer-Purgstall, *Geschichte der Assasinen* {Stuttgart, 1818}, French trans., J. Hellert {as *Histoire de l'ordre des assasins*} [Paris, 1833], p. 114; St Guyard, "Fragments relatifs à la doctrine des ismaélis," *Notices et Extraits* {*des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 22, i (1874),} p. 8 {*sic*, the article is on pp. 177–428}). This man reportedly did not accept the things in which his ancestors had believed, burned the books and treatises about the Ismā'īlī heretics, and sent his son Shams secretly to Tabrīz so that he would be taught the Islamic sciences. While still a child, Shams was renowned for his exceptional beauty and he learned embroidering from the women of Tabrīz. The author {Jāmī} of *Silsilat al-dhahab* {Bombay, 1289/1872–3} disagrees with this, however, and says that Shams Tabrīzī was not the son of Khwānd Jalāl al-Dīn, who had the byname Naw-Musulmān, but was the son of a cloth merchant from Tabrīz – or, according to another report, a cloth merchant from the province of Bā-zer in Khurāsān who had gone to Tabrīz to trade – and was born in Tabrīz. Dawlat-Shāh, saying

وبنده میگوید از هر کجا باشد گو باش کار بمعنی دارد نه بصورت، ذوق در آشنائی عالم ارواح

است نه در تولد اشباح

{Wherever he may be from, deeds are judged by meaning not by form, and mystical discernment lies in knowing the world of spirits not in producing bodies}, refrains from advancing any definite opinion on this matter ({*Tadhkira*,} p. 195). At the end of the edition of {Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī's} *Kulliyyāt-i Shams-i Tabrīz* that was published in India {Lucknow, 1302/1885}, there is a simple biography that merely repeats the account in the *Nafaḥāt* and a death date cited from {Lāhawrī's} *Khazīnat al-asfiyā'*, which also tells us little.

50 According to Dawlat-Shāh, he was the *murīd* of Rukn al-Dīn Sinjābī (*Tadhkira*, p. 196). The relational name {i.e. *nisba*} of this shaikh was not, however, as Prof. Browne has reported, Sinjābī, but Sinjāsī, as all the other sources unanimously state. Nicholson records this name correctly and also includes in his work verbatim the *silsilatnāme* of the *ṭarīqa* that Dawlat-Shāh mentions. Reportedly, Rukn al-Dīn had ordered him to go to Anatolia and inspired him with the fire of love for a theological student there, i.e. Mawlānā. According to {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, even before puberty, Shams had fasted for days for the love of Muḥammad. According to a widely known report, he became a mystic through {the teachings of} Shaikh Abū Bakr Selabāf {the garment maker} Tabrīzī, or, according to another report, through Rukn al-Dīn Sinjāsī, or, according to another report, through Bābā Kamāl Jandī. The most reasonable theory, as the author of the *Nafaḥāt* also acknowledges, is that this well known dervish met each one of them separately (*Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 520).

51 {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt* records the following incident that occurred while he was in the company of Bābā Kamāl: *Her keşf-ü feth ki Şeyh Fahre'd-Dîn 'Irâkî'ye yüz gösterirdi, ânı nazm ve nesr libâsında izhâr ederdi ve Baba Kemâl'in nazarına eriştirirdi. Şeyh Şemse'd-Dîn ândan hiç nesne izhâr etmezdi. Birgün Baba Kemâl âna eyitti: Oğlum Şemse'd-Dîn, ol esrâr ve hakâyıktan ki oğlum Fahre'd-Dîn izhâr eyler; sana hiç nesne lâyih olmaz mi? Eyitti: Ândan ziyâde müşâhede düşer, amma şol sebepten ki ânın bâzı mustalahat ma'lûmu olmuştur, Kâdir'dir ki ânlara mahcûb* {*mahbûb* in the original} *libâsta cilve vere ve bende ol kuvvet yoktur. Baba Kemâl buyurdu ki: Hak Sübhânehû ve Ta'âlâ sana bir musâhib rûzî kıla ki, evvelîn ve âhirînin maârif ve hakâyıkını senin adına izhâr ede ve hikmet ırmakları ânın kalbinden lisânına cârî ola ve harf ve savt libâsına gire ve ol libâsın tırâzı senin adına ola* {Every mystical illumination and revelation that occurred to Shaikh Fakhr al-Dīn 'Irāqī, he revealed in the garb of poetry and prose, and brought it to the attention of Bābā Kamāl. Shaikh Shams al-Dīn never revealed anything. One day Bābā Kamāl said to him, "My son Shams al-Dīn, does nothing ever occur to you of those secrets and truths that my son Fakhr al-Dīn reveals?" He replied: "Even more than him. But because he knows the right terminology, he is able to clothe them in a lovely dress. I do not have that capacity." Bābā Kamāl said, "May God provide you with a companion who will reveal in your name (i.e. under your auspices) the teachings and truths of the ancients and the moderns, may the rivers of wisdom flow from his heart to his tongue and enter the garb of letters and sounds, and may the *ṭirāz* {embroidery} of that garb be in your name"} (*Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 520–1). {Jāmī's source for this story was, in fact, the *Jawāhir al-asrār* of Ḥusain Khwārazmī, the fifteenth-century shaikh in the lineage of Bābā Kamāl Jandī. See the edition by Muḥammad Javād Sharī'at (Isfahan, 1360/1981), p. 131.} As will be seen below, Mawlānā's creation of *Dīwān-i Shams al-ḥaqā'iq* was attributed to this miracle and prayer of Bābā Kamāl.

52 Nicholson describes his personality in the following manner: "He was comparatively illiterate, but his tremendous spiritual enthusiasm, based on the conviction that he was a chosen organ and mouth-piece of Diety, cast a spell over all who entered the enchanted circle of his power. In this respect, as in many others, for example, in his strong passions, his poverty, and his violent death, Shamsi Tabrīz curiously resembles Socrates; both imposed themselves upon men of genius, who gave their crude ideas artistic expression; both proclaim the futility of external knowledge, the need of illumination, the value of love" (*Dīvāni Shamsi Tabrīz*, p. xx).

53 According to an exceptionally widespread report, Shams Tabrīzī's death occurred in a very horrible manner. And the *manāqib* books add to it a mysterious twist. One night while Shams was sitting with Mawlānā, someone called him outside. Shams went out, saying that they were summoning him to be killed. An ambush awaited outside {the original says: Seven people had conspired and had laid an ambush}. They were about to kill him by attacking him with knives. Shams gave a shout,

however, and the assassins, among whom was Mawlānā's middle son 'Alā' al-Dīn, fainted. When they came to, they saw a few drops of blood on the ground, but no other trace of Shams was ever found. According to one account, he was buried next to Mawlānā Bahā' al-Dīn Walad, but according to another the murderers threw his body into a well. One night he appeared to Sulṭān Walad in a dream and told him where he could be found. So he went in the middle of the night with his intimate companions and buried him next to Amīr Badr al-Dīn, who had built Mawlānā's *madrasa* ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 523). It is recorded in Sipahsālār, however, that he suddenly disappeared and that Mawlānā even went as far as Damascus to search for him ({*Manāqib*,} p. 179). Dawlat-Shāh also says that he withdrew to Damascus from Konya ({*Tadhkira*,} p. 197). When we take into consideration Mawlānā's search, and the fact that there is absolutely nothing about this terrible murder in Sipahsālār, which is a very trustworthy source on these matters, then the account of the *Nafaḥāt*, according to which he was murdered, becomes very dubious. Therefore, in my opinion, Nicholson's acceptance of the account of the *Nafaḥāt* is mistaken. If he had seen Sipahsālār and if he had known that Mawlānā had searched for Shams after his disappearance, he could not have concluded that Shams was murdered. Evliyā Chelebi says that he visited the head of Shams Tabrīzī in Khūy {in Iranian Azerbaijan} (*Seyāḥatnāme*, Book 2, fo. 307b).

54 Dancing and whirling {*samā'*}, which were strictly forbidden to ordinary people who gave in to their carnal appetites, were always regarded as permissible to *'āshqs* and Ṣūfīs. Indeed, many treatises were written on this subject. Many of the great Ṣūfīs, in response to a need that arose from their spirit, practiced the *samā'* and considered it to be a means of reaching mystical ecstasy. For example, Yūsuf b. al-Ḥusain, whom the jurists of Rayy accused of being a heretic, used to perform the *samā'*. The great Ṣūfī poet Shaikh Abū Sa'īd Ibn Abī 'l-Khair was a frequent practitioner of the *samā'*. During that time, he would be carried away by mystical ecstasy and tear apart his clothing. Shaikh Najm al-Dīn Kubrā first denounced the *samā'*, but later became a frequent practitioner of it. Shaikh Majd al-Dīn Baghdādī also did the *samā'*. The great Ṣūfī contemporaries of Mawlānā, such as Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī and Sa'd al-Dīn al-Ḥammūyī, did the *samā'* as well ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 378, 385, 402, 478, 483, 486). Mawlānā began the *samā'* instructed by Shams Tabrīzī and continued to practice it for the rest of his life. Indeed, he adopted the *samā'* as a religious ceremony and {part of} the mystical path. There are many passages in Mawlānā's poetry to the effect that "the *samā'* is the nourishment of the lovers that allows one to imagine union with the Beloved," and others regarding the rules and conduct of the *samā'*. A chapter in Sipahsālār's book of Ṣūfī legends is devoted to a description of the true *samā'*, its rules and conduct ({*Manāqib*,} pp. 91–5). While many religious scholars have declared the Ṣūfī *samā'* to be permissible and have advocated it, others up to the present time have persistently considered it to be forbidden.

55 The following couplets, which are very significant, are found in one of the *ghazals* that Mawlānā sent to Damascus (Sipahsālār, {*Manāqib*, Turkish} trans., p. 174):

بی حضورت سماع نیست حلال　　همچو شیطان طرب شده مرجوم

یك غزل بی توهیج گفته نشد　　تارسد آن بشرفهٔ مفهوم

پس بذوق سماع نامهٔ تو　　غزلی پنج وشش بشد منظوم

شام از نور صبح روشن باد　　ای بتو فخر شام وارمن وروم

{Without your presence, *samā'* is not lawful.
Joy, like satan, has become the victim of stoning.

Without you, not one *ghazal* has been uttered
That attains the dignity of understanding.

So, for the pleasure of hearing (*samā'*) your name
Some five or six *ghazals* have been composed.

May the night (Shām) be illuminated with the light of dawn,
Oh you who are the source of pride for Damascus (Shām) and
Armenia and Rūm (cf. Aflākī, *Manāqib*, O'Kane trans. pp. 488–9).}

56 Sipahsālār, {*Manāqib*, Turkish} trans., p. 179. Dawlat-Shāh says nothing in his *Tadhkira* about Mawlānā going to Damascus, p. 197:

ضرورة شیخ شمس الدین این نوبت عزیمت شام نمود ودوسال شیخ شمس الدین در نواحیٔ

شام بود ودر آرزوی او مولانا میسوخت وقوالان را میفرمود تا سرود عاشقانه میگفتند

وشب وروز بسماع مشغول بود، واکثر غزلیات که در دیوان مولانا مسطوراست در فراق

شمس الدین گفته است، وگویند در خانهٔ مولانا ستونی بود چون غرق بحر محبت شدی

دست درآن ستون زدی وبچرخ آمدی واشعار پرشور میگفتی ومردم آن اشعار می نوشتند.

{At this juncture Shams al-Dīn had to go to Damascus, where he remained for two years, during which Mawlānā burned with desire for him. He ordered the musicians to compose love songs, and night and day he engaged in *samā'*. Most of the *ghazals* contained in Mawlānā's *dīwān* were composed in separation from Shams al-Dīn. It is said that Mawlānā's house had a column, and whenever he was drowned in the sea of love, he would grasp that column and turn round about it, reciting poems with great excitement, and others would write those poems down.}

57 These poems, today collected under the title *Dīwān-i Shams al-ḥaqā'iq*, were composed in different periods. Nicholson is correct in believing that a large number were written after the departure of Shams. Hüseyin Dâniş writes that Dawlat-Shāh states that they were written in Damascus after Shams had disappeared (*Ser-Âmedân-ı-Suhan*, p. 343), but this is completely mistaken, for he cites verbatim the passage of Dawlat-Shāh on this matter, which is given above in the previous note. Dawlat-Shāh says that Mawlānā wrote most of the *ghazals* in the *Dīwān* after Shams went to Damascus for the last time, and this is also what Nicholson claims. {These collected poems are known under several titles. See the bibliography.}

58 Even in the brief forward that he wrote to the *Dīvāni Shamsi Tabrīz*, Nicholson shows quite clearly and categorically the major relationships between Mawlānā's Ṣūfī views and Neoplatonist ideas. This ancient philosophical system, which based the question of *takwīn* {creation} on love {*'ishq*} and was in harmony with Pantheism, was no different from the principles taught by Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. This is fairly well described in E. J. W. Gibb's *History of Ottoman Poetry* {vol. 1, Chapter 2}. While discussing below the Ṣūfī ideas of Yūnus Emre and the overwhelming similarity between his works and those of Mawlānā, I will give a brief account of Neoplatonist thought, which constitutes, in fact, the basis of our Ṣūfī literature.

59 Such an endeavor, which would lay the foundation for a strictly philosophical study, would be extremely important and very useful with respect to literary history, but it

is outside my field and belongs to specialists in Islamic philosophy. The brief notes given below do not even form the basis for such an effort.

60 One day Mawlānā was passing in front of the jewelry shops in Konya. While passing before the shop of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, he became exalted with the rhythm of the hammer and began the *samāʿ*. He then recited a poem that began with the following verse:

یکی گنجی بدید آمد در این دکان زر کوبی \ زهی صورت، زهی معنی، زهی خوبی، زهی خوبی

{A treasure has appeared in that gold-beater's shop. / Such form! Such essence! Oh beauty! Such beauty! (Aflākī, *Manāqib*, O'Kane trans. p. 495).} As soon as he realized what was happening, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn continued to strike his hammer without thinking about the damage he was doing to the gold that he was beating. A little later, he left his shop on Mawlānā's invitation and offered him his services (Sipahsālār, {*Manāqib*, Turkish} trans., p. 181; {Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 523). We know that Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn had already attached himself to Mawlānā before Shams arrived (Sipahsālār, *Manāqib*, p. 171). And after the departure of Shams, Mawlānā adopted Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn as his companion and assuaged his grief with him. Sulṭān Walad describes at length how Mawlānā valued and respected him and, indeed, how the other *murīds* were jealous of him:

چون ورا دید شیخ صاحب حال بر گزیدش ز جملهٔ ابدال
رو بدو کرد جمله را بگذاشت غیر او را خطاء وسهوا نگاشت
گفت آن شمس دین می گفتیم باز آمد بما چرا خفتیم
. . . .
شورش شیخ شد از وساکن وآن همه رنج گفت وگو ساکن
شیخ با او چنانکه با آن شاه شمس تبریز جنانکه خاصه الَه
خوش در آمیخت همچو شیر وشکر کار هر دو ز همدگر شد زر.

{When that mystic Shaikh saw Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn
He chose him from among the ranks of saints.
Turned his face towards him, put all else aside,
Reckoned all others in error, in the wrong.
"That Shams-i Dīn of whom we always spoke
Has come back to us! Why do we slumber?"

. . .

Because of him the Shaikh's agitation was stilled.
All the pain of talk and gossip was stilled.
The Shaikh was with him as he had been with that king,
Shams-i Tabrīz, just as God's intimate friend.
They mingled pleasantly, like milk and sugar.
They made gold out of one another. (Cf. Lewis, *Rumi*, p. 206.)}

61 On the occasion of his death, Mawlānā recited a *ghazal* that began with the following verse (Sipahsālār, {*Manāqib*, Turkish trans.,} p. 189):

ای ز هجران وفراقت آسمان بگریسته دل میان خون نشسته عقل وجان بگریسته

{Oh you at whose departure the heavens wept in pain! / The heart wallowed in blood, while mind and soul wept. (Ed. Furūzānfar, no. 2364. See Aflākī, *Manāqib*, O'Kane trans. p. 510.)} Furthermore, in {Mawlānā's} *Dīwān-i kabīr*, there are many *ghazals* that are addressed to him or that describe his exalted spiritual rank, such as the *ghazals* that include the following couplets:

کار زرکوبان چوزر کردی چو زر \ شه صلاح الدین که توصد مردهٔ

.....

چون صلاح الدین صلاح جان ماست \ آن صلاح جانهارا باز گو

.....

صلاح الحق والدین نمایدترا \ جمال شهنشاه سلطان ما

.....

هست صلاح دل ودین صورت آن ترك یقین \ چشم فرومال وبین صورت دل صورت دل

.....

آن شه صلاح دین است کو پایدار بادا \ دست عطاش دائم در گردنم قلاده.

{You have made the gold-beaters' work golden, golden,
Oh king, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, you are (worth) a hundred men.

. . .

Because Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn is the well-being (*ṣalāḥ*) of our soul
Reveal that well-being of souls.

. . .

Ṣalāḥ al-Ḥaqq wa 'l-Dīn shows to you
The beauty of the King of Kings, our Sultan.

. . .

The face of that Turk is surely the well-being of heart and religion.
Rub your eyes and see the face of the heart, the face of the heart.

. . .

That is the king, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, may he live forever!
May his hand of favor always be a necklace on my neck.}

62 Dawlat-Shāh, {*Tadhkira*,} p. 195, states that Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī received the *khirqa-i sulūk* {patched cloak of his order} through several intermediaries from Shaikh al-Shuyūkh Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Zarkūb who was associated with Ḍiyā' al-Dīn Abū 'l-Najīb al-Suhrawardī, but this is completely mistaken.

63 The Sayyid Abū 'l-Wafā-yi Baghdādī, who died in 501/1107–8 and was known by the byname Tāj al-'Ārifīn, was a very great Ṣūfī. For information on him, one can

consult the famous work *Manāqib-i Tāj al-'Ārifīn* (MS in my private library). Sipahsālār, who is the most credible source on this matter, says, {*Manāqib*, Turkish trans.,} p. 191, that Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn was a descendant of this shaikh. The same source is cited in this regard in {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 525. {On Baghdādī, see Alya Krupp, *Studien zum Menāqybnāme des Abu l-Wafā' Tāğ al-'Ārifīn*, part 1, *Das historische Leben des Abu l-Wafā' Tāğ al-'Ārifīn* (Munich, 1976).}

64 Hüseyin Dâniş provides the following information on this without naming the source: "It has not been determined exactly when the *Mathnawī* began to be written. It is composed of six large sections and a total of 2666 couplets {*sic*, probably 12,666 couplets or 26,000 verses}. The second section began to be composed two years after the completion of the first, i.e. in 1263 CE However, because Ḥasan Ḥusām al-Dīn, Jalāl al-Dīn's excellent student, who was preoccupied with writing the *Mathnawī* directly from his master's dictation, died at that time, the task of writing this work was interrupted" (*Ser-Âmedân-ı Suhan*, p. 342). As for the number of couplets in the *Mathnawī*, Dawlat-Shāh says ({*Tadhkira*,} p. 197):

مثنوی را چهل وهشت هزار بیت گفته اند وبعضی زیاده وبعضی کم گفته اند

{They say that the *Mathnawī* contains 48,000 couplets. Some say more, some less}, but this is an exaggeration. I cannot go into detail here on the question of the seventh volume of the *Mathnawī*, which did not belong to Mawlānā but was later attributed to him. Let me simply state here that Hüseyin Dâniş's attempt to show that Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn died after finishing the first volume of the *Mathnawī* does not conform to any of the historical sources and is a very serious mistake. The one who died was his wife. The death of Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn was actually twelve years after that of Mawlānā.

65 In India, Iran, and Turkey, where Persian culture was very widespread, the *Mathnawī* had an almost sacred character. The opinion that it was "the heart of the Koran" {*maghz-i Qur'ān*} is quite old. Indeed, Mawlānā's *Dīwān*, like that of Ḥāfiẓ, was used for telling fortunes ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 423). If all the different assessments and views that have been presented of the *Mathnawī* since a very early time were collected, they would form a rather long treatise. It is claimed that this work has not had a direct influence on the great mass of the Turkish people and that its influence has been confined to the Mawlawīs and those under the spell of Persian literature, but its indirect influence on the great mass of the Turkish people has, in fact, been much greater than has been thought.

66 This spiritual influence, which began with Gülshehrī, took very clear form with 'Āshıq Pasha. The latter's *Gharībnāme*, which is very famous among the Turks, is virtually a Turkish *Mathnawī*. As for Yūnus Emre, the influence of the *Dīwān-i Shams al-ḥaqā'iq* is much more striking.

67 I have discussed above, citing his *Fīhi mā fīh*, why and for what purpose Mawlānā wrote poetry (see n.33 of this chapter). Mawlānā distinguished himself from ordinary poets with such laments as

شعر چه باشد بر من تاکه زنم لاف ازو \ هست مرا فن دگر غیر فنون شعرا،

{What is poetry to me that I should boast of it? I have another art, different from the arts of the poet} and

من کجا شعر از کجا لیکن بمن در میدمد \ آن یکی ترکی که آید گویدم هی کیم سن

ترك کی تاجیك کی رومی کی زنکی کی \ مالك الملکی که داند موبمو سرو علن.

{What have I to do with poetry? But it breathes within me.
When a Turk comes along, he says to me, *Hey kim sen* "Hey who are you?"
Who is Turk, who Tajik? Who is Rūmī, who Zangī?
Who knows the Kingship, hair by hair, hidden and manifest?}

Sulṭān Walad put forth an excellent and quite correct opinion of the poetry of Mawlānā: "The *ʿāshuq*, i.e. the true Ṣūfī, and the poet are distinct from each other. The Koranic dictum {26:224} والشعراء يتبعهم الغاوون {As for the poets: the erring follow them} concerns the latter, for while the poetry of the *ʿāshuq* is a commentary on the words of God, that of the poet is like the odor of garlic. The poetry of the *ʿāshuq* is the result of wonder and intoxication {with the love of God}, but that of the poet is the product of the self." In various poems, Mawlānā requests from God the tongue of *ḥāl* {mystical state} and opposes the tongue of *qāl* {speech of the religious scholars}:

پرده است بر احوال من این گفتن واین قال من ای ننك گلزار ضمیر از فکرت چون خارمن
یا رب بغیر این زبان جانرا زبانی ده روان در قطع ووصل وحدتت تا بگسلد زنارمن
روزی برون آیم زخود فارغ شوم از نیك وبد گویم صفات آن صمد بی نطق در انبارمن.

{This talk of mine is a curtain covering my inner states.
What a disgrace: the rose-garden of conscience comes from my thorn-like thoughts.
Oh Lord, give my soul a fluent tongue other than this tongue,
So that in cutting through to union with Your oneness, my *zunnār* (Christian belt) will break off.
One day I shall go outside myself, go beyond good and evil;
I shall utter the attributes of that Eternal One in the storehouse of my heart, without speech.}

Ziya Pasha's saying, *Şâir dimen öyle ehl-i hâle / İrâs-i nakîsedir kemâl'e* {Don't call a mystic a poet / That is to attribute imperfection to perfection} in the *Kharābāt* {his *Harâbât* (Istanbul, 1291–2/1874)}, results from such ideas. In order to understand better this difference between the works of ordinary poets and the poetry of Ṣūfīs, see the section below on the poetry of Yūnus Emre.

68 In many places in the *Mathnawī*, Ḥakīm Sanā'ī and, to a lesser degree, ʿAṭṭār are mentioned. There are also a great many allusions to them in the *Dīwān*. Mawlānā considered himself to be a follower of Sanā'ī and ʿAṭṭār. In his works, especially in the *Mathnawī*, their influence is strikingly obvious.

69 Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn, who, while Mawlānā was still alive, was his *khalīfa* for nine years, died in 684/1285–6 (Sipahsālār, {*Manāqib*, Turkish trans.,} pp. 197–201). If we consider that the arrangement of the *Mathnawī* was begun in 662, then we must also push back Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn's career as a *khalīfa* to Mawlānā to that date. Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn's being instructed to begin recording the *Mathnawī* must have occurred after he became a *khalīfa* of Mawlānā. If we consider that the period during which he served as a *khalīfa* was between 662 and 672, then it appears that 662 must be the date when he began the *Mathnawī*, for this cannot be regarded as the beginning date of the second volume. Consequently, Hüseyin Dâniş's statement {in his *Ser-Âmedân-ı Suhan*} that 662, which corresponds to 1263–4, must be regarded as the

beginning date of the second volume and that the first book was completed in 660, i.e. 1261–2, is evidently mistaken. It is for this reason that I stated above that this great book was written within a period of seven or eight years. Dawlat-Shāh believes that Ibn Akhī Turk and Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn were two different persons and says that Mawlānā "*dest-i irâdeti Çelebi'nin dâmen-i terbiyetine vurduğunu*" {applied the hand of will power to the skirt of Chelebi's training} ({*Tadhkira,*} p. 195). The historical facts given above suffice to confirm the error of these two claims.

70 Extensive information can be found in Dawlat-Shāh {*Tadhkira*}, {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., and in various other sources on these personalities, who occupy an important place in Persian Ṣūfī literature because of their poems imbued with mystical excitement. It is beyond the scope of my work to treat in detail all of these Ṣūfīs who possess *dīwāns*, some of which have been published.

71 One day they asked Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī his opinion of Mawlānā. He replied, "*Bâyezîd ve Cüneyd bu zamânda olsalardı, bu merdler merdinin gâşiyesini görtürmeyi cânlarına minnet bilirlerdi*" {If Abū Yazīd and Junaid were alive, they would realize that to carry the horse blanket of this excellent man would bestow a blessing on their souls} ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish trans.,} p. 520). Similar examples could fill many pages.

72 Hüseyin Dâniş mentions the existence of *Fīhi mā fīh*, based on Nicholson's account, and then says, "This work must be rather rare today" (*Ser-Âmedân-ı Suhan*, p. 343). Carra de Vaux says that this work was completely unknown in Iran, *EI*[1], s.v. "Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī." However, this small work is quite famous among the Mawlawīs in Istanbul. There are manuscript copies of it in our public libraries and in private hands. {Ed. Badī' al-Zamān Furūzānfar (Tehran, 1338 sh./1959), English trans. A. J. Arberry as *Discourses of Rumi* (London, 1961), and Thackston as *Signs of the Unseen: The Discourses of Jalaluddin Rumi* (Putney, VT, 1994).}

73 It is quite clear from the statements of al-Kāshgharī on this matter that some works were written in the Oghuz dialect before the Turks came to Anatolia. The idea that there were two separate dialects called Seljuk Turkish and Ottoman Turkish has no historical or linguistic basis. There is no need to mention here the useless information of the nineteenth-century Orientalists on this matter because work like theirs is not even worthy of scholarly criticism. Nevertheless, because the Hungarian Orientalist Jozef Thúry has recently advanced extremely erroneous views on this important problem, let me use him as an example to show briefly how poorly our linguistic history has been studied to date. According to Thúry, "The most important masses of Turks who came to Anatolia were the Seljuks in the second half of the eleventh century and the Qayı in the first half of the thirteenth century. Because they were both from the Oghuz, there was a close blood and linguistic relationship between them. The Seljuks were not, however, a distinct ethnic group. They were composed of a number of ethnic groups who had broken away and come from different linguistic regions in various places in Central Asia" ("Ondördüncü 'asır sonlarına kadar Türk dili yâdıgârları," pp. 100–2). I have adequately discussed above the emigration of the Turks to Anatolia, so the erroneousness of this assertion is obvious. The mass of the Turks in Anatolia were composed of Oghuz, i.e. Turkmen. The migration of the Qayı and their role in founding the Ottoman state are only of significance from a political perspective, not because they brought to Anatolia an ethnic block who spoke a different dialect – for their number was extremely limited and their dialect was also that of the Turkmen. The aforesaid article by Thúry contains, from beginning to end, mistaken conclusions derived from very defective and very erroneous analyses.

74 Baṭṭāl Ghāzī was a legendary Turkish hero who, according to legend, was named Abū Muḥammad Ja'far b. Sulṭān Ḥusain b. Rabī' b. 'Abbās al-Hāshimī, was born in Malatya, and lived 900 years ago. Al-Ṭabarī, however, mentions a historical figure

named ʿAbd Allāh al-Baṭṭāl who died a martyr in 122/739–40. Janābī and Hezārfen carelessly confuse these two accounts, i.e. the legendary with the historical. Even Halil Edhem, citing {Yāqūt's} *Muʿjam al-buldān*, vol. 8, p. 195, is not able to escape this error, which was also shared by Kātib Chelebi and Evliyā Chelebi (*Kayseriye şehri* {Istanbul, 1334/1915–16}, p. 131). The legend of Baṭṭāl Ghāzī, which had both an heroic and religious quality, lay behind the creation of many works about him {*Baṭṭālnāmes*}, both in verse and in prose, since the earliest period of the Seljuks. Thus, the Orientalist H. Ethé quite rightly asserts that, basically, this work was written to prepare soldiers for the conquest of Anatolia. Whoever originally wrote it, and for whatever purpose, this work, which reflects the shared feelings of the Turks in those days, won great fame among the common people. Indeed, it spread as far as eastern Turkistan where there are a number of legends about this legendary hero; even his tomb is to be found there, in Aksu. According to legend there, Baṭṭāl Ghāzī was the fourth grandson of Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya – who in fact died in Medina in 81/700–1 and was buried in Baqīʿ – and was known by the name Imām ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ʿAlawī (*Taʾrīkh-i Sairāmī* {i.e. Mullā Mūsā b. Mullā ʿĪsā Sairāmī's *Taʾrīkh-i amanīyya* (Kazan, 1905),} p. 254). This important subject, about which we Turks have not yet done any research, was first studied in detail by H. Fleischer (*Kleinere Schriften* {Leipzig, 1885–8} vol. 3, pp. 226ff.). Ethé later translated this legend into German (*Die Fahrten des Sajjid Batthâl* [Leipzig, 1871]). There is also important information on this in the *ZDMG* {i.e. A. D. Mordtmann's "Die Dynastie der Danischmende,"} 30 {1876}, pp. 468–9; and Georg Hüsing's work {*Beiträge*} *zur Rostahmsage (Sajjid Battâl)* (Leipzig, 1913), is worthy of note. Yet, despite all these studies, it cannot be claimed that this subject has been adequately investigated. What is certain is that the legend was first written down at the time of the Seljuks. The tomb attributed to the famous Sayyid Baṭṭāl Ghāzī south of Eskişehir is greatly venerated in that region and a Bektashī *tekke*, mosque, and soup kitchen are also found nearby (see *EI*[1], s.v. "Baṭṭāl" [editors]). There are important details in Evliyā Chelebi on Baṭṭāl Ghāzī (*Seyāḥatnāme*, Book 3, fo. 7a, Book 4, fos 192b, 196a) and I have collected extensive information from various sources for the analytical work that I am preparing on the Bektashīs and *abdāls*, on his place among the Bektashīs and, especially, the *abdāls*, and on the history of the Sayyid Ghāzī Tekke. For now, see my article "Abdal" in *Türk halk edebiyatı ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul, 1935). [For additional material and bibliographical information on both the historical and legendary figures of the Sayyid Baṭṭāl, as well as on other related matters, see *İA*, s.v. "Battal" (Pertev N. Boratav), and *EI*[2], s.v. "al-Baṭṭāl" (M. Canard and I. Mélikoff).] {For English trans. and Turkish transcription of the legend of Baṭṭāl Ghāzī, see Y. Dedes, *Battalname* (Cambridge, MA, 1996). See also Hasan Köksal, *Battalnâmelerde tip ve motif yapısı* (Ankara, 1984), and Saim Sakaoğlu, "Battal-nâme," *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı: Belleten*, 1992, 67–74.}

75 The following couplets by ʿĀshıq Pasha suffice to show how much Turkish was denigrated even in the eighth/fourteenth century:

Türk diline kimsene bakmaz idi
Türkler'e hergiz gönül akmaz idi
Türk dahi bilmez idi bu dilleri
İnce yolu ol ulu menzilleri.

{No one cared for the Turkish language.
No one had affection for the Turks.
Even the Turks did not known their own language
The narrow path, the great way-station.}

Thanks to various documents, we know very well that this point of view was maintained even in the ninth/fifteenth and tenth/sixteenth centuries. It would be beyond our subject to go into further detail on this matter here.

76 "Afterward the governing council was established. Because all records and orders had been written in Persian, Turkish had almost disappeared. Consequently, all documents that were to be read in the council were to be in Turkish and conversing in other languages was strictly forbidden. Because the registers and other account books had been written up to that time in Arabic and Persian, Turkish was written with difficulty and everyone who wrote in the registers used a different spelling" (Hayrullâh Efendi, *Tarih-i âl-i osmân*, vol. 1, p. 110). It is very uncertain how long this important action, which occurred after the Qaramānids took de facto control of Konya on 10 Dhū 'l-Ḥijja 676/May 5, 1278, remained in effect. Nevertheless, this event is enough to show that Turkish had reached a level of development whereby it could replace Persian and Arabic as the official language of that period. This event also definitely confirms that works were produced in Turkish in Anatolia since the very first arrival of the Seljuks. {Köprülü implies that Persian was the language of instruction in the *madrasas*, but provides no evidence of this. Traditionally Arabic was the language of instruction in these schools of Islamic law. All the major relevant texts were in that language. Cf. his note 87 below.}

77 The poet Gülshehrī recounts at length {*Manṭiq al-ṭair*, facsimile edn [Ankara, 1957], p. 51, and MSS in the Istanbul Archeology Museum Library and the Hâlis Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul} the famous story of Shaikh Ṣan'ān under the heading *Dāsitān-i 'Abd al-Razzāq* in the first part of his work and at the end of it he states:

Bir kişi bu dâstânı eylemiş
İlla lafzın gey çepürdük söylemiş

Vezniçün lafzın gidermiş harfını
Artuk eksük söylemiş söz sarfını

Şimdi Gülşehrî giyürdi bu aya
Lefgerî tonlar ki benzedi baya

Anber ile saçın ördi sünbülün
Gönlegin atlasdan eyledi gülün

Söz hurûfın artuk eksük kalmadı
Âlim anladı vü câhil bilmedi

Tanrı'nun kudretlerin yâd eyledi
Mustafâ'nun cânını şâd eyledi

Böyle rengîn böyle datlu böyle ter
Husrev-û Şîrîn sözü oldı meğer.

{Someone told this story,
but made the words very complicated

He left out letters for the sake of the meter,
and added or subtracted word endings.

Now Gülshehrī has clothed this moon
in Livorno (?) garments, so it resembles a rich man.

He plaited the hyacinth's locks with ambergris,
and made the rose's dress out of satin.

He did not add or subtract letters.
The wise understood, the foolish did not know.

He recalled God's powers
and gladdened Muḥammad's soul.

His words have such color, such taste, such freshness,
that they might very well be Khusraw and Shīrīn.}

It is evident from this that before Gülshehrī, i.e. in the sixth/twelfth or seventh/thirteenth century, a poet had written about this subject in verse, but because his language was coarse and primitive and his use of meter was naturally very defective, Gülshehrī felt it necessary to rewrite it. This information is of historical value in showing that the *ʿarūḍ* meters had begun to be used by the Turks of Anatolia much earlier than has been thought, and in showing how old subjects were taken up again by later poets.

78 There are some fragments of poetry in Greek and Turkish in Mawlānā's *Dīwān-i kabīr*, {the latter} are not of a quality or quantity that would permit us to consider him a Turkish poet. Some of these fragments, which are mainly macaronic {*mulamma'*}, sometimes satirical, and occasionally consist of complete passages, were included in Necib Âsım's *Türk tarihi* {Istanbul, 1316/1898–9}, pp. 439–42, citing a treatise by Veled Chelebi. In addition, two lines of poetry not found there appear in Fâik Reşad's book, *Tarih-i edebiyat-ı osmâniyye* {Istanbul, 1329/1911}, p. 30. The Turkish passages from Mawlānā, however, do not consist of {just} these fragments. Moreover, there are even great differences in the form in which they appear in different copies of the *Dīwān*. The publication of the requisite commentary on, and explanation of, this poetry by Veled Chelebi, who has a truly profound knowledge of this subject, is awaited with great anticipation {see Şerefeddin (Yaltkaya), "Mevlânâ'da türkçe kelimeler ve türkçe şiirler," *TM*, 4 (1934), 111–67}. Ziya Pasha did not mention Mawlānā as a Turkish poet, and Namık Kemal in his *Tahrîb-i harâbât* {Istanbul, 1301/1883–4 and again in 1304/1886–7} found fault with this, but Namık Kemal's judgment is not altogether correct. In order to give an idea of this poetry and the variants found in the manuscripts, I can cite verbatim from an old anthology another version of a *ghazal* in the *Türk tarihi* {Turkish words underlined}:

یعنی که من در عالم یالکز سنی سور من گر تو مرا نخواهی من خود سنی سور من

روزئ تشنه خواهم خلوت سنك قاتکده تو پر پیاله نوشی هم من قویوز چالارمن

هردم بخشم گویی یور کیت منم قاقدن من روی سخت کردم نزدیك ترکلور من

من یار با وفایم بر من جفا قیلاسك با آنچنین جفاها سندن قچان قچر من

تو همچو شیر مستی داخی قانم ایچرسك من چون سگان کویت دنبال تو کزر من

ای ماه شمس تبریز غرق اولدی عشق ایچنده گر تو زمن نپرسی من خود کلور صورر من.

{It means that I in the world, I only love you. If you do not want me, still I love you.
On the day of thirst, I want to be alone at your side.
You'll drink a full goblet and I'll play the kopuz.

Every moment you say in anger: Go, depart from my side. I become obstinate and nearer I come.
I am the loyal lover; you act cruelly toward me. With such acts of cruelty, how can I flee from you?
You are like a raging lion and you drink my blood. I am like the dogs of your street, I follow after you.
O moon of the sun of Tabrīz, he is drowned in love. If you do not ask for me, I'll come myself and ask.}

79 In Hacı Kemal's *J̌āmiʿ al-naẓāʾir* {MS in the Beyazıt Umumi Library in Istanbul}, which includes works of the earliest Anatolian poets, the names of whom are not even mentioned in the *tadhkiras*, there is an ethical Ṣūfī poem written in simple language and elementary *ʿarūḍ* meter by a poet named Shayyād Ḥamza. Its language, subject, and form of versification clearly reveal that it is an early work. There is an account of this man, who is not mentioned in any of the *tadhkiras* or biographical dictionaries, in Lāmiʿī's *Laṭāʾif*, which states that he was a contemporary of Naṣr al-Dīn Khwāja and was a Ṣūfī who performed miracles. If we bear in mind that Naṣr al-Dīn Khwāja died in 683/1284–5 (Köprülü, *Nasrettin Hoca* [Istanbul, 1918], p. 3), we may assert that Shayyād Ḥamza was also a figure of the seventh/thirteenth century {Bayram identifies Naṣr al-Dīn Khwāja with Akhī Evren, *Tarihin ışığında Nasreddin Hoca ve Ahi Evren* (Istanbul, 2001), with a death date between 658/1260 and 660/1262, see n.41 above}. Indeed, the nature of his work corroborates this. With the following couplets,

Ecel tutmış elinde bir ulu câm
Kī ol câmın içi dolu ser-encâm
Kīme ayak sunar, kime içürmiş
Kīmi esrük yatar toprakta müdâm
Kī bir bir içer ol sâkî elinden
Bay-û yohsul, ulu kiçi, hâs-û ʿâm
Ẕehî şerbet ki bir kez andan içen
Ne subh olduğunu bilür ne aḫşâm

{Death has a large cup in his hand.
The cup is full of the end.
He offers the cup to some people and lets them drink.
Some lie drunk in the earth forever.
One by one they drink from the hand of that cupbearer.
Rich and poor, great and small, elite and common folk.
What beverage is this that he who drinks it once,
Knows not whether it is morning or evening}

found at the end of a poem of nineteen couplets which begins by complaining of the transitory nature of this world, the poet tries to awaken the heedless. He also states that favor and benefaction from the mercy of God reached his own heart, and that he was otherwise innocent of the poetic arts:

Bu sâkî cümlesin esrüdiserdir
Ne cemâat geliserdir, ne îmâm
Ne gül-ruh kurtulısar, ne şeker-leb
Ne ʿanber-hat kalısar, ne gül-endâm
Bu gafletten niçin uyanmadın sen

Niçin gâfil yatırsın sen ey ʿâvâm
Şeyyâd Ḥamza'nın gönlüne her dem
Gelir Hak rahmetinden lutf-ü inʿâm
Ne ʿarûz bilir ol ne nahv-ü tasrîf
Ne kâfiye, redîf ne tecnis-i tâm.

{This cupbearer will make everyone drunk.
No congregation will come and no *imām*.
Neither the rose-checkered one will escape, nor the sugar-lipped;
Neither the one with perfumed beauty-spot nor the one with rose-like body.
Why then have you not awakened from this heedlessness?
Why do you lie heedless, O foolish folk?
To Shayyād Ḥamza's heart at every moment
Comes grace and favor from God's mercy.
He does not know metrics or grammar,
He does not know rhyme or *radīf* or figures of speech.}

It can plausibly be inferred that Shayyād Ḥamza, who reveals with this short poem that he was not an artist but an ordinary Ṣūfī, must have written more hymns in the syllabic meter than such poems in the *ʿarūḍ* meter, but they were later forgotten. The difference in time between this Ṣūfī poet, whose work was probably in circulation up to the tenth/sixteenth century, and Gülshehrī, was at the most – as a best guess – about half a century. [Köprülü was the first to introduce Shayyād Ḥamza to the literary world. See his "Anatolische Dichter in der Seldschukenzeit, i. Šejjād 'Ḥamza," *Körösi Csoma Archivum*, 1 (1921–5), 183–90. This article appeared in Turkish translation in *Türk Yurdu*, 1 (1340/1921–2), 27–34. One should also consult *İA*, s.v. "Şeyyad Hamza" (Sâdettin Buluç) on the subsequent writings of Köprülü and the articles and texts published by Mecdut Mansuroğlu and other writers concerning this poet.] {Now see *EI²*, s.v. "Sheyyād Ḥamza" (Kathleen Burrill). Metin Akar has shown that Shayyād Ḥamza lived in the first half of the fourteenth century, i.e. after Yūnus Emre. See his article "Şeyyad Hamza hakkında yeni bilgiler," *Türklük Arastırmaları Dergisi*, 2 (1986), 1–14, and Semih Tezcan, "Anadolu Türk yazınının başlangiç döneminde bir yazar ve çarh-name'nin tarihlendirilmesi üzerine," *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları*, 3 (1994), 75–88.}

80 Sulṭān Walad's Turkish poetry consists only of this. The poetry attributed to Sulṭān Walad in {Ziyâ Pasha's} *Harâbât* does not belong to him, and the poem that begins with the famous line "*Ben bilmez idim gizli ʿiyân hep sen imişsin*" {I did not know that, visible and invisible, all is You}, which Namık Kemal has attributed to him as well, belongs to Nawʿī. It was translated from Jāmī's quatrain that begins در دیده عیان تو بودهٔ من غافل {You have been visible but I was negligent}. Thúry gives considerable importance to the passages in the *Harâbât* and also is of the opinion that "This poem has fourteen syllables per line and the rhyme scheme is abab, whereas Seljuk verse has eleven syllables per line and consists of rhymed couplets" ("Ondördüncü ʿasır sonlarına kadar Türk dili yâdıgârları," p. 105). This is very odd. First of all, it is certain that, with respect to their language and versification, these verses cannot belong to that period. Second, the works of Mawlānā and Sulṭān Walad were not, as he believed, written in the syllabic meter. Third, there are passages in both Mawlānā and Sulṭān Walad written in various *ʿarūḍ* meters and in different styles, i.e. in *ghazal* as well as *mathnawī* style. I believe that this brief critique suffices to show how poorly the Hungarian academician has studied this subject. {See *EI²*, s.v. "Sulṭān Walad" (Gudrun Schubert), and Franklin Lewis, *Rumi*, index.}

81 This poetry was first published in 1829 in Vienna {by Hammer} in the *Jahrbücher der Literatur*. Subsequently, all sorts of opinions have been expressed about it, and it

has been translated into various languages from this edition. Radloff has published separately the Turkish part, 156 couplets, in his {"Über alttürkische Dialekte: (1) die seldschukischen Verse im} Rebâb-Nâmeh," {*Mélanges Asiatiques*, 10 (1890–4), 17–77} and Ignaz Kúnos has also translated these texts in his {"Egy ó-török nyelvemlek,"} *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*, 22 {1892}, 480–97. On this subject, see the bibliographies in C. Salemann {"Noch einmal die seldschukischen Verse: (Sultan Veled, *Rebabname*),"} *Bulletin Scientifique de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St Pétersbourg* {n.s., 2 (= 34, 1892), 293–365, also in *Mélanges Asiatiques*, 10 (1894), 173–245}, in V. D. Smirnov, {"Les vers dits 'seldjouk' et le christianisme turc,"} in *Actes du 11^e^ Congrès International des Orientalistes (1897)*, {third section, 143–57} published in Paris in 1899, and in K. Foy's article {"Die ältesten osmanischen Transscriptionstexte in gothischen Lettern; zugleich eine Beitrag zur altosmanischen Literature"} in *Berlin Universität, Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, Mitteilungen, Westasiatische Studien*, {4 (1901), 235}. There are many valuable manuscripts of these works in our libraries, so that it is possible to collect all of Sulṭān Walad's Turkish writings. Veled Chelebi has collected them, but unfortunately he has not yet published them. In the sixth volume of E. J. W. Gibb's {*History of Ottoman Poetry*}, there are about sixty-seven couplets from the *Rabābnāme* and also a few short fragments of verses from Sulṭān Walad's *Dīwān* (pp. 1–5).

82 The few couplets given below suffice to show that Sulṭān Walad pursued this goal and did not think that even his Turkish was adequate for this (*Rabābnāme*) {Mecdut Mansuroğlu, *Sultan Veled'in Türkçe manzumeleri* (Istanbul, 1958), pp. 24–5, = *Rabābnāme*, lines 97–100}:

Türkçe bilseydüm ben eydeydüm size
Sırları kim Tañrıdan değdi bize
Bildüreydüm sözile bildüğümi
Bulduraydum ben size bulduğumı
Dilerem kim göreler kamu anı
Cümle yoksullar ola benden gani
Bildürem dükeline bildüğümi
Bulalar ulu kiçi bulduğumı

{If I had known Turkish, I would have told you
The secrets that God has imparted to me.
I would have informed you in words of what I know
And let you find what I have found.
I wish that all could see that (truth)
And that all the poor would be rich because of me;
That I would inform all of what I know
And let great and small find what I have found.}

83 See above on the story of Shaikh Ṣan'ān, the Qaramānid Muḥammad Bey's attempt to make Turkish the official language, and Shayyād Ḥamza. Because historians who recorded Seljuk history did not wish to attribute any literary quality to the basic works written in that period on a popular level, they claimed that "there was not yet any Turkish poetry in that period" (*Mukhtaṣar Saljūqnāme* trans., p. 216 {i.e. Yazıcı-oğlu 'Alī's Turkish trans. of Ibn Bībī's *al-Awāmir al-'alā'iyya*}). Later, Ottoman historians and *tezkirecis* {biographers}, as a result of a lack of knowledge combined with this literary prejudice, held the same opinion. 'Āshıq Chelebi says, "There was no Turkish poetry at the time of Orhan Ghāzī {1324–60}. At the time of Murad I, only one poet, named Aḥmad, translated from Persian an epic called *Suhail wa naw-bahār* in the *shāhnāme* meter. While it is Turkish in manner, it does have certain

peculiarities of style, but copies of it are rare" (*Tadhkira* {i.e. his *Mashā'ir al-shu'arā'*}, fo. 24). Similarly, 'Ālī says, *Hafî olmaya ki Osman Han ve Orhan Han ve Sultân Murad Han zamânlarında şu'arâdan kimse zuhûru mâlûm değildir. Mücerred sâde nazma kâdir bâzı varsağı-gûlar dahî şöhret bulmamıştır; zirâ ol zamânda sükkân-i mülk-i Rûm ekseriyâ guzât-ı Etrâk ve Tatar idügi mâlûm ve sâir ahâlî merz-ü bûm ise evlâd-ı kefereden zuhûr etmiş bir bölük sâde-levh idügleri mefhûm olmağın içlerinde şi'ir-şinâsları bile ma'dûm idi* {It is not known if any poets appeared during the time of Osman Khān, Orhan Khān and Murad Khān. Even folk singers, who were capable of simple, plain verse, did not achieve fame; for it is known that at that time most of the inhabitants of the kingdom of Rūm were Turkish and Tatar *ghāzīs*. The rest of the people of the country were a bunch of simpletons who were descendants of infidels, so it is obvious that there were none among them who knew poetry} (*Kunh al-akhbār*, vol. 5, p. 115). He thus expresses an opinion quite the opposite to reality. The documents in our possession today clearly demonstrate that the early historians and *tezkirecis* were definitely unable to acquire an adequate knowledge of the first stages of Ottoman literature. Consequently, it is necessary to regard the similar accounts of the Seljuk historians {about early Seljuk literature} as equally unreliable, although few documents have come down to us.

84 Gülshehrī's version of *Manṭiq al-ṭair* is dated 717/1317. There is one manuscript, copied in Egypt at the beginning of the tenth/sixteenth century, in the Hâlis Efendi {Library in Istanbul} and another, defective, manuscript in the Müze-i Humâyûn Library {Istanbul Archeological Museum}. There is no information on Gülshehrī at all in the *tadhkiras* {biographical works}. We only know that this poet first wrote a work in Persian called *Falaknāme* and also wrote *ghazals* and *qaṣīdas* in addition to the *Manṭiq al-ṭair*. Three *ghazal*-like didactic Ṣūfī poems are found in {Hacı Kemal's} *Jāmi' al-nazā'ir*. Gülshehrī, who in the *Manṭiq al-ṭair* reveals himself to be a follower of the great Persian Ṣūfīs and, especially, Mawlānā and Sulṭān Walad, mentions that he had exceptional authority in {the town of} Gül-Shehrī and was not the shaikh of any village or town, as was often the case at that time, so it was necessary to regard him as a great Ṣūfī whose fame had spread in all directions. If we take into consideration the fact that Gülshehrī was Kırshehrī, as recorded in the *Velāyetnāme* of Ḥājjī Bektash Veli, then it would appear that this great Ṣūfī poet was from Kırshehir {Kırşehir}. At the end of a Persian commentary on the Arabic *Amthila* {paradigms for the conjugation of verbs} registered as number 4837 in the Ayasofya Library, it is recorded that it was written by Shaikh Mas'ūd b. 'Uthmān, who was associated with the small town of Gülshehrī in Anatolia, on 4 Muḥarram 741/July 1, 1340. I wonder if this Shaikh Mas'ūd b. 'Uthmān Gülshehrī is the same man as our Gülshehrī. If not, must we conclude, based on the difference in date of composition of these two works, that they are two different persons? Or there is a third possibility: because Shaikh 'Uthmān Gülshehrī was the father of Shaikh Mas'ūd Gülshehrī, perhaps the former was the author of the *Manṭiq al-ṭair* translation and the latter the author of the *Amthila* commentary. For now, nothing definite can be said about this. In a very valuable work by Shaikh-oghlu dating from the early years of the ninth/fifteenth century and including poetry from quite a few, mostly unknown, poets of the eighth/fourteenth century, I came across several passages attributed to Khwāja Mas'ūd as well as two hemistichs belonging to Khwāja Gülshehrī (from the *Kanz al-kubarā'*, a unique copy in my private library written in the author's hand). As likely as it is that these two verses and the *Manṭiq al-ṭair* translation and the poems in the *Jāmi' al-nazā'ir* belong to the well known poet named Gülshehrī who lived at the end of the seventh/thirteenth and the beginning of the eighth/fourteenth century, it is equally likely that there is no connection between this and the author of the *Amthila* commentary and Khwāja Mas'ūd. At any rate, it is difficult to believe that Gülshehrī,

who must have been a man of mature age when he wrote the *Manṭiq al-ṭair*, would have composed the *Amthila* commentary twenty-four years later. Also, Shaikhoghlu, who undoubtedly had a good knowledge of the men of this period, carefully distinguishes between Khwāja Gülshehrī and Khwāja Masʿūd and shows them to be two different poets. In the manuscript in the Hâlis Efendi Library, there is the following entry: *Kitāb-i Manṭiq al-ṭair min kalām-i shaikh al-muḥaqqiqīn murshid al-ṭālibīn al-ʿāmil al-fāḍil al-shaikh Aḥmad al-Gülshehrī* {the book of *Manṭiq al-ṭair* by Shaikh . . . Aḥmad al-Gülshehrī}, which clearly shows that our Gülshehrī was Aḥmad Gülshehrī and corroborates the ideas that I have proposed. {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Gülshehrī" (Fr. Taeschner).}

85 Gülshehrī, who by the standards of that period paid serious attention to purity of language and faultlessness of versification, and who achieved considerable success, shows that he was a true artist. In contrast to his contemporaries, who generally thought of nothing other than propagating an idea and a goal, there is a perceptible lyricism in the works of this poet who paid close attention to the aesthetic effect that his work would have. Even while giving the most abstract moral advice, he can convey to the reader an aesthetic delight. Then, while describing scenes of nature, he possesses a rather artful and lively style that is at once very colorful and very simple. Artistically, there is a great difference between the poetry of Gülshehrī and the works of Shayyād Ḥamza or Ṭūrsūn Faqīh, Naqīb-oghlu, Muʿarrif of Ladik, Ḥasan of Beypazar and even Sulṭān Walad, which are dry, dull, and devoid of artistic concern. Gülshehrī, who had a good idea of his own worth, claimed that his translation of the *Manṭiq al-ṭair* was not inferior to ʿAṭṭār's original version – having given it, along with many additions, a quality that was richer and more personal than the original – and that before him no work of such beauty had been written in Turkish. He is not completely unjustified in saying this. (I hope to publish soon a study devoted to Gülshehrī and his work. See that study for abundant details useful for comparing him with his contemporaries and the Persian poets {never published}.)

86 This enormous didactic Ṣūfī work that ʿĀshıq Pasha, the grandson of the famous Bābā Ilyās Khurāsānī, wrote in Kırşehir in 730/1330 is a kind of *Mathnawī* in Turkish. It is written in the same meter and form, and is divided into ten chapters of ten sections each. In this long didactic work, which was written for the religious purpose of teaching the rules of the order to Turks who did not know Persian, there are many quotations from Persian Ṣūfī poets and, especially, from Mawlānā. Despite extensive research, I was able to find in this huge work only very few passages that reveal the particular features of life in Anatolia at that time. ʿĀshıq Pasha, who, in one passage, expresses his longing for the misty mountains of Turkistan, is much inferior to Gülshehrī artistically. Still, this huge work also deserves a comprehensive study with respect to lingustic history. My study of ʿĀshıq Pasha and his son Elvan Chelebi is almost ready for publication. [For considerable information on both ʿĀshıq Pasha and his son Elvan Chelebi, one should see *İA*, s.v. "Âşık Çelebi" (M. F. Köprülü). The critical bibliography in this article is a valuable guide for those working on this subject. In addition, see also Semavi Eyice, "Çorum'un Mecidözü'nde Âşık Paşa-Oğlu Elvan Çelebi zâviyesi," *TM*, 15 (1969), 211–44.] {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "ʿĀshıḳ Pasha" (Fahir İz), and Kemal Yavuz (ed.), *Âşık Paşa, Garib-nâme* (Istanbul, 2000).}

87 These *ozans* were the earliest priest-sorcerer-poets of the Oghuz. The men who held the same position among the Tunguz were called shamans, among the Altay Turks *kam*, and among the Qirghiz *bakhshi*. These men, who combined in themselves a number of functions, including sorcerer, dancer, musician, and physician, had great importance among the people. The extent of this importance, their costume, musical instruments, and the kind of tasks they performed differed, of course, in time and

place. Nevertheless, their duties included such things as making sacrifices to the sky gods, sending the souls of the dead to the underworld, preventing evils from demons, and preserving the memory of the dead. There were separate ceremonies for each of these things. Some of these practices are still current among the Altay Turks and the Qirghiz. The *ozans* would enter an exuberant state during these ceremonies, recite poems, and play the *kopuz* to accompany them. These literary recitals, which were accompanied by music and had a magical effect, are the earliest form of Turkish poetry. Although the Turks of various regions and in different periods were subject to the influence of Chinese, Indian, Persian, or Islamic civilization, the social function of these *ozans* was constant. Their social influence was especially great in those places and times in which the primitive national religion was preserved. Later, of course, their importance decreased. Still, in the early armies of the Turks, as far back as that of Attila, the ruler was invariably accompanied by an *ozan*. Their heroic poems, which they recited to the accompaniment of the *kopuz*, flattered the sensibilities of an entire people. We know quite well from Latin sources what a profound effect these epic poems had on the audience in Attila's military camp. The *ozans* did not confine themselves to composing poems about recent events and heroic legends, or elegies in praise of the dead; they also sang the old poems belonging to the *Oghuz Destanı*. Even after falling under the influence of Islam, these *ozans* did not disappear. As a result of the social division of labor in the great centers, the professions of poet, fortune-teller, sorcerer, astrologer, and physician became separate from one another. Illnesses were treated by physicians; musical instruments were played by musicians; poetry and literature became the preserve of scholars who studied Arabic and Persian religious and literary topics in the *madrasas*; and the legends of the old *bakhshi-ozans* were taken up by the Ṣūfīs. Yet the *ozans* survived as Muslim folk poets. We find them in Anatolia until the ninth/fifteenth century. Afterwards, *ʿāshuqs* take the place of *ozans* (for more information, see my "Türk edebiyatının menşe'i," pp. 12–27). [After extensive research on the word *ozan*, Köprülü published a study on it under the heading "Ozan" in the book *Türk dil ve edebiyatı hakkında araştırmalar* (Istanbul, 1934), pp. 273–92. This was reprinted in his collection of articles entitled *Edebiyat araştırmaları* (Ankara, 1966), pp. 131–44.] {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ozan" (P. N. Boratav).}

88 Every nation has a national instrument especially used for accompanying its primordial national songs. This instrument is incorporated into the nation's tales and legends, and memory of it is preserved for centuries. The oldest musical instrument that the earliest Turkish popular poets, i.e. the precursors of the *bakhshi-ozan*, used in relgious ceremonies and later in assemblies of an artistic nature was the *kopuz*. This instrument, which resembles the *ʿūd* {lute} of the Arabs, has been continuously found over the centuries from the earliest times in various Turkish countries. In all the legends in which we find the *ozan*, he has, without fail, a *kopuz* in his hands. We encounter this in the earliest Uighur texts, in Central Asia from the fifth/eleventh century on, and in Anatolia since the early Seljuk period. The *kopuz* is mentioned in the works of Mawlānā, Yūnus Emre, and Gülshehrī. Indeed, in the Seljuk period and in the courts of the rulers, there were also, in addition to the *ozans*, *kopuz* players who were distingushed from them. For considerable information on this instrument, which is also found among the Hungarians and the Ukrainians, see my article "Türk edebiyatının menşe'i," pp. 57–63. I am also preparing a brief study of this subject. [For concise information on the *kopuz*, see *İA*, s.v. "Kopuz" (Mirza Bala).]

89 "Selçukîler zamanında Anadolu'da Türk medeniyyeti," pp. 213–14, {Leiser trans., pp. 50–1.}.

90 A passage of sixty-four couplets in the ninth chapter of his *Gharībnāme* mentions the etiquette of the *alps* and the requirements {for being an *alp*}. It begins:

Kamı ol kim ister alp'lık adını
Almak ister düşmeninden dâdını
Düşmeni kahreyleyip basmak diler
Başını at yanına asmak diler
Gelsün işitsün ki alp'lık nicedür
Alp'ların sermâyesi gör kim nedür
Eydeyim bir bir sana ahvâlini
Kim bilesin Alp-erenler hâlini

{Where is he who desires the name of *alp*?
He who wishes to punish his enemy?
He who wants to subdue and trample the foe,
And to hang his head at his horse's side?
Let him come and hear what being an *alp* means.
See what is the stock and capital of the *alps*.
Let me tell you their qualities one by one,
So you will know the status of the *alp-erenler*.}

This fine passage goes on to say that nine things are required of the *alps*: "a stout heart, a strong arm, zeal, a good horse, a special garment {i.e. armor}, a bow, a good sword, a lance, and a suitable companion" (*Gharībnāme*, Beyazıt Umumi Library, MS 333 {see the Yavuz edn, vol. 2/2, p. 549, lines 8487–90}). [Köprülü dwelt on this subject in his *Les Origines de l'empire ottoman*. See index under "*alp*." He also published an original philological and historical study of this word in *İA*, s.v. "Alp."] {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Alp" (O. Pritsak).}

91 {This, like *alp*, *ozan*, etc., is part of the romantic view of the Turkish past to which Köprülü adhered.}

92 "Selçukîler zamanında Anadolu'da Türk medeniyyeti," p. 214, {Leiser trans., p. 51}.

93 *Erbâb-ı gınâ ve melâhîyi hâzır ettiler, Şâhinşâh Hazretleri'nin fütûhi üzerine elhân-ı cân-perverle gûyendelik ettiler ve alplık ve bahâdırlık zikrini ki asâkir-i mansûre ol gün takdim kılmışlardı, ozan'lar ve kopuzcu'lar elfâz-ı garrâ birle bir sebil hikâyet ayıttılar* {They prepared the singers and entertainers. They sang inspiring songs about the conquests of His Excellency the King of Kings and the *alp*-like and heroic deeds that the victorious soldiers had accomplished that day. And the *ozans* and *kopuz* players, with brilliant words, narrated.} (*Mukhtaṣar Saljūqnāme-i Ibn Bībī*, {Yazıcı-oğlu ʿAlī, Turkish} trans., p. 348.) The same source also informs us that the poets in the courts of the Seljuk rulers were also influenced by the era of the *alps*, for they took a great interest in the subject of heroism . . . *Hwân-ı husrevânı yendikten sonra evânî-i bezm ortaya geldi ve nağme-serây-ü gam-zidây mutribler küffâr devleti nevbetinin fırō-daştı çün dil-pezīr ve tarab-engîz pâre ve pîşrevler ber-daşt ettiler ve şuʿarâ kasâid-i kâmrânîyi sahâif-i Mâni üzerine nakşedip mutribler bahâdırların dilâverliklerin, düşmanı kahrettiklerin ve pehlevanlar cengin hûb elhân-ü âheng ve kavl-i rast birle hâzırlar semʿine iriştirdiler* {After the imperial feast was consumed, drinking vessels were brought out, singers of songs and care-dispersing musicians offered heart-pleasing and joyous pieces and *peshrevs* {a musical form} on the occasion of putting an end to the state of the unbelievers. Poets inscribed felicitous *qaṣīdas* upon painted pages of Mani (a celebrated Persian painter and founder of Manichaeism, d. 274, 276, or 277 CE; his name epitomized great art). With elegant tunes and melodies and perfect words, the musicians conveyed to the listeners' ears the heroes' valorous deeds, their defeat of the enemy, and the combat of the champions"} (*ibid.*, p. 366). All these details show that we must consider that period of Anatolian history to be a time of *alps*. {On minstrels and *kopuz* players, see Karl Reichl, *Turkic Oral Epic Poetry*

(New York, 1992) and *Singing the Past: Turkic and Medieval Heroic Poetry* (Ithaca, NY, 2000).}

94 Women like Seljān Khātūn and Bānī Chichek Khātūn in the stories in the *Kitāb-ı Dede Korkut* are nothing more nor less than *alps*. When Kanlı Koja wants to marry off his hero son Kān Ṭurālı, his son replies, *Baba, çün meni iverim dirsin, mana lâyık kız nice olur? Baba, men yerimden durmadın evvel durmuş ola, men karakoç atıma binmedin evvel binmiş ola, men kanlı kâfir iline varmadın ol varmış, mana baş getirmiş ola, dedi* {Father, you want to have me married, but can you find a girl who would be my match? Father, I want a girl who must get up before I do. She must be able to mount her horse before I mount my black stallion. She must be able to reach the bloody land of the infidels before I do, and she must bring me an enemy head" ({ed. Kilisli Rifat (Istanbul, 1332/1916), p. 96, {English trans. Geoffry Lewis, p. 117; the standard edition of the *Dede Korkut* is by Muharrem Ergin, *Dede Korkut Kitâbı* (Ankara, 1964), the best is the recent edition by Semih Tezcan and Hendrik Boeschoten, *Dede Korkut Oğuznameleri* (Istanbul, 2001)}). This shows very clearly the general conception of women at the time of the *alps*. The kind of woman that Kān Ṭurālı, i.e. the *alps* of that period, wanted was not a beloved of the type that the later minstrels imagined but was a heroine with exactly the same martial qualities as the men. Indeed, the women of the era of the *alps*, i.e. the time of the *ozans*, could only have had such heroic traits.

95 The *türkü* is a folk song with a musical setting peculiar to the Turks. *Türküs* were composed in the manner of modern-day art-songs {*şarkı*}. What distinguished them was not the literary form but the musical setting. In other words, this genre was not of a literary character but was completely musical. Indeed, because these *türküs* are unique to the early periods when music and poetry could not yet be distinguished, the fact that they differed from each other musically is quite natural. {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Türkü" (Edith Ambros).}

96 The *türkmānī* is a folk-song with a musical setting peculiar to the Turkmen. There is no difference in form between it and other *türküs*. The difference is strictly in the musical setting.

97 The *varsağı* is originally a kind of folk-song with a musical setting peculiar to the Varsaks. In addition to the various accounts of the Varsaks in our historical works, Pavet de Courteille provides considerable information on them in the notes at the end of his {French} translation of {Ibn Kamāl or Kemāl Pasha-Zāde's} famous *Mohaçnāme*, p. 164. These Varsak Turks, who came to Anatolia early on and settled in the Tarsus region, continually caused difficulties for the Ottoman state. They even participated in the uprising of the Qaramānids during the reign of Sultan Murad I. Varsak was also the name of the stony region west of Tarsus where they originally lived. *Varsağıs* composed to be recited with a musical setting peculiar to them became famous in Anatolia and Azerbaijan at a very early time. Not only does ʿĀlī, for example, mention a number of those who sang *varsağıs* in the early Ottoman period, but ʿĀshıq Chelebi also says that Yūnus Emre wrote works in the *varsağı* style (ʿĀshıq Chelebi, *Tadhkira* {i.e. his *Mashāʿir al-shuʿarā'*}). We know that Mehmed Beg, a poet with the pen name Shamsī who flourished in Azerbaijan in the tenth/sixteenth century, was well known for singing *varsağıs* in that region (Ṣādiqī Kitābdār, *Tadhkira*, Nuruosmaniye Library, MS 3720), that Sultan Murad IV wrote a *varsağı* for his companion Mūsā Chelebi, and that Evliyā Chelebi sang it in his presence (Evliyā Chelebi, *Seyāḥatnāme*, Book 1, fo. 70a). With respect to meter, the rule for the *varsağıs* is not very strict. Sometimes our *ʿāshıqs* composed *varsağıs* of eleven syllables per line, but most often used eight. As for form, they were composed of four-line stanzas {quatrains}, just like *koşmas* {see the following note}, *türküs*, and *türkmānīs*, with the fourth lines rhyming. *Varsağıs* had to be written in somewhat coarse and masculine language and in a *dâğî* manner {a vocal musical work having the character of *uzun*

hava, i.e. no rhythmical pattern}. In this regard, Qaraja-oghlan can be considered superior to virtually all other minstrels. From the fact that Na'īmā used the word *türkü* to designate the frontier folk-song that {Ibrâhîm} Pečewī {Peçevî} recorded as a *varsağı*, we know that *varsağı*, which differed from the *koşma*, *türkü*, and *türkmānī* forms only in musical setting, had long been used synonymously with *türkü* (*Ta'rīkh-i Na'īmā* [Istanbul, 1280/1863–4], vol. 1, p. 158; Hammer, {*Geschichte des Osmanischen Reichs*, Turkish} trans., vol. 7, p. 216).

98 The *koşma*, or *koşug* as it was known among the Eastern Turks, is one of the oldest and most popular forms in the syllabic meter. We can accept that the *koşug*, which is defined as *rajaz*, *qaṣīda* in {al-Kāshgarī's} *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*, is one of the earliest surviving forms of Turkish poetry, belonging to the time when there was no distinction between words and music. The word *koşmak*, in fact, means "to add a musical setting to a text." The *koşma* of the *'āshuq* type is an independent and much used verse form with a specific musical setting and sung in a special way. The *koşmas* sung with this musical setting have, in recent centuries, usually been of eleven syllables per line and composed as quatrains. But in the past, *koşmas* were sung in various meters (for a discussion of the *koşma* and other verse forms in *'āshuq* literature, see my series of articles in the newspaper *İkdam*, "Sazşâirleri," I–II; April 3, 7, 11, 16, 19, 25; May 2, 7, 9, 31; June 6, 1914.)

99 We know the antiquity of *deyiş* {a folk poem or song}, which means approximately "singing," from one of Mawlānā's Turkish verses: *Hem men çakır içer men, hem men teyiş bilir men* {I also drink wine and I also know *teyiş*.} This shows that *deyişes* were already quite famous by Mawlānā's time. This is also a rudimentary form in which musical setting and text were not yet distinguished.

100 As will be easily understood from its name, this was also a simple, primordial and "rustic" from of verse that definitely was sung. The poet Vehbi, while satirizing at length popular poetry and popular poets in the famous *Sukhan* {poetry} *qaṣīda*, speaks disparagingly of these forms as well:

> *Kimi mânî kimisi vâdi-i Türkmânî'de*
> *Kara-oğlan Kaya-başısı yellellâ-yi suhan.*
>
> {Some write *mânî* (folk quatrains); some, in the valley of *türkmani*,
> Write *kayabaşı* of Qara Oghlan with the refrain: *yellellâ.*

Cf. translation in Kemal Silay, *Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court* (Bloomington, IN, 1994), p. 131, verse no. 46.}

101 For a comprehensive treatment of this strange attitude and the psychological factors that gave rise to it, see my article "Türk edebiyatında âşık tarzının menşe' ve tekâmülü," pp. 5–46. In the view of the old *madrasa*-educated class, who reserved for themselves a privileged place in society and regarded everything belonging to the common people to be, invariably, base and trivial, "*Mevzû-i ilm-i edeb, kelâm-i Arab'dır*" {the subject of the science of literature is the Arabic language} ({Tashköprü-Zāde,} *Mawḍū'āt al-'ulūm*, {Turkish trans. (Istanbul, 1313/1895–6),} vol. 1, p. 334 {the title of the Arabic original is *Miftāḥ al-sa'āda* while *Mawḍū'āt al-'ulūm* is the title of the Turkish translation by his son Kemal al-Dīn}). Consequently, let alone preserving and appreciating what remained of that early national literature, they vehemently denigrated it, considering works that even hinted at popular taste to be "meaningless and worthless." Unfortunately, we find that this medieval mentality has endured to the present day.

102 See my discussion of this matter above in Chapter 1, p. 17, n.31. When we take into consideration the fact that this national epic, which was translated from Persian into Arabic in 211/826–7, was originally translated into Persian from a work composed

in Turkish, it is quite evident that the Turkish national epic – as Klaproth quite rightly stated {apparently referring to his *Asia Polyglotta*} – was already established before Islam and that both the Persians and the Chinese made use of it. {See *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Oghuz-nāma" (Irène Mélikoff).}

103 The information that we have in Rashīd al-Dīn's *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*, which is a primary source for early Turkish history, clearly reveals this {see Karl Jahn's German trans., *Die Geschichte der Oġuzen des Rašīd ad-Dīn* (Vienna, 1969)}. When Rashīd al-Dīn began to write this enormous work at the order of Ghazan Khān, there were learned men from various ethnic groups in his retinue and they made use of the earliest sources for the history of their own peoples. (On this subject, see the edition of *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* published {ed. and Russian trans.} by I. Berezin {of the introduction on Turkish and Mongol tribes and the history of Chingiz Khān in *ZVO*, 5 (1858), 7 (1861), 13 (1868), 15 (1888)}, Abū 'l-Ghāzī {Bahādur Khān's} *Shajara-i Turk* {ed. and French trans. J. J. P. Desmaisons as *Histoire des Mogols et des Tatars* (St Petersburg, 1871–4)}, and especially the excellent work that E. Blochet published as the introduction to *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* under the title *Introduction à l'histoire des mongols* in the *Gibb Memorial Series*, old series {(London, 1911), now see the introduction to Thackston's English trans. as *Rashiduddin Fazlullah's Jamiʿu't-tawarikh = Compendium of Chronicles*, part one (Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, 1998). For various editions of the *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*, see *The Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. 5, ed. J. A. Boyle (Cambridge, 1968), p. 705}.) All of these sources clearly show that Rashīd al-Dīn, while writing the section on the Turks and Mongols, benefited from a certain Amīr Pūlād Chingsang, and also obtained information from reports and documents preserved in the treasury. Reference to this is also found in Shams al-Dīn Kāshānī's work in verse *Shāhnāme-i Chingīzī*, which cites the *Jāmiʿ al-tawārīkh* (Hamidiye Library, Lala Vakfı MS 354 {now in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul}). {On Kāshānī's versified history of the Mongols, see the Russian translation by Iu. È. Bregel' of C. A. Storey's *Persian Literature* as *Persidskaia literatura: Bio-bibliograficheskii obzor* (Moscow, 1972), vol. 2, pp. 767–8, vol. 3, p. 1463.}

104 It appears that Necib Âsım and Mehmed Ârif, for example, in their unfinished *Türk tarihi-i umûmisi* (Istanbul, 1325/1907), p. 4, believed that the *Oghuznāme* was some kind of history. Alî Emîrî Efendi, in the introduction to {Beyâtî Shaikh Mahmûd's} *Jām-i jam āyīn*, also thought that the *Oghuznāme* was a history of the ancient Turks, *Jām-i jam āyīn* (Istanbul, 1331/1913), p. 5 {a modern Turkish trans. of Beyâtî's work is included in Atsız, *Osmanlı tarihleri* (Istanbul, 1949)}. Bursalı Tâhir Bey was of the same opinion, stating, "In light of certain evidence that we possess, the *Oghuznāme* must be considered the most valuable of the national histories written about the tribes constituting the Turks. It has been established, based on certain documents, that this great history existed in the area of Azerbaijan up to around 1000 AH, but it is no longer extant" ({"Aşık Paşa,"} *Türk Derneği*, no. 1 {1327/1911}, p. 12).

105 In the *Bahjat al-tawārīkh*, a brief history of Islam – which also mentions the Ottomans up to the accession of Muḥammad II – composed by the historian Shükrullâh and dedicated to the famous Maḥmūd Pasha, one of the viziers of Muḥammad II, the following important note is found attesting to the existence and nature of the *Oghuznāme* (Nuruosmaniye Library {in Istanbul}, MS 3059):

چنین است که در تاریخ سنه ۸۵۲ مرحوم سلطان مراد این فقیر را بر سالت میرزا جهانشاه منظور داشت. چون رسیدیم وخدمت بجای رسانیدم. روزی شقاول آمد که میرزا باشما خلوت صحبت خواهد کرد. باید آمدن سمعاً وطاعةً گفته رسیدیم. در اثنای صحبت میرزا فرمود که

سلطان مراد برادر اخروی منست وغیر از برادری خویش منست. سبب خویشی را پرسیده شد. فرمود که مولانا اسماعیل تواریخ خوان را بخوانند وهم تواریخ اوغوز بیارند. مولانا اسماعیل آمد وکتابی آورد بخط مغلی نوشته. ازان کتاب خبر داد که اوغوز را شش پسر بود، نام ایشان کوك آلب، یبر آلب، دکز آلب، کون آلب، آی آلب، ییلدیز آلب. میرزا فرمود که نسب برادرم سلطان مراد بکوك آلب بن اوغوز می رسد ونسب قره یوسف بدکز آلب می رسد.

{In the year 852, the late Sultan Murad sent me on a mission to Mīrzā Jihānshāh (the Qara Qoyunlu ruler in Tabrīz, reigned 841–72/1438–67). After I had arrived and paid my respects, one day the officer in charge of foreign envoys came and said that the Mīrzā wished to meet with me in private audience. "To hear is to obey," I replied, and went. In the course of the conversation the Mīrzā said: "Sultan Murad is my other-worldly (spiritual) brother, but he is also a brother by kin." When I asked him to explain kinship, he ordered the chronicle-reciter Mawlānā Ismāʿīl to be summoned and that he should bring the History of the Oghuz. Mawlānā Ismāʿīl came and brought a book written in Mongol (i.e. Uighur) script. From that book he reported that Oghuz had six sons: Gök Alp, Yer Alp, Denīz Alp, Gün Alp, Ay Alp, and Yıldız Alp. The Mīrzā said: "The lineage of my brother Sultan Murad goes back to Gök Alp. The lineage of Qara Yūsuf (Qara Qoyunlu ruler, reigned 791–823/1389–1402) goes back to Denīz Alp." A Turkish trans. of the section of *Bahjat al-tawārīkh* on the Ottomans is included in Atsız, *Osmanlı tarihleri*, while the Persian text of the same section and a German trans. are provided by Theodor Seif in his "Der Abschnitt über die Osmanen in Šükrullāh's persischer Universalgeschichte," *Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte*, 2 (1923–6), 63–128.} I think Tâhir based his assertion that "the *Oghuznāme* existed in the area of Azerbaijan up to around 1000 AH" on this source. This copy of the *Oghuznāme*, written in Uighur script, was either the digest of a national epic that included legends belonging to the Oghuz lineages, or a historical work that began with the legend of Oghuz Khān and then included historical information on one or more branches of the Oghuz and bore the name *Oghuznāme* because it concerned the Oghuz. If we consider that the traditions about the early period of every nation are much more legendary than historical, it is not surprising that the men of that time did not distinguish historical events from legends. In the Ottoman period, they called the general histories of the Turks, which went as far back as Oghuz Khān and included the Seljuks, *oghuznāme* by extension because they were pan-Oghuz in character. The *Oghuznāme* of the famous Lûtfî Pasha is, in fact, such a work. The original *Oghuznāme*, however, was a collection of legends. Searching for another great historical work, aside from these two, entitled *Oghuznāme* is a fantasy arising from a misunderstanding of the true nature of the *Oghuznāme*. Curiously, our recent historians have been deceived in this matter.

106 In his *Saljūqnāme*, Yazıcı-oğlu ʿAlī says, "The narrative of the lineages of the Turks was recorded in the *Oghuznāme* in Uighur script from the tales of their sages and esteemed story tellers" (Topkapı Sarayı MS). In this statement, he shows that some parts of his work were extracted from the *Oghuznāme* written in Uighur script. In addition, while mentioning Oghuz Khān and Gün Khān, the author {Beyâtî Shaikh Mahmûd} of the *Jām-i jam āyīn*, which was written in 886/1481–2, attributes the information on them to the *Oghuznāme* (p. 21). Furthermore, in {Yazıcı-oğlu ʿAlī's} translation of Ibn Bībī's *Saljūqnāme*, 'Alā' al-Dīn Kai-Qubād is described as "knowing well the *Oghuznāme* and other histories" (p. 217). In my view, all these statements

concern the general histories of the Oghuz, which started with the Oghuz legend, as I have stated in the note above, and not a genuine original *Oghuznāme* that was a collection of legends. I will mention one more conclusive piece of evidence to show that all the various kinds of Turk-Oghuz histories were called *oghuznāmes* and that *oghuznāme* was not the name of a single work as our recent historians imagine. The *Oghuznāme* in the possession of Jihānshāh considered the Ottoman rulers to be descendants of Gün Khān, but the *Jām-i jam āyīn*, which is also based on an *oghuznāme*, shows them to be of the dynasty of Gök Khān. This means that the "*Oghuznāme*" is not a single, specific work, but was a name commonly given to all Turk-Oghuz histories.

107 This author wrote an abridged general history in Arabic entitled *Durar al-tījān*, which included events up to 709/1309–10. It is arranged chronologically and mainly discusses events in Egypt and occasionally other related matters. It is dedicated to the famous {Mamlūk sultan} al-Malik al-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalāwūn. While describing the events of 628/1230–1, the author gives a long introduction on Chingiz Khān, part of which he cites as follows from the *Oghuznāme*: "I intend to mention here the first time this people {the Mongols} burst upon the scene and their origins. The noble *Sharī'a* cannot, however, approve of certain aspects of this subject. This information was taken from their book *Ūlū Khān Aṭā Bitigī*. The name of this book means Great King Father. This is a book with which the Mongols and Qipchaqs, who are descendants of the ancient Turks, are pleased and happy. This book is greatly revered by them, just as among the Oghuz Turks there is a book called the *Oghuznāme* that circulates from hand to hand. The origins of the Oghuz and all of their early rulers are mentioned in this book. The Turks are called Oghuz, for one of their great leaders was named Oghuz. In this book called the *Oghuznāme*, an account is given of a certain Depegöz (Tepegöz). This Tepegöz destroyed the countries of the early Turks and killed their great leaders. According to their tradition, he was an ugly and loathsome man. He had a single eye in his forehead. His mother was a sprite from the ocean. He was immune to sword and lance. His father's hat, which completely covered his head, was made of the hide of ten rams. The Oghuz have many famous tales about Tepegöz. These tales are still current. Wise men and sages among the Oghuz memorize these tales and recite them while playing their *kopuz*. Finally, the esteemed, famous, and powerful Basat son of Urus (Uruz), who grew up among the Turks, killed this Tepegöz. As to the reason for killing him, there was a girl who grew up among the Oghuz whom no one could surpass in marksmanship. This girl goaded Basat to kill Tepegöz. Basat's father also played a role; for when Basat overcame this girl, carried her off {i.e. married her} and brought the good news to his father, his father said, 'I thought that you had killed Tepegöz.' For these reasons, when Basat heard about Tepegöz he conceived many cunning plans, carried them out, and killed him. Such things occurred between Basat and Tepegöz that are impossible to believe. They are among the superstitions of the Turks. I wrote this introduction so that the readers of the book would understand that I know many things about the Turks" (Damad Ibrahim Paşa Library, MS 913). This Turkish writer, whose account of Tepegöz shows that he was familiar with the stories of Dede Korkut, has made one minor error in this matter. There is no girl in the story of Tepegöz. {See U. Haarmann, "Turkish Legends in the Popular Historiography of Medieval Egypt," *Proceedings of the VI Congress of Arabic and Islamic Studies . . . 1972* (Uppsala, 1975), pp. 97–107.}

Muallim Cevdet also mentions the notes on the *Oghuznāme* by the Egyptian writer Zakī Pasha, who cites a copy of this work in the Khedival Library in Cairo. I have cited these above in Chapter 1, p. 17, n.33. Let me also cite from Cevdet's article the author's account of how and where he saw the MS and his description of it: "The

other Turks also have a book, which is called the *Oghuznāme*. This work is the history of the first rulers of the Turks, the most famous of whom bore the name Oghuz. I am familiar with both books. My knowledge of them allows me to affirm that I have perfectly comprehended the history of the Turkish people and allows me to state that the stories that I will relate about this people can be regarded as very reliable. My father was the *amīr* of Sharqiyya province {in Egypt} in the year 709 {1309–10}. The capital of this province is Bilbays. One of my friends, Amīn al-Dīn Ḥamdī, brought me a manuscript after following a discussion with some *'ulama'* about the Tatars. He said that he had acquired this work from the late Amīn al-Dīn Bāysarī and that it was unique. Its paper was made in Baghdad and was of silk. It was written in the hand of a pupil of the famous ʿAlī b. Hilāl al-Bawwāb. Its text included gilded decorations. Its binding was very refined and woven of yellow silk, and it had a gold case. My friends al-Ḥammūyī, Jalāl al-Dīn Ibn Zaitūn, and Manṣūr al-ʿAbbās and I got together and studied this book. We read it together and I copied out the things that we were able to understand. We could not understand certain passages. The author wrote that his name was Jibrā'īl Ibn Bakhtūshūʿ, that he was a physician, and that after this book had originally been translated from Turkish into Persian he had translated it from Persian into Arabic in the year 211 {826–7}. This book came from the treasury of Abū Muslim Khurāsānī. In fact, the author claims that Abū Muslim was descended from Bakhtu Khān and claims that he inherited this book" (Muallim Cevdet, "Oğuz-nâme – Kitâb-ı Dede Korkut," in the special issue of *YM* commemorating Çanakkale {Gallipoli}, March 5, 1331, vol. 2, pp. 89–91). This Jibrā'īl Ibn Bakhtūshūʿ was from a Syriac {speaking} family of physicians who won great fame in the ʿAbbāsid period. Like his father and grandfather, he served as the chief physician of the ʿAbbāsids ({Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa, *'Uyūn al-anbā' fī*} *ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'* {Cairo, 1299/1882}, vol. 1, p. 127). Because Cevdet did not mention his source, we don't know the work from which Zakī Pasha took this information. Zakī Pasha also states, however, that the unique copy of the *Durar al-tījān* is in Istanbul {now ed. Gunhild Graf as *Die Epitome der Universalchronik Ibn ad-Dawadaris* (Berlin, 1990)}, and so it would probably be a mistake to believe that Cevdet cited this passage from a second copy of that work in Egypt (Aḥmad Zakī, *Mémoire sur les moyens propres à déterminer en Egypte une renaissance des lettres arabes* [Cairo, 1910], pp. 13–14) {this was indeed the source; see Ibn al-Dawādārī, *Kanz al-durar*, vol. 7, ed. Saʿīd ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ ʿĀshūr (Cairo, 1972), pp. 218–19}. If the *Kanz al-durar wa jāmiʿ al-ʿibar* {or *al-ghurar*}, which is an abridgement of the *Durar al-tījān* and of which volumes 1, 2, 4, and 5 are in the Ayasofya Library and volumes 3, 6, 8, and 9 are in the Topkapı Sarayı Library, were properly studied, the subject of early Turkish mythology would certainly be much better illuminated.

108 The collection of legends found under the name *Kitāb-ı Dede Korkut* is nothing other than the *Oghuznāme* that Abū Bakr Ibn {ʿAbd Allāh b.} Aybak al-Dawādārī saw. The edition published in Istanbul based on the unique copy in Dresden contains twelve separate legends, each of which is also called an *oghuznāme*. The first Ottoman historian to see this *Kitāb-ı Dede Korkut* was Rūḥī. The following narrative is cited from him in Müneccim-başı's *Jāmiʿ al-duwal*: *Kadîmü'z-zamânda Türkmen kabâili beyninde Korkut Ata nâm bir ehl-i hâl azîz vardı; birgün buyurdu ki saltanat âkıbet Oğuz-Han'ın vasiyyeti üzre Oğlu Kayı-Han evlâdına nakledip ilâ âhiri'z-zamân ber-devâm olur* {In olden times there was a saint named Korkut Ata among the Turkmen tribes. One day he said, "Sovereignty will eventually, according to the will and testament of Oghuz Khān, transfer to the descendants of his son Qāyı Khān and will last until the end of time" (*Jāmiʿ al-duwal*, {Turkish} trans., vol. 3, p. 267) {cf. Geoffry Lewis trans. *The Book of Dede Korkut*, p. 3; Orhan Gökyay, *Dedem Korkudun kitabı* (Istanbul, 1973), p. lxviii}. This tradition is taken almost verbatim from the *Kitāb-ı Dede Korkut*. Barthold has also

provided some brief information on this work, which first attracted the attention of H. O. Fleischer and then J. H. von Diez in Europe and was partially translated (see *EI*[1], s.v. "Ghuzz"). This valuable collection of legends, which, judging from the proper names in it, evidently belongs to the Turks living in the region of Azerbaijan, Bayburt, and Georgia, i.e. in the region of the Eastern Oghuz, which we call the "Azerī language area," needs a thorough linguistic and historical analysis. Some of these popular legends – such as the story of Bey Beyrek – which the *ozans* have sung for centuries accompanied by the *kopuz*, exist in other written versions. Others, such as that of Tepegöz, are still current orally among the people. Indeed, the figure of Dede Korkut is encountered among the Turkmen of Azerbaijan and in the Syr Darya region. This saint, who, according to one legend, went to Arabia to learn about Islam and, after meeting Abū Bakr, became a Muslim, is not a historical person as K. Inostrantsev believes {see Gökyay (ed.), p. IX}, but a completely legendary figure. In my view, the Ulug Turk in the Uighur Oghuz legend published by Radloff, the Irkıl Ata in Rashīd al-Dīn, and this Dede Korkut represent the same figure and clearly show the religio-artistic position of the *ozans* in early Turkish society. Finally, let me say that I have also encountered among Turks other than the Oghuz stories written in the same manner and style as those in the *Kitāb-ı Dede Korkut*, i.e. in the same kind of metrical prose {or free verse}.

109 Shaikh Süleyman Efendi gives the following information on the words *ozan* and *ozancı* in his *Lughat-i chaghatay ve türkî-yî ʿosmânî*: "*Ozan*: a song without meter in the *mânî* style that was sung in the story and epic of Qara Khān and Oghuz Khān. *Ozancı*: a man who plays the drum {*davul*} and tambourine {*def*} while singing an *ozan*, i.e. *mânî* and song." The definition in the Chaghatay-Persian lexicon of the Budapest Academy is as follows:

یکطور خوانند کی باشد درمیان اتراك، در نقل اوغوز خان وقراخان گویند

{A kind of singing among the Turks which is sung in the story of Oghuz Khān and Qara Khān.} The famous Pavet de Courteille somehow misunderstood this in his *Dictionnaire Turc-Oriental* and says "The invention of this was attributed to Oghuz Khān and Qara Khān," which is a mistake. This word, which is not found in Vambéry's *Čagataische Sprachstudien*, appears among the Yakut in the form of *oyun*, meaning "shaman." In any case, the definitions given by Süleyman Efendi show that *ozans* were well known for singing, above all, the epic of the Oghuz and that this epic was "a song without meter in the *mânî* style," which exactly characterizes the stories of Dede Korkut. {See İlhan Başgöz, "From Gosan to Ozan," *International Journal of Central Asian Studies*, 2 (1997), 5–13; on *mânî*, see *EI*[2], s.v. "Māni" (P. N. Boratav).}

110 A number of legends – coming from many different sources – that constitute the Bektashī tradition reveal this feature very clearly. Sarı Saltık, for example, was not an ordinary dervish, but a hero who conquered countries with a wooden sword and spread the faith.

111 The famous Geyikli Bābā, for example, mounted a gazelle in front of the army besieging Bursa and went into battle with a sword weighing 60 *okkas* {1 = 1.28 kg}. In like manner, Abdāl Murad carried out many heroic deeds with a wooden sword that was four *arşıns* (68 cm) in length. Hammer considers Geyikli Bābā to be the Saint George of the Ottomans, or to be the furious Roland {Orlando Furioso} who was the subject of so much heroic poetry in Western literature – a very good analogy. As a sign of respect, Süleyman the Magnificent cut off one-third of his sword and had it placed in the royal treasury (for accounts of this, see the first volume of Hammer's {*Geschichte des osmanischen Reichs*}; {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq*,

{Turkish} trans.; {Sa'd al-Dīn's} *Tāj al-tawārīkh*; 'Āshıq Pasha-Zāde's {*Tawārīkh-i āl-i 'uthmān*}; {İsmâ'îl Belig Bursalı's} *Güldeste-i riyâz-ı irfân*; 'Ālī's {*Kùnh al-akhbār*}; Neshrī's {*Kitâb-ı cihan-nümâ*}; Lāmi'ī's *Munāẕara-yi bahār-u shitā'*, and the special histories written about Bursa). {Cf. Heath Lowry, "The 'Sword of Roland' and the 'Sword of Abdal Murad': A Note on the History of Brusa (Bursa) in the Light of Six Centuries of Travellers' Accounts (1325–1925)," in Çiğdem Kafescioğlu and Lucienne Thys-Şenocak (eds), *Essays in Honour of Aptullah Kuran* (Istanbul, 1999), p. 241. Lowry finds Köprülü's remarks confusing, but Köprülu is not concerned with a particular sword or sword legend.}

8

THE LIFE OF YŪNUS EMRE

A Bektashī tradition

There is considerable information about Yūnus Emre in Bektashī tradition, which sought to present virtually every one of the early great Ṣūfīs who flourished in Anatolia as a disciple and follower of Ḥājjī Bektash. Consequently, before I provide historical information on the life of Yūnus Emre, it is useful to present his portrait in exactly the way it is given in Bektashī tradition. This tradition took shape in the ninth/fifteenth century – in a somewhat forced manner – and is, for the most part, highly contrary to historical reality because of the time in which it was established. Nevertheless, it is still possible to extract some historical information from it by subjecting it to serious and rigorous criticism.

According to this Bektashī tradition, when Ḥājjī Bektash arrived in the lands of Rūm {Anatolia}, among a number of great Ṣūfīs who were there, such as Sayyid Maḥmūd Ḥairānī, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, and Ḥājjī Ibrāhīm Sulṭān,[1] was a shaikh named Emre who "possessed great holiness."[2] Ḥājjī Bektash summoned all the *erens* of Anatolia. But this shaikh, for some reason, did not accept the invitation. The other *erens* of Anatolia informed Ḥājjī Bektash that he did not want to come. Ḥājjī Bektash then sent his dervish named Sarı Ismā'īl,[3] who had previously joined him along with Qaraja Aḥmad,[4] to Emre to summon him. He asked him the reason why he had not come previously. Emre said that a hand, appearing from behind a curtain, had granted him permission to enter the Ṣūfī path, and that he had never seen anyone called Ḥājjī Bektash at that banquet of *erens* that he had attended. When Ḥājjī Bektash asked whether that hand had a mark on it, he said that he saw a green mole on the palm. Ḥājjī Bektash immediately extended his hand. Emre was astonished to see the green mole on his palm, and when he realized that he was in the presence of the spiritual guide {*murshid*} who had previously given him his hand, in amazement he uttered three times, "*Tapduk padişahım*" {At your service my Padishah}![5] From that day forth, his name was Tapduk Emre.[6]

In one of the surrounding villages, there was a very poor man named Yūnus who earned his living as a farmhand. One year, there was a famine and Yūnus's poverty intensified. Finally, it occurred to him to go to Ḥājjī Bektash – having

heard of his many miracles and graces – and ask for help. He loaded some medlars on his ox and went to the *dargāh* {dervish convent [of Ḥājjī Bektash]}. Prostrating himself at the feet of the *pīr*, he gave him his gift and requested some wheat in exchange. Ḥājjī Bektash treated him with kindness and had him as a guest for several days in his *dargāh*. But Yūnus was anxious to return. When the dervishes told the *pīr* that Yūnus wished to leave, he sent word, saying "Does he want wheat or the miraculous influence {*himma*} of the *erens*?" The heedless Yūnus asked for the wheat. When Ḥājjī Bektash learned this, he again sent word, saying "If he wishes, let me blow on each medlar fruit." Yūnus continued to insist on the wheat. Ḥājjī Bektash sent word a third time, saying "If he wishes, let me exert my miraculous influence for each seed {in the medlar fruit}." When Yūnus again insisted on the wheat, he finally ordered that they give it to him.

Yūnus left the *dargāh* and set out for home. He had not gone far, however, before he realized that he had made a big mistake. Greatly regretting it, he immediately returned and admitted his blunder. Ḥājjī Bektash then told him that he had given Yūnus's "lock" to Tapduk Emre and, therefore, if he wished {to open it}, he should go to him. As soon as Yūnus heard this, he rushed to Tapduk's *dargāh* and told him what had happened. Tapduk appointed Yūnus to gather firewood for his *dargāh*. During the fully forty years in which this devoted dervish carried out this task, he was never seen to bring in a bent or damp piece of wood.

One day, after these many years, an assembly of *erens* was held. The woodcutter Yūnus was present with his shaikh. Also present was a very well known composer of hymns named Yūnus the Singer. In the assembly, Tapduk Emre entered a state of mystical ecstasy and addressed Yūnus the Singer, saying "I am filled with love. Come, sing a little!" He tried several times, but no sound emerged from his lips. Finally, Tapduk Emre turned to the woodcutter Yūnus and said "Well, the time has come. Your lock has been opened. The words of Ḥājjī Bektash have been fulfilled. Don't stand there! Sing!" At this, the veil was removed from Yūnus and the lock was opened and he immediately began to compose skillful and eloquent orations and hymns.[7]

B His life

If we put aside the legend and examine the life and personality of Yūnus Emre from a strictly historical and positivist point of view, we will be confronted with a number of major problems that, to some degree, are impossible to solve, because the information on him provided by the earliest historical sources is often inadequate or contradictory, and even mixed somewhat with legends. There are, to be sure, several hints and clues to the life of Yūnus Emre in his own works, but as will become quite clear from the following chapter on his *Dīwān*, they too must be used with great caution. Faced with these meager and conflicting materials, we must admit right away that the information that we will give on his life cannot be regarded as positively established.

Yūnus Emre – or, as he is usually called in his poetry, Qul Yūnus, ʿĀshıq Yūnus, or Yūnus Emrem[8] – was a simple dervish who lived in the second half of the seventh/thirteenth century and the beginning of the eighth/fourteenth century. Some biographical works place his death date as late as 843/1439–40, as expressed by the chronogram *gulshan-i tawḥīd* {actually amounts to 828}, but neither this claim nor the attempt by Tashköprü-Zāde to show that he was a shaikh during the reign of Bayezid I {791–804/1389–1402} is correct.[9] Some recent scholars, like Melioransky, hold such opinions, but even in light of the inadequate documents that we possess today, they can very easily be rejected.[10]

First of all, the Bektashī tradition is very strong evidence on this point. If Yūnus Emre died in 843/1439–40, as was claimed, or if he lived into the early years of Bayezid I, the Bektashī tradition, which is virtually confined to the Ṣūfīs belonging to the second half of the seventh/thirteenth century and the early years of the eighth/fourteenth century, could not have appropriated him. In order to include him in the Bektashī tradition, which was certainly established by the end of the eighth/fourteenth century or the beginning of the ninth/fifteenth century, it would have been necessary for Yūnus Emre to have lived at a much earlier time and for his historical character to have subsequently been more or less forgotten.[11]

Second, ʿAshıq Pasha-Zāde, who provides fairly accurate and reliable information on the shaikhs and religious scholars of these early periods, such as Ḥājjī Bektash, considers Yūnus Emre to have been contemporary with such Ṣūfīs as ʿĀshıq Pasha, Akhī Ören {Evren}, Qaraja Aḥmad, and Geyikli Bābā, and writes that they were among the leading personalities of the reign of Orhan {*c.*724–61/1324–60} and that some of them reached as far as the time of Murad I {761–91/1360–89}.[12] It is more reasonable that Yūnus Emre, who was considered to be a contemporary of ʿĀshıq Pasha, lived in the second half of the seventh/thirteenth century than that he died in 843/1439–40.

Third, the fact that several of ʿAshıq Pasha's poems are listed in {Hacı Kemal's} *Jāmiʿ al-naẓā'ir* as imitations {*naẓā'ir*} of those of Yūnus Emre, shows that Yūnus lived some time before him.[13]

Fourth, a foreigner named Mühlbacher who was taken prisoner by the Turks in 841 or 842/1438 and later, after spending about twenty years in Edirne, Bergama, Bursa, and Chios {incorrectly given as Cyprus in the 1st edn}, returned to his country, copied down two of Yūnus's hymns in Gothic letters and translated them into Latin. If Yūnus Emre belonged, in fact, to the eighth/fourteenth or ninth/fifteenth centuries, it would have been impossible for his poems to have been so widespread at that time. It would appear, therefore, that Yūnus Emre lived only into the early years of the eighth/fourteenth century and that his hymns had spread throughout Anatolia and Rumelia by the time of Mühlbacher's captivity.[14] In light of this historical evidence, the view put forward by Melioransky – that Yūnus Emre lived at a later time than we suppose – can hardly be defended.[15]

Yūnus Emre was a Turkmen peasant who lived in the second half of the seventh/thirteenth century in a village close to Sivrihisar, or one of the villages

dependent on Bolu, near the Sakarya River.[16] It is apparent from the literary works in his *Dīwān* that he tried for a long time to set out on the mystic path, but he was unsuccessful in achieving this goal until he became a disciple of Tapduk Emre.[17] It is also clear from Bektashī tradition that this man, whom ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde mistakenly presents as eminent during the reign of Sultan Orhan, and whom Tashköprü-Zāde presents as eminent during the reign of Bayezid I, was one of many well known shaikhs who filled Anatolia in the seventh/thirteenth century; he lived a solitary life in a village near the Sakarya River.[18] The legendary reports according to which he was a blind shaikh belonging to the Qādirī *ṭarīqa* are not based on any historical evidence.[19] The information that I have given {above} on Ṣūfī life in Anatolia at that time renders it likely that Tapduk Emre belonged not to the Qādirī but rather to the Bābāʾī *ṭarīqa*; and the fact that there are a number of features that would not be welcomed by the *Sharīʿa*-minded in Yūnus's belief system also supports this conclusion. And while, as I will show at length in the next chapter, it would not be correct to consider Yūnus's Ṣūfī personality to have been formed solely under the influence of Tapduk Emre, it would be equally incorrect to believe that he completely escaped his influence. When the personality of Yūnus Emre is studied in the context of the Ṣūfī movements in seventh/thirteenth-century Anatolia, the spiritual figure of Tapduk Emre also becomes more or less clear. There is a tradition that has long existed among the Anatolian dervishes according to which Tapduk Emre received spiritual instruction from a certain Sinān Efendi, or Sinān Ata, a Central Asian Turkish shaikh who went to Anatolia from Bukhārā following the Mongol invasion. This tradition goes far to explain the influence of Aḥmad Yasawī on Yūnus Emre.[20]

Tapduk Emre, who, according to the translator of {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqāʾiq, Müddet-i ömründe halk âleminden uzlet ve intıkâʿ üzre olup silâh-ı salâh ile habl-i alâkayı katʿetmi ve şîme-i kerîme-i aktâb üzre seccâde-i irşâda cülûs eyleyib, kerâmât-ı âliye izhâr eylemiş* {spent his life in isolation and cut off from the world, severed the cord of worldly ties with the sword of righteousness, sat on the carpet of spiritual learning with the chief saints of the noble qualities, and performed sublime miracles}, was a famous Ṣūfī who acquired enormous spiritual influence throughout the Sakarya region. It was especially during that confused period, which corresponds with the decline of the Seljuks, that the influence of the Ṣūfīs over the people increased markedly. Yūnus Emre also succumbed to this widespread spiritual state and followed Tapduk Emre's path of religious instruction. Yūnus spent a lengthy period practicing austerities. In order to complete his religious training, he labored for years with an enthusiasm unique to the dervishes. Summer and winter, he carried wood to the *dargāh* from the Sakarya forests. His being thus occupied collecting wood in the mountains naturally led to the creation and spread of many stories about him among the people. These legends have even come down to our time. One day, according to tradition, Tapduk Emre looked at the wood that Yūnus had brought and noticed that it was all straight and dry. "Is there no bent wood left in the mountains?" he asked, feigning ignorance.

"There is a lot of crooked wood in the mountains," Yūnus replied, "but at your gate it is not proper for anything to be bent, even the wood."[21] In any case, among the adherents of the *ṭarīqa*, Yūnus was known for centuries as the model of a dervish who was able to reach the highest levels of spirituality by showing absolute devotion to his spiritual guide. We frequently find passages in his *Dīwān* that show his deep and very sincere affection for, and devotion to, Tapduk Emre.[22]

All the stages of Yūnus's life after his association with Tapduk Emre are shrouded in darkness. According to legend, he completed his religious training after serving his shaikh for a full forty years – because it was not possible to do this in less than forty years[23] – and reached the level of enlightenment. At that point, he began to write his hymns. Another legend relates that, on the order of his shaikh, he wandered from country to country for forty years and only then reached the stage of enlightenment.[24] Whatever the case, some of the poems in his *Dīwān* indicate that both Mawlānā and his shaikh Emre Sulṭān died before he did,[25] and that he went to Damascus for a while on the order of his spiritual guide, stopped in ʿAyntāb en route, and delivered a number of orations there.[26] Indeed, there are even some poems in his *Dīwān* that imply that he went to Mecca to visit the Kaʿba {i.e. make the pilgrimage}.[27]

It appears, therefore, that ʿĀshıq Yūnus labored for years in his shaikh's *tekke*; after he obtained spiritual maturity and after legends of his miraculous deeds spread among the people, he departed from there – with Tapduk's permission, naturally; he visited various countries and then became chief of a dervish order {*sajjāda-nishīn*} – in all likelihood in a place different from that of his shaikh. One poem in his *Dīwān* alludes to his leaving Tapduk's *dargāh* and going to other countries,[28] while another poem states that "dervishes came to him from the country of his shaikh."[29] It is evident from all this that Yūnus Emre was his shaikh's most renowned *khalīfa* and that after his shaikh's death his dervishes flocked around Yūnus. Thus, Yūnus Emre, about whom legends spread throughout Anatolia during his lifetime, lived a rather long time and, after writing many hymns and orations and seeing them spread among the people, died some time after 707/1307.[30] Given the documents in our possession, it is, unfortunately, not possible to determine precisely the date of his death.

C Yūnus Emre's illiteracy

Based on all the documents currently in our possession, we must consider Yūnus Emre to have been an illiterate dervish. The translator of {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq* states, *Ẓâhir-i hâlde okumağa dili varmayıb, hâme gibi hurûf-ı teheccînin edâsında kâsır olduğu* {his tongue could not read in a clear fashion and, like a reed pen, he lacked the ability to pronounce the letters of the alphabet}. And ʿĀshıq Chelebi alleges that *Okumak kasdettiği hâlde, hurûf-ı teheccîyi ikmâle dili dönmediği* {he tried to read, but his tongue did not properly pronounce the letters of the alphabet}.[31] E. J. W. Gibb, who was unable to add any more to this and reports it verbatim, also concluded that he was illiterate, but Melioransky disagreed and claimed that

Yūnus certainly knew how to read and write.[32] This issue cannot be resolved until proper research is done on similar phenomena in the history of Ṣūfism and on the meaning and nature of illiteracy according to the Ṣūfīs.

In the view of the Ṣūfīs, knowledge was divided into two kinds: exoteric knowledge, or the knowledge of the *Sharī'a*, and esoteric knowledge, or knowledge of truth. The Ṣūfīs referred to the latter with the special term *'irfān* {spiritual knowledge}. The first kind, i.e. primary knowledge, is mediated by the senses or the intellect and can be transmitted. The source of spiritual knowledge, on the other hand, is divine inspiration {*ilhām*}. The *madrasas* were the centers of exoteric knowledge or the knowledge of canonical law, while the *tekkes* were the centers of spiritual knowledge, which was obtained from spiritual guides {s. *murshid*} through divine inspiration. This is why the people of the *Sharī'a* were called "the people of words" {*ahl-i qāl*}, while the people of true knowledge {*ahl-i ḥaqīqa*} were called "the people of mystical states" {*ahl-i ḥāl*}.[33] Just as anyone could be a legal scholar or physician without being *ahl-i 'irfān*, i.e. possessor of mystical ecstasy, so anyone, despite inability to read and write, could become *'ārif bi'llāh* – a knower of God, a mystic. Although some Ṣūfīs among the religious scholars tried to show that exoteric knowledge was a necessary basic foundation for esoteric knowledge,[34] still all the great Ṣūfīs unceasingly opposed the *ahl-i qāl*.[35] Indeed, if one were to study the history of Ṣūfism, one would find many great Ṣūfīs who were famous for being "illiterate," yet had spiritual knowledge. The countless examples of this phenomenon suffice to prove that Yūnus Emre was by no means exceptional in this respect.[36]

In one of his poems, Yūnus Emre speaks boastfully of his illiteracy, saying *Yûnus Emrem öldü fakîr / Ecel öfkesini* {*ensesini* in 1st edn} *dokur / Gönül kitabından okur / Eline kalem almadı* {My Yūnus Emre died a dervish / Death struck him on the neck / He read from the book of the heart / He did not take pen in hand; this *ghazal* is not in the standard editions by Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre: Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân* (Istanbul, 1965) and Faruk Timurtaş, *Yûnus Emre Divanı*, 3rd edn (Ankara, 1986)}. And in one of his hymns, he reveals the pride he felt in being illiterate as opposed to the *ahl-i qāl*, saying *Erenlerin sohbeti artırır ma'rifeti / Câhilleri sohbetten her dem süresim gelür* {Company with the *erens* increases knowledge / I would like to drive away the ignorant ones from the company}. But was Yūnus Emre in fact such an illiterate dervish that "he could not pronounce the letters of the alphabet"? Did he not know how to read and write at all? We cannot accept at face value Yūnus Emre's confession that he did not take pen in hand, or the reports in the early sources on this matter. It may have been possible for a completely illiterate dervish to write short hymns, but not a long *mathnawī* of almost 500 couplets, such as the one at the beginning of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān*.

Still, even though his claim that he could not pronounce the letters of the alphabet may be an exaggeration, it would also be going too far to regard this simple dervish as a man who was fully literate and who had a *madrasa* education. As I will explain in the next chapter, there are very clear indications in his work that he knew well the legends of the prophets and saints, old Iranian mythology,

even the general concepts of the religious knowledge {*'ilm*} of his day. Yūnus Emre was not one who delved deeply into Arabic or Persian literature or into the *madrasa* sciences. He had neither the Persian eloquence of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī nor the profound knowledge of 'Āshıq Pasha. Nevertheless, although this very simple Turkish dervish, who said *Mescid ve medresede çok çok tâ'at kılmışam / Aşk od'una yanuben andan ben kâl'e geldim* {I performed a great many acts of piety in the mosque and *madrasa* / I was burned in the fire of love and then I came to speech}, did not have a firm knowledge of the rules of Persian literary style, he surely knew Persian literature sufficiently to enjoy Mawlānā's poems. Otherwise, the strong and clear influence of Mawlānā on his work would not be so obvious.

This man, who grasped the Ṣūfī philosophy that was prevalent in Anatolia in his time with a spiritual facility in no way inferior to that of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī and who succeeded in expressing it in the simplest terms with unmatched power, certainly did not "lack the ability to pronounce the letters of the alphabet." In order to raise the level of his spirituality to a higher plain, the translator of {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq* and 'Âshıq Chelebi related this report {of his illiteracy}, which arose from the popular imagination, with full sincerity and conviction, because if this were the case then his poetry could be considered to derive from an altogether divine source.[37]

D His burial place and tomb

There is also considerable confusion about the burial place of Yūnus Emre, whose place and date of death are unknown. In Muslim countries, even prominent figures whose burial places are well known may have various grave sites or tombs – and not just persons like Yūnus Emre whose place of death is uncertain. People everywhere wanted important Ṣūfīs {to be buried} in their own region so that they could benefit from their spirituality and holiness. In the East, therefore, there have been many disputes over such sites. The following are the major burial places and tombs in Anatolia said to belong to Yūnus Emre.

1. In Bursa, in the *dargāh* of 'Abd al-Razzāq of the Sa'dī *ṭarīqa* in the Şibli Quarter between {the districts of} Chelebi Sultan Mehmet and Emir Sultan, there are three tombs in the names of Yūnus Emre, 'Āshıq Yūnus, and 'Abd al-Razzāq, along with an inscription. Shaikh Aḥmad 'Izzī-Zāde Sayyid 'Abd al-Laṭīf briefly mentions this tomb {of Yūnus Emre} in his work *Khulāṣat al-wafayāt*,[38] and Rızâ Tevfik, who visited it, also gives some details about it.[39] According to tradition, this burial place was originally determined by Muḥammad Niyāzī Miṣrī based on a spiritual revelation. There are many reasons why it cannot be accepted as Yūnus Emre's true burial place. First, various authors, such as Evliyā Chelebi, İsmâ'îl Belig, and Lāmi'ī Chelebi, who, before Niyāzī, discuss those buried in Bursa and the *türbes* found there, say nothing of such a *türbe*. Furthermore, not only is it likely that Yūnus Emre died before the conquest of Bursa, but there is also absolutely no record of his being present at the conquest of that city or

visiting it afterward. In fact, we know quite well the early Ṣūfīs who lived in Bursa during the years following its conquest. If a renowned Ṣūfī like Yūnus Emre had lived and died there, the authors whom I have mentioned, as well as the older historians, would surely have recorded this fact. In addition, there is a report that Yūnus Emre had a *khalīfa* named ʿĀshıq Yūnus. But this is a dubious tradition of no historical value, because there is no mention of it in the older historical sources and because it spread among the people at most a century ago.[40]

2. In the province of Manisa, in a village named Emre, composed of seventy houses lying between the districts of Kula and Sâlihli {i.e. the village of Yūnus Emre about twenty kilometers west of the town of Kula}, there is a stone *türbe*. Inside are the graves of Tapduk Emre, his children and grandchildren, and, in front of the threshold, the grave of ʿĀshıq Yūnus {see photographs, p. 276}. There are no inscriptions on the graves; there is only a small ax carved on the grave of ʿĀshıq Yūnus.[41] Mehmed Tâhir, who visited this site, says that this particular gravestone is at most fifty or sixty years old. In my view, an ax is a symbol related to the famous legend about the firewood that I mentioned above. According to a tradition widespread among the villagers, Yūnus, who showed great reverence for his shaikh, specifically willed that he be buried at the threshold to his tomb, so that those who visited the shaikh would have to tread upon and step over his own grave. The fact is, it cannot be claimed by any means that this burial place belongs to Yūnus Emre's shaikh or to Yūnus Emre.

3. An hour and a half from Erzurum, at the foot of the Palandöken Mountains, is the village of Dutcu, which overlooks the Erzurum plain from the east. In this village is the *türbe* of Tapduk Emre and Yūnus Emre. It is protected by a wall and furnished with a thick wooden railing. The village and the lands around it were established as a pious foundation for the *dargāh* of ʿAlī Bābā. After prayers, the villagers of Dutcu always dedicate a *Fātiḥa* to the spirit of Yūnus Emre and in summer many people come from Erzurum to visit his tomb and recite the hymn *Yemen illerinde Veyse'l-Karanî*.[42] However, we have no historical evidence that Yūnus Emre went to, or settled in, that region. And because we know that Tapduk Emre lived as a hermit in the Sakarya region, it is impossible to consider this grave to be Yūnus Emre's true burial place.

4. According to a report {told by} İsmâʿîl Hakkı {d. 1137/1725}, the graves of Yūnus Emre, his shaikh Tapduk Emre, and his shaikh Sinān Efendi are under a dome *Kiçiborlu kasabası kurbündeki gadîr-i ʿazîmin cânib-i şarkîsinde olan puşte tarafında bir karyede* {in a village by a hill east of a large pond near the town of Kiçiborlu}.[43] This report, which is not found in any other historical source, is not worthy of any credence. We possess no historical evidence to corroborate it.

5. It therefore remains to prefer and accept the fifth and last possibility, namely the report in Lāmiʿī Chelebi's translation of {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt* and its supplement {*Dhail*} that Yūnus Emre is buried at the confluence of the Porsuksuyu and the Sakarya. While this report has not been positively proven, it certainly seems more plausible than the others.[44] However, when we recall that

Figure 3 One of the reputed burial sites of Yūnus Emre, east of İzmir in the province of Manisa, Turkey. Yūnus's grave is in the foreground. Tapduk Emre and relatives are inside. (Photo courtesy of Berrin Dirim.)

Figure 4 The cenotaph of Tapduk Emre in the tomb next to the grave of Yūnus Emre. (Photo courtesy of Berrin Dirim.)

Yūnus Emre established a *zāwiya* in a different place from his shaikh's residence, this strengthens the likelihood that Tapduk Emre is buried in the place specified by Lāmi'ī and that Yūnus Emre was buried in the place mentioned by Shaikh İsmâ'îl Hakkı. The intimacy between shaikh and disciple surely prevented the separation of the two in the popular imagination, so that one could not help but believe they were buried in the same place. In any case, the many graves of Yūnus Emre scattered about the vast area of Anatolia are very significant indications of the sanctity ascribed to him by the people. Mehmed Tâhir also states, in addition to the above, that Yūnus has another burial place in Karaman, but he gives no details about it.[45]

E His fame

After Yūnus Emre's death, he was not quickly forgotten, as were other popular Ṣūfīs who were his contemporaries or predecessors. To the contrary, his fame spread throughout Anatolia and Rumelia and lived on for centuries among people of all classes. From this point of view, we can certainly regard him as a representative of the Turkish genius. In the last chapter, I will explain how this great folk poet created a new type of literature, or, more accurately, how he combined an old type with his own personality and gave it new life. Therefore, instead of going into literary details here, I would like to prepare the ground for an internal and literary analysis of his work by showing – to the extent that the few documents in our possession allow – how Yūnus Emre was viewed by people of different classes after his death. For this purpose, let me first examine the extent of his fame among the Ṣūfīs, then his fame among the popular masses who were directly influenced by these Ṣūfīs, and finally the views of him held by the classic {Turkish} poets who imitated Persian models.

By the beginning of the eighth/fourteenth century, Yūnus Emre had already acquired many important and respected followers, such as 'Āshıq Pasha and Qayghusuz Bābā. His fame continued unabated among the Ṣūfīs in the ninth/fifteenth century. I have described above, citing the *Velāyetnāme*, the important place that was given to him in the Bektashī tradition, which had been fixed in that century. We also find Yūnus Emre mentioned among the great Bektashīs in the *Khaḍirnāme*, which records and confirms the same tradition.[46] Beginning with histories like that of 'Āshıq Pasha-Zāde {d. after 889/1484}, which started to be written in the tenth/sixteenth century, and then in {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq*, {Sa'd al-Dīn's} *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, the translation of {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt*, {'Ālī's} *Kunh al-akhbār*, and later histories and biographical dictionaries, Yūnus is always described as a great Ṣūfī. Indeed, even Tashköprü-Zāde could not refrain from mentioning the famous legend about the firewood, which passed into Bektashī tradition.

This evidence, however, no matter what its value, cannot be considered as important as the views advanced by genuine Ṣūfīs. For example, there is a curious report in {Hüdā'ī's} *Wāqi'āt Uftāda* that shows what great importance

Yūnus Emre had among the Ṣūfīs of the tenth/sixteenth century. Supposedly, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī confirmed the high rank {of spirituality} that he had reached by saying, "Whatever levels of spirituality I advanced to, this Turkman elder, Yūnus, preceeded me."[47] This legend cannot, of course, be accepted from a historical point of view, but it is nevertheless quite significant. On the other hand, according to this source, the ascetic and devout man Shaikh Uftāda, while influenced by Ibn al-ʿArabī, was generally hostile to Yūnus's broad-minded and free-thinking views.[48] The famous Olanlar Shaikhi Ibrāhīm Efendi, the author of the *Dil-i Dânâ* {MS in Köprülü's private library}, who died in 1066/1655–6, was an admirer of Yūnus Emre and he used to say *Lisân-ı kadîm üzre maʿnâ icrâ eylemiş er, Yûnus Emre Hazretleri'dir* {The man (or, saint) who expressed spiritual meaning in the old language was his excellency Yūnus Emre}.[49] Similarly, the famous Muḥammad Niyāzī Miṣrī, the founder of the Miṣrī branch of the Khalwatiyya *ṭarīqa* who died in 1105/1694, honored and glorified Yūnus Emre in some of his poems.[50] He also wrote a commentary on his famous hymn that begins with the verse *Çıktım erik dalına anda yedim üzümü / Bostan ısı kakıyub der ne yersin kozumu* {I climbed up a plum branch and there ate grapes / The owner of the garden became angry and said "Why are you eating my walnuts?"}.[51] İsmâʿîl Hakkı of Bursa, a Ṣūfī writer who appeared after Niyāzī, also cited and commented on several of Yūnus Emre's couplets in his commentary on the *Muḥammadiyya* {of Yazıcı-oğlu Mehmed} and had much praise for him.[52] And in a separate work, following Niyāzī, he wrote a detailed commentary on Yūnus Emre's {aforementioned} hymn.[53] All of this material shows that Yūnus Emre acquired great fame among the Ṣūfīs beginning in the eighth/fourteenth century and that, rather than being forgotten, he was glorified and admired more ardently in each succeeding period.

Yūnus Emre's great renown among the Ṣūfīs also explains how it is that the fame he acquired among the popular masses – who were, for the most part, directly under the influence of the Ṣūfīs – flourished unabatedly since the eighth/fourteenth century. Indeed, the presence of his shrines in various places in Anatolia and the proliferation of legends about him over the centuries fully support this contention. We can clearly see the extent of the influence of Yūnus Emre's hymns on the people by leafing through the old collections of folk poetry (*cönk* {see n.54}). We invariably find Yūnus's poems in all these miscellanies, which span various periods and belong to people of different cultural levels.[54] Just as the testimony of the captive Mühlbacher in the ninth/fifteenth century shows that the hymns of Yūnus Emre were already popular during his time, {Hacı Kemal's} *Jāmiʿ al-nazā'ir*, which belongs to the early years of the tenth/sixteenth century, indicates the importance of these works in the following century. The works of Yūnus Emre, which we can regard as a native production with respect to incorporating artistic elements that appealed to the Turkish national taste, not only had a great influence on the Bektashīs, because they adumbrate a broad-minded and free-thinking Ṣūfī philosophy, but were also deemed significant among the Qızılbash Turkmen from an early date. One of Khaṭā'ī's {i.e. the Safavid Shāh

Ismāʿīl I, 907–30/1501–24} poems clearly reveals Yūnus's spiritual influence on these simple Turkmen already at that time.[55]

The Persian-imitating poets, seeing that Yūnus's hymns written in the syllabic meter were read with great pleasure among the people, feigned indifference to his work, or belittled it, or showed their spite by considering it to be outside the sphere of poetry. Some of those who wrote biographical dictionaries of poets, and whom we can call our first literary historians, such as Sehî Bey {d. 955/1548–49, see *EI²*, s.v. "Sehī Bey" (G. A. Tekin)} and Laṭīfî {d. 990/1582, see *EI²*, s.v. "Laṭīfī" (M. Çetin)}, did not find it necessary to mention Yūnus Emre, although they discussed many other shaikhs and Ṣūfīs who wrote in the *ʿarūḍ* meter. ʿĀshıq Chelebi did devote seven or eight lines to him, following Tashköprü-Zāde, but could not refrain from considering his work to be Ṣūfî hymns rather than poetry. Because an ancient classification made a sharp distinction between the poet and the *ʿāshıq*, i.e. between the artist who was preoccupied with non-religious subjects and the one who took his inspiration from religion and mysticism,[56] the fact that Yūnus was known by the Ṣūfīs as a great *ʿāshıq* was a highly respected view. But this notion, in the biased view of the Persian-imitating poets, was somewhat belittling, and many of the biographers would not even describe him as a Ṣūfî. These points suffice to show that the early poets did not have a very good opinion of him. The author of the *Dih-murghnāme*, even though he was a poet whose work is full of Ṣūfî ideas, could not use respectful language with regard to Yūnus Emre.[57] Similary, Vehbî spoke of his hymns with downright ridicule and scorn.[58] Yet even this attitude, expressed in various periods, is significant historically as pointing to Yūnus's unshakable fame among the people.

Thus, despite the inadequate documentation in our possession, it is clear that Yūnus Emre exercised enormous influence for centuries over the Turks in Anatolia, Rumelia, and even Azerbaijan; and his fame has survived up to the present, overcoming all the vicissitudes of his time. This influence, whose causes and consequences I will try to explicate in the last chapter, was not confined to just one period, one milieu, or a certain class, but was propagated from the highest intellectual and cultural level down to the lowest and, therefore, we must recognize Yūnus Emre – after Aḥmad Yasawī – as the most renowned poet to appear among the countless Turkish poets who flourished over the centuries and the one whose work has been the most enduring. The influence of Yūnus Emre on the Anatolia Turks and their mystical folk literature was of the same nature and extent as that of Aḥmad Yasawī on the Eastern Turks. In the following pages, I will also show the relationship and similarities between the two. The cry of *Yemen illerinde Veyse'l-Karanî*, which is raised most evenings in the poor and almost deserted streets of Istanbul and Anatolia in a lonesome and melancholy strain, and the simple and beautiful hymns that issue from the large, broken, iron-grilled windows of the neighborhood schools, and are always recited with special melodies in the *mevlid* assemblies {generally in a mosque or a private home} and in the *tekkes*, show that Yūnus Emre is still very much alive among

the people and that he still dominates the popular spirit. Our biographers, who considered art to consist of imitation and artificiality, did not appreciate the importance of this popular Ṣūfī poet because he wrote according to the popular taste in the folk meters and language. But, in fact, he is a most worthy figure of study in our literature. A man whose work is still recited, after six centuries, among all classes of people and in all parts of the country with passion and enthusiasm must surely be considered a rare representative of the national taste.[59]

NOTES

1 I have provided some information above on the nature of the Bektashī tradition, on the period of its formation, and on its firm establishment (Chapter 4, pp. 102–5). The Bektashīs tried to increase the prestige of this tradition by mixing historical personalities, such as Sayyid Maḥmūd Ḥairānī, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, and Ḥājjī Ibrāhīm Sulṭān, who had won fame in Anatolia in the seventh/thirteenth century, into their own legends. Not only are legends about these figures found in the *velāyetnāmes*, they are also mentioned in a long poem entitled *Khaḍirnāme* that {the Bektashī saint} Muḥyī 'l-Dīn wrote in 880/1475–6 {MS in Köprülü's private library}. The *waqf* document of Sayyid Maḥmūd Ḥairānī, which was drawn up in 655/1257–8, and that of Ḥājjī Ibrāhīm Sulṭān, which was drawn up in 665/1266–7, have survived to the present and are still in force. Consequently, the historical nature of these personalities and their time is fairly well known. Here I only want to point out, in particular, that those Ṣūfīs who were genuine historical figures and were mentioned as having a relationship with Ḥājjī Bektash lived in either the seventh/thirteenth or early eighth/fourteenth century.

2 Unfortunately, the linguistic research that has been done to date on the word *emre* has not yielded anything very definite. Let me simply describe the various theories that have been proposed on this matter and indicate the one that I support. Hammer read this word as a variant of *imre* in his famous *Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst* {*bis auf unsere Zeit* (Pest, 1836–8)} and wanted to equate it with the same word in Hungarian meaning *'āshuq*. He indicates this by translating it into German as *emmerich*. Necib Âsım says that this word, which was used in the form *amrak*, *emre* in Turkish and *imre* in Hungarian, means *'āshuq*. Rızâ Tevfik also simply accepts Hammer's theory, saying "There is no doubt that *imre* means *'āshuq*, that is, 'poet'; other meanings are random conjectures that can be easily rejected," ({Yûnus Emre hakkında biraz daha tafsilât,"} *Büyük Duygu*, nos 10–13, {1 (1331/1913),} p. 178). However, as Karl Foy has quite rightly objected, this is a very whimsical explanation that is based on no evidence whatsoever ("Die ältesten osmanischen Transscriptionstexte in gothischen Lettern," p. 237). Indeed, as Foy also very correctly writes, the forms *emre* or *emrem* are found in all the early texts having vowel marks, but the form *imre* is not. J. H. Mordtmann agrees with this and gives the following noteworthy information on this subject: "The exact meaning of the word *emre* is not known. The former owner of the copy of T. Bianchi's dictionary {*Dictionnaire Turc-Français* (1835; reprinted Paris, 1871)} that is in my possession records next to this word that it meant 'brother' in old Turkish, but he does not give an example. I can give one, however. In the introduction to the *ferman* {edict} given to Ghāzī Evrenos Bey, and published by Diez {'Murat I, Sultan of the Turks. Abschrift [und Text] der Stiftungs- und Statthalterschafts-Urkunde . . . ,' *Denkwürdigkeiten von Asien*, 2 (1815), 101–32}, the word occurs in the meaning of 'brother,'" ({"Türkisches zu Foy's 'älteste osmanische Transscriptionstexte,' " *Berlin Universität, Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, Mitteilungen, Westasiatische Studien*, 5 (1902),}

p. 168). Mordtmann goes on to say that this word was written in different ways – such as *emrem*, *emirem*, *emir*, *emre* – in various copies of this *ferman*. It is found, in fact, as *emre* in the copy of this *ferman* in Ferîdûn Bey's *Münşeat* (*Münşeat-ı selâtîn* {Istanbul, 1274/1857–8}, vol. 1, p. 87); as *emir* in a manuscript copy that appears to have been written in the eleventh/seventeenth century and is in my private library; and as *emrem* in a *berat* {sultanic diploma, letter-patent} in the Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin {now the Staatsbibliothek} and published by F. Kräelitz ({"İlk osmanlı padişahlarının ısdar etmiş oldukları bazı beratlar,"} *TOEM*, no. 28 {1330/1912}, p. 246). In a footnote, Kräelitz states that this word is a mistake for *emirem*, but this is a strictly subjective interpretation. If we refer to the opinions of the early writers on this matter, we find that the author {Mehmed b. Ahmed Nişânci-Zâde} of *Mir'āt al-kā'ināt* {MS 2420 in the Nuruosmaniye Library in Istanbul} says that the word *emre* means "eldest brother," thus supporting Mordtmann's opinion. In my view, the opinion of Shaikh Ismā'īl Ḥaqqī Bursawī {Bursalı Shaikh İsmâ'îl Hakkı, d. 1137/1725, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ismā'īl Ḥakḳī" (Günay Kut)} is perhaps closest to the truth. He says, *Emre zâhir budur ki Türkî'de elkâb-ı medihdendir. Etrâk arasında Atabeg ve Rûmiyân meyânında lala ve emsâli gibi* {Evidently *emre* is an honorific title in Turkish, similar to *atabeg* among the Turks and to *lala* and the like among the Ottomans} (*Şerh-i Rumûzât-ı Yûnus Emre*, copy in my private library). This explanation of the word *emre* shows rather clearly that the word *emrem* in the *berat* {in this case granted by Bayezid I (1389–1402)} of Evrenos (Evren-uz) {this etymology is dubious; see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ewrenos" (Irène Mélikoff)} Bey, was used instead of *atabeg-i devlet* {"father *bey* of state," minister} and indeed meant "elder brother." We know that in addition to titles like *ata* and *bābā* for Turkish shaikhs, the word *akhī* was especially used at that time in the meaning "brother." It is very likely that the words *emre* and *emrem* were the Turkish equivalents of the titles *akh* and *akhī*. Despite all my research to date, I have found no additional information to shed light on this subject, in either the major contemporary linguistic sources, such as {Abū Ḥayyān al-Gharnāṭī's} *Kitāb al-idrāk li-lisān al-atrāk* {712/1313}, {the anonymous} *Tarjumān-i turkī wa 'arabī* {743/1343, ed. Houtsma as *Ein türkisch-arabisches Glossar*}, and {the anonymous} *al-Tuḥfa al-zakiyya fī 'l-lugha al-turkiyya* {eighth/fourteenth century, ed. T. Halasi-Kun as *La Langue des Kĭptchaks* (Budapest, 1942),} or in {al-Kāshgarī's} *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* {begun in 464/1072 and completed in 469/1077}. If the seventh/thirteenth- and eighth/fourteenth-century works from Anatolia that are in our possession were subjected to lengthy and detailed linguistic analysis, or if valuable new documents from that period were to appear, perhaps this minor linguistic problem, like a great many others, could be more definitely solved. The views that I have advanced are the most defensible based on our current knowledge.

3 Sarı Ismā'īl was very famous in the Bektashī tradition. He was one of the leading *khalīfas* of Ḥājjī Bektash. One comes across a great many legends concerning him in the *velāyetnāmes*, but unfortunately we have no information on his {true} historical existence. But if we consider how the Bektashī tradition was created by blending the available legends, we can grant the possibility that a dervish with this name lived in western Anatolia in the seventh/thirteenth century or early years of the eighth/fourteenth century.

4 According to the Bektashī *velāyetnāmes* and the *Khaḍirnāme*, Qaraja Aḥmad was one of the great saints of Anatolia who received spiritual enlightenment from Ḥājjī Bektash. {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq* also mentions him among the high officials during the reign of Orhan. According to that source, his father was a king of the country of the Persians. He himself went to Anatolia because he was overwhelmed by mystical rapture. He lived and died near Akhisar. Subsequently, his tomb gained fame among the people for curing the ill (*al-Shaqā'iq*, {Turkish} trans., vol. 1, p. 33). Citing Bektashī tradition, 'Ālī also describes his importance, *Ol tarihte Rûm-erenleri'nin kutb-ı nâm-dârı*

Karaca Ahmed Sultân idi; Sivrihisar'da sâkin Seyyid Nûre'd-Dîn nâm 'umde-i vâsılîn terbiyesiyle seccâde-nişîn olmuştu, asrında elliyedi bin mürîd-i hidâyet-nüvîd, Karaca Ahmed Sultân'in taht-ı hükmünde bedîd idi {At that time, the most famous of the saints of Anatolia was Qaraja Aḥmad Sulṭān. He became the chief of a religious order under the tutelage of a leading mystic named Sayyid Nūr al-Dīn, who lived in Sivrihisar. During his time, 57,000 disciples seeking spiritual guidance appeared under the authority of Qaraja Aḥmad Sulṭān} (*Kunh al-akhbār*, vol. 5, p. 55). E. J. W. Gibb thought that there was good reason to doubt the veracity of 'Ālī's information on the shaikhs of this early period. Of course, if he had known that this information derived from the Bektashī *velāyetnāmes*, he would not have given it any credence.

5 Lexicons such as {Abū Ḥayyān al-Gharnāṭī's} *al-Idrāk*, {the anonymous} *al-Tuḥfat al-zakiyya*, and {the anonymous} *Tarjumān-i turkī wa 'arabī*, which are the most important linguistic sources for this period, give the following definitions: *tapmak* = to find; *tapışmak* = to get together, to meet; *tapşırmak* = to bring people together, to have people meet; *tapu*, *tabu* = service; serving God, worship; *tapu eylemek* = to serve; *tapuci*, *tabuci* = servant. The semantic development through which this word – which today we also use to mean "to worship" – gradually passed appears here very clearly. This word was first used simply with the meaning "to seek out." Then it gradually began to express the concept "to seek out God, to reach God, to adore and worship God." Mehmed Tâhir Bursawī {Bursalı Tâhir} says that in the vicinity of Erzurum the word *tapdak* is used to mean "smooth, even" {*düz, ârızasız*} (*Osmanlı müellifleri* {Istanbul, 1334–43/1916–25}, p. 194 {*sic*; it is unlikely that this has anything to do with *tapduk*}). The explanation given here suffices to indicate the meaning of *tapduk* during the period in question {i.e. served, worshipped}.

6 *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Velī*, fo. 30 (cited from the copy in my private library {see the Gölpınarlı edn, p. 21}). This is also mentioned in the section entitled دربیان آمدن حاجی بکتاش بروم باجازت خواجه احمد یسوی {Concerning the arrival of Ḥājjī Bektash in Anatolia by permission of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī} in the versified version of the *Velāyetnāme* {also in Köprülü's private library}. Originally written in prose by Firdevsī {-i Rumi, d. after 1500}, this work was later versified in approximately 6000 couplets by a novice poet with the pen name Nihānī at the behest of Faiḍ Allāh Efendi, a descendant of Ḥājjī Bektash. The historian 'Ālī also mentions this legend in his history, citing the *Velāyetnāme* (*Kunh*, vol. 5, p. 56).

7 Citing the section entitled دربیان فرستادن حاجی بکتاش ولی یونس امره را بطبدق امره: {Concerning Ḥājjī Bektash Veli's sending Yūnus Emre to Tapduk Emre} in Nihānī's versified version of the *Velāyetnāme*. The historian 'Ālī also briefly reports this story of the *Velāyetnāme* in the sentence *Yûnus Emre hizmet-i âlîlerinde iken terbiyetini Tapduk Emre'ye bunlar buyurmuşlardır* {While Yūnus Emre was in the service of the exalted one (i.e. Ḥājjī Bektash), he ordered him to receive his training from Tapduk Emre} ({*Kunh*, vol. 5,} p. 57). In the prose version of the *Velāyetnāme*, there are a few more minor details on this subject that were ignored when this work was rendered into verse. According to this text, Yūnus was occupied with plowing and sowing at a place called Sarı-göl north of Sivrihisar; and after he entered the service of Tapduk Emre, he carried wood on his back for fully forty years for the convent (*Velāyetnāme*, fo. 68 {see the Gölpınarlı edn, pp. 48–9}).

8 In addition to these, we also find in the poetry of Yūnus Emre the pen names Miskīn Yūnus, Dervish Yūnus, Koja Yūnus, or simply Yūnus. We encounter the same kind of thing; that is, a poet using various forms of his pen name, with Aḥmad Yasawī. No historical authority can be given to the reports that Yūnus Emre had a *khalīfa* named 'Āshıq Yūnus. While discussing the burial places and graves of Yūnus Emre below, I will state the source of this report, which appears at the beginning of the published edition of his *Dīwān*. The Russian Orientalist Melioransky also mentions an 'Āshıq

Yūnus as a disciple of Yūnus Emre, but this results from his uncritical acceptance of this report in the *Dīwān* ("K voprosu o znachenii i proiskhozhdenii slov 'chäläb' (chalap) i 'chälābi' v turetskom iazyke," {*ZVO*, (St Petersburg), 15 (1902–3), pp. 36–43}). The *mīm* (م) at the end of the word *emre'm* is the possessive pronoun like that at the end of the words *paşam* and *hacım*. It is not part of the original word. Indeed, we know of various examples of contemporary Ṣūfīs who had such additions to their names. Thus, 'Āshıq Pasha-Zāde mentions 'Āshıq Pasham and Kochum Seydî ({*Tawārīkh-i āl-i 'uthmān*,} p. 199). Another well known example is Ḥājjim Sulṭān, a *khalīfa* of Ḥājjī Bektash, many of whose legends have been recorded and even published.

9 *Al-Shaqā'iq*, among the personalities of the fourth *ṭabaqa*, published on the margins of Ibn Khallikān, p. 119 {i.e. published on the margins of the Būlāq edition of the *Wafayāt* in 1300/1882}. *Al-Shaqā'iq*, {Turkish} trans., and supplement {*Ḥadā'iq*}, vol. 1, p. 78.

10 Based on the couplet *Tarîh dahi yediyüz yedi idi / Yûnus cânı bu yolda kodı idi* {The date was 707 (1307–8) / when Yūnus set his heart on this path}, which is found in Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān* and to which Walad Chelebi first drew attention, the Orientalist E. J. W. Gibb considers him to be a Ṣūfī who lived at the end of the seventh/thirteenth and beginning of the eighth/fourteenth century (*A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. 1 {, p. 165}). Mehmed Tâhir and Necib Âsım agree with this (Mehmed Tâhir, *Aydın vilâyetine mensûb ricâlin terâcim-i ahvâli* {(Izmir, 1324/1906), new ed. M. Akıf Erdoğru (Izmir, 1994)}, the section on Yūnus Emre; *Osmanlı müellifleri*, vol. 1, p. 193; Âsım, *Millî arûz*, [Istanbul, 1329/1911], p. 7). Melioransky, who was aware of studies on Yūnus Emre by Gibb, Foy, and Mordtmann and who also had recourse to {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq* and {Shams al-Dīn Sāmī's} *Qāmūs al-a'lām*, gives the following opinion in order to defend the information on Yūnus Emre provided by *al-Shaqā'iq* and refute Gibb: "Reading these couplets, Mr Gibb concludes that the date given by Tashköprü-Zāde is mistaken and that Yūnus Emre lived a hundred years before that date. In my view, however, such a deduction is baseless. The problem arises from the fact that, shortly before these couplets, there are other couplets praising uprightness. Consequently, in my view, we are completely justified in saying that what this couplet states is that Yūnus Emre should be included among the *murīds* of Tapduk Emre, who is called *Ṣāḥib-i irshād* {the one who guides on the right path} by Tashköprü-Zāde. How old could Yūnus have been when he set out on this path? I cannot answer this question directly, but it is worthy of note that the Central Asian Ṣūfīs joined the *ṭarīqas* at a very young age. As Gibb has stated, for example, the famous Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī, who has some points in common with Yūnus Emre, says several times that he entered the service of Shaikh Arslan Bābā at the age of seven. Thus, there is some basis for us to conclude that Yūnus Emre was a child when he entered the *ṭarīqa* in 707 {1307–8}. In that case, he could undoubtedly have lived until the early years of the sultanate of Bayezid I. If we were eventually to learn that 707 was simply Yūnus Emre's date of birth, I personally would not be the least surprised" (Melioransky, "K voprosu o znachenii"). Hammer's discussion of this matter is very confusing and erroneous. In one place in his book {*Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst*}, he writes, without giving a source, that he was a poet during the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent (926–74/1520–66), while in another he indicates that he was a poet of the eleventh/seventeenth century. Similarly, he mentions these two Yūnus Emres in the index as the same person, but he says nothing about when they lived. G. Flügel also considers him to be a poet of the tenth/sixteenth century (Mordtmann, "Türkisches zu Foy's").

11 Indeed, in this tradition, which was fixed in such works as the *Velāyetnāme* and *Khaḍirnāme*, he is always mentioned among Ṣūfīs of the seventh/thirteenth century. A few of these, such as Qaraja Aḥmad and Yūnus Emre, could have lived into the eighth/fourteenth

century. In my opinion, this evidence of the Bektashī tradition is very valuable and worthy of credence in determining the time when Yūnus Emre lived.

12 ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde, *Tawārīkh-i āl-iʿuthmān*, pp. 199–200.

13 If there were no other evidence, by itself this would mean nothing, for it is also occasionally reported, mistakenly, in the *Jāmiʿ al-nazā'ir* that an earlier poet composed imitations {*nazā'ir*} of another poet who came after him. But when this is added to the other evidence, Hacı Kemal's testimony on this matter gains additional value.

14 Foy, "Die ältesten osmanischen Transscriptionstexte in gothischen Lettern," 4 (1901). In this work, entitled *Tractat*, which appeared in the fifteenth century, had many readers as late as the seventeenth century, and was published in many editions, there is, among some miscellaneous information on the Turks, the text of two hymns by a poet named Yūnus. They are written in Gothic letters and are accompanied by a Latin translation. Foy devoted extensive research to these hymns (*ibid.*, 4 [1901], 5 [1902]), especially with regard to linguistic history. They also attracted the attention of J. H. Mordtmann, M. Hartmann, Brockelmann, and Houtsma. Foy did not believe that these hymns belonged to Yūnus Emre, but they must in fact be his, as Mordtmann and Hartmann conceded. Anyone who is somewhat familiar with the works of Yūnus Emre will conclude that, linguistically and stylistically, the passages that I will include in the next chapter can only be attributed to Yūnus Emre. Furthermore, in that period, there was no other Ṣūfī poet named Yūnus to whom it might be possible to attribute these works. The anonymous recorder of these hymns, who was only fifteen or sixteen years old when taken prisoner at the Ottoman capture of the fortress of Mühlbach and who remained among the Turks a full twenty years, being sold seventeen times, states that he knew Turkish language and literature very well and that Turkish *khwājas* {masters, religious scholars} even took lessons from him. If Yūnus Emre, who lived in one corner of Anatolia, had died in 843/1439–40 – that is, one year before Mühlbacher was taken prisoner – his works would not have been sufficiently widespread and famous for him to know about them and to record and translate in preference to other works of this kind. To my way of thinking, this problem can be solved very easily. It is quite natural that the hymns of Yūnus Emre, who lived one century earlier than Melioransky conjectured, whose legends were famous enough to enter Bektashī tradition, whose historical personality had been forgotten, and whose works had spread in all directions, would have been recorded and translated by Mühlbacher in preference to other such works. On the one hand, this reveals the fame of Yūnus Emre at that time and, on the other, it supports Mühlbacher's claim that he knew the contemporary literature of the Turks fairly well. Hammer also mentions Mühlbacher's captivity and his work, which was first printed in 1530 (Hammer, {*Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*, Turkish} trans., vol. 2, pp. 205, 350).

15 In certain poems in the various printed and manuscript copies of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān*, one finds praise and veneration of, or else allusions to, some of the great Ṣūfīs who came after Yūnus Emre, such as Ḥājjī Bayram Veli or Amīr Sulṭān. In the hymn with the refrain *Bize dervişler geldi* {The dervishes came to us}, for example, Ḥājjī Bayram is mentioned.

Hacı Beyram-İli'nde *Bergüzâr var elinde*
Şeker damlar dilinde *Bize dervişler geldi*

{In the province of Ḥājjī Bayram, With gifts in their hands, With sugar dripping from their tongues, The dervishes came to us.} Now, Ḥājjī Bayram died in 833/1429–30. Similarly, there are passages in Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān* that describe Shaikh Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. ʿAlī Ḥusain al-Bukhārī, known as Amīr Sulṭān, who died in the same year, such as the poems that end with the following couplets:

Bahr-i isyândan halâs olmağ için ihlâs ile
Sıdk ile Sultân Emîr'in eteğini tutalım

Yûnus Emre söyler sözü, âşık olmuş gönlü gözü
Unutman duâdan bizi Emîr Sultân Türbesi'nde

Yûnus sana cândan tutmuştur özü
Hem mübârek rûhuna sürer yüzü
Efendim ceddine ulaştır bizi
Yeşil tonlu Emîr Sultân merhabâ

{To be rescued from the sea of rebellion, with sincerity,
With honesty, let us grasp the skirt of Sulṭān Amīr.

Yūnus Emre says the words. His heart and eyes have become lovers.
Do not forget us in your prayers, in the tomb of Amīr Sulṭān.

From his heart Yūnus clings to you,
And rubs his face (in the dust) at your blessed spirit.
My lord, convey us to your ancestor.
Amīr Sulṭān with the green cloak: Greetings!}

In addition to this Amīr Sulṭān, on whose behalf the poet Aḥmad Pasha wrote the famous eulogy containing the stanza *Ey âlem-i Velâyete Sultân olan Emîr / Ve'y mülk-i Rûm'a Rahmet-i Rahmân olan Emîr* {Oh Amīr, who is sultan of the realm of saintliness / Oh Amīr, who is compassion of the Compassionate to the Kingdom of Rūm}, there are other Amīr Sulṭāns buried in Izmir and Üsküb, but the poems in Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān* evidently relate to the original and famous Amīr Sulṭān. Would not the fact that Yūnus Emre recited poetry about these Ṣūfīs who died in 833 confirm the view that he died in 843 rather than the idea advanced by Melioransky that he was born in 707? {Still,} as I will demonstrate in detail when speaking of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān* in the next chapter, the *Dīwān* currently in our possession is not composed entirely of passages belonging to Yūnus Emre. The works of a number of subsequent poets – even including other poets with the pen name Yūnus – are mixed into it. Therefore, we can definitely conclude that neither the passages concerning Ḥājjī Bayram nor those concerning Amīr Sulṭān were written by Yūnus Emre.

16 It is clearly stated in the Bektashī tradition that he was from Sivrihisar. The translator of {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq* writes that he was from Bolu (p. 78), whereas the author of that work does not specifically state where he was from, but simply states that he was a disciple of Tapduk Emre (on the margins of Ibn Khallikān, {*Wafayāt,*} vol. 1, p. 119). Shams al-Dīn Sāmī indicates that he lived at the confluence of the Sakarya and Porsuk rivers, but Melioransky disagrees and claims that this resulted from emending the information provided by Tashköprü-Zāde on Tapduk Emre. The truth is that this account in Sāmī's *Qāmūs al-aʿlām* derives from the material about the tomb of Yūnus Emre given in Lāmiʿī's supplement to his {Turkish} translation of {Jāmī's} *Nafaḥāt* (*Nafaḥāt* trans., p. 691). Because I will discuss his tomb at length below, I will not go into the subject here. Let me simply say that, although it is not possible to assert with certainty where Yūnus Emre was from, it could not be far wrong to believe that he was born in the vicinity of Bolu.

17 In the works of Yūnus Emre, there are quite a few passages showing this. Shaikh {Shams al-Dīn} Muḥammad Niyāzī Miṣrī {d. 1105/1694, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Niyāzī" (F. Babinger); Baha Doğramacı, *Niyazi-yi Mısri hayatı ve eserleri* (Ankara, 1988); Mustafa Kara, *Niyazi-i Mısri* (Ankara, 1994); and Derin Terzioğlu, "Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyazi-i Misri (1618–1694)," dissertation, Harvard University, 1999}, for example, also supports this notion in the commentary that he wrote on the poem

Çıktım erik dalına anda yidim üzümü / Bostan ısı kakıyıb der ne yersin kozumu {I climbed up the plum tree branch and there ate grapes / The garden's owner became angry and said, "Why are you eating my walnuts?"}, which was very famous among the Ṣūfīs: *İmdi Azîz'in bu beyitten muradları, mürşîdsiz ben şarî'at ve tarîkat ve hakîkati kendi bildiğimin ile indîce sülûk edüb vâsıl-ı Hak olurum diye sa'y edenlerin ahvâlini temsîl tarîkiyle beyân etmektir. Yâni, böyle eden kimsenin hâl-ü şânı, kangı meyve ne şecerden bittiğin bilmeyib, gönlü üzüm istedikte, erik ağacından biter diye erik ağacından arayan, gönlü erik istedikte ceviz ağacından erik biter diye ceviz ağacına çıkan bî-akl kimseler gibi olur. Meselâ, a'mâ olan kimse cümle renkleri siyah sandığı gibi . . . Azîz, bu hâli kendisine nisbet eylese câizdir; bir zamân böyle mürşîdsiz çalışıb birşey hâsıl edemeyib, sonra mürşîd-i kâmile mukârin olmuş ola* {Now what the saint intended by this couplet was to express allegorically the condition of those who try to teach Divine Truth without a spiritual guide, merely following subjectively what they know concerning the *Sharī'a* (sacred law), *ṭarīqa* (mystical path), and *ḥaqīqa* (truth). In other words, the condition of someone who does this is like that of those who do not know what fruit grows from which tree. They are like ignorant ones who, desiring grapes, look for them on a plum tree because that is where they think they grow, or desiring plums climb up a walnut tree because that is where they think they grow. This is like someone who is blind thinking that all colors are black. The saint must have compared this situation to his own. He once exerted himself in this way without a spiritual guide, but he was unable to achieve anything. Then he attached himself to a perfect guide (and was successful)} (commentary {*Sharḥ-i nuṭuq-i Yūnus Emre*} published on the margins of the *Dīwān* of Yūnus Emre {Būlāq, 1254/1838–9}).

18 'Āshıq Pasha-Zāde, *Tawārīkh-i āl-i 'uthmān*, p. 200; {Tashköprü-Zāde,} *al-Shaqā'iq*, p. 119; *al-Shaqā'iq*, {Turkish} trans., vol. 1, p. 78; {Sa'd al-Dīn,} *Tāj al-tawārīkh*, vol. 2, p. 429. Shaikh İsmâ'îl Hakkı says both Tapduk Emre and Yūnus Emre *Anadolu'da Keçiborlu nâm kasaba kurbünde olan gadîr-i 'azîm'in cânib-i şarkîsinde olan puşte tarafında bir karyede neşv-ü nemâ bulduklarını* {grew up in a village by a hill east of a large pond near a town named Keçiborlu in Anatolia} (from the commentary *Sharḥ-i rumūzāt-i Yūnus Emre*} that he wrote on the poem *Çıktım erik dalına*, fo. 12 in the MS in my private library). I will discuss this problem below while dealing with the burial places of Yūnus Emre.

19 This is a legendary report that is widespread among the dervishes, but it has no historical value. One or two hymns in the *Dīwān* of Yūnus Emre, which have the refrains *Abdü'l-Kâdir gibi bir er bulunmaz* {There is no *er* like 'Abd al-Qādir} and *Meded et Sultânım Şeyh Abdü'l-Kâdir* {Shaikh 'Abd al-Qādir is my helper and sultan}, have given rise, I think, to the belief that both Yūnus Emre and his shaikh were Qādirīs (Mehmed Tâhir, *Osmanlı müellifleri*, vol. 1, p. 192). We have no knowledge, however, of the presence of the Qādiriyya in Anatolia at that time. There were then Rifā'ī *tekkes* in Anatolia, so it would be more reasonable to assert that they were Rifā'īs. As will be seen from the discussion in the next chapter on Yūnus's *Dīwān*, it is virtually certain that these hymns do not belong to Yūnus Emre. {On the hymn with the former refrain, see Mustafa Tatçı, *Âşık Yunus ve diğer Yunusların şiirleri* (Ankara, 1991), p. 61.}

20 Shaikh İsmâ'îl Hakkı gives the following important account on this matter: *Nezîl olduğum Bursa'dan bitarîki'l-hac Antakya tarafına sevk-ı esb-i 'azîmet edib kasaba-i mezbûre nevâhîsinden mürurumda orada mâder-zâd olan ehl-i tarîkatten birine mülâkî oldum. Kavl-i mervârid-vârını bu vechile âvîze-i gûşum eyledi ki: Mukaddemâ Buhâra cânibinde istilâ-yı etrâktan sarsar-ı ızturâb ve bâd-ı ihtilâl vezân oldukda berk-i vücûd-i evliyâ gülşen sarây-ı ikâmetlerinden cüdâ ve perîşan oldukda ez-cümle Şeyh Sinan Efendi nâm bir 'azîz-i enâm sahrâ neverd-i sefer olarak Şeyh Yûnus Emre karyesine firûkeş edib Tapduk Emre'yi irşâd eylemiş, ba'de'z-zamân Yûnus Emre zuhûr edib ol dahî zâhiren ve bâtınen Tapduk'a tapu kılmış ve yedinden câm-i ser-şâr-ı feyz nûş etmiş, nitekim buyurur: Yûnus bir doğan idi / Kondu Taptuk eline / Av ve şikâre geldi / Bu yuva kuşu değil* {I set out on horse from Bursa, where I was stopping, toward Antakya on the

pilgrimage road and passed through the region of the aforesaid town. I met a member of the *ṭarīqa* who was native to that place and I lent an ear to his pearl-like words. He said: "A long time ago, when the storm-wind of disquiet and suffering blew in the region of Bukhārā from the invasion of the Turks (i.e. Mongols) and the petals of the saints were blown helter-skelter from the rose-garden palace of their residence, one of them, a saint of mankind named Shaikh Sinān Efendi, traveling in the wilderness of wandering, sojourned in the (future) village of Shaikh Yūnus Emre and became the spiritual guide of Tapduk Emre. Some time later, Yūnus Emre appeared and served Tapduk outwardly and inwardly, drinking from the cup of abundant enlightenment. As he states: 'Yūnus was a falcon / he alighted on Tapduk's hand / he went hunting and in search of prey / this was not a nesting bird'"} (commentary {*Sharḥ-i rumūzāt-i Yūnus Emre*} on the same *ghazal*, same folio). Although this dervish tradition, recorded two centuries ago, is not to be found in any other source, that is no reason to completely discount its importance. The time when Tapduk Emre was alive corresponds quite well with the time when Shaikh Sinān of Bukhārā arrived in Anatolia after migrating because of the Mongol invasion. According to the account that I gave in the first part of this book on the spread of the Yasawiyya, it is quite likely that this shaikh was a Yasawī dervish. We cannot exclude the possibility that the influence of Aḥmad Yasawī, which is frequently encountered in the works of Yūnus Emre, can be partially ascribed to this event.

21 Tashköprü-Zāde records this in particular,

ولم يوجد فيها حطب معوج أصلا فسأله الشيخ عن ذلك فقال لا يليق بهذا الباب شئ معوج

{There was not a single piece of bent firewood. When the shaikh asked him about this, he said, "Nothing crooked is worthy of this gate," *al-Shaqā'iq*, Furat edn p. 57}. The translator also cites this, embellishing it with a stroph of Persian that discusses the benefits of uprightness. In the history of Ṣūfīsm up to the time of the Bektashī tradition, one often finds incidents similar to this story of the firewood. In the legends of certain Yasawī shaikhs, it is stated that they reached the rank of spiritual guide by carrying wood to the dervish *dargāh* ({Ḥazīnī,} *Jawāhir*, p. 279). Similar things are found in the legends of other Ṣūfīs. When Shaikh Abū 'l-Ghaib Jamīl al-Yamanī went out into the open country to collect wood, a lion ate his donkey. As punishment, he loaded his wood on the lion and brought it in ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 641). Similarly, Sayyid Aḥmad al-Bukhārī was the wood gatherer for the famous İlâhî-i Simâvî *dargāh* (*ibid.*, p. 466). {It is curious that Köprülü did not link this story with the accounts of Ḥakīm Ata.}

22 Thus, in various copies of his *Dīwān*, I have come across such passages as the following: *Âşık Yûnus girdi yola / Uğradı Tapduk Emre'ye / Her dem ciğer kanı ile / Vasf-ı hâlim yazar oldu* {The lover Yūnus entered upon the path / He visited Tapduk Emre / Every moment with his heart's blood / He writes the attribute "the Forbearing"}; *Yûnus eydür azıklıyım / Tapduk'umuz dost yüzüdür / İşte bu söze inanmayan / Bunda bulsun ettiğini* {Yūnus says: I am provided for the journey / Our Tapduk is the face of the Friend / Those who do not believe these words / Will find what they have done here (i.e. will get their just deserts in this world?)}; *Yûnus Emre'm sen tek otur / Da'vâ-yı ma'nâyı bitür / Tapduk'leyin bir er getür / Câna başa kalmaz ola* {Yūnus Emre, you sit quiet / Finish your claim to (spiritual) meaning / Bring a man (or, saint) like Tapduk / Let nothing remain (?) for soul and head}; *Yûnus sen Tapduk'a kılgıl duâlar / Âşıklar meydânı 'arş'dan uludur* {Yūnus, recite benedictions for Tapduk / The field of the lovers is bigger than God's throne}; *Miskîn Yûnus bu sözü cân içinde söyledi / Söyleyen de bî-haber Tapduk Emre kârıdır* {Miserable Yūnus said these words in his soul / The sayer was unaware that it was the work of Tapduk Emre}; *Yûnus sen Tapduk'una kıl duâlar / İçme sen zehr-i kâtil aşk*

elinden {Yūnus, recite benedictions for Tapduk / Do not drink lethal poison from the hand of Love}; *Aşk sultânı Tapduk'tur, Yûnus gedâ ol kapuda / Gedâlara lûfteylemek kâidedir Sultâna* {The sultan of Love is Tapduk and Yūnus is a beggar at the gate / Kindness to beggars is a rule for sultans}; *Yûnus'tur bunu söyleyen / Tapduk'a kulluk eyleyen / Din yoksulun bay eyleyen / Ol Subhâna'llâh değil mi* {It is Yūnus who says this / Who serves Tapduk / Is it not that Praise of God / Who makes rich the one who is poor in religion?}; *Yûnus yine esrüdi Tapduk yüzün görelden / Meğer anın elinden bir cur'a şerbet içmiş* {Again Yūnus has been intoxicated, ever since he saw Tapduk's face / Perhaps he has drunk a cup of wine at his hand}; *Miskîn Yûnus bilişeli / Cân-ü gönül verişeli / Tapduk'uma erişeli / Gizlü râzım açar oldum* {Ever since miserable Yūnus became acquainted / Ever since he gave up heart and soul / Ever since I attained Tapduk / I have begun to reveal my secrets}; *Sorun Tapduk'lu Yûnus'a bu dünyâdan ne anladı / Bu dünyânın kararı yok, sen ne imiş, ben ne imiş* {Ask Tapduk's Yūnus what he understands of this world / This world has no stability. What are you? What am I?}; *Yûnus esrüyiben düştü sokakta / Çağırır Tapduk'una 'âr gerekmez* {Yūnus got drunk and fell in the street / He calls Tapduk – no need to be ashamed!}; *Şeyh-ü dânişmend-ü velî / Cümlesi birdir er yoli* {Shaikh and sage and saint / All are one (on?) the saint's path}; *Yûnus'tur dervişler kulu / Tapduk gibi serveri var* {Yūnus is slave of the dervishes / He has a commander such as Tapduk}; *Aşktır bunca âvâzlar / Dediğim ma'nâ sözler / Tapduk Yûnus'u gözler / Bu vilâyet içinde* {Love is so many voices / The meaning I utter is words / Tapduk has his eye on Yūnus / Within this sainthood}; *İsrâfîl Sûr'in urıcak / Her bir sûret nefsim diye / Ben anmayam hiç Yûnus'u / Tapduk köle oldum dile* {When Isrāfīl blows his trumpet / Every form will assert itself / I will not recall Yūnus at all / Tapduk, I am your slave, command me!}; *Emre'm bir doğan idi kondu Tapduk eline / Av ve şikâre geldi, bu yuva kuşu değil* {Yūnus was a falcon. He alighted on Tapduk's hand / He came to hunt. This is no nesting bird}. Shaikh İsmâ'îl Hakkı cites this last couplet in a passage of his commentary on the *Muhammadiyya* {i.e. his *Faraḥ al-rūḥ* (*Şerh ül-muhammediye ül-mevsum bi ferah ür-ruh*), a commentary on Yazıcı-oğlu Mehmed's *Muḥammadiyya* (Būlāq, 1252/1836), see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Yazid̲ji-ogh̲lu" (Edith G. Ambros)} and comments on it as follows: يقال العارف صيد الحق ولا يكون للصيد صيد {It is said: the knower of God is the prey of divine Truth; and the prey has no prey.} In other words, *Ârifi-bi'llâh olanı Hak teâlâ kemend-i cezbe ve dâm-ı muhabbet ve dâne-i esrâr ile sayd eylemiştir. Pes ol ki Sayyâd-ı Ezel'in şikârıdır, âna başka şikâr olmaz. Suâl olunursa ki, Mesnevî'nin ve Yûnus Emre'nin bu beyitlerinden murâd nedür ki buyururlar* آن خیالاتی که دام اولیاست \ عکس مهرویان بستان خداست – *Yûnus bir doğan idi . . . v.s. Cevâb budur ki, hayâlât ile murâd, mevcûdât-ı hâriciyyedir ki Sıfât-ı Hakk'ın aksi ve eseridir, evliyâ ve 'urefâya dâm olduğu budur ki, her biri bir ismin ve bir sıfâtın mazharı olmağla, basîret ehli âna nazar eylese bir nevi' şuhûd saydeder. Pes 'ârifin bu saydı şikâr etmesi hakikatte kendinin sayd-i Hak olduğundandır* {God hunts the knower of God with the lasso of Attraction and the snare of Love and the grain of Mystery. Thus, he who is the prey of the Eternal Hunter has no other prey. If one inquires: What then is the meaning of the verse in the *Mathnawī* (Book 1, line 72; trans. Nicholson) "Those phantasies which ensnare the saints are the reflection of the fair ones of the garden of God"; and Yūnus Emre's verse, "Yūnus was a falcon . . . etc.," the answer is: by "phantasies" (*khayālāt*) he means external reality, which is the reflection and the trace of the divine attributes; by "snare of the saints and the mystics" he means that each one is the locus (= place of manifestation) of one of His names and attributes, so that if people of insight look at it, that is a kind of hunting for witness (of the divine). The mystics' hunt for this prey actually results from he himself being the prey of God (= divine Truth)} (commentary on the *Muḥammadiyya*, p. 111).

23 While commenting on a couplet in the *Muḥammadiyya*, İsmâ'îl Hakkı says, *Nâzımın kelâmında işâret vardır ki* كنت يتيماً فى الصغر *mazmûnu üzre bu yolun yetîmi ola. Suâl olunursa ki, Şeyh Hacı Bayram Velî irşâdın bulan nice yetîm olur ve Uveysî-meşreb kalur, cevâb budur ki sâlik*

ol sülûkten kırk sene gâyetine dek terbiyeye muhtâçtır. Hacı Bayram'ın terbiyesi ise bu gâyete resîde olmamıştır. Nitekim Şeyh Üftâde-i Bursavî dahî eğerçi sekiz sene kadar Hızır Dede ile sohbet etmiştir ve lâkin Hızır Dede'nin vefâtından sonra ser-menzil-i murâda erince ne zahmetler çekmiştir ve kezâlik Şeyh Hûdâyî dahî mezkûr Üftâde'nin vefâtından sonra bisyâr ibtilâ görmüştür. Nitekim bâzı niyâz sûretinde îrâd ettiği ilâhiyyâtından münfehimdir. Elhâsıl erbâb-ı sülûkün ekseri yetîm kalmıştır ve lâkin meşreb-i pâk ehlinden cür'a'nûş olmağla irşâd-i Hakk'a mazhar olub ان الله ادبنى فاحسن *te'dîbi mazmûnu üzre mahrûm kalmamışlardır* {Here the poet refers to the *Ḥadīth*: "I was an orphan in my youth" to indicate that he is an orphan on the path [i.e. having no spiritual guide]. If the question is asked, how can one who found the spiritual guidance of Shaikh Ḥājjī Bayram be an orphan and stay *weysi-meşreb* [i.e. be of the "school" of Uways al-Qaranī, a contemporary of the Prophet who lived in Yemen and reached illumination without a guide, see Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1975), pp. 28, 89, 105], the answer is this, that the follower of a mystic path needs guidance on that path for as long as forty years. As for the guidance of Ḥājjī Bayram, it did not last that long. Similarly, Shaikh [Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Muḥammad] Uftāda Bursawī remained in the company of Hızır Dede for about eight years, but after Hızır Dede's death, when he reached the last desired stage [of spiritual development], he suffered great difficulties. And again, after the aforesaid Uftāda died [988/1580], Shaikh [Maḥmūd b. Faḍl Allāh b. Maḥmūd] Hüdā'ī [his *khalīfa*, d. 1038/1628–9, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Hüdā'ī" (I. Beldiceanu-Steinherr)] also encountered many tribulations, as one gathers from some hymns that he recited in the form of entreaty. In short, most of the men of the mystic path remained orphans, but because they had drunk at the hand of men of pure character they became the object of God's spiritual guidance and were not deprived of the chastisement referred to in the maxim, "God chastised me and did well" [in other words, God punished me and it was an act of kindness on His part to do so]} (commentary on the *Muḥammadiyya*, p. 255). It appears that Yūnus Emre was fortunate: by spending forty years with his shaikh, he successfully completed all the stages of the path, and so did not remain an orphan.

24 In several of Yūnus's poems, we find passages showing that he traveled in this way from country to country. For example: *Gel ey Yûnus-ı bîçâre / Var derdine eyle çâre / Gezin şöyle şardan şara / Yoktur garîb benciliyin* {Come, oh helpless Yūnus / Go, find help for your ailment / Wander thus from city to city / There is no homeless one like me}. As a rule among the Ṣūfīs, except for those who preferred solitude and seclusion, it was an old custom to visit various places and travel abroad. Among the people of Anatolia, there is a widespread legend about Yūnus Emre. Supposedly, his shaikh, for some reason, ordered him to travel for forty years. After wandering about for a full forty years, he returned to his shaikh's *dargāh*. Finding Ana Baji – that is, his shaikh's wife – he asked her his shaikh's opinion of him. She said, "Tomorrow at the time of the morning prayer, lie down on the shaikh's path. The shaikh, of course, will ask me who you are. I will say to him, 'Yūnus.' If he asks, 'Is this our Yūnus?' understand that your ordeal has finally come to an end." The next morning Yūnus took this advice and lay down on the path. When his shaikh asked, "Is this our Yūnus?" he understood that his ordeal had finally come to an end, and as a gesture of thanks he fell at his shaikh's feet. From that day forward, by order and permission of his shaikh, he began to recite those famous hymns. This legend, which is quite reminiscent of an earlier legend concerning Zangī Ata and Sayyid Ata in the first part of this book, Chapter 4, pp. 89–94, and the Bektashī legend in section A of this chapter agree in showing the poetry of Yūnus Emre to be completely of divine origin.

25 *Hakîkat erenleri gitti dünyâdan her biri*
Konya'da Mevlânâ Hudâvendiğâr yatur

Yûnus sen de ölürsün, kara yere girersin
Mürşidlerin ulu'su ol Emre Sultân yatur

{The saints of truth have gone from this world, every one
In Konya the lordly Mawlānā lies buried
You too will die, Yūnus, and enter the black earth
The great one of the *murshids*, that Emre Sulṭān lies buried.}

26 *Emr-i mürşid ile oldum Şâm'a revâne*
Ne mümkindir gide Şâm'a böyle dîvâne
Murâd olan Anteb imiş çıktı beyâne
Yûnus bir nutuk söyledi Anteb'de (!?)

{By order of my *murshid*, I went to Shām (Syria or Damascus)
How is it possible for such a madman to go to Shām?
It turned out that by Shām he meant ʿAyntāb
So Yūnus delivered an oration in ʿAyntāb.}

27 As, for example, in the poems that begin: *Rûm'dan çıktım yürüdüm, mûm olup sızdım eridim / Şükür Hakk'a yüzler sürdüm ne güzel Kaʿbe yolları* {I set out from Rūm and walked, I became a candle and melted / Thanks to God, I rubbed my face (in the dust of) the roads to the Kaʿba the beautiful} and *Edüb niyyet gittik Kaʿbe iline / Vardık tavâf ettik El-hamdü li'llâh / Ol cennetten çıkan Hacer (-i) esved'e / Yüzümüzü sürdük El-hamdü li'llâh* {We made the resolution and went to the country of the Kaʿba / We arrived and performed circumambulation – praise be to God! / Upon that black stone which emerged from Paradise / We rubbed our face – praise be to God!}. As I will explain below, however, there is always the possibility that these couplets do not belong to Yūnus Emre, and consequently that he did not visit the Kaʿba.

28 *Vardığımız illere, şol safâlı güllere*
Baba Tapduk maʿnâsın aldık El-hamdü li'llâh
Açduk evi kışladık çok hayırlar işledik
Üş bahar oldu geri göçtük El-hamdü li'llâh
Derildik pınar olduk, ayrıldık ırmak olduk
Şol akar sular olduk şükür El-hamdü li'llâh
Tapduk'un tapusunda, kul olduk kapusunda
Yûnus miskîn çiğ idik, piştik El-hamdü li'llâh

{To the countries where we went, to those happy roses,
We took Bābā Tapduk's spiritual message – praise be to God!
We set up house and spent the winter. We performed many good deeds.
As soon as it was spring, we migrated back – praise be to God!
We gathered together and became springs. We broke asunder and became rivers.
We became those flowing streams. Thanks to God, praise be to God!
In Tapduk's service, we became slaves at his gate.
Miserable Yūnus, we were raw. We became cooked – praise be to God!}

29 *Dost bağcesi gülünden, şükür anın dilinden*
Yûnus şeyhin ilinden bize dervişler gelür

{From the rose of the Friend's garden, thank God! From His tongue,
Yūnus, from the shaikh's country the dervishes come to us.}

30 In the long *mathnawī* at the beginning of Yūnus's *Dīwān*, there are two separate references to this date; taken together, they must be considered definitive evidence that Yūnus died after this date (MS in my library).

Söze tarîh yediyüz yedi idi
Yûnus cânı bu yolda fedâyidi

{The date for this discourse was 707
Yūnus's soul was pledged upon this path}

. . .

Yûnus cân doğruluğa kıldı kodı
Anın çin tarîhi yediyüz yedi

{Yūnus pledged his soul to uprightness (?)
The true date of that was 707.}

31 *Egerçi ümmîdir ammâ debistân-ı kuds sebak-hânıdır . . . ve lisân-ı kâli, lisân-ı hâle tercemân etmiş abdal ve ebrârdandır ve lisân-ı gaybla, [izhâr-ı] mâ-fi'z-zamîr eden ashâb-ı esrârdandır. Mervîdir ki her bâr ki okumak kasdetmiş, hurûf-ı tehecciyi ikmâl etmeye dili dönmemiş ve âyîne-i kalbi küdûrât-ı nukûş-u hutût ile donmamış. Bedîheten bu beyti demiş: Nazar eyle ebteri, bâzâr eyle götürü / Yaradılanı hoş gör, Yaradan'dan ötürü* {Although he was illiterate, he was a student of the school of holiness. He translated the language of words into the language of states. He was an *abdāl* and a righteous person. He was one of the people of mysteries who reveal what is in the heart with the tongue of the unseen world. It is related that, whenever he tried to read something, he could not get his tongue around the letters of the alphabet and the mirror of his heart was not darkened by the turbidities of inscriptions and writings. He recited the following couplet extempore: *Nazar eyle ebteri bâzâr eyle götürü / Yaradılanı hoş gör, Yaradan'dan ötürü* (Regard "the one cut off" [cf. Koran, 108:3, referring to enemies of the Prophet]. Do business wholesale. / Be tolerant toward creatures, for the sake of the Creator)} (ʿĀshıq Chelebi, *Tadhkira* {i.e. *Mashāʿir al-shuʿarā'*}, the entry on Yūnus Emre {we used the Meredith-Owens edn, 98b}). The translator of {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq* agrees with this, saying: *Zâhir-i hâlde okumağa dili varmayıp, hâme gibi hurûf-i teheccînin edâsında kâsır idi; ammâ debistân-ı kudsün hurûf-i maârif-i ledünnîyesinde mâhir idi* {It was obvious that he could not bring himself to read. Like a reed pen, he was cut short to produce the letters of the alphabet. But he was expert in the letters of the sciences of the knowledge of the consciousness of God learned in the school of holiness} (p. 78). This claim of illiteracy, however, is found neither in the original Arabic version of *al-Shaqā'iq* nor in Saʿd al-Dīn, who, for the most part, cites it (*Tāj al-tawārīkh*, vol. 2, p. 429). This is additional evidence for the legendary nature of this claim. Nevertheless, there is frequent reference to his illiteracy in the *Dīwān*, as in the following:

Ol dost bana ümmî demiş, hem adımı ümmî komuş
Dilim şeker, gövdem kamış, bu söyleyen nemdir benim
Ümmî benem Yûnus benem, dokuz atam dörttür anam
Aşk odu'na düşüb yanam sûk-u bâzâr nemdir benim

{That Friend called me illiterate (*ummī*) He gave me the nickname "Ummī."
My tongue is sugar, my body is reed. What does all this talk have to do with me?
I am Ummī. I am Yūnus. I have nine fathers and four mothers.
I fall into the fire of love and burn. What do getting and spending have to do with me?}

32 *A History of Ottoman Poetry* and Melioransky's aforesaid study {apparently his "K voprosu o znachenii"}.

33 In Ṣūfīsm, the followers of the path must be inwardly illiterate even if outwardly they are learned. Outwardly, the effect of their knowledge is behavior in accordance with the stipulations of the *Sharīʿa*; inwardly the effect of their illiteracy is to receive knowledge directly from God. For, as long as one is not simple and pure of heart, the book of the heart cannot be exposed to divine manifestations. Consequently, it is more difficult for the learned to enter upon the mystic path. This is why it was said of the Prophet that he was both illiterate and learned. He was illiterate for the sake of spiritual Truth but learned for the sake of the *Sharīʿa*, for, although he did not learn knowledge of spiritual Truth from anyone, he acquired the *Sharīʿa* from Gabriel. There is a difference between mediated and unmediated knowledge. Mediated knowledge is knowledge that can be expressed; {unmediated knowledge is knowledge that can be (this phrase seems to be missing in the text)} pointed to. The knowledge that Moses learned from Khaḍir was such "pointed to" knowledge. Unmediated knowledge is pure Truth. Therefore it is necessary for the followers of the path to acquire "expressed" knowledge from a master of the outward, i.e. a *mudarris*, and to acquire "pointed to" knowledge from a master of the inward, i.e. a *murshid*. {The *ʿulamāʾ* have knowledge that can be expressed in words, *ʿibāra*. The Ṣūfīs have knowledge that can only be indicated or shown, *ishāra*. See *EI*^{2}, "Ishāra" (P. Nwiya); al-Kalābādhī, *Taʿarruf li-madhhab ahl al-taṣawwuf*, English trans. Arberry as *The Doctrine of the Sufis* (Cambridge, 1935; reprinted Lahore, 1966), p. 76; William Chittick, *The Ṣūfī Path of Knowledge* (Albany, NY, 1989), pp. 245–6.}

34 Thus, İsmâʿîl Hakkı, giving the example of the Prophet's receiving knowledge of the *Sharīʿa* from Gabriel, states that one should not look down on masters of outward knowledge, that is, religious scholars {*ʿulamāʾ*}: . . . *Yalnız mescid ve medresede olan tâʿat ve ibâdet ile vücûd kal olmaz ve gönül teʿayyünâttan fenâ bulmaz. Bil ki insân-ı kâmil sohbeti ve dilde zevk-ı mahabbet hâleti lâzımdır; ammâ ol ki bu zamânede bâzı ümmîler ilm-i zâhire müteallık zebân-dırâzlık ederler, yerinde değildir; bil ki hatâ-yı mahzdır. Kişinin zâhiri âlim ve bâtını ümmî gerektir. Ol maʿnâya ki levh-i dil cümle nukûştan sâde olmadıkça, esrâr-ı ilâhiyyeye mahal olamaz. İşte, bu bidâyet hâlidir, nihâyette ise zâhir ve bâtın bütün ilim olur* {One's body does not become refined merely by acts of piety and worship in the mosque or *madrasa*, nor does one's heart gain annihilation in God from performing obligatory acts. Rather, one must keep company with spiritual masters and taste love in one's heart. But the fact that in this age some illiterates are abusive in their talk about outward knowledge is not proper. Rather, it is pure error. A man should be outwardly learned and inwardly illiterate. The reason is that if the tablet of the heart is not completely blank, it cannot become the locus of the divine mysteries. This is the beginning state. As for the final state, outward and inward become total knowledge} (commentary on the *Muḥammadiyya*, p. 114). The same author also explains the words of those who were opposed to *qāl* ("words") in the following manner: *Nâzımın bu maʿnâyı kâl'ı terk ile emirden sonra zikrettiğinin vechi budur ki, kâl'de emr-i şerʿî dâhil değildir. Bil ki emr-i şerʿî hâl denilen maʿnâya vusûle vesîledir. Vesîle dahî makâsıda mülhaktır. Pes kangı sûfî-sûretin ki zâhirinde emr-i şerʿî riâyeti olmaya, elbette hâl-ehli olmaz* {The reason that the poet mentioned this *maʿnā* after declaring that *qāl* be abandoned is that *Sharīʿa* matters are not included in *qāl*. Rather, *Sharīʿa* matters are a means of arriving at the *maʿnā* called *ḥāl*. The means is also dependent upon the objectives. Therefore, any would-be Ṣūfī who does not outwardly observe the *Sharīʿa* definitely cannot become possessor of *ḥāl* (mystical states)} (*ibid.*, same part, p. 216). The early Ṣūfī Abū ʿAbd Allāh Mukhtār b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad al-Harawī said, *Ubûdiyyetin aslı oldur ki, zâhirde şöyle olasın ki senden cemiʿ şerʿ zâhir ola ve bâtında şöyle olasın ki, zikrin gayrı anda sığmaya* {The essence of devotion to God is that you should behave outwardly such that your behavior conforms completely to

the law of God; and you should behave inwardly such that your behavior contains nothing but *dhikr* (remembrance of God)} ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 391). However, the true ecstatics and possessors of *ḥāl*, the pantheist Ṣūfīs, were not very devoted to the outward appearances.

35 Hundreds, indeed, thousands, of examples of this can be found in Mawlānā, Ḥāfiẓ, Jāmī, and the Turkish Ṣūfī poets.

36 Citing Kharqānī, Shaikh al-Islām al-Harawī says that the famous Ṣūfī Khwāja Khayirja was so illiterate that he could not pronounce *al-ḥamdu li-llāh* {praise be to God} but that nevertheless he was *ghawth-i rūzgār* {"Help of the age," i.e. the highest Ṣūfī spiritual authority or "pole"} ({Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 378). Similarly, Shaikh al-Islām Abū Naṣr Aḥmad al-Jāmī, known for several of his works, was illiterate. At the age of twenty-two, he retired to the mountains. After eighteen years of mortification of the flesh, he returned and, when he mixed with the people, the doors of *'ilm-i ladunnī* {knowledge imparted directly by God through mystic intuition} were opened to him (*ibid.*, p. 392). Shaikh Berke al-Hamadānī also knew nothing apart from the *Fātiḥa* and a few *sūras*, and he could not even recite these properly. Nevertheless, the famous 'Ayn al-Quḍāt al-Hamadānī {i.e. 'Abd Allāh b. Abī Bakr al-Miyānajī, d. 526/1131, see *EI²*, *Supplement*, s.v. both names (J. K. Teubner)} admitted that this dervish, who did not know what *qāla yaqūlu* {past and present forms of the Arabic verb "to say," i.e. the first thing about Arabic grammar} was, knew the Koranic truths much better than he did, and that he greatly benefited from him in this respect (*ibid.*, p. 473). The famous shaikh Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Khiyāwī al-Shirwānī was also completely illiterate, and made his living as a weaver (*ibid.*, p. 572). So, those who truly deserve the title of *ḥakīm* {sage} are these illiterate *'ārifs* {mystics who had attained true knowledge of God}. In determining what is meant by wisdom {*ḥikma*} in the Arabic ولقد آتينا لقمان الحكمة {We gave Luqmān wisdom, Koran 31:12}, the religious scholars differed. According to the Ṣūfīs, *ḥikma* means to be aware of the reality of things and to act accordingly; and to know the most sublime of things, who is God, through divine knowledge. If someone knows all things but does not know God through divine knowledge, he cannot be called *ḥakīm*. But those who are *'ārifs*, even if they are ignorant of the formal and exoteric sciences, deserve this attribute. Because Ibn Sīnā, for example, tried to reach God through reason, the Ṣūfīs do not consider him to be a *ḥakīm*.

37 The renowned Ummī {illiterate} Sinān, who is known for the hymns that he wrote in the manner of Yūnus Emre, and was the founder of the Sināniyya branch of the Khalwatiyya, was in fact an *'ālim*, but he adopted the nickname Ummī as a result of a dream that he had. Aside from this famous Ṣūfī who died in 958/1551–2, Elmalılı Shaikh Muḥammad Sinān – the *murshid* of Niyāzī – who was from the Yiğit Başı {i.e. Aḥmad Shams al-Dīn b. 'Īsā al-Marmarawī Yigitbashī, d. 910/1504} branch of the Khalwatiyya, is also known by the byname Sinān-i Ummī. This Ṣūfī poet died in 1075/1664–5 {1069/1658 in *EI²*, s.v. "Niyāzī," p. 65}.

38 In *Khulāṣat al-wafayāt*, concerning Bursa, that this individual wrote based on {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq*, {İsmâ'îl Belig's} *Güldeste-i riyāḍ-i 'irfān*, {Mehmed b. Mustafâ} Baldırzâde's {*Rawḍat-i awliyā'*, more popularly known as *Ta'rīkh-i wafayāt* or *Wafayāt*, for MSS see Babinger, *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke* (Leipzig, 1927), no. 171}, *Dhail-i riḍā* {not further identified}, and his own *Rawḍāt al-mufliḥūn* {of which *Khulāṣat al-wafayāt* is probably an abridgement}, we find the following description in the section devoted to *türbes*: *Yûnus'lar: Emîr Sultân yolunda Şiblî Önüne karîb mahalle arasında üç zât-ı meşhûrun merâkıd-ı 'aliyyeleri ziyâret olunur. Evvelki Yûnus Emre, Âşıq Yûnus ikinci, üçüncü Abdu'r-Razzâk Ser-bülend deyu ta'rîflerinde şuarâdan biri ebyât inşâd edüb, türbe kapısı üzerinde nakş olunmuştur* {Yūnuses: on the Amīr Sulṭān road, in the district near Şiblī Önü, one may visit the exalted resting places of three famous men: Yūnus

Emre, ʿĀshıq Yūnus, and ʿAbd al-Razzāq Ser-bülend. Some verses describing them are inscribed over the door of the *türbe*} (MS in the library of the late Hâşim Paşa). Mehmed Tâhir also briefly mentions this shrine of Yūnus Emre (in the entries on Yūnus Emre in his *Aydın vilâyetine mensûb ricâlin terâcim-i ahvâli* and *Osmanlı müellifleri*).

39 "If you turn to the right just before reaching the mosque of Amīr Sulṭān and enter a small street, you will immediately come to a tiny square. This place is the Qara ʿAbd al-Razzāq district. To the right of that little square there is a ruined house and in the wall there is a tiny window, partially overlooking the garden of that house, and covered with an iron grill. Just opposite that courtyard, the grand Yūnus Emre is buried along with two of his companions. I carefully read the inscription over the window and copied it in my notebook. Aside from Yūnus Emre and ʿĀshıq Yūnus, it also mentions someone called ʿAbd al-Razzāq. The Qara ʿAbd al-Razzāq who gave his name to this district is this person. I give the inscription verbatim:

Asl-ı sütûde gevherü'l-Hak Yedekci-zâde
Cûd-ü keremle yektâ zât-i cihân-pesendi
Rağbet edüb bu câyı ihyâya kıldı hikmet
Üçler makâmın icrâ etti gören beğendi
Evvelki Yûnus Emre, Âşık Yûnus ikinci
Üçüncü Abdü'r-Razzâk Uşşâk-ı ser-bülendî
Hayrât-ı pâki olsun makbûl-i kurb-i Bâri
Ola şefâ'atiyle bânîsi behre-mendi
İlhâm olundu geldi bir zât dedi tarîh
Üç kabri kıldı maʿmûr li-llâh ʿAlî Efendi

{God's jewel, of blessed origin, Yedekci-Zâde
Unique in generosity, one with whom the world is pleased
Desired to restore this place and did it with wisdom.
He made the shrine of the three saints, which pleased those who saw.
First Yūnus Emre, second ʿĀshıq Yūnus,
Third ʿAbd al-Razzāq, Lovers with head held high.
May his pure good deed be acceptable with the Creator.
May he who built it partake of His intercession.
Someone was inspired and came up with this chronogram:
"Ali Efendi renovated the three tombs for the sake of God."}

"It is evident from this that a certain charitable individual named Yedekci-Zâde Alî Efendi repaired and restored the tombs of these three venerable men. According to the *abjad* method of reckoning {enumeration by letters of the alphabet}, the chronogram indicates exactly 1252/1836–7. There is also a puzzle here, for this means that it had been repaired in 1252, that is, 77 {mistakenly given as 114 in 3rd edn} years ago. But according to my research, Yūnus Emre's tomb was completely in ruins for some time and so inconspicuous that its location was not evident. The famous Niyāzī became especially interested in this tomb and determined its true location" (Rızâ Tevfik, his article "Yûnus Emre'yi ziyâret" in *Peyâm ilâve-i edebiyyesi* {literary supplement to the newspaper *Peyâm*}, June 19, 1329 {1911}). I am of the opinion that there is no basis to the report, which was widespread among the leading members of the *ṭarīqa* in Bursa, that Niyāzī discovered this tomb of Yūnus Emre, because İsmâʿîl Hakkı, who, just like Niyāzī, held the works of Yūnus Emre in high regard, says nothing at all about the tomb of Yūnus Emre in Bursa in his *Sharḥ-i rumūzāt-i Yūnus Emre*, which he wrote thirteen years after Niyāzī's death, that is, in 1118/1706–7. Instead, he indicates that he was buried in a town near Kiçiborlu. If Niyāzī had really

discovered this place, İsmâʿîl Hakkı would certainly have mentioned this claim, even if he did not accept it.

40 In n.8 of this chapter, I stated that there was no historical basis to the report that there was also an ʿĀshıq Yūnus who was a *khalīfa* of Yūnus Emre. The source of this report is the tombs in Bursa that are at most a hundred years old and have no historical value. When the *Dīwān* was published, ʿĀshıq Yūnus was also mentioned, based of course on this report. When we realize that this new story, which has been around for only a hundred years, is not found in any of the various historical sources written over so many earlier centuries, and cannot be traced back even as far as the time of Niyāzī, then no historical and positive significance can be attributed to it. The errors of Melioransky and Rızâ Tevfik on this point derive from their accepting every report they saw without subjecting it to critical inquiry.

41 The section on Yūnus Emre in Mehmed Tâhir's *Aydın vilâyeti'ne mensûb ricâlin terâcim-i ahvâli* and *Osmanlı müellifleri*.

42 One of my students from Erzurum gave me this information. And Rızâ Tevfik, citing a friend from Erzurum in his article in *Peyâm*, corroborates it. It was told by a second-hand book-dealer, an old man from Erzurum, that there was an old and very large copy of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān* in that *türbe*. The works and legends of Yūnus Emre were very well known and widespread in all of those regions. {The hymn *Yemen illerinde Veyse'l-Karanî* (Uways al-Qaranī in the lands of Yemen) refers to Uways al-Qaranī, a legendary or semi-legendary contemporary of the Prophet Muḥammad. He supposedly lived in Yemen and corresponded with the Prophet by telepathy. He became a prototype of the Ṣūfī guided solely by divine grace. See Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, p. 28; *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Uways al-Ḳaranī" (J. Baldick); for the text of the hymn with the aforesaid refrain, see Tatçı, *Aşık Yunus*, pp. 182–4.}

43 İsmâʿîl Hakkı, from the aforesaid MS of his *Sharḥ-i rumūzāt-i Yūnus Emre*.

44 *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., p. 691; *Eskişehir-Ankara yolu üzerindeki istasyonlardan Sarıköy istasyonunda bu zât adına bir ziyâret-gâh vardır ki, Lâmiʿî Çelebî'nin beyân ettiği yerdir* {At the Sarıköy station, on the road between Eskişehir and Ankara, there is a place of pilgrimage dedicated to this man. It is the place mentioned by Lāmiʿī Chelebi} ({Mehmed Tâhir,} *Osmanlı müellifleri*, p. 194).

45 *Ibid.*

46 In the section of {Muḥyī 'l-Dīn's} *Khaḍirnāme* with the heading *Beyân-ı seyrân-ı derûn-i bahr ve ʿacâyibhâ-yı o ve musâhabet-i mahlûkât ki der kaʿr-ı deryâ sû be-sû* {Concerning a Journey to the Bottom of the Sea and its Marvels and the Creatures that he consorted with there}, Yūnus Emre is mentioned in the following manner:

Geldi erenler cemʿ ile gösterdiler ucdan uca
Tapduk Sarı Saltuk bile gösterdi hem ucdan uca
Hem Yûnus Emrem geldiler çün bir yire ilettiler
Bir ak denize attılar gösterdi hep ucdan uca

{The saints gathered together and showed (?) from end to end
Even Tapduk and Sarı Saltuk showed from end to end
And Yūnus Emre came: When they brought him to a place,
They tossed him into a white sea (or, a Mediterranean). He showed from end to end.}

In the following section *Beyân-ı cemʿiyyet-i kübrâ ve sohbet-i heme evliyâ* {Concerning a Great Assembly and a Meeting of All the Saints}, we again come across the name of Yūnus Emre among a number of early Ṣūfīs, such as Ḥājjī Bektash, Sayyid Maḥmūd Ḥairānī, Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī, Mawlānā, Sulṭān Walad, Faqīh Aḥmad, Shams Tabrīzī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Zarkūb, Rasūl Bābā, Sayyid Baṭṭāl Ghāzī, Sulṭān Shujāʿ, Malik

Ghāzī, Akhī Ören {Evren}, Sarı Saltuk, and Amīr Sayyid, along with some whose names we don't recognize:

Âşık Beşe Tapduk Beşe geldi Kılıç Abdal bile
Hem Yûnus Emrem de bile bir gine görsem yüzlerin

{'Āshıq Beshe and Tapduk Beshe came with Kılıch Abdāl
And also Yūnus Emre – I wish I could see their faces once again.}

47 The words of the Jilwatī shaikh Muḥyī 'l-Din Uftāda of Bursa, who died in 988/1580–1, were recorded by his *khalīfa* Shaikh Hüdā'ī {on the Jilwatiyya, see *EI*², s.v. "Djilwatiyya" (Abdülbâkî Gölpınarlı)}, so this large Arabic work is called *Wāqi'āt Uftāda*. There are MSS of this work, some parts of which have been translated into Turkish, in the libraries of the Hüdā'ī Dergâh {apparently the Hüdâiyye Tekkesi, now known as the Cafer Ağa Mosque in Istanbul}, Atlama Taşı {i.e. the Hacı Halil Mosque in Istanbul}, Bayezid Mosque, the Great Mosque {i.e. Ulu Cami in Bursa?}, and in other places. If we take into consideration the date of Mawlānā's death, it is clear that this statement has only legendary value and cannot be accepted historically.

48 What İsmâ'îl Hakkı says on this subject is quite significant: *ve bu makûle kelimât ekser esnâ-i şevk ve galebe-i hâlde sâdır olmağla kadh ve cerhe sâlih değildir; zîrâ sâhibi ma'zûrdur ve lâkin mümkün oldukça ibârette edebe riâyet etmek gerektir. Ânın için Yûnus Emre'nin bu makâlesini ki buyurur: Cennet cennet dedikleri birkaç köle birkaç hûri / İsteyene versin ânı bana seni gerek seni. Afdalü'l-müteahhirîn ve emselü'l-müteeddibîn Şeyh Üftâde hoş görmeyib, hakkında* ليس كما ينبغى *buyurmuşlardır ve nice müftîler dahî cenneti istihkâr tarîkiyle bu kelimâtı okuyan cehele-i sûfiyyeyi ikfâr etmişlerdir* {This kind of utterance, which usually emerges while in a state of ecstasy and *ḥāl* (mystical experience), is not subject to criticism, for the one who utters it is excused. Nevertheless, in the expression (of such utterances), one must observe propriety as far as possible. Thus, concerning the following utterance of Yūnus Emre: "Paradise – what they call Paradise – A few slaves, a few houris / Let him give it to the one who wants it, I need You, You." Afḍal al-Muta'akhkhirīn (the best of the later ones [Ṣūfīs]), Amthal al-Muta'addibīn (the epitome of the well cultured ones) Shaikh Uftāda was not pleased and said, "It is not proper! And many a *muftī* has deemed foolish Ṣūfīs, who recite this utterance in order to express their scorn of Paradise, to be (guilty of) *kufr* (unbelief)"} (commentary on the *Muḥammadiyya*, p. 75). Indeed, the men of the *madrasas*, who are blindly suspicious of any ascetic or Ṣūfī, have never hesitated to use the weapon of *takfīr* {accusation of unbelief} against such unrestrained views.

49 Ghaibī, one of the *khalīfas* of Ibrāhīm Efendi, collected the Ṣūfī sayings of his *murshid* in a work entitled *Suḥbatnāme-i Ghaibī*. In it we find the following opinions about Yūnus Emre: *Lisân-i kadîm üzre ma'nâ icrâ eylemiş er Yûnus Emre Hazretleri'dir ki bu siyakta bizim bu suâlimize ki: Derviş dilinde söyleyen kim idigin bilir misin / Ya kulağında dinleyen kim idigin bilirmisin kelâmıdır ki ânların / Bu dilimde söyleyen kendisidir va'llâhi / Kulağımda dinleyen kendisidir va'llâhi / Gördüm iki âdemdir biri sen ve biri ben / Hakîkatte sen ben yok kendisidir va'llâhi* {The saint who expressed spiritual truth in the old language was his excellency Yūnus Emre. I asked him the following question: "Do you know who it is who speaks with the dervishes' tongue? / Do you know who it is who listens with the dervishes' ear?" He answered appropriately, saying, "The one who speaks with my tongue is Himself, by God! / The one who listens with my ear is Himself, by God! / I saw that among men one is you and one is me / In truth, there is no you and I; there is Himself, by God!"} (*Suḥbatnāme-i Ghaibī*, MS in Hâşim Pasha Library {in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul}).

50 As, for example, in the following couplet found in his *Dīwān*: *Başsız kabak gibi sen tekerleme söz ile / Yûnus'leyin Niyâzî irfânı arzularsın* {Talking nonsense like a headless

squash / You desire the spiritual knowledge of someone like Yūnus and Niyāzī}. This *Dīwān* is widely known among the Ṣūfīs. Various editions have been published, but the most reliable one was published in Cairo {Būlāq} in 1254/1838–9. {Now see Kenan Erdoğan (ed.) *Niyazî-i Mısrî ve Divanı* (Ankara, 1998), where the verse is on p. 169.}

51 There exist several MSS of this commentary {*Sharḥ-i nuṭuq-i Yūnus Emre*} and it was printed on the margins of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān*. Niyāzī exhibits a great and sincere respect and affection for Yūnus Emre in this commentary. {See the edn of this commentary by Neclâ Pekolcay and Emine Sevim, *Yunus Emre şerhleri* (Ankara, 1991), pp. 137–52, and the discussion of it in Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, pp. 334–5.}

52 İsmâ'îl Hakkı claims that, because it is not possible to attain God rationally, such people – even the likes of Ibn Sīnā – cannot be called *ḥakīms*. He then advances the notion that Yūnus Emre was a "mystic sage" {*hakîm-i ârif*}: *Diyâr-ı Rûm'da Anadolu'da medfûn olan Yûnus Emre demekle şöhret-yâb olan böyle değil iken yine Lisânü'l-Gayb'dır ve ânın nazmettiği maârif, Lisân-ı Türkî üzre kimseye makdûr olmamıştır ve cümle ândan sonra gelib nazm-ı ma'ârif edenler ânın mâidesine tufeylî olmuştur.* قال المرحوم قدس سره *"Yûnus Emrem öldü fakîr / Ecel öksesini* {*sic*, *ensesini* in 1st edn} *dokur / Gönül kitâbından okur / Eline kalem almadı." Pes bu makûleye hakîkatta hakîm denilir; zirâ ecell-i ma'ârif ile muttasıftır. Felâsifenin hikmet tesmiye ettiği makûlât, hakîkatte hikmet değildir; zîrâ mü'min ve kâfir anda müsâvidir ve âfet-i vehm-ü hayâl şevâibinden hâlî değildir. Bir ma'nâ ki kesb-i fikir ile hâsıl olmuş ola, zannîdir ve bir emir ki keşf-i Hak'la vücûd bulmuş ola, kat'îdir. Vahy'illâhi nice mevhibe-i enbiyâ ise, hikmet dahî mevhibe-i evliyâdır* {While the man known as Yūnus Emre, who is buried in the lands of Rūm, in Anatolia, is not such a one, still he is *lisān al-ghaib* (spokesman of the invisible world). And the mystical doctrines that he versified were not vouchsafed to anyone in Turkish (other than to him). And all those who came after him and versified mystical doctrines were parasites at his table. The late (Yūnus Emre), may (God) hallow his secret (said of deceased Muslim saints), said, "Yūnus Emre died a dervish / Death struck him on the neck / He read from the book of the heart / He did not take pen in hand." This sort of person truly deserves to be called *ḥakīm*, for he is endowed with the noblest of sciences. The doctrines that the philosophers called *ḥikma* (wisdom) are not in fact *ḥikma*, for the believer and unbeliever share in them equally, and they are not free from the defeats of harmful fancy and conjecture. A notion that is obtained by exercising the mind is conjectural; and a command that occurs by divine revelation is certain. Just as divine inspiration is granted to the prophets, *ḥikma* is granted to the saints} (commentary on the *Muḥammadiyya*, vol. 1, p. 82). It is obvious that İsmâ'îl Hakkı has recognized Yūnus Emre as the greatest of our Ṣūfī folk poets and their leader.

53 One of his commentaries is an explanation of the hymn *Çıktım erik dalına anda yedim üzümü* {I climbed up a plum branch and there ate grapes}, which Niyāzī had also previously commented on. It was written in 1118/1706–7. Another was a commentary on the hymn *Çıktım bâdem dalına anda yedim üzümü* {I climbed up an almond branch and there ate grapes}. It was written in 1123/1711–12. Both are unpublished. Mehmed Tâhir mentions the commentary on only one of Yūnus Emre's *ghazals* among the works of İsmâ'îl Hakkı (*Osmanlı müellifleri*, vol. 1, p. 29). As I have indicated, İsmâ'îl Hakkı wrote separate commentaries on these two *ghazals*. There is a MS of each in my private library {see the editions of these commentaries in Pekolcay and Sevim, *Yunus Emre şerhleri*, pp. 153–81}. At the end of his commentary on the second *ghazal*, while explaining the line *Kul çalmadan uyandım hem çalarım sazımı* {I awoke without striking anyone, all my striking was on my *saz*}, he expounds Yūnus's perfection in the following manner: *ve bundan, şeyh-i mezbûrun ekâmil-i nâstan olduğu bâhir oldu. Ânın için kelimâtı, kemâle dâirdir; yoksa beyne'l-Cemâl ve'l-Celâl müteredded değildir, sâir kelimât-ı 'uşşâk gibi* {It is evident from this that the aforesaid shaikh was among the most perfect of

men. Therefore his words are about perfection. But he does not waver between the beauty of God and the awesome might of God, as is the case with other *ʿāshuqs* (the implication being that he chose beauty)}.

54 In the past, everyone who had some literary taste, no matter what his social class, possessed miscellanies (s. *majmūʿa*) and collections of folk poems {s. *cönk*}. *Cönk*, meaning memorandum book, is a *majmūʿa* that opens lengthwise. These miscellanies contain, according to the taste of their owners, bits and pieces of poetry, letters, wise advice, pleasantries, and a thousand other such things. Some of these *majmūʿas* simply consist of hymns belonging to the dervishes. Among such *majmūʿas* that reveal the Ṣūfī temperament of their owners, there is hardly any that does not include Yūnus Emre's poems. {See Orhan Şaik Gokyay, "Cönkler üzerine," *Folklor ve Etnografya Araştirmalari*, 1984, 107–65; also the series of short studies by M. Sabri Koz, the first three of which are "The Dervish Cönk," "An Istanbul Cönk," and "Two Cönks from the First Half of the 19th Century," *4th Floor, The Bulletin of the Yapı Kredi Sermet Çifter Research Library*, no. 1 (2001), 18–23, no. 3 (2001), 16–22, no. 4 (2002), 10–16. Koz uses some *cönks* from Köprülü's library.}

55 *Mihr-ü vefâ biribirinden azdı*
Behlûl baykuşleyin viranda gezdi
Seyyid Nesîmî'yi zâhidler yüzdi
İncinmedi Hak'tan gelen cefâya

Bu işlerin cümlesini Hak etti
Tabduk bahrî olub ummâna battı
Yûnus kırk gün balık karnında yattı
İncinmedi Hak'tan gelen cefâya

{Love and loyalty strayed from each other
Bahlūl wandered amidst ruins like an owl
Sayyid Nesīmī was flayed by ascetics
He was unharmed by the cruelty that came from God.

God brought about all of these things
Tapduk became a kingfisher and plunged in the ocean
Yūnus lay forty days in the fish's belly
He was unharmed by the cruelty that came from God,}

(from the unique MS in my private library of the work entitled *Manāqib al-asrār, bahjat al-aḥrār*, which the Safavid Shāh Ismāʿīl {supposedly} wrote under the pen name Khaṭāʾī in order to disseminate the rules and protocols of his own *ṭarīqa*). This work attributed to Shāh Ismāʿīl, a collection of whose poetry in excellent Turkish is found in the British Museum (Charles Rieu, *Catalogue of Turkish Manuscripts {in the British Museum* (London, 1888)}, no. 205), has been completely unknown up to now {see Minorsky, "The Poetry of Shāh Ismāʿīl I," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies*, 10 (1940–2), 1007–53; and Tourkhan Gandjeï, *Il Canzoniere di Šāh Ismāʿīl Ḫaṭāʾī* (Naples, 1959)}. This work contains the religious beliefs of the Qızılbash, and is thus very valuable with respect to our religious history. It also includes a significant number of poems in the syllabic meter by both Shāh Ismāʿīl and certain Qızılbash poets who preceded him, and so it is also a very important source for our literary history. From a careful study of *Manāqib al-asrār, bahjat al-aḥrār*, I have reached the firm conclusion that it does not, in fact, belong to Shāh Ismāʿīl {on his poetry, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ismāʿīl I: His Poetry" (T. Gandjeï)}. Nevertheless, this does not lessen its importance. I have benefited from it greatly in my studies of the religious history of Anatolia.

56 The poets of pre-Islamic Arabia, the Jāhiliyya {i.e. time of ignorance}, had a religio-magical aura and very great influence among the people. Consequently, in order to undermine their influence, the Koran naturally contains a number of {divine} judgments against poetry and poets. Still, because poetry and eloquence had acquired great importance in Arab life (see {Zaydān,} *Medeniyyet-i islâmiyye tarihi*, vol. 3, p. 49, citing such sources as {al-Suyūṭī's} *Muzhir*, *Bulūgh al-arib* {?} and {Ibn ʿAbd Rabbihi's} *al-ʿIqd al-farīd*; Brockelmann's and Huart's histories of Arab literature {respectively *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, 2nd edn (Leipzig, 1909), not to be confused with Brockelmann's multi-volume catalogue of Arabic works with the same title, and *A History of Arabic Literature* (London, 1903)}, the Prophet treated very favorably the poets who had accepted Islam. He had poetry recited in his presence and even encouraged Ḥassān b. Thābit to write satirical poetry about polytheists. Kaʿb b. Mālik once asked whether or not it was legitimate to satirize unbelievers. The answer he received from the Prophet was "satirizing unbelievers is like shooting arrows at them with the tongue and thus is tantamount to fighting {*jihād*} for the sake of God" (Surūrī {d. 969/1562}, at the end of *Baḥr al-maʿārif*, from the MS in my private library {on this writer see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Surūrī" (Edith Ambros)}; there are very important materials concerning the permissibility of poetry and its benefits in Nawʿī's {apparently the Ottoman poet, d. 1007/1599, and not the Persian poet, d. 1019/1610} famous letter {?}, and especially in the introduction to ʿĀshıq Chelebi's *Tadhkira* {i.e. *Mashāʿir al-shuʿarā'*} and Ḥashmet's {d. 1181/1768} *Sanad al-şuʿarā'*, MS in my private library {on the latter, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ḥashmet" (Mehmed Kaplan)}. For poetry to be acceptable, in this manner, the upholders of religious law and the Ṣūfīs subsequently restricted it to such subjects as *tawḥīd* {profession of the unity of God}, *naʿt* {praising the Prophet}, and *akhlāqiyyāt* {ethics}, and for a long time any other, non-religious, poetry was viewed with disfavor. Taking advantage of this, the Ṣūfīs distinguished between the poetry of *ʿāshıqs*, i.e. themselves, and that of the poets in order to separate true love, with which they were preoccupied, from physical love, about which the other poets sang. We saw above how Sulṭān Walad – conforming to this old Ṣūfī view – distinguished the poetry of the *ʿāshıq* from that of the poet. Sinān Pasha {d. 891/1486} too, after criticizing poets at length in his *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'*, explains the difference between them and Ṣūfīs: . . . *Ammâ sakın bu sözden Hoca ʿAttâr, Şeyh Irâkî emsâlini şâir sanma, Hazret-i Mevlânâ gazeliyyâtını bu kabilden addeyleme; ânların kelimâtı derd-i dildir ki söylerler ve ânlar gazellerini harâret-i aşkla takrîr eylerler. Ânların Dîvân'ları dûde-i safâ – vü dâd ile tahrîr ve tertîb olunubdur ve ânların mecmûʿaları tılaa-yı hüsn-i iʿtikâd ile tasvîr ve tezhîb olunubdur. Ânların sözleri aşk meclisinin sazı olur ve ânların neşîdelerinin bir dürlü âvâzı olur* { . . . But from what I have said you should not suppose that Khwāja ʿAṭṭār, Shaikh ʿIrāqī, and the like, were poets. Nor should you consider the *ghazals* of Mawlānā to belong to this class. Their utterances are expressions of heartache. They recite their *ghazals* with the fever of love. Their *dīwāns* are composed with the lampblack of purity and justice. Their *majmūʿas* are illuminated with the gold of firmly held belief. Their songs (*söz*) are the musical instruments (*saz*) of the assembly of love (*ʿishq*) and their verses have a kind of echo (*âvâz*)} (*Tadhkirat al-awliyā'*, MS in the Beyazıt Umumi Library in Istanbul {now ed. Emine Gürsoy (Ankara, 1987), and see *EI*^{2}, "Sinān Pasha, Khodja" (Christine Woodhead)}). Laṭīfī, in order to give value in this way to poets whose work has no mystical character whatsoever, alleges in his *Tadhkira* that even non-religious subjects also definitely have a mystical import (pp. 10–12), but this allegation by no means conforms to reality. Therefore, despite the claim by writers like Laṭīfī and Nawā'ī (*Maḥbūb al-qulūb*, {ed. Vefik Pasha (Istanbul, 1889), sections published by M. Belin in *Caractèrs, maximes et pensées de Mir Ali Chîr Névâii* (Paris, 1860)}, pp. 30–3) that all poets should be considered mystics, we must accept the Ṣūfīs' distinction between the *ʿāshıq* and the poet.

57 The *Dih-murghnāme*, which was influenced by ʿAṭṭār's *Manṭiq al-ṭair*, was written in 919/1513–14 by a poet known as Ishıq Shamsī or Dervish Shamsī. He was a contemporary of Sultan Selim I, to whom he presented this work (on this poet, see Laṭīfī, {*Tadhkira*,} p. 209; ʿĀshıq Chelebi, {*Mashāʿir*,} vol. 5, p. 42; {Kınalı-Zâde} Ḥasan Chelebi, {*Tadhkirat al-shuʿarā*', MS TY 1737 in Istanbul University Library; ed. İbrahim Kutluk (Ankara, 1979–81),} p. 112. According to Laṭīfī, he was from Sivrihisar, but according to ʿĀshıq Chelebi and Ḥasan Chelebi he was from Iran. Laṭīfī's report that he died at the end of Selim I's reign is mistaken, because he says in his own work that he reached the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent. {Now see İdris Güven Kaya, *Derviş Şemsi ve Deh Murg Mesnevisi* [Cambridge, MA, 1997].}) The following passage, which is found in this work under the heading ذم كردن زاغ جعد را {Disparagement of the Ill-favored Crow} and shows that contemporary Ṣūfīs continuously recited the hymns of Yūnus Emre, is very worthy of note:

Sûfîdir yâni kuşun benden kaçar
Şöyle zâhiddir ki saldurmaz geçer
Günde halk içinde açtıkçâ dehân
Kendüden gayrı Müsülmân yok hemân
Yûnus Emre sözlerin tekrâr ider
Subh oluncâ nâ-bedîd olur gider
Dâimâ kavli budur sâfîlerin
Zühdü yoktur şimdiki sûfîlerin

{He is a Ṣūfī – I mean, your bird – he flees from me
He is such an ascetic that he passes by without attacking.
During the day when he opens his mouth in a company
You'd think there was no Muslim beside himself.
He repeats the words of Yūnus Emre.
At dawn he disappears.
The words of the pure are always thus.
The Ṣūfīs nowadays have no asceticism.}

58 In his famous *Lutfiyya*, Vehbī {Sünbülzâde Vehbî, d. 1224/1809}, speaking of beggars, says the following:

Bed-sadâ böyle dilenciye tamâm
Har gedâ der zurefâ-yi aʿcâm
Bâzı cerrâr da şâir geçinür
Cerr-i eskalda mâhir geçinür
Dağıdır halka müzeyyef tarîh
Olarak lâyık-ı levm-ü tevbîh
İşiten Yûnus ilâhîsi sanur
Bu edâsın gören âdem usanur

{All beggars are in bad repute
The beggar is a donkey amidst the refined and witty Persians
Some beggars pass as poets
They are skilled at lifting weights
They broadcast contemptible chronograms
Being worthy of blame and reproach
The listener thinks it is a hymn of Yūnus
The man who sees this behavior is disgusted.}

59 [In the fifty-six years that have passed since the publication of the first edition of *Early Mystics* {i.e. between the first and third (1976) editions}, much has been written on Yūnus Emre. Indeed, in September 1970 an international seminar was organized on him in Istanbul. Nevertheless, apart from certain details, there has been little advance beyond the framework that Köprülü established. For recent publications on Yūnus Emre and his *Dīwān*, see Faruk K. Timurtaş, *Yunus Emre divanı* (Istanbul, 1972), pp. 38–42.] {Now see, for example, the studies on Yūnus Emre by Ahmet Yaşar Ocak collected in his *Türk sufiliğine bakışlar*; and *EI*^{2}, "Yūnus Emre" (Edith G. Ambros).}

9

THE WORK OF YŪNUS EMRE

A His work

Yūnus Emre's only work is his famous *Dīwān*, which includes *ghazals* and hymns composed in the syllabic meter {*ḥurūf-i hijā'*}. Before analyzing this text, which was first published lithographically in 1302/1884–5 {in Istanbul as *Dîvân-ı âşık Yûnus Emre*} and again in 1320/1902–3, we need to understand how reliable it is and, if it is a faithful text, whether or not Yūnus composed any other work. To be sure, the analysis that I made above of the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, which has long been attributed to Aḥmad Yasawī, has shown the erroneousness of several points that researchers up to the present time have generally accepted as axiomatic (Chapter 5, pp. 127–9). But the surviving work of Yūnus Emre, along with contemporary linguistic and literary products, considerably facilitates our research on this topic.

As with the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, manuscript copies of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān* are quite numerous. Nothing could be more natural for a poet whose hymns reached the most remote corners of Anatolia and Rumelia and were well known for centuries among the people. Yet, despite all my research, I have not been able to find a copy of this *Dīwān* dating from the eighth/fourteenth or ninth/fifteenth century. The manuscripts in our possession are, in fact, all products of recent centuries. The reason for this is that Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān* was compiled and arranged centuries after his death by a dervish who was very devoted to him.[1]

As far as we know, the oldest texts belonging to Yūnus Emre are the hymns published by Mühlbacher.[2] After these hymns, which were written down in the first half of the ninth/fifteenth century, we can consider a few hymns recorded and identified by Hacı Kemal of Eğridir, the author of *Ǧāmiʿ al-nazā'ir*, to be the oldest text belonging to him.[3] Subsequently, hymns recorded in the name of Yūnus Emre appeared in various poetic anthologies compiled at various periods, and later on, whoever it was who compiled the *Dīwān* made use of them. Consequently, it is obvious that we cannot fully attribute to Yūnus Emre the printed version of his *Dīwān* or the various manuscript copies of it that belong to later periods, nor can we reject the possibility that he wrote some hymns in addition to those in the *Dīwān*. A casual examination of the printed *Dīwān* suffices to

confirm this. This *Dīwān*, consisting of 10,000–12,000 verses, contains many passages that do not belong to Yūnus Emre[4] and, at the same time, it lacks many items that we know definitely do belong to him, such as the passages published by Mühlbacher. The variation among the manuscript copies of the work derives from the fact that, in the absence of any reliable early copy, each compiler included, according to his own understanding, whatever poems {of Yūnus Emre} he happened to come across. Apparently Yūnus recited many hymns without intending for them to be compiled into a *dīwān*;[5] the *Dīwān* was later compiled from those hymns that had been recorded, with a number of differences, in various anthologies. This is why the same hymns appear in such different versions in various works[6] and also why we cannot regard either the published version of the *Dīwān* or the manuscript copies that we possess as reliable documents with respect to linguistic history. To compile a reliable version of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān*, it is necessary – keeping in mind the basic points that I have outlined above – to collect the passages of his work scattered among the various manuscripts and anthologies and then subject them to a rigorous comparative linguistic critique according to the characteristics of contemporary Anatolian Turkish, and produce a new *Dīwān* by the method of *reconstitution philologique*. Still, from the point of view of literary {as opposed to linguistic} history, we can say that the most basic historical critique will suffice to show the place of Yūnus Emre in our literature and the literary character of his work.[7]

B Linguistic character

Our discussion of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān* has shown that long preparatory work would be required in order to make a linguistic analysis of it. Indeed, a thorough linguistic analysis is beyond the scope of this book, but we do possess sufficient information to give a general idea about the linguistic and dialectical features of the *Dīwān*. Because we find in Yūnus Emre's works exactly the same linguistic characteristics as in the works of Shayyād Ḥamza, Sulṭān Walad, Gülshehrī, ʿĀshıq Pasha, and other contemporary writers, we can consider them to be among the oldest {Turkish} works in Anatolia. Although no scholarly analysis has been made to date on these works with respect to phonology and lexicon, this old Anatolian Turkish, which immediately strikes one as being closely akin to the Azerī dialect,[8] is nothing but a later and more developed form of the old Oghuz Turkish.[9]

This Oghuz Turkish, which very early had become a written language, continued as such after the Turks settled in Anatolia, although it underwent certain changes under the influence of environment and other factors. Relatively few works, including some books, produced in this language – those that I have mentioned above – have come down to us, but thanks to them we have a fairly good understanding of Anatolian Turkish in the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries. The linguistic characteristics of Anatolian Turkish that are peculiar to these early periods, and that are rather different from those that

appeared later, after the conquest of Constantinople, are later found as well in Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān*, so one naturally includes it within this same domain. Although it is likely that there were some insignificant local variations between it and the other old works belonging to the same periods, research on this topic, as I stated above, requires a complete rearrangement and restoration of the text of the *Dīwān* according to its earliest form. To be sure, such a study may be of greater value to linguistic than to literary history. In any case, the language of Yūnus Emre is, like that of other contemporary Anatolian works, despite some archaic features, pure Anatolian Turkish.[10]

C Literary character

Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān* is composed of several *mathnawīs* and numerous *ghazals* and strophic poems (*musammaṭs*). It contains altogether some 5000–6000 couplets, most of which are in the syllabic meter.

The *mathnawīs*, which constitute a minor part of the work, about 600 couplets, and which come after a short prose introduction at the beginning of the *Dīwān*,[11] actually form a unit that is divided into the following sections: *Dāstān-i rūḥ wa nafs wa mā yataʿallaqu bihimā min al-aḥwāl* {Poem of the spirit and carnal soul and the conditions concerning them}, *Dāstān-i qanāʿat* {Poem of contentment}, *Dāstān-i ghaḍab* {Poem of wrath}, *Dar-bayān-i aḥwāl-i ṣabr wa ḥikāyat-i Yūsuf ʿalayhi's-salām* {Concerning patience and the story of Joseph, upon him be peace}, *Dar-bayān-i ḥālāt-i bukhl* {Concerning avarice}, *Dar-bayān-i aḥwāl-i Qārūn* {Concerning Korah}, and *Dar-bayān-i dāstān-i ʿaql* {Concerning the intellect}. These *mathnawīs*, which discuss the conditions of the spirit and the carnal soul and such moral issues as avarice, contentment, patience, and generosity, are inspired by the rules of Ṣūfī ethics; and the influence of ʿAṭṭār, Sanāʿī, and Mawlānā on them is immediately apparent. In a manner replete with allusive symbols that were very popular among the Ṣūfīs, Yūnus expounds the distinctions of reason and faith, the nature of the four elements {earth, water, air, and fire}, the merciful and satanic powers that govern the world of the heart, the temptations of the carnal soul, and the importance of contentment and patience. Occasionally, in order to emphasize and clarify a point, he will illustrate it by means of a simple story, such as the greed of Korah, or Joseph's patient trust in God when he was in the well, and show the dangers {awaiting one} on the Day of Judgment.

His descriptive style is generally quite artful. For example, after the Emperor of Intellect captures the Land of Greed, he raises Contentment to the throne. But there is a bandit on the road leading to that land. He dwells at the top of the mountain and never descends from it. Those who follow this rebel, whose name is Pride, never consider that the long rope of death will reach them wherever they are. Yūnus Emre advises them to implore Intellect, a great man who possesses Justice. Intellect orders Humility to drive Pride from the top of the mountain. Then Humility takes the form of a river and flows into the sea. Those who dive into that sea under the guidance of Intellect find there unheard of pearls, coral,

garnets, and rubies. When Intellect learns that Pride has been defeated with the help of Humility and Contentment, he joyfully thanks God. This does not, however, end the disorders in the kingdom of the body. Two antagonists, Comfort and Pleasure, are about to appear again. Intellect learns about this through his spies and orders Patience to oppose them. Patience successfully puts an end to these difficulties. Nevertheless, the roads are long and dangerous. There are enemies like Avarice, Envy, Hatred, and Slander who prevent one from reaching the goal. But Intellect finds a means to overcome them: Righteousness. When one puts on the honorable robe of Righteousness, i.e. when one attains divine Truth, the torch of faith burns brightly; the thief in the house of the body, that eternal seducer of mankind, comes into the open and can no longer hide.[12]

Written in 707/1307–8, this rather long *mathnawī*, which forms a unit, shows that Yūnus Emre was not an illiterate poet as has been claimed, but, to the contrary, can be regarded as a Ṣūfī inspired by the mystical moralist poets of Iran. Anyone who briefly studies our literary works that were produced between the second half of the seventh/thirteenth and the first half of the eighth/fourteenth century may easily judge that this *mathnawī* exactly fits this period with respect to its subject, world view, and form of expression. Composing this *mathnawī* in the Persian *ʿarūḍ* meter is also completely in accordance with the literary traditions of that period, because contemporary Anatolian poets, under the influence of the great Persian Ṣūfīs, had accepted the Persian *ʿarūḍ* meter along with the *mathnawī* form. Yet, because the {Turkish} language was still not suitable for the *ʿarūḍ* meter, the words could by no means be read naturally. Instead, they had to be lengthened or shortened. And because artistic excellence could not be achieved, the rhymes are almost always faulty. Therefore, those who have studied the work of Yūnus Emre up to the present have usually regarded this *mathnawī* as written in the syllabic meter.[13] This moralistic poem, of a more or less didactic nature, is technically very defective and cannot be compared aesthetically to Yūnus's other works, because it was nearly impossible to add something of his own personality to such didactic versifying. The need to remain bound to a foreign technique to which neither he nor the language was accustomed was also a factor in this.

After this long *mathnawī*, there appears a short invocation {*munājāt*}, awkwardly made to fit the *fāʿilātun*, *fāʿilātun*, *fāʿilāt* meter. Following this, the hymns, i.e. Yūnus Emre's original, important, and personal works, are arranged in a series according to the last letters of the rhyming element. Indeed, the most popular of Yūnus Emre's works for centuries have been these hymns or orations {s. *nuṭuq*} (in Bektashī terms, *nefes* {hymn}). As one finds generally among the Muslim mystics, some of these works express views that are broad and lofty – i.e. that defend honor and dignity – or are even quite humanistic. Others are orations urging the need for prayer and fasting. Most of them are exuberant poems concerning the philosohy of *waḥdat al-wujūd* {unity of being}. All of them breathe a profound and pure excitement, a divine impulse combined with purity of heart and sincerity. This singer of hymns, who only cried out to offer sincere worship

to his creator and to expound to the heedless the great divine Truth that he had attained, was, in his own words, *Hakk tecellîsini şâir dilince eden bu âşık koca* {this enraptured old man who poetically described the self-disclosure of God}. He knew perfectly all the stories and traditions of ancient history and the scientific and philosophical views and systems of the time. In various places in the *Dīwān*, there are eloquent references to Islamic and Persian traditions, such as the sultanate of Solomon, the treasure of Farīdūn, and the treasure of Nūshirwān; to all the stages in the history of the prophets; to the legends of the great Ṣūfīs, such as al-Ḥallāj and Dhū 'l-Nūn; and to contemporary intellectual and philosophical systems. After reviewing them, it is absolutely clear that the tradition of Yūnus Emre's illiteracy can by no means be considered historically correct.

In a state of mystical rapture and pious reverence, ʿĀshıq Yūnus Emre sometimes speaks of a love that is sublime and replete with mysteries, or else of the fearful clamor of the Day of Judgment, or the rivers of milk in Paradise and the divine nightingales' singing of the unity of God. Yet like all Turkish mystics, he could not be completely indifferent to nature. Just as there is an enthusiasm for, and attraction to, nature in the early Turkish poetry in {al-Kāshgharī's} *Dīwān lughāt al-turk* and in {Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib's} *Kutadgu Bilig*,[14] there also exists a certain pleasure in nature in the works of Yūnus Emre, who wandered about the forests of the Sakarya obsessed with divine love. Yet, because his eyes could not escape from the depths of the inner world, even in the very few scenes of nature in the *Dīwān* one is again struck by colors and degrees of spirituality; and the result appears in a completely unexpected manner, i.e. either as moralistic advice or as a mystical aphorism.[15] In this respect, it would be quite subjective and mistaken to try to establish a connection between Yūnus Emre's works and his milieu.[16]

Also, compared to the moralistic and philosophical poems in the *Dīwān*, there is very little of a mystical-satirical nature. Poems of this genre, which were also written by conscientious Ṣūfīs in imitation of the utterances of certain of those obsessed with divine love {*majdhūb*}, had a very clear meaning to those who were sufficiently familiar with Ṣūfī symbols, although the *ahl-i qāl* {conventional religious scholars}, who could not penetrate their depth of meaning, regarded them as utter nonsense. Yūnus Emre's poems, such as his famous hymn *Çıktım erik dalına anda yedim üzümü* {I climbed the plum branch and there ate grapes}, are exactly of this type, and extensive commentaries have been written about some of them.[17]

The meter and form of Yūnus Emre's works are also worthy of study. Up to now researchers have concluded that he used only the syllabic meter, but the fact is that he used both *ʿarūḍ* and the national {i.e. syllabic} meter. I described briefly above how the *ʿarūḍ* meter was gradually applied to Turkish by the Anatolian poets of that time (Chapter 7, p. 209). In this respect, it should be seen as very natural that Yūnus Emre, who was by no means an illiterate dervish, used the *ʿarūḍ* meter, although he lived among the people and addressed himself to them. Just as it is obvious that some of the poems in the *Dīwān* that were composed perfectly in the *ʿarūḍ* meter do not belong to Yūnus Emre, it is equally

certain that the *ʿarūḍ* works written in primitive form in Turkish – and usually in such a defective manner that they are indistinguishable from {works in} the syllabic meter – do belong to Yūnus Emre. Basically Yūnus Emre employed the simple *ʿarūḍ* meters that were the most compatible with the syllabic meter.[18]

Although Yūnus Emre used the *ʿarūḍ* meter, he wrote a significant number of his hymns – and naturally the most beautiful and original of them – in the syllabic meter. The major factor in this was his desire to address the popular masses, among whom he grew up, more effectively by using a cadence to which they were accustomed. In addition, his desire not to differ from other such popular works, which were surely written before him under the influence of Aḥmad Yasawī and his imitators, played a strong role in this. A Ṣūfī poet who understood the affection and attachment that the people had for such works would certainly, in the famous words of Mawlānā, offer the same kind of goods to his readers. Still, it should not be forgotten that, at that time, in addition to all of these factors, the foreign *ʿarūḍ* meter was preferred in works of a didactic nature, whereas in lyrical works the artist tended to the national meter in accordance with his disposition. Yūnus Emre, who was quite unconcerned with art or artistry and composed his poems simply by divine impulse, quite naturally conformed to the natural and national cadence that was stored in his conscience. One encounters virtually every form of the syllabic meter in the *Dīwān*, namely, 6; 7; 8; 5 + 5 = 10; 6 + 5 = 11; 6 + 6 = 12; 7 + 7 = 14; 8 + 8 = 16. Among these, the ten- and twelve-syllable forms are quite rare in our literature. While one observes that Yūnus was not bound to the caesura in these forms, or that he was indifferent to various deficiencies, generally speaking he was very successful in his use of these meters.

In addition to the Persian *mathnawī* and *ghazal* forms in the *Dīwān*, there is also the old *koşma* form, which we may also call quatrains or *musammaṭs*. Yūnus Emre's most beautiful poems are arranged above all in this latter form. As I stated above while discussing Aḥmad Yasawī, the *koşma* or quatrain form is the oldest and most widespread form in Turkish folk literature. Yūnus Emre preferred this form not because he was imitating Persian quatrains or *musammaṭs*, but simply because he was under the strong influence of folk literature.[19] Thus, it is clear that Yūnus Emre did not depart from the popular taste with respect to either meter or form and that he unconsciously took advantage of the aesthetic source that the popular spirit had accumulated over the centuries.

D Yūnus Emre the moralist

As I mentioned above, some of Yūnus Emre's *mathnawīs* and hymns are of a didactic nature. With them he tried to propagate a type of Ṣūfī morality. There is no doubt that some of these works are of poor quality and lack originality compared to his genuine Ṣūfī works. In other words, the moralist persona of Yūnus Emre that we are going to examine here was very undistinguished compared to his Ṣūfī persona. In any case, in order not to exclude from our study of Yūnus

Emre even the most insignificant aspects of his life, let me briefly describe the bases of the Ṣūfī morality that he tried to expound.[20]

The Ṣūfī morality that Yūnus Emre propagated is first of all a genuine summons to conform to the teachings of the Koran and *Ḥadīth* and to respect the principles of the *Sharī'a*, even to the most minor details, because the *Sharī'a* is the essential foundation of the *ṭarīqa*. Those who do not respect it are threatened with eternal punishment. Second, there are several negative and positive moral principles that are required by the Prophet's *Sunna* {*al-sunna al-muḥammadiyya*}. These are so well known that there is no need to repeat them here. In quite a few of his poems, Yūnus expounds at length the need to remain bound by them: patience, contentment, generosity, benevolence, and so forth. But these are all general points that constitute the moral bases of Islam. True Ṣūfī morality begins after this. While it includes much more serious obligations, it is also more refined and more humane {*insānī*}.

Yūnus begins this propaganda with an invitation to the Ṣūfī way. Many of his hymns instill the notion that "without attaching oneself to a perfect guide on the mystical path, one cannot reach the goal."[21] But this way, this Ṣūfī way, is very demanding. The difficulties to be undergone are not of the sort that could be endured by those subject to the physical self and carnal passion, which are closely bound to this world. For this reason, it is first necessary to make the adepts aware of these difficulties. Thus many of Yūnus Emre's hymns are explanations of these difficulties. Being a dervish does not simply mean being a disciple and wearing the cap {*tāj*} and patched cloak {*khirqa*}. One must put all this aside and, allowing oneself to be the target of arrows of censure {*malāma*}, eliminate all sense of shame and honor so that genuine {divine} love may be established {in one's heart}. Only then, thanks to the power of this love, can duality {of the self and the divine} be transcended and only then will the secret of divine unity be revealed. There is no other way, for this will not occur by studying the religious sciences.[22]

As I will explain below when discussing the Ṣūfī beliefs of Yūnus Emre, such a view of existence requires one to trust in God and submit to Him {*tawakkul wa taslīm*} and to renounce, abandon, and divest oneself completely from worldly affairs. At that point, the dervish must tolerate everything and consider it good. Once he has attained this state, he no longer makes distinctions among people, whether good or bad, Muslim or *mājūsī* {fire-worshipper}. Indeed, he even treats kindly those who have treated him badly.[23] It is for this reason that the ascetic Yūnus Emre, who, in some of his hymns, makes the most grave accusations against "one who has never prayed," reveals a broad, humane compassion in some of his most valuable compositions propagating the principles of Ṣūfī morality, and goes as far as to say that he who does not look at the seventy-two sects as equal, he who makes distinctions among them, even if he is a religious instructor, he is still in fact a sinner.[24]

It is, therefore, very clear that this Ṣūfī morality, the basic principles of which I have tried to establish, was not something peculiar to Yūnus Emre but was

something that the great Persian Ṣūfī moralists had promulgated.[25] While Yūnus Emre's style is weak and insipid in some of his poems where he defends the principles of an orthodox pietistic asceticism, he comes across as a forceful, sincere, and distinctive individual in those passages that instill a very broad and humane Ṣūfī morality. It is also quite obvious from this that Ṣūfism is not, according to this early Turkish Ṣūfī, a lifeless thing composed of terminology and a code of rules. Instead, just as with Abū Saʿīd Ibn Abī 'l-Khair and Mawlānā, it is something living and to be lived, a spiritual need, a divine impulse.

E Yūnus Emre the Ṣūfī

Yūnus Emre's Ṣūfī views, like those of all the early Anatolian Ṣūfī poets, are either directly borrowed from Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī or virtually identical to his. In order to understand the Ṣūfī ideas of Jalal al-Dīn Rūmī, to which we can give the name *panthéisme idéaliste* {i.e. *wujūdiyya-i khayāliyya*}, it would first be necessary to explain the principles of the Neoplatonists, especially the late Neoplatonists. But in order not to go beyond the scope of my work, which is merely a literary and historical study, I will be content to cite and elucidate briefly the Ṣūfī principles that are very beautifully summarized in the work of the Persian Ṣūfī poets, such as Mawlānā and Jāmī.[26] The basic principle is that of the unity of being {*waḥdat al-wujūd*} or *panthéisme idéaliste*, which is common to all Muslim Ṣūfīs and is expounded in perhaps its most perfect and refined form by Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Ibn al-ʿArabī.[27]

{In the following three paragraphs, Köprülü paraphrased E. J. W. Gibb, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. 1, pp. 16–19, but we have used Gibb's text.}

> God is Absolute Being. He therefore necessarily comprises within Himself all apparent existences whatsoever; and Absolute Good, therefore necessarily Absolute Beauty, Beauty being one side or aspect of Good. Such is the Divine Nature; and having learned this, we may perceive how the phenomenal universe came into existence. Ere yet time was, God dwelt alone in unrevealed loveliness and glory; alone in solitary radiance shone Absolute Beauty; no eye was there to gaze enraptured on Its unspeakable fairness, no heart to thrill in ecstasy at Its all-perfect harmony. A marked characteristic of Beauty, whatever be the form it may assume, is an innate desire of self-manisfestation. This is very clearly expressed in a famous Hadis or "Apostolic Tradition," continually on the lips of the poets, in which God, in answer to a question of David as to why He had created man, replies, "I was a Hidden Treasure, therefore was I fain to be known, and so I created creation in order that I should be known."[28]
>
> But how was this manifestation thus demanded by the Divine nature to be brought about? It is an axiom that things can be known only through their opposites or negations. Now the opposite or negation of

Absolute Being, which is one and the same with Absolute Beauty and Absolute Good, is necessarily Not-Being, Not-Beauty, Not-Good. But such can have no real existence, for all real existence is of necessity comprised in Absolute Being, of which this is the negation. Not-Being is then only a phantasm evoked for a season and for a special purpose. As Absolute Being could be known only through Its negation Not-Being, so Absolute Good could be known only through Its negation Not-Good; and as Absolute Being and Absolute Good are one, so also are Not-Being and Not-Good. Evil has therefore no real existence; there is no Absolute Evil as there is Absolute Good; by its very nature Evil is temporary and limited, it is but an illusion which the conditions of manifestation have rendered necessary for a while.

The process of manifestation was accomplished thus. When Not-Being became opposed to Being there appeared on the former, as in a mirror, a reflection or shadow of the latter. This reflection, which partakes of the nature of both Being and Not-Being, is called Contingent Being, and is none else than the phenomenal universe.[29] Some Ṣūfīs liken this to the reflection of the sun on a still lake. As the universe is thus the image of Absolute Being, that is of God, reflected in the mirror Not-Being, so, they continue, is man the eye in that image, and as when we look in a mirror, we perceive a small image of ourselves reflected in the pupil, so is the image of God reflected in this eye which is man. Thus is God revealed unto Himself and unto man, and thus moreover does man contain in himself the image of God.[30]

{In the following paragraph, Köprülü paraphrased Gibb, vol. 1, pp. 19–21; again we have used Gibb's text.}

Man, like the phenomenal universe in which he finds himself, and of which he presents an epitome, is double-natured, partaking at once of Being and Not-Being, of Good and Evil, in other words, of the elements of existence and non-existence. This Divine particle in man, this spark of Pure Being, is ever seeking, consciously or unconsciously, to be reunited to its source; but so long as the phenomenal state lasts, the presence of the element of Not-Being holds it back. Man's business then is to eliminate, so far as may be, this element of Not-Being, and to attain to that union with God, that absorption into the Divine, which though to be fully achieved only after death of the body, is possible in a certain measure even in this present life. Those who learn the mystery of موتوا قبل ان تموتوا {Die before you die} have successfully done this. The way to do this is to conquer self; for self, which seems so real, is in truth the supreme illusion as it is the cause of all our woe. We have no self; whatever we have of Real Being is God's not ours; the rest is mere nothingness, the negation of Being, the negation of Good, to hug which

> can bring only sorrow. Thus, Love {*'ishq*, ecstatic love of God} is necessary to conquer the physical self. By Love, and by Love alone, can the dark shadow of Not-Being be done away, can the soul of man win back to its Divine source. Human love is not itself the end, it is but the means to the end; it is the "Bridge" across which the pilgrim of the Truth must pass. But fair as the Bridge may be, the pilgrim must beware of lingering thereon, lest haply he should fail to reach his journey's end. Once across, his eyes are opened, his heart is made clairvoyant through Divine Love; wherever he turn his gaze he sees the Face of God. If he turn his eyes inward and look into his own heart, there he can read letter by letter the very heart of God. For he has now become one with God, knowing and feeling that there is naught beside God. Thus the annihilation in God which is called "becoming Truth with the True," i.e. to perish in absolute being, is this. Al-Manṣūr's {al-Ḥallāj's} statement "I am the Truth," and Abū Yazīd Bistāmī's exclamation "There is none other than God within my cloak" are exact expressions of this.[31]

What is needed for this is ecstasy {*wajd wa ḥāl*}. I have discussed above the Ṣūfī stages that follow this, i.e. *baqā'* {subsistence}, which comes after *fanā'* {annihilation}, and the final state, which is *'ubūdiyya* {servanthood} and *rujū' ilā 'l-bidāya* {returning to the beginning; on these terms see Chittick, *The Sufi Path of Knowledge*, pp. 219, 310–11, 105}.

After briefly expounding these basic beliefs, which are found not only in Yūnus Emre but in virtually all Turkish and Persian Ṣūfī poets, it will be much easier to understand Yūnus Emre's Ṣūfī poems. As appears clearly and categorically in many places in his *Dīwān*, this great Turkish Ṣūfī was influenced by the work of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī,[32] and like him was very closely attached to the path of *wujūdiyya-i khayāliyya* = *panthéisme idéaliste*, which I have explained above. Sometimes, by saying that he could not further expound the truth because he revered the discipline of the *Sharī'a*, he provides teaching that suits the upholders of religious law and the ascetics. But usually he leaps beyond this boundary with divine rapture,[33] admitting that the path of love is true religion; that the followers of the *Sharī'a* cannot attain that station; that his {i.e. Yūnus Emre's} religious community is different from every other, and his religion and piety are exceptions to existing religions; and that even without ritual prayer and ablutions he has attained the prayer-niche of the divine Friend.[34] Yūnus gives the following categorical and eloquent response to the objections to this by the "externalists" {*zâhir ehli*} – the legal scholars and jurists:

Bana nâmâz kılmaz diyen, ben kıluram nâmâzımı
Kılur isem kılmaz isem ol Hak bilür niyâzımı

Hak'tan artık kimse bilmez kâfir, müsülmân kimdürür
Ben kıluram nâmâzımı Hak geçirdiyse nâzımı

Ol nâz dergâhından geçen maʿnâ şarâbından içen
Hicâbsız cân gözin açan ol bilür benim sözümü

{They say that I do not pray – but I *do* pray.
And whether I pray or not, God knows my supplication.

Only God knows who is an infidel, who a Muslim.
I *do* pray, if God has forgiven my pride.

He who passes beyond the court of pride, who drinks the wine of Spiritual Meaning,
Who opens the eyes of his soul without a veil – he knows what I am saying.}

It is obvious that Yūnus Emre has no business with the legal scholars and jurists, those concerned with the external or superficial meaning of scripture, i.e. the established religious authorities, because they claim to know truth simply by means of the intellect. Using only the intellect and the senses on this dangerous path cannot be productive. For this, ecstasy (*wajd*, *ḥāl*) is required; but those are people who understand religion and God from books (*qāl*):

Hakîkat bir denizdir şerîʿat anın gemisi
Çoklar gemiden çıkıp denize dalmadılar

Dört Kitâb'ı şerheden hakîkatte âsîdir
Zîrâ tefsîr okuyup maʿnâsın bilmediler

{Truth is a sea, and the *Sharīʿa* is a boat.
Many never leave the boat and plunge into the sea.

Those who expound the Four Books are sinners in truth:
They read exegesis, but do not know the meaning of what they read.}

Because Yūnus Emre entered this path with Love, his *Dīwān* is replete with cries of Love. Just as Love occupies the prime place in Plato, Plotinus, and later in Mawlānā, so it does in Yūnus Emre. He shouts "Ever since I drank the wine of Love, I don't know what I am. In order to reach You, I passed beyond my own existence (i.e. I overcame the physical self and thus eliminated the element of non-existence). Now see me!" And he finally understands the nature of this Assembly of Love {*aşk meclisi*}:

Bir sâkîden içtik şarâb ʿarştan yüce meyhânesi[35]
Ol sâkînin mestleriyüz cânlar anın peymânesi

Bunda dâim yananların küllî vücûdü nûr olur
Ol od bir od'a benzemez hiç belürmez zebbânesi

Bu meclisin mestlerinin Ene 'l-Hak demleri olur
Yüz Hallâc-ı Mansûr gibi en kemdürür dîvânesi

Ol meclis kim bizde olur anda ciğer kebâb olur
Ol şem'a kim bizde yanar ay ve güneş pervânesi

Ol meclisin bekrîleri İbrâhîm Edhem gibidir
Belh şehrince yüzbin ola her köşede bir dânesi

Aşk şarâbın içenlere gel bir nazar eyleyi-gör
Bunca yıldır nice döner ol meclisin piyâlesi

Yûnus bu cezbe sözlerin câhillere söylemegil
Bilmez misin câhillerin nice geçer zamânesi

{We drank wine at the hands of a Cupbearer whose tavern is higher than the heavenly throne.
We are drunkards of that Cupbearer, our souls are His wine cup.

Here those who constantly burn are wholly transformed into light.
That fire is unlike any fire: there are no flames to be seen.

Those drunk in this assembly only sing: I am Truth.
Like a hundred Ḥallājes, the lowliest of them is mad.

In that assembly of ours the heart (lit.: liver) is the kebab.
Of that candle which burns in us the sun and moon are moths.

The drunkards of that assembly are like Ibrāhīm b. Adham:
In a single corner are as many as a hundred thousand in the city of Balkh.

Come take a look at those who have drunk the wine of Love:
In so many years, how often the wine cup has made its rounds.

Yūnus: don't utter these words of rapture to the ignorant.
Don't you know that the time of the ignorant will pass?}

This path of Love is undoubtedly not an easy one. Many dangers must be overcome and many hardships must be met before one reaches the goal.[36] Yet once one has attained Truth on this path, all difficulties – ugliness, evil, and non-existence – disappear and the traveler sees God everywhere. He finds everything consumed in absolute being.

Ma'nâ bahrine daldık Vücûd seyrini kıldık
İki-Cihân ser-teser cümle Vücûd'da bulduk

Gece ile gündüzü gökte yedi yılduzı
Levh'te yazılan sözü cümle Vücûd'da bulduk

Mûsâ çıktığı Tûr'u gökte Beytü'l-Ma'mûru
İsrâfîl'deki Sûr'u cümle Vücûd'da bulduk

Tevrât ile İncîl'i Furkân ile Zebûr'u
Bunlardan hem beyânı cümle Vücûd'da bulduk

Yedi gök yedi yeri dağları denizleri
Uçmak ile tamuyu cümle Vücûd'da bulduk

Yûnus'un sözleri Hak cümlemiz dedik sadak
Kande ister isen bak cümle Vücûd'da bulduk

{We plunged into the sea of (spiritual) meaning. We made a tour of Being.
We found in Being the totality of both the worlds, from end to end.

Night and day and the Seven Stars in the sky (= Big Dipper),
The words written on the celestial Tablet – we found all of them in Being.

Mount Sinai which Moses ascended, the Frequented House in Heaven,
And Isrāfīl's trumpet – we found all of them in Being.

Torah and Gospel, Koran and Psalter,
Together with their explanation – we found all of them in Being.

The seven heavens and seven earths, the mountains and the seas,
Paradise and Hell – we found all of them in Being.

Yūnus's words are Truth. We all said: "He has spoken truly."
Look wherever you will – we found all of them in Being.}

After seeing everything in the universe consumed in absolute being, after the element of non-existence is utterly destroyed, and after not separating himself from it {absolute being}, the follower of this path obtains absolute happiness. Therefore, in contrast to those who seek God outside oneself, Yūnus Emre's saying *Hak cihâna doludur kimseler Hakk'ı bilmez / Kendinden istesene ol senden ayrı olmaz* {The Truth (or, God) fills the world, but no one knows the Truth. / Why don't you seek Him in yourself? He will not be apart from you} rings true, for according to this idea, even absolute being, which is the uniquely true existence and by means of which everything exists, is reflected within human consciousness. The following poem perfectly expounds this conviction:

İstediğimi buldum âşkâre cân içinde[37]
Taşra isteyen kendin kendi pinhân içinde

Kâimdir ol ırılmaz ansız kimse dirilmez
Adım adım yer ölçer hükmü revân içinde

Bu tılısmı bağlayan cümle dili söyliyen
Yere göğe sığmayan girmiş bir cân içinde

Girdim gönül şehrine daldım anın bahrine
Aşk ile seyrederken iz buldum cân içinde

Şâh oluben oturur kula buyruk tutturur
Fermânını buyurur kendi fermân içinde

{I found what I was seeking plainly evident in my soul.
He who seeks his self outside himself is himself hidden within.

He is everlasting and never departs. Without Him no one comes to life.
He measures the earth step by step. His reign is in the soul.

He who has cast this spell, who speaks in every language,
Who is not comprised by heaven and earth – He has entered inside a single soul.

I entered the city of the heart. I plunged into His sea.
While touring with Love, I found the trace inside my soul.

He is king and sits on his throne, giving commands to His subjects.
He gives His command, but He Himself is in the command.}

This should never be understood, however, as a form of incarnation {*ḥulūl*, indwelling of God in a creature} or union {*ittiḥād*}, because in order for incarnation or union to be possible another being is required in addition to God. The Ṣūfī belief, however, accepts nothing but absolute being, as I mentioned above.[38] The hymn below, which reveals Yūnus Emre's concept of emanation {*ṣudūr*} and self-disclosure of God {*tajallī*}, shows that he did not differ from the other great Ṣūfīs in this matter as well; and that is why we can by no means attribute the above words to incarnation or union.

Oradan gönderildim aşk ile bile geldim[39]
Bu âleme çıkıcak bir aceb hâle geldim

Gör ne yuvadan uçtum halka râzımı açtım
Aşk tuzağına düştüm tutuldum ele geldim

Geldim uş yine varam yine Rahmân'ım bulam
Sanurlar beni bunda davara mâla geldim

Kudret sûret yapmadan firişteler tapmadan
Âlemi halk tutmadan ilerü yola geldim

Çün dost açtı yüzümü gösterdi kendözümü
Gönlümdeki râzımı söyledim dile geldim

Tuzaktayım ne gülem ne hâldeyim ne bilem
Bir garîbçe bülbülem ötmeğe güle geldim

Tuzağa düşen gülmez âşık hiç râhat olmaz
Kimse hâlimden bilmez bir aceb ile geldim

{I have been sent from there. I have come with Love.
When I emerged into this world, I came into a wondrous state.

See from what a nest I have flown. I divulged my secret to the people.
I fell into Love's trap. I was caught and now I am in the hands
of others.

I come, and lo! I will return. I will find my Merciful One again.
They think that I have come here looking for cattle!

Before divine power made the forms, before the angels worshipped,
Before the world was created, I came forth on the way.

When the Friend uncovered my face and made me manifest,
I spoke and revealed the secret in my heart.

I'm in the trap: why should I laugh? How do I know what state I'm in?
I'm a nightingale far from home. I have come to the rose to sing.

One who falls in the trap does not laugh. The lover is never at ease.
No one knows of my condition. I have come to a wondrous country.}

In saying here "The lover is never at ease," Yūnus means that lovers have no peace in this transitory world, because they wish to obtain divinity immediately and go quickly to their original abodes. The divine bird of the heart, which has flown from the nest, keeps fluttering in order to return to its nest as soon as possible. This is why Mawlānā said: مرغ دلم میطپید هیچ سکونی نداشت مسکن اصلیش دید یافت در او ساکنی {The bird of my heart is fluttering. It never rests. It has seen its original abode. It has found rest there.}

The externalists do not know the condition of lovers, nor understand their language. Thus, it is a torment for lovers to live amidst creatures not of their own kind, in a world that does not belong to them.[40] This is what Yūnus Emre expresses with these moving cries. They are a commentary on Plato's principle, "to die is to live."

Ben bunda garîb geldim ben bu ilden bezerem[41]
Bu tutsaklık tuzağın demi geldi üzerem

Yetmişiki millete suçum budur hak dedim
Kırkı hiyânet durur ya ben niçin kızaram

Bir çeşmeden akan su acı tatlı olmaya
Edebdir bana yirmek bir lüleden sızaram

Şerî'at erenleri nice yol ide bana
Hakîkat deryâsında bahrî oldum yüzerem

Çü ben suçumu bildim cümlesin bende buldum
Mansûr'em dâre geldim kül oluben tozaram

{I have come here as a stranger. I am weary of this country.
The time has come for me to break this trap where I am held captive.

I said to the seventy-two religious communities: "This truly is my fault."
Forty of them are treachery – so why should I get angry?

Water flowing from a fountain is not bitter or sweet.
The proper thing for me is to tear it apart (?) and let me ooze out through a pipe.

How can the men of the *Sharī'a* make a way for me?
I am a kingfisher in the sea of Truth – let me swim!

Because I acknowledged my fault, I find them all in me.
I am al-Ḥallāj and have come to the gallows. I am ashes – let me be blown away!}

I stated above the reason for honoring man, that he was created as the most perfect form {*aḥsan-i taqwīm*} and that divine attributes are manifest in him.[42] The major reason for his moral exaltedness is the heart. Some of Yūnus Emre's poems on the heart, and especially the hymn below, are no less precious than the most beautiful passages of the Persian Ṣūfīs on this subject.

Ak sakallı bir koca hiç bilmez kim hâl nice
Emek vermesin hacc'a bir gönül yıkar ise

Sağır işitmez sözü gece sanur gündüzü
Körbür münkirler gözü âlem münevver ise

Gönül Çalab'ın tahtı Çalap gönüle bahdı
Dört Kitâb'ın ma'nâsı budur eğer var ise

{An old man with a white beard who does not know what ecstasy is:
Let him make no effort to go on the Ḥajj, if he is going to break a heart.

He is deaf and cannot hear speech. He thinks day is night.
The deniers' eyes are blind, although the world is brightly lit.

The heart is God's throne. God has regard for the heart.
If the Four Books mean anything, *this* is what they mean.}

I described above the kinds of moralistic conclusions that could be derived from this mystical theory. According to the Ṣūfīs, if man, i.e. the perfect man who overcomes the element of non-existence and attains divine Truth, is so important then naturally the most sublime knowledge also belongs to him. Because our primary task is to know God, and knowing Him occurs through knowing ourselves, the most important science, or, more correctly, the fundamental science is that which teaches the mysteries of man. This cannot be found in books like

the science of conventional religious scholars. It can only be found via the path of Love and by means of a spiritual guide, in other words by the science of mysticism. Yūnus Emre also knows this reality, but he favors stating it not to jurists and religious scholars who are heedless of it, but to lovers.

İlm okumak bilmektir hem kendüyü bilmektir[43]
Çünkü kendin bilmezsen bir hayvândan betersin

Yûnus işbu sözleri âşık'a di âşık'a
Gir gönüle yararsa birkaç dahi katarsın[44]

{Knowledge is knowing how to read, and also knowing one's self.
Because if you don't know yourself you are worse than an animal.

Yūnus: utter these words to lovers, to lovers.
Enter the heart. If it suits, you will add even more (?).}

Just as the idea of the perfect man arises from the theory of emanation and self-disclosure {of God} in Ṣūfī philosophy, so does the idea of *dawr* {the cycle of existence passing out from the Divine Reality down through the Arc of Descent and then back into the Godhead in the form of the Perfect Man}, which is related to it. Hence, we have creation poems {*dawriyyas*}, which are very famous in Ṣūfī literature. According to the theory of emanation and self-disclosure that I described above, something that comes into existence in this material world, which is the lowest of the existing worlds, is first manifest in the form of an inanimate object, then as a plant, animal, and man, and finally it enters the form of the perfect man and reaches God. This then is the secret of منه بدأ الامر واليه يعود {Existence originates from Him and returns to Him}, i.e. existence emerges from absolute being, descends to this world, leaves it again, and returns to the source. The Ṣūfīs likened this cyclical movement to a circle and divided it into the arc of descent and the arc of ascent.

The divine light, which emerges from absolute being, passes in a sequence from Universal Intellect {God} to the nine intelligences, to the nine souls, to the nine celestial spheres, to the four natures {heat, cold, wetness, and dryness} and as far as the earth to the four elements {earth, water, fire, and air}; this is the origin of the arc of descent. Following this, the same light passes from earth to mineral, then to plant, then to animal, then to man and then to the perfect man and returns again to its source. This second cycle is called the return or arc of ascent.[45] Mawlānā depicts this cyclical movement very well in one of his famous lyric poems,[46] and there are also passages that touch on this celebrated Ṣūfī doctrine in the *Mathnawī*,[47] Nāṣir-i Khusraw {d. between 465 and 471/1072 and 1078},[48] Ibn Yamīn {d. 769/1368},[49] Faiḍ-i Hindī,[50] and {Maḥmūd Shabistarī's} *Gulshan-i rāz*.[51] This teaching, which Turkish Ṣūfīs used with great skill as a subject of poetry, is essentially Neoplatonic. The doctrine of metempsychosis, on the other hand, is found neither in the great Ṣūfīs nor in Yūnus Emre.[52]

So, just as we find *dawriyyas* in the poetry of the great Persian Ṣūfīs, Mawlānā in particular, we also find quite a few in Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān*, usually penned with great freedom and excitement. Yūnus writes in fervent language that in the beginning he was together with the Beloved, i.e. absolute being; then he became mineral, plant, animal, and man; then he took the form of Moses and went up Mount Sinai, he became Abraham and wanted to sacrifice Ishmael, he became the ram that was sacrificed, he became Joseph and was sold, he became the one who purchased him, he became Jesus and went up to heaven, and he was present at the Prophet's ascension . . . etc. From this it is evident that Yunus was not afraid of the chastisement of the *Sharī'a*, despite his admission to the contrary. The description that I have given above of the spiritual state of Anatolia at that time, suffices to show how Yūnus Emre could have had such unrestrained ideas and, more importantly, how he did not hesitate to express them. Let me give as an example one of the most unrestrained *dawriyyas* that he wrote:

Ol Kâdir-i kün feyekûn lutf edici Rahmân benem[53]
Kesmeden rızkını veren cümlelere Sultân benem

Nutfadan âdem yaratan yumurtadan kuş dürüden
Kudret dilini söyleten zikreyleyen Subhân benem

Kimisini zâhid kılan kimisine fısk işleten
Ayıplarını örtücü ol Delîl ve Burhân benem

Benem ebed benem bekâ ol Kâdir-i Hak – mutlakâ
Yarın Hızır ola sakâ anı kılan gufrân benem

Et ve deri, sögük ve cân, ten perdelerini tutan
Kudret işim çoktur benim hem Zâhir u 'Ayân benem

Hem bâtinem hem zâhirem hem evvelem hem âhirem
Hem ben Ol'um hem Ol benem Ol Kerîm-i Subhân benem

Yoktur arada tercemân andagı iş bana beyân
Oldur bana veren lisân ol deniz ve ummân benem

Bu yeri gökü yaratan bu 'arş ve kürsî devriden
Binbir adı vardır Yûnus ol sâhib-i Kur'ân benem

{I am He with power over "Be and it was," the Beneficent, the Merciful.
I am Sultan over all, who gives their nourishment without stint.

I am He who created Adam from semen, who produces birds from eggs,
Who gives speech to the tongue of Power, the reciter of praise and the One who is praised.

I am He who makes some ascetics and others fornicators.
And who conceals their faults; I am the Evidence and the Proof.

I am the Eternal, the Powerful, absolute Truth.
Tomorrow Khaḍir will provide you with water: I am He who forgives him.

I am He who keeps body and soul together, flesh and skin and bones.
I have many deeds of Power. I am the Apparent, the Evident.

I am the Hidden and the Apparent, the First and the Last.
I am He and He is I. I am that Generous one who is praised.

There is no interpreter between us. Whatever He does is evident to me.
It is He who gave me a tongue. I am the ocean and the sea.

I am He who created heaven and earth, who turns the heavenly throne.
He has a thousand and one names, Yūnus. I am the possessor of the Koran.}

From these accounts, to which many more examples could be added, it is clear that Yūnus Emre grasped with great intuitive power – a power no less than that of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī – the most extensive and refined Ṣūfī philosophy that prevailed in Anatolia at that time and succeeded in expressing it with astounding force and eloquence using the primitive Turkish of that period. While we can by no means consider Yūnus Emre to be an illiterate dervish, we may not fault him because he was not able to create a wholly individual philosophical system. He appropriated to himself entirely the broad and unrestrained views of Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, and their disciples. In his spirit a mystic, in his character he was a great and genuine artist. A number of leading Persian poets and Ṣūfīs had adopted Neoplatonism in its Islamic form while making no attempt to create an individual system; and Yūnus Emre followed their lead. Yet he succeeded in expressing all the Ṣūfī principles in the simplest language and in such an artistic manner, and he made his works live so vigorously among the people that his like has never been seen in our literature or in Persian literature. Yūnus Emre was not a great philosopher, but he was a sincere, enthusiastic, and genuine Ṣūfī and above all a poet of genius. After Aḥmad Yasawī, one encounters no other Ṣūfī poet in all Turkish literature who had as much influence as Yūnus Emre.[54]

It would be totally incorrect to regard Yūnus Emre as a *bāṭinī*, i.e. "as a follower of the creeds that did not conform to the official doctrines,"[55] because he did not go beyond the principles found in Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī and Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, principles that were not even regarded as contrary to the *Sharī'a* – albeit interpreted allegorically – even by a large segment of the orthodox religious establishment.[56] If Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī, Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī and their followers are to be considered as *bāṭinīs*, then Yūnus Emre would also have to be included among them, but Muslim scholars never understood the term *bāṭiniyya* in this fashion.

F Yūnus Emre and Ḥurūfism

Ḥurūfism is a creed that was spread by Faḍl Allāh al-Naʿīmī Astarābādhī in the eighth/fourteenth century and penetrated Anatolia in the ninth/fifteenth and tenth/sixteenth centuries. Its fundamental beliefs and the reasons for its appearance have been very well studied.[57] Although a number of Turkish Ṣūfī poets like Nesīmī, Rafīʿī, and Tamannāyī adopted this creed,[58] no one to date has made the slightest suggestion that Yūnus Emre was a Ḥurūfī; neither the old historians and biographers nor modern researchers have spoken of such a likelihood. Rızâ Tevfik, probably believing Yūnus Emre was a ninth/fifteenth-century poet, was the first to conclude from certain passages he saw in the *Dīwān* that he was a Ḥurūfī.[59] The information I provided in the previous section on the life of Yūnus Emre showed that it is virtually certain that he died long before the appearance of Faḍl Allāh Astarābādhī and thus to regard him as a Ḥurūfī is completely without foundation. Indeed, no evidence whatsoever has come to light indicating that he was in fact a Ḥurūfī. Some things do exist in his work pertaining to Arabic letters and their secrets,[60] but they are common to all the great Ṣūfīs and are a part of Ṣūfī Islam, not as a fundamental principle but as an appendage, and it is impossible to attribute Ḥurūfism to those Ṣūfīs who speak of them.[61] If one were to consider everyone who believed in the secrets of the Arabic letters to be a Ḥurūfī, then one would have to accept that Ḥurūfism was established long before Faḍl Allāh. But because it is certain that the strange and childish system that we know under the name Ḥurūfism originated with this figure, such a claim is untenable.[62] In short, because all Ṣūfīs believed in the secrets of the letters, and because this belief has no connection with Ḥurūfism, nothing further need be said on this matter. Rızâ Tevfik apparently ignored the importance that Muslim mystics gave to the Arabic script and never considered whether Yūnus Emre came before or after Faḍl Allāh. He created the issue of Yūnus Emre's Ḥurūfism out of nothing and tried to include him among the Ḥurūfī poets. In light of this brief discussion, it is obvious how baseless and fanciful this claim is.

G Conclusion

In Chapter 7 of this book, I outlined the spiritual and literary character of Anatolia before Yūnus Emre and described the milieu in which he flourished. After providing descriptions of Yūnus Emre's poetry with respect to its linguistic and literary character and its ethical and mystical features, I would now like to draw the threads together and make some brief general remarks concerning his artistic achievement and his similarity to Aḥmad Yasawī.

First, was Yūnus Emre an artist, and what inherent value does his work have from a strictly aesthetic perspective? From the time of our early biographers, whose elementary and limited views of art we know quite well, to the present – which has naturally been influenced by these same elementary views – Yūnus Emre has never been thought of as an artist. Indeed, as I have shown above,

Yūnus Emre, who was an ardent Ṣūfī, was not concerned in the least with art and artistry. He simply sang of his soul and his spiritual excitement, his needs and inspirations. As with all Ṣūfīs, the single external factor that drove him in this matter was his desire to assist people by giving them spiritual guidance. Nevertheless, his lack of concern for art, his disregard of the regularities of language and rhymes, were never obstacles to his becoming an artist, indeed a great artist. To the contrary, if he had been preoccupied with artistry according to the conception of that time, he would not have been able to avoid an affectation of style, i.e. the rules of old classical literature, and consequently he would not have been able to pour out his soul with such sincerity. The basis of art is personality, and the most powerful personalities are those who are the most sincere. In other words, the fact that Yūnus Emre was ignorant of his own artistry is by no means an obstacle to considering him a great artist.

Yūnus Emre's art was a completely popular, i.e. a completely Turkish, art, so that when we analyze it we discover two major fundamental elements. First, the Islamic-Neoplatonist element gave Yūnus Emre his mystical and ethical principles. This constitutes the matter in his work. Second, the Turkish popular element provided his language, style, meter, and verse-form. This constitutes the form of his work. Because form and matter cannot be separated from each other – and can only be analyzed by abstraction – these two elements have coalesced in Yūnus Emre's personality, resulting in art that is completely national, i.e. completely Turkish with respect to taste. Expressing this metaphorically, we could say that Yūnus dissolved these two elements in the crucible of his personality and brought forth brand new material possessing completely different and distinctive qualities. Yūnus Emre's power – or, to use a more forceful and more accurate expression, his genius – derives from this capacity. And essentially this form of genius is also completely Turkish.[63]

Yūnus Emre created this national art form and imprinted it – in a manner so forceful that it would not fade over the centuries – with the seal of his personality. The distinctive qualities of this art form are purity, sincerity, simplicity, clarity, and power. While reading Yūnus, we sense that a simple ingenuous dervish, with eyes full of compassion and love, is singing to us in divine language. In his addresses and pleas to God, this dervish, who opens his soul to us like an old friend, shouts, weeps, or protests, or else, always with a most natural purity, simplicity, and sincerity, sings in a state of rapture. His work has no trace of anything artificial, ostentatious, ceremonial, or in conformity with rules of etiquette. The simplicity of his soul is reflected transparently in all his hymns. Yūnus Emre speaks about the most profound and difficult metaphysical questions with amazing clarity. Even those who know nothing about the subtleties of Islamic mysticism or the doctrines of the Neoplatonist school become spiritually acquainted with these subjects by reading his hymns, for they will have perceived in their hearts the riddles of existence. Yūnus Emre had the ability to instruct the people by making them sense these mysteries – albeit in the simplest manner – with the purity and directness of an illiterate. He expressed himself forcefully and

convincingly and his way of presenting the most intractable problems was straightforward. Indeed, his ingenuous boldness in expounding the most sublime truths is too personal and sublime to be found even among the greatest Persian Ṣūfīs.

Sırât kıldan incedir kılıçtan keskincedir
Varıp anın üstüne evler yapasım gelir
Altında gayyâ vardır içi nâr ile pürdür
Varıp ol gölgelikte biraz yatasım gelir
Ta'n eylemen hocalar hatırınız hoş olsun
Varuben ol tamuda biraz yanasım gelir

{*Sırât* (the eschatological bridge over hell) is thin as a hair and sharp as a sword:
I would like to go there and build houses on it.
Below it is the inferno, blazing with fire:
I would like to go and lie down a while in that shade.
Don't blame me, teachers – please think well of me –
I would like to go and burn in hell a while.}

This manner of expression, which the reader finds astounding and convincing at the same time, is so natural that we would almost think we were hearing it from the mouth of the famous illiterate shepherd whom Moses encountered.[64] But Yūnus Emre was not illiterate like this shepherd. He was familiar with all the contemporary {intellectual} systems. Still, it is marvellous how he can resolve the most abstruse metaphysical questions with such purity of heart and simplicity and with such a sense of the popular taste, while lending them the sincerity of an illiterate. The primary features that we found in Yūnus Emre's art – simplicity, clarity, power – we also see clearly in other branches of Turkish art – for example, in architecture – which is its most exemplary branch.[65] This too shows that Yūnus's literary genius was completely national and typical.

This brief analysis of Yūnus's art also makes clear why his works have flourished for centuries among the people. The first of the two elements that shaped Yūnus Emre's art, i.e. the Islamic-Neoplatonist element, has hardly diminished during the six centuries that have elapsed since his time. To the contrary, it has persisted, and indeed continually increased in importance right up to modern times. The intellectual heritage of the ancient Greeks, which was studied in the *madrasas*, and later the rich and valuable works of the Persian Ṣūfīs, which were read in the *tekkes*, reinforced this manner of feeling and thought and spread it to the masses. As these views, which slowly spread from the upper classes to the common people, eventually became pervasive among the public, it became impossible, of course, for the hymns of Yūnus Emre to be forgotten. Above all, the fact that this element was presented in new dress with forms wholly derived from the people and in a manner that suited their taste, and thus the most sublime and difficult metaphysical doctrines were expressed in a national form that was simple

enough to be understood by the people, gave a very prominent place to Yūnus Emre's hymns among even the simplest folk.

As I said above while analyzing the reasons for the success of Aḥmad Yasawī, the general conservativeness of popular literature over the centuries, i.e. the lack of a major change in the popular taste, was another factor contributing to the popularity of his work for centuries. In addition, one must also search for Yūnus's artistic success, which endured for centuries, not only in the lack of a significant intellectual and spiritual change in the milieu that his art addressed, but also somewhat in his personality, in his genius. If this were not the case, our great intellectual {Gökalp} would not have tried to imitate the national and sincere style of Yūnus Emre's hymns in a number of his own hymns written during the recent years of revolution in which great importance has been given to research on the national taste.[66]

Those who read separately my ideas about Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre could easily make for themselves a comparison between the two. In order to save them the trouble, it will suffice for me to briefly list certain important differences between them. First, it is certain that Aḥmad Yasawī and his followers influenced Yūnus Emre and his predecessors in Anatolia. Even the artistic elements of Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre are virtually identical. In Yūnus Emre, however, the philosophical element becomes broader and more sublime, assuming an explicit form of pantheism {*wujūdiyya-i khayāliyya*}. At the same time, the expression is no longer dry and didactic, but acquires a lyrical and lively form. The difference between them cannot be explained simply as the result of period and milieu. Yūnus Emre apparently never gave a thought to founding a *ṭarīqa* and so never gained the spiritual influence of the founder of a *ṭarīqa.* Nevertheless, he had a much more sensitive temperament than Aḥmad Yasawī and was a much more individual artist. He was also a more exuberant and vigorous Ṣūfī than Aḥmad Yasawī. In all of Turkish literature, from its origin to the present, no greater Ṣūfī poet has ever appeared.

NOTES

1 We possess no clear documentation on this matter, but the fact that all copies of the *Dīwān* belong to recent centuries leads us to accept this notion. Otherwise, because the works of this early poet were so well known and widespread, we should certainly find an early copy of his *Dīwān* written in the eighth/fourteenth or ninth/fifteenth century. The lack of a *dīwān* is the reason why early anthologies {*majmū'as* and *cönks*} are full of Yūnus Emre's hymns. I mentioned above that true Ṣūfīs who sang simply for the sake of the divine, without any concern for artistry, and without any desire for fame, rarely recorded and arranged their works into *dīwāns* and that even the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* was collected and arranged by an enthusiastic *murīd* long after the death of Aḥmad Yasawī. It is clear that the works of Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre are quite similar in this respect.

2 Foy, who made a number of extensive linguistic analyses of the two texts that Mühlbacher published, cites them in Arabic script as follows, transcribed here, with certain corrections, as early texts of Yūnus Emre {"Die ältesten osmanischen

Transscriptionstexte in gothischen Lettern," with further emendations based on recent studies by Talât Tekin, "Yunus Emre'nin gotik harfleriyle iki manzumesi," *Erdem*, 3 (1987), 367–92, and Heidi Stein, "Das türkische Sprachgut im 'Tractatus de Moribus, Condictionibus et Nequicia Turcorum' (1481) des Georg von Ungarn," *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 14 (1995/6), 39–78; 15 (1997), 89–118}:

Gâfil olma aç gözünü
Kötülük etme dünyâda

Niceler yatır düşüben
Sümükleri saçışuban

Kim âh edüb kalır zârı
Göçmüş yatır pîr u karı

Sorma hâlin kimisine
Kim isini gövdesine

Hanı Muhammed Mustafâ
Dünyâ kime kaldı vefâ

Aldanma mâla davara
Sevik ile bile vara

Yûnus bu sözleri çatar
Kendisi nekadar dutar

Hâline bak öleni gör
Yazukların dileni gör

Girm ilan, çiyan üşüben
Çürüyen ovulanı gör

Günâhdur elinde varı
Miskînleri güleni gör

İnanma yaramasına {?}
Ulşup yeni yılanı gör {?}

Hüküm etti Kaf'tan kaf'a
Aldanıben kalanı gör

Kulluk eyle Hakk'a yara
Bâkî yoldaş olanı gör

Halka ma'rifet satar
Söylediği yalanı gör

* * *

Yanar içim göner özüm
Ölüm endîşesi ne hoş

Öliseriz belli beyân
Teneşir üstüne konup

Hiç bilmezem ben nice idem
Yakasız don giyem gidem

Gele bana kavum kardaş
Kim olısar bana hâldaş

Kalam ben 'amelim ile
Gide kavum güle güle

Sana eydirem ey paşa
Kimi isiden bağır pişe

Yarın siyâset kurula
Kim emîr sâyevân birle

'Amel verer onda cevâb
Şol kişiye olmaz azâb

Yûnus imdi kıl yarak
Cümle halâyık dirile

Ben ölümü anıçag
Ululara danıçag

Gizli içimiz olur ayân
Halk önünde yunıçag

Hangi yana sefer idem
Başsız ata biniçeg

Ola sine degi yoldaş
Ben sin'imde kalıçag

Her niceyse hâlim ile
Evden yana döniçeg

Neler geliserdur başa
Kim şarâba kanıçag

Cümle halâyık dirile
Kimi isiden yanıçag

'Amelsize olur 'itâb
Bunda âzâd ohçag

Utanmayasın doğru bak
Adlı adıyle sayılıçag

{Don't be neglectful: open your eyes; consider your condition; see the dying. Don't do evil in this world; seek forgiveness for your sins.

How many have fallen and lie in the grave, with swarms of worms, snakes and centipedes,

Their bones scattered. See how they decay and turn to dust.

Some sigh and moan: everything is sin in their hands.
The elders have passed on and lie in the grave. See how the miserable sinners laugh.

Ask no one of his condition, trust not one who is contrary (?).
He who was warm in his body (?) – see how he howls and expires.

Where is Muḥammad Muṣṭafā who ruled the world from end to end?
To whom has the world been faithful? See those who are left deceiving themselves.

Do not be deceived by worldly wealth. Worship God.
Go together with the Beloved (Prophet). See who is the eternal wayfellow.

Yūnus puts these words together. He sells wisdom to the people.
But how much does he hold to it himself? See what lies he is telling!

* * *

My innards burn when I recall death.
How pleasant is the anxiety of death when I marvel at the great ones.

We shall die, that is clear. What is hidden within us will be plain to see.
When we are placed upon the bier and we are washed before the people.

I don't know at all what I should do, which direction I should go.
I'll wear the garment without a collar (i.e. shroud) when I mount the horse without a head (i.e. bier).

My people and kin will come to me and be my wayfellows as far as the grave.
Who will be my companion when I am left in my grave?

I'll be left with my deeds, with my condition, whatever it may be.
My people will go back laughing, when they return home.

I will tell you, o pasha, what things will befall me:
Some will have their livers cooked by the heat (in hell), while some quench their thirst with the wine (of paradise).

Tomorrow punishment will be meted out; all creatures will be gathered together.
Some *amīrs* (?) protected by shade, while some burn in the heat.

Our good deeds will answer for us there. He who lacks good deeds will be punished,
That man will not be tormented who is noble in this world.

Yūnus make provisions now. Don't be ashamed, look straight ahead.
All creatures will be gathered together and each one will be counted by name.}

The language of these texts reveals their antiquity quite well. For example, we encounter Sulṭān Walad's concept of *mâl davar* {worldly goods} in his line *Yoğ idi mâlum tavarım kim virem* {I had no worldly goods to give} here in the line *aldanma mâla davara* {Be not deceived by worldly goods}. We also come across such adverbial and verbal forms as *geliben*, *kaliben*, *geliser*, and *kalıser*, belonging to the early periods of Turkish and found in the works of Sulṭān Walad, ʿĀshıq Pasha, and Gülshehrī. Similarly, *sin* in the line *Ben sin'imde kalıçag* means "grave." We also find this word in {al-Kāshgharī's} *Dīwān lughāt*

al-turk (vol. 3, p. 101). In the {anonymous lexicon} *Tercemân-ı Türkî ve Arabî* {743/1343}, which belongs to that period, this word is also found having the meaning "grave" and "statue." It is very likely that this refers to the statue placed on the grave according to a well known custom among the early Turks. While Foy's linguistic explanations need to be criticized in many respects, I will not mention them here. I will say, however, that these texts, despite Foy's claim to the contrary, definitely belong to Yūnus Emre. The second of these two poems has another characteristic that we find in our earliest folk poetry and in the work of Aḥmad Yasawī, namely, that the fourth verse, which serves as a refrain, is always one syllable short compared to the main verses. In other words, the poem is mainly in 4 + 4 meter while the refrains have seven syllables (on this subject see Chapter 5, pp. 160–1, nn.44 and 45).

3 There are a number of poems belonging to Yūnus Emre in the *Jāmi' al-nazā'ir*, which was collected and arranged by Hacı Kemal from Eğridir in 918/1415–16 {on the latter, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Mukhtārāt" (Günay Kut), p. 531}. I will cite one of them here verbatim in order to give an idea of their linguistic nature:

Düşmüşem elden ayağa Şâh-u Sultânım meded
Dertliyem geldim kapuna derde dermânım meded

Sen hakîkat serveri ben bir kemîne kul senin
Hizmete geldim kabûl et ben kulun Hân'ın meded

Sendedir mühr-î Süleymân sana fermân ins-ü cân
Yeryüzünü tuttu dîvler ey Süleymân'ım meded

Fikr-ü zikrindir hemîşe gönlümün eğlencesi
Kimse yâr olmaz bana hiç tendeki cânım meded

Yanalıdan nâra bağrım aşkına Ceyhûn gibi
Durmaz akar gözlerimden yaş ile kanım meded

Kâfileden ayrı düştüm ey Emîr Hâcı'm benim
'Âsi hurma berkesinde kaldı kârvânım meded

Aşk ile geldi kapuna Tapduk'ım Yûnus senin
Gice gündüz endîşem Tapduk'um-ü cânım meded

This *ghazal*, which is not found in the published *Dīwān*, but is also in a manuscript copy {of the *Dīwān*} in my private library, is corrupt in many respects.

4 There is no question that there are many poems in the printed and manuscript copies of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān* that do not belong to him. For example, the hymn that mentions him in the couplet *Yûnus idi pîşrevimiz Âşık Paşa Küşterî'miz / Ol demde oku İsmâ'îl Miskîn niyâmında idi* {Yūnus was our forerunner, 'Āshıq Pasha our Kushterī / Recite at that time, Ismā'īl: Miskīn was asleep (?)} – which shows that Yūnus had precedence followed by 'Āshıq Pasha and Shaikh Kushterī {d. *c.*767/1366} – clearly appears to have been written by a Ṣūfī poet with the pen name Ismā'īl and cannot possibly be attributed to him. Similarly, other hymns written by someone with the pen name Amīr Sayyid do not belong to him. In addition, it would be incorrect to assume that all the hymns by writers with the pen names Yūnus, 'Āshıq Yūnus, Dervish Yūnus, Miskīn Yūnus, Qul Yūnus, and Yūnus Emrem can be attributed to him. As I mentioned above while discussing Aḥmad Yasawī, poems that a number of unknown dervishes who had the pen name Yūnus wrote in imitation of those by Yūnus Emre, which had for them a sacred quality, have been mixed with his genuine poetry. Given Yūnus Emre's great fame, hymns belonging to others could also have been attributed to him as they were copied from one anthology to another. For example, the famous

hymn *Abdu'l-Kâdir gibi bir er bulunmaz* {There is no saint like ʿAbd al-Qādir}, which has been presented as belonging to Yūnus Emre, is attributed to Eşrefoğlu {d. 873/1469, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Eshrefoghlu" (Fahir İz)} in an anthology in my possession. In my discussion above of Aḥmad Yasawī's *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*, I dwelt on the factors that gave rise to this phenomenon.

5 One comes across traditions mixed with all sorts of superstitions that point to the large number of Yūnus Emre's hymns among the dervishes. According to these traditions, Yūnus Emre recited improvised hymns – or, to use another well known term, orations {*nuṭuq*} – wherever he stopped and there were so many of them that some were sung by animals, some by humans, and some by angels. Such traditions are very significant for showing the place and influence of Yūnus Emre among the people.

6 For example, the hymn quoted above {in n.3} that was taken from {Hacı Kemal's} *Jāmiʿ al-nazā'ir* appears in the following form in the manuscript copy in my private library:

Düşmüş (em) elden ayaga şâh(u) sultânım meded
Dertlüyüm geldim kapuna derde dermânım meded

Sen hakîkat severisin ben kemîne kemterin
Kulluğa geldim kapuna ben kula hânım meded

Sendedir mühr-i Süleymân sana fermân ins-ü cîn
Yir yüzini tuttı dîvler hey Süleymân'ım meded

Yanalıdanberi bağrım aşkına Ceyhûn gibi
Durmaz akar gözlerimden yaş ile kanım meded

Kâfileden ayrı düştüm ey Emîr Hâcı'm benim
ʿÂsi hurma berkesinde kaldı kârbânım meded

Kulluğa bel bağlayub Tabdûk'a Yûnus (?!) *gibi*
Gice gündüz endîşem câna cânanım meded

One may also find different versions – often quite confused – of the same hymn in various places in one *Dīwān*.

7 There are numerous manuscript copies of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān*. {In Turkey} copies are found in many libraries, including the Galata Mevlevî-hânesi Library (no. 608) and the Âtıf Efendi Library {in Istanbul} (no. 1047). Many other copies are found in the libraries of Europe. One frequently comes across not only the *Dīwān* but also anthologies containing the works of Yūnus Emre in Flügel's manuscript catalogue for Vienna, in Pertsch's catalogue for Berlin, and in catalogues of other libraries. In addition to a fairly good manuscript copy in my private library, I have been able to examine five or six other copies of the *Dīwān* in private hands. In an anthology in the Esad Efendi Library {in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul}, quite a few hymns of Yūnus Emre are given together with the names of the composer. My private library also includes many anthologies that contain works of Yūnus Emre. In any case, those who wish to make linguistic analyses of his *Dīwān* will be able to find numerous such manuscripts of it as well as anthologies.

8 For the close relationship between Azerī dialect and early Anatolian Turkish, see *İA*, s.v. "Âzerî" (M. F. Köprülü).

9 On the classification of Turkish dialects in the fifth/eleventh century, see the long discussion above {in Chapter 5, pp. 130–4} concerning the dialect in which Aḥmad Yasawī wrote.

10 E. J. W. Gibb compares the language of Yūnus Emre and Sulṭān Walad and reaches the following conclusion: "The language, though naturally abounding in long-obsolete words and forms, is considerably more Ottoman than that of the *Rebáb-Náme*

verses. This may probably be in some measure owing to the 'corrections' of successive copyists, but it is no doubt chiefly attributable to the fact that the author was a northern Turk" (*A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. 1, {p. 167}). I definitely cannot accept the idea that there was such a great difference, with regard to language, between the works of Yūnus Emre and Sulṭān Walad. If we possessed an early and reliable copy of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān*, I could very easily prove my contention. But even without such a copy – thanks to other works from Anatolia from those periods – I can assert very strongly that morphologically and phonetically there is no significant difference between the works of Yūnus Emre and Sulṭān Walad and that their poetry should be included in the same linguistic parameters. The fact that Gibb provides no evidence for his claim reveals its weakness. If Gibb had seen early contemporary copies of these works, he would not have attributed such a great difference to the works of Sulṭān Walad. I could strengthen my contention with considerable evidence if necessary.

11 In the printed edition of the *Dīwān*, and in most manuscript copies, this prose introduction is laid out as verse. On closer examination, however, it is obvious that it is not verse but a kind of rhymed prose. I have only found this laid out as prose in some good and carefully written manuscripts.

12 In the printed *Dīwān*, this *mathnawī* is found in a very corrupt and completely unreliable form. The manuscript copy in my private library, however, is in the proper and correct form. It is written in the *mafā'īlun*, *mafā'ūlun*, *fa'ūlun* meter and has more or less preserved its early linguistic features {see Gölpınarlı edn, pp. 2–37}.

13 Veled Chelebi {İzbudak}, in an article that he wrote in 1313/1895–6 for a special joint issue of *Tercümân-ı hakîkat-Servet-i fünûn* {i.e. the daily newspaper *Tercümân-ı hakîkat* and the illustrated weekly *Servet-i fünûn*}, is of the same opinion. E. J. W. Gibb, who perhaps follows him, also agrees: "All this verse is written in the Turkish metres, which is doubtless what Tashköpri-záde means when he speaks of Yúnus' words being in the 'ballad style.' . . . Yúnus' verse is rugged beyond that of any other Turkish poet; this is in part owing to the fact that he alone used exclusively the uncultivated Turkish metres; Sultán Veled . . . and Yúnus' contemporaries and immediate successors . . . wrote in one of the established Persian metres" (*A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. 1, {pp. 167, 168}). Melioransky, in his treatise that I mentioned above {"K voprosu o znachenii"}, also says "The language of Yūnus Emre is purer and sounder than the language of subsequent Ottoman poets. His meter is the syllabic meter. These two features, which were viewed unfavorably by Ottoman men of letters and historians, give, in my opinion, much greater value to his work." The reason for this mistaken idea must be sought not only in the lack of a critical attitude, but in the unreliability of the text of the printed *Dīwān* and in the fact that even 'Āshıq Chelebi and Tashköprü-Zāde indicate that he wrote only in the syllabic meter.

14 In Chapter 1 (pp. 11–12), I touched on the feelings for nature in our early folk poetry. For more on this subject, see my *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (Istanbul, 1928), pp. 87, 184, 194ff. In the *Kutadgu Bilig*, there are some passages that sincerely describe nature, such as in the introduction to the ode about Bughrā Khān. See the text published by Radloff {*Das Kudatku-Bilik*; and see Dankoff's Eng. trans., pp. 41–3, and his study "On Nature in Karakhanid Literature," *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 4 (1980), 27–35}.

15 As, for example, in the passages:

Gitti bu kış zulmeti geldi bahâr nâz ile
Yeni nebâtlar bitti cünbüş oldu yaz ile

Yine merg-zâr oldu uş yeni gülzâr oldu
Ter nağme düzer oldu mûsıkî de sâz ile

Hoş haber geldi dosttan bezendi bâğ-ü bostân
Ötüşür hezâr destân bülbülleri râz ile

Kīm görmüştür baykuşu gülsitâna girdiğin
Leylekler zikredemez bir latîf âvâz ile

Nice mâh saklar isen dürdâne gevher olmaz
Leylek leylekle uçar hemîşe bâz bâz ile

El kuşu elden ele gül kuşu gülden güle
Baykuş vîrâne sever şâhînler pervâz ile

{Winter's darkness is gone. Coyly spring has come.
Plants have sprouted again exuberantly with the coming of spring.

The meadow is green again, the roses are in bloom.
The air is filled with fresh melody and song.

Good news has arrived from friends. The gardens are all decked out.
A thousand nightingales sing and coo.

Who saw the owl enter the rose garden?
The storks can recite no litanies with a delicate voice.

No matter how many months you keep it, the pearl will not become a jewel.
Stork always flies with stork and hawk with hawk.

Bird of hand from hand to hand, bird of rose from rose to rose.
Owls love ruins, falcons love to fly.}

It is clear that nature is not the basic subject here. The poet, using artistic language, is interpreting its manifestation in a completely mystical fashion. Other such nature poetry found in the *Dīwān* is generally of the same kind. For a true Ṣūfī who finds what he is searching for wholly and exclusively in his own conscience, this should be considered normal.

16 In a short monograph entitled *Millî arûz*, Necib Âsım attributes the *ghazal Müsülmânlar gönül şehri açılmaz key alâmet var / nazar eylen bu dünyâya aceb dürlü melâmet var* {Muslims: the city of the heart will not open. There is a good sign. / Look at this world: there are wondrous kinds of blame}, which I very much doubt belonged to Yūnus Emre, to the confused time at the end of the Seljuk period and tries to establish an artificial relationship between the works of this dervish, who was indifferent to the outside world, and his milieu. The poetic inspiration of the Ṣūfīs, however, is dependent only on their own inner nature and conscious universe and is remote from any concern with time and place. The unity that is perceptible amidst the endless variety of phenomena in the universe and the existence that is concentrated in self-consciousness are the only stock-in-trade of a true Ṣūfī. The adorer of unity who finds absolute being, which is the greatest reality, in the conscience would not deign to complain about his time in the following manner: *Ne kâdî adl-ü dâd eyler ne kayguluyu şâd eyler / Ne ümmî i'tikâd eyler ne imâmda imâmet var* {The *qāḍī* neither practices justice nor cheers the distressed. / Neither does the illiterate have faith nor does the prayer-leader lead the prayer}. There are stories that persist among the people about the evil, oppression, and irreligion of every period, government, and government official and there are various ballads and poems of this kind that we can consider an outward manifestation of this spiritual condition, but they have no Ṣūfī significance whatsoever. On the whole, the Ṣūfīs are not pleased with this world and are opposed to it. But this displeasure does not result from good times, bad times, or times of public disorder, or from any such material reasons. Instead, it arises simply from the desire to attain immediately the "original abode" {*maskan-i aṣlī*, i.e. God}.

17 Shaikh Jamāl al-Dīn Lūrī, who was in Shīrāz when Abū Bakr {the Salghurid, 628–58/1231–60} was the Atabeg of that city, was a Ṣūfī obsessed by divine love. From time to time, he recited satirical verse. Using these satirical verses as a pretext, some religious scholars issued a *fatwā* for his execution and wanted an authorization from the ruler to carry out the *fatwā*. The ruler said that he would not grant such an authorization as long as Shaikh Najīb al-Dīn Buzghush and Muʿīn al-Dīn did not declare him to be an infidel. They concluded that because he was overcome by divine love, he could not be declared an infidel and he was therefore saved ({ Jāmī,} *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 533–4). Some Ṣūfīs, while not being obsessed by divine love but imitating those who were, did not hesitate to recite, from time to time, satirical verses of a Ṣūfī character. We have, for example, the following *ghazal* by Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, for which Shams al-Dīn Sīwāsī provided a commentary {*Sharḥ-i ghazal-i Mawlānā*, MS in Köprülü's private library}:

دوش وقت صبحدم در چرخ پالان یافتم \ در میان دانهٔ خشخاش سندان یافتم

یك کلاهی داشتم از لبلبوگم شد زمن \ در میان دفتر ملا سلیمان یافتم

یك قطار اشتر بکوه قاف بود اندر گذر \ در کنار بحر بی پایان بجولان یافتم

ناقهٔ صالح عصای موسی وروح پدر \ هر سه را در بطن مادر زنده بی جان یافتم

آن خر عیسی وآن سوزن که باشد پای بند \ آن خراندر خانه سوزن در گریبان یافتم

دخل هفت اقلیم را ازگندم وگاورس وجو \ پخته نانی خوردم وبی ضرب دندان یافتم

سیصد وشصت کاوکوهی سرنکون باشاخها \ درتنور چار مغز جوز بریان یافتم

صد هزار آهو بره لبها پر از شیر حکم \ در میان بیضهٔ بلبل بافغان یافتم

دوش وقت صبحدم رفتم بسوی میکده \ صور اسرافیل را در خم بافغان یافتم

نعل می بستند روزی اشترانرا ده بروم \ حلقهٔ گم شد ازان در گوش خاقان یافتم

خوش بگفتی این سخن ملا جلال الدین روم \ معنیش را در میان نقل قران یافتم

{Yesterday at dawn I found a pack-saddle in the wheel;
I found an anvil in the middle of a poppy seed.

I had a hat made of chickpeas. I lost it.
I found it in the middle of Mullā Sulaimān's register.

A camel train on Mount Qāf was in the pass:
I found it wandering at the shore of the boundless sea.

Ṣāliḥ's she-camel, Moses' rod, father's soul:
I found all three alive and dead in mother's belly.

Jesus' donkey and the needle that is a fetter:
I found that donkey in the house and that needle in the collar.

I ate a piece of boiled bread made from wheat and millet and barley,
And without striking my teeth, I found the income of the seven climes.

I found 360 mountain-cows with their horns head down
In the oven of a roasted walnut.

I found a hundred thousand fawns, their lips full of the milk of wisdom,
Moaning in the middle of a nightingale's egg.

Yesterday at dawn I went to the tavern.
I found Isrāfīl's trumpet moaning in a barrel.

Ten camels in Rūm were shod one day.
One ring was lost: I found it in the Khāqān's ear.

You have spoken these words nicely, Mullā Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī.
I have found their meaning while transcribing the Koran.}

According to the Ṣūfīs, this kind of satirical verse, which is also found in the *Dīvān* of Yūnus Emre, can be interpreted in several ways. It seems that Yūnus Emre, as I will explain below, agreed with Mawlānā in this matter as in many others. We often find such satire in subsequent imitators of Yūnus Emre, such as Qayghusuz, who wrote this kind of hymn, and in many Bektashī poets right up to recent times. It would be wrong to dismiss such poems as nonsense based on their outward form alone, without taking into account their true meaning from the Ṣūfī point of view. In the first line of Mawlānā's *ghazal*, for example, by *dûş* {yesterday} he means *ʿālam-i alast* {primordial world}, by *subhdem* {dawn} he means *tajallī-i afʿāl* {self-manifestation of acts}, by *pâlân* {pack-saddle} he means *rūḥ* {soul}, by *dâne-i haşhaş* {poppy seed} he means *shayʾ-i ḥaqīr* {insignificant thing}, and by *sindân* {anvil} he means *nafs-i ammāra* {soul that commands evil}. Thus the meaning of this first couplet becomes clear.

18 This is an important characteristic that is noticeable not only in Yūnus Emre but also in almost all the poets of that period. In periods when the language was still unable to accommodate the *ʿarūḍ* system, our poets could only use those *ʿarūḍ* meters that were very close to the syllabic meter. For the most part, they did this so poorly that, as I stated above, several scholars have not been able to tell if they were writing in the *ʿarūḍ* or the syllabic meter. The errors of Thúry, E. J. W. Gibb, and even Veled Chelebi on this subject have resulted from this. Indeed, *ʿarūḍ* patterns like *fāʿilātun*, *fāʿilātun*, *fāʿilāt* and *mafāʿīlun*, *mafāʿīlun*, *faʿūlun*, when badly used, are difficult to distinguish from the eleven-syllable pattern.

19 E. J. W. Gibb expresses the following opinion in this matter: "Yet Yúnus had practically no model; though inspired by Jelál, he did not, like the early mesnevi-writers, copy the Persian masters, and there was no lyric poetry in Western Turkish. There was nothing but some rude folk-songs and popular ballads; and it was in the way of these that Yúnus fashioned his verses. He may indeed have seen or heard the Díwán-i Hikmet of Khoja Ahmed-i Yeseví, which has much in common with his own both in manner and matter; but this is in Eastern, not Western, Turkish" (*A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. 1, {p. 169}). Also, "In most of the ghazels there is present, in greater or less measure, the favourite Turkish arrangement of a thrice-repeated internal sub-rhyme, an arrangement which, as has been said before, works out into practical identity with what in more literary poetry is known as musemmat verse" (*ibid.* {p. 167}). The accounts that I have given above show that Gibb was in error on many points. First, Yūnus Emre imitated the Iranian masters in the composition of *mathnawīs*. Second, poets like Shayyād Ḥamza used the *ʿarūḍ* meter and *ghazal* form before Yūnus Emre. Third, on the relationship between Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre, I will shed further light below in addition to what I stated above. For the relationship between him and Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, see the sections below on the ethics and philosophy of Yūnus Emre.

20 Muslim mystics advanced certain ideas about ethics in general and always regarded the issue of ethics as a complementary aspect of their system. Al-Ghazālī was a consummate teacher of ethics and Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī's {d. 632/1234} *ʿAwārif al-maʿārif* is an excellent handbook of Ṣūfī ethics {German trans. Richard Gramlich as *Die Gaben der Erkenntnisse des ʿUmar as-Suhrawardī* (Wiesbaden, 1978)}. These ethics are a unified system that took shape not only from Neoplatonist doctrines but also from the Koran, *Sunna*, and the traditions of the great Ṣūfīs. It is beyond the scope of our subject to analyze them here. I will simply provide some information to show the relationship of Yūnus Emre with other Ṣūfī teachers of ethics. Ṣūfism, according to some Ṣūfīs, is founded on three virtues: adherence to poverty; persistent exertion; and abandoning contention and willfulness. Al-Suhrawardī distinguishes between poverty and Ṣūfism, but says that according to a noble *ḥadīth* love for the needy and wretched is the key to paradise. The same writer shows humility – in Yūnus Emre's term, *alçaklık* {lowliness} – as the first principle of Ṣūfī ethics. Others include sociability, offering assistance and condolence, forgiveness, kindness, justice, and compassion. Concerning kindness, Sufyān al-Thawrī {d. 161/778} said, "Kindness is doing good to someone who does bad to you, because reciprocating good for good is like paying for something you have purchased in the market." Al-Suhrawardī describes the importance of compassion in the Ṣūfī view in the following manner: "If people loved each other and appreciated the benefits of compassion, there would no longer be a need for courts. Justice is the handmaiden of compassion. It is used where compassion is lacking." For the Ṣūfī, "Observing the principles of compassion is better than observing the principles of pious asceticism because observing compassion is inward whereas observing the acts of worship is outward." It is clear that Ṣūfī ethics were of a lofty and humane nature. As the basis of personal ethics, this system promotes the cleansing of one's mind of evil thoughts, and of the humbling of the self; and as a basis of social ethics it promotes meeting evil with good by loving one's fellows with a love and compassion acquired from divine love. Generally speaking, these are the basic principles of Yūnus's ethics as well. It is clear, therefore, that the goal of Ṣūfī ethics is to attain divine Truth as "the perfect man."

21 Like, for example, the hymn with the refrain *Bir kâmil mürşide varmayınca olmaz* {Nothing can be achieved without a perfect guide}.

22 As in the following hymn, for example {Cf. Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre*: *Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, p. 74}:

İkilikten geçemedin, hâli kâl'den seçemedin
Hak'tan yana uçamadın fakîhlik oldu sana fak

Cübbe ve hırka taht u tâc versen gerektir aşka bâc
Dörtyüz mürîdle elli hac terk eyledi Abdü'r-Razzâk

Anın gibi dîn ulusu haç öptü çaldı nâkûsu
Sen dahi bırak nâmûsu gel berü putun oda yak

Âşık maʿşûk birdir bile aşktan gelir her söz dile
Bî-çâre Yûnus ne bile ne kara okudu ne ak

{You have not gone beyone duality. You have not distinguished spiritual state (*ḥāl*) from doctrine (*qāl*).
You have not flown toward divine Truth. Legalism has become a trap for you.

You have to give up your Ṣūfī attire (patched cloak, etc.) as a toll to love.
ʿAbd al-Razzāq (Shaikh Ṣanʿān in ʿAṭṭār's *Language of the Birds*) gave up 400 disciples and fifty pilgrimages.

Such a great Muslim pietist kissed the cross and rang church bells.
You too, forget your "honor," come here and set fire to your idol.

Lover and beloved are one together. Every word comes to the tongue out of Love.
What should helpless Yūnus know? He has read neither black nor white.}

There is an allusion here to the story of Shaikh Ṣan'ān, which was very well known among the Ṣūfīs.

23 The following lines of Yūnus Emre, which are very much in harmony with the ethics of the Gospels, are worthy of note:

Kīm bize taş atar ise güller nisâr olsun ana
Urmaklığa kasdedenin düşem öpem ayağını

Her kim bana söğer ise her dem duâ kılam ana
Çırâğıma kasdedenin Hak yandırsun ocağını

{If someone throws stones at us, let us shower him with roses.
If someone wants to strike me, let me fall down and kiss his feet.

If someone curses me, let me respond with a blessing.
If someone wants to take away my lamp, may God kindle his hearth.}

The poem below also reveals the bases of Ṣūfī ethics and how humane they were but how difficult to follow:

Döğene elsiz gerek, söğene dilsiz gerek
Derviş gönülsüz gerek, sen derviş olamazsın

Derviş bağrı baş olur, gözü dolu yaş olur
Koyundan yavaş olur, sen derviş olamazsın

Muhammed darılmazdı, sen yine darılırsın
Bu darılmak sende var, sen derviş olamazsın

Derviş Yûnus sen dahi her gördüğün kakırsın
Bu kakımak sende var, sen derviş olamazsın

{To one who strikes you, you should be handless (not retaliate); to one who curses you, you should be tongueless (dumb, silent).
The dervish should be heartless (not take offense?) – you cannot be a dervish.

The dervish should have wounds in his breast; his eyes should be full of tears;
He should be as gentle as a lamb – you cannot be a dervish.

Muḥammad never took offense, yet you still do.
As long as you take offense, you cannot be a dervish.

Dervish Yūnus: you too get angry at whatever you see.
As long as you get angry, you cannot be a dervish.}

Here Yūnus Emre bases Ṣūfī ethics squarely on the *Sunna*. This great Turkish Ṣūfī poet did not hesitate to freely reveal these broad humane views in many of his other poems as well. In one poem, he states the need to honor and serve guests, i.e. strangers, whether they be Muslim or Christian; and in various other poems he also mentions the importance of the heart, which is the house of God, and the value of

pleasing others. These principles have several ethical consequences. In one poem, he says {cf. Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre*: *Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, p. 144}:

Dürüş kazan ye yedir bir gönül ele getür
Bin Ka'be'den yegrekdur bir gönül 'imâreti

{Strive and earn, eat and feed others; take one heart into your hand (i.e. be kind to one person).
Cultivating a single heart is better than a thousand Ka'bas.}

Elsewhere he states it even more beautifully:

Gönül Çalab'ın tahtı Çalab gönüle bahtı
İki cihân bedbahtı kim gönül yıkar ise

Sen sana ne sanursan ayruğa hem anı san
Bir ma'nâ Dört-Kĭtâb'tan budur eğer var ise

{The heart is God's throne. God pays regard to the heart.
It is the misfortune of both the worlds if someone breaks a heart.

Whatever you think of yourself, think the same of others.
If the Four Books have any meaning, this is it.}

These lines forcefully express a sublime principle of Ṣūfī ethics. Compared to them, we can rate as rather uninspired Jāmī's famous poem:

دل بدست آور که حج اکبرست \ از هزاران کعبه یك دل بهترست

کعبه بنیاد خلیل آذ رست \ دل نظرگاه جلیل اکبرست

{Win a heart – that is the greatest Ḥajj.
One heart is better than a thousand Ka'bas.

The Ka'ba is the shrine of Abraham;
The heart is the shrine of the Glorious One.}

We also find this influence of Yūnus Emre in the following fine quatrain by Khaṭā'ī:

Hatāyî hâl çağında
Hak gönül alçağında
Yüzbin Ka'be yapmaktır
Bir gönül al çağında

{Khaṭā'ī is in a mystic state.
Truth is in a humble heart.
Building a hundred Ka'bas
Is in winning a single heart (?).}

Many other such examples of aphorisms concerning Ṣūfī ethics can be found in Yūnus Emre's hymns. This is an important and broad subject that deserves its own thorough study.

24 The following poem is one of the best examples to show Yūnus Emre's Ṣūfī ethics {cf. Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre*: *Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, p. 49}:

Söylememek harcısı söylemenin hâssıdır
Söylemenin harcısı gönüllerin pasıdır

Gönüllerin pasını ger sileyin der isen
Şol sözü söylegil kim sözün hulâsasıdır

Sözü doğru diyene kuli'l-hak dedi Çalab
Bunda yalan söyleyen yarın utanasıdır

Yetmişiki millete bir göz ile bakmayan
Halka müderris olsa hakîkatte âsîdir

Şerî'atin haberin şerhile diyem işit
Şerî'at bir gemidir hakîkat deryâsıdır

Ol geminin tahtası nekadar muhkem ise
Deniz mevc uruncağız soyub uşadasıdır

Bundan içerü haber dinlegil benden ey yâr
Hakîkatin kâfiri şer'in evliyâsidir

{The expense of not speaking is the income of speaking.
The expense of speaking is rust on the heart.

If you wish to wipe away the rust on your heart,
Speak only those words that are the epitome of speech.

To one who speaks truth, God has said: "Say: the truth . . ." (Koran, 18:29).
He who speaks false today will be ashamed tomorrow.

He who does not consider the 72 religious communities as equal
Is a sinner in truth, though he be a religious instructor to the people.

Listen and I'll inform you about the *Sharī'a* along with the commentary:
The *Sharī'a* is a boat in the sea of Truth.

No matter how firm the planks of that boat,
When the waves of the sea strike it, they will shake it to pieces.

Now listen, my friend, and I'll inform you of the hidden meaning:
The infidel of Truth is the saint of the *Sharī'a.*}

25 In order to demonstrate the degree to which the ethics propagated by the Muslim mystics are based on Neoplatonism, it is necessary to touch on Plotinus' conception of ethics. According to Plotinus, because God is absolute perfection, every created thing is perfect in its kind and degree. Nothing occurs subject to accident. Everything, every phenomenon, has an ultimate cause. This theory of ultimate cause, which Plotinus explains in great detail, naturally leads to optimism. His defense of the argument against the existence of evil is very strong. "Evil does not exist of its own accord; it only coexists with good. Inequality is a condition of order and regularity. To be sure, when evil is abstracted and exists in isolation, it is evil, not good. For example, ugliness is ugly, not beautiful; but if every part were beautiful, the whole could not be beautiful." He expresses the refutation of pain and death more clearly and elegantly than Seneca and all of the Stoics. Death is so insignificant that on festival days people gather to watch it. It is a kind of stage play and cannot be taken seriously. What suffers pain or dies is not our soul but our material existence. The only correct thing in life is duty. The cries and sobs that fill the world do not prove the existence of evil, but the cowardice of mankind. Plotinus, who was a panthiest and fatalist, should have confused duty with nature and nature with necessity. But, while denying free will, he

speaks of it as though not denying it (for, like Spinoza, he accepts the existence of free will only on condition of observing the laws of nature and agrees that actions based on perception and intelligence and without compulsion are voluntary). The ethics of Plotinus, like those of Plato, are pure, severe, and take divine perfection as the goal. The influence of the Stoics on Plotinus in this respect is also quite obvious. According to Plotinus, prudence, courage, and temperance are the virtues of man as a political animal, i.e. the bases of social ethics. As for the virtues required for the philosophers, they comprise not only these virtues, to which the people are confined, but also the purifying and inspiring virtues that save us from this world and prepare us for ecstacy, i.e. justice, knowledge, and love. These are the bases of individual ethics. For Plotinus, like Plato, knowledge is a virtue that elevates mankind and generates love. Finally, above all these ethical virtues there is mystical ecstasy, union with God, which is the ultimate goal of ethics as well as the ultimate goal of metaphysics {except for the first sentence, Köprülü translated this footnote to this point from Adolphe Franck (ed.), *Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques*, 2nd edn (Paris, 1875), s.v. "Plotin," (Jules Simon), p. 1349}. If we compare Plotinus' ethical principles with Ṣūfī ethics, we can readily see that Ṣūfī ethics have a close relationship with Muslim tradition, although we find in it the influence of all the Greek ethical systems. The principles of social ethics in particular are broader, more humane, and stronger in Ṣūfī ethics than in those of Plotinus.

26 This great movement, which is famous in the history of philosophy under the general name of Neoplatonism, and which continued strongly for a full three centuries from the second to the sixth century CE, was basically inspired by Platonic doctrine. The original founder of this movement was Ammonius Saccas, a Christian, and it arose as a system of thought in Alexandria. If we take into consideration the status of Alexandria at that time, we can more or less account for the basic features of this system. Alexandria was then a place where various philosophies and religions were found. In addition to hosting disciples of Plato and Pythagorus, various Jewish sects that prepared the ground for the cabala by interpreting the Bible or else tried to combine Philo and Greek philosophy with Judaism, and Gnostics who claimed a connection with Zoroaster, it was home to a Christianity that had established a strong center of activity there with Saint Athanasius and sought to oppose Greek philosophy. A complex spiritual state resulted from this mixture of creeds. Critical skepticism and naive superstition reigned side by side. The destruction and transformation of customs produced an ascetic reaction in all of these beliefs. The three basic qualities of Neoplatonism – eclecticism, mysticism, and asceticism – can be explained quite well as a result of the influence of this environment. The greatest representative of this system of belief was Plotinus. This philosophical system, which constituted the last active stage of ancient Greek philosophy and formed a link between the ancient scientific mentality and the medieval mentality, ultimately acquired a completely mystical nature with Iamblichus and his students. (For more information on these subjects, see the following works: Étienne Vacherot, *Histoire critique de l'école d'Alexandrie*, 3 vols, {1846–51; reprinted Amsterdam, 1965}; Jules Simon, *Histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie*, 2 vols, [Paris, 1845]; Jules Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, *De l'école d'Alexandrie*; {*rapport à l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques, précédé d'un essai sur la méthode des Alexandrins et le mysticisme, et suive d'une traduction de morceaux choisis de Plotin*}, [Paris, 1845]. One can consult *La Grande Encyclopédie* and Adolphe Franck's *Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques* on each of the individuals and subjects found in these works. In the article on Plotinus in the latter work, there is an adequate account of the French translation of this work.) E. J. W. Gibb defends the connection of Muslim mysticism with Neoplatonism as follows: "Many Orientalists consider Súfiism to be an offshoot from the Vedánta philosophy of India. My reasons for preferring to regard it as a development of

Neo-Platonism are: Firstly, the practical identity of the two systems, except, of course, where coloured by the prevailing positive religion; Secondly, the circumstance that Súfiism as a system is first heard of in Syria, the country of Iamblichus, where Neo-Platonist ideas were widely spread; . . . ; Thirdly, the fact that the other side of Muhammedan philosophy is beyond question derived from the Neo-Platonist exponents of Aristotle" (*A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. 1, p. 53, n.2). I mentioned above (Chapter 7, p. 244, n.58) that Nicholson explained this subject very well in his introduction to the *Dīwān Shams al-ḥaqā'iq* {i.e. *Selected Poems from the Dīvāni Shamsi Tabrīz*}.

27 'Azīz b. Muḥammad al-Nasafī's account of *waḥdat al-wujūd* is as clear as it is brief:

اهل وحدت میگویند که یکی بیش نیست وآن وجود خداست تعالی وتقدس، وبغیر از وجود خدای تعالی وجود دیگر نیست وامکان وجود ندارد که باشد. ودیگران میگویند که اگر وجودیکی بیش نیست، اما این وجود ظاهری دارد وباطنی دارد. چون این مقدمات معلوم کردی، اکنون بدانکه اهل وحدت میگویندکه باطن این وجود یك نوراست که جان عالمست وعالم مالامال این نوراست. واین نور نوریست نا محدود ونا متناهی وبحریست بی پایان وبی کران. حیات وعلم وارادت وقدرت باین نوراست. بینایی وشنوایی وگویایی وروایئ اشیا از این نوراست. بلکه خود همه این نوراست. طبیعت وخاصیت وفعل اشیا درین نوراست. اگرچه صفات وافعال واسامئ اشیا از این نوراست، اما این نور یکی بیش نیست وافراد موجودات بیکبار مظاهر این نورند وهریك دریچه اند. وصفات این نور از این دریچها بیرون تافته است. ای درویش، این نور اول وآخر ندارد، وفنا وعدم را بوی راه نیست. دریچهای نومیشوند وکهنه می گردند وبخاك میروند واز خاك باز می آیند وخود می باشند وخود میروند وخود میزایند. هریك آنچه ما لابد ایشانست تا بکمال خود رسند با خود دارند واز خود دارند. واین نور بدین مظاهر خود عاشق است از جهت آن که این نور درین مظاهر خود کمال خود را می بیند, وصفات واسامئ خود را مشاهده میکند. واز این جاست روح آدمی بر جسم خود عاشقست، از جهت آنکه جسم آدمی مظهر صفات روح آدمیست وروح جسم خود را می بیند وصفات واسامئ خود را مشاهده میکند. واز این جاست گفته اندکه خود را بشناس تا خدایرا بشناسی، کنون دانستی که این نوراست که خود را می شناسد. واین نوراست که جان عالمست وافراد عالم جمله ومظاهر این نورند . . . .

{The people of unity say that existence is one and no more, and that is the existence of God. There is no other existence than the existence of God, nor is any other possible. Others say that while existence is one and no more, this existence has an outer and an inner aspect. Furthermore you should know that the people of unity say that the inner aspect of this existence is a light that is the soul of the world. The world is full of this light, which is unbounded and infinite, a sea without a shore. Life and Knowledge and Will and Power exist by virtue of this light. Sight and hearing and speech and the beauty of things are from this light, or rather they are this light. Nature and quality and the activity of things are in this light. Although the attributes

and actions and names of things are from this light, still this light is one and no more. The individual existing things are all together manifestations of this light, or they are so many windows, and the attributes of this light shine out from these windows. O dervish! This light has no beginning and no end, and there is no way for it to cease existing. New windows appear and grow old and go into the ground and re-emerge out of the ground; they appear and grow and reproduce of their own accord. Each one possesses whatever it needs in order to attain its own perfection. And this light is in love with these manifestations of itself, because in them it sees its own perfection and witnesses its own attributes and names. For this reason, man's soul loves its body, because the human body is a manifestation of the attributes of the human soul: the soul sees its own body and witnesses its own names and qualities. And for this reason, it is said: Know yourself, so that you may know God. Now you may understand that this is the light that knows itself and that is the soul of the world, and the individual things of the world are all manifestations of this light} (cited from al-Nasafī's *Ẕubdat al-ḥaqā'iq* as found in Ferid Bey's work entitled *Vahdet-i vücûd* [Istanbul, 1331/1913], pp. 80–1 {the *Ẕubdat* has been edited by A. E. Bertel's in *Piat' filosofskikh traktatov na temu 'Āfāq va anfus'* (*O sootnosheniiakh mezhdu chelovekom i vselennoi*) (Moscow, 1970), pp. 90–207, and by Ḥaqq-virdī Nāṣirī (Tehran, 1405/1363/1985)}). Because of the simplicity of the passage, I have simply cited the text {without translating it!}.

28 I will touch here on the way in which the Ṣūfīs resolved the problem of creation, which is always the weakest aspect of any philosophical system. According to Ṣūfīs, the cause of creation and emanation is Love. The poet who said *Kendi hüsnün hûblar şeklinde peydâ eyledin / Çeşm-i âşıktan dönüp sonra temâşâ eyledin* {You revealed your own beauty in the form of beautiful (beings) / Then contemplated it with the eyes of lovers} expressed this as a very succinct principle. Many Ṣūfīs, however, including Jāmī, the author of *Salamān wa Absāl*, explained the important subject of creation in terms of a more explicit Neoplatonism that corresponds almost perfectly to Plotinus' theory of emanation. From it arose the view of *Ḥaḍarāt-i khams*, i.e. *Beş 'âlem* {the five worlds}, which are not separate worlds in separate places, but constitute different stages of the same existence as they recede in a balanced relationship from *wujūd-i ḥaqīqī* {true existence, i.e. God} and descend stage by stage. As summarized by 'Abd Allāh Bosnawī {d. 1054/1644, in his commentary on Ibn al-'Arabī's *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*, i.e. *Tajalliyāt 'arā'is al-nuṣūṣ* (Būlāq, 1252/1836–7); English trans. Bulent Rauf *et al.* as *Ismail Hakki Bursevi's Translation of, and Commentary on, Fusus al-hikam by Muhyiddin Ibn 'Arabi (attributed to 'Abd Allāh Bosnawī)* (Oxford, 1986)}: above and beyond the universe is the divine world that is the source of everything. It is not included in the other five *ḥaḍarāt*. The first of the five *ḥaḍarāt* is *ḥaḍrat-i ghaib-i muṭlaq* {the world of the absolutely invisible}, or *ḥaḍrat-i 'amā* {world of nebulosity}. This is the world of immutable entities (*a'yān-i thābita*, which is essentially the same as Plato's ideas). The second *ḥaḍra* is *ghaib-i muḍāf* {world of the relatively invisible} and is the world of intellects {*'uqūl*} and souls {*arwāḥ*}. They call this the world of domination {*'ālam-i jabarūt*}. The third *ḥaḍra* is *'ālam-i mithāl* {world of images} or the world of sovereignty {*'ālam-i malakūt*, see Chittick, *The Self-Disclosure of God* (Albany, NY, 1998), pp. 259–60}. They also call this the intermediate world {*'ālam-i barzakh*, between the spiritual and corporeal; see Chittick, *The Sufi Path of Knowledge*, pp. 14, 117–18}. The fourth *ḥaḍra* is *'ālam-i shahāda* {visible world, see Chittick, *ibid.*, p. 114} or *'ālam-i mulk* {corporeal world, see Chittick, *ibid.*, p. 282}. This is the world in which we act. The fifth *ḥaḍra* is *'ālam-i insān* {world of mankind}, which sums up and comprises all the others, for mankind is the microcosm (*'ālam-i ṣughrā*) {on these worlds, cf. E. J. W. Gibb, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. 1, pp. 55–6}. These worlds are sometimes classified as *'ālam-i ghaib – 'ālam-i barzakh – 'ālam-i shuhūd*, but usually *'ālam-i ghaib – 'ālam-i shuhūd*. Thus the concept of the five worlds, which gradually become more complex as they precede from the Unified

Essence {God} and fall from grace, is actually an application to Islam of the theory of emanation (*tajallī*), which was peculiar to the school of Alexandria. Their meaning of *ʿaql-i kull* {universal intellect (God)} and *ʿaql-i awwal* {first intellect} for *nash'at-i ūlā wa thāniya* {first and second existence} was also under the influence of Plotinus' *nous* {"The original Being first of all throws out the *nous*, which is a perfect image of the One and the archetype of all existing things. It is at once being and thought, ideal world and idea. As image, the *nous* corresponds perfectly to the One, but as derived it is entirely different. What Plotinus understands by the *nous* is the highest sphere accessible to the human mind, and, along with that, pure thought itself," Encyclopaedia Britannica (1955), s.v. "Neoplatonism" (Adolf van Harnack; John Malcolm Mitchell)}. As in Mawlānā's couplet {*Mathnawī*, Book 2, line 978}

این جهان یك فکرتست از عقل کل \ عقل چون شاهست صورتها رسل

{This world is one thought (emanating) from the Universal Intellect / The Intellect is like a king, and the ideas (are his) envoys; Nicholson trans.} these Neoplatonist beliefs are quite obvious in ʿĀshıq Pasha's didactic *mathnawī*, *Gharībnāme*. Let me briefly describe the concept of *aʿyān-i thābita* {immutable entities; see Chittick, *The Sufi Path of Knowledge*, pp. 83–6} in order to finish this account of the *ḥaḍarāt*. *Aʿyān-i thābita* "are the possibile realities that exist in God's knowledge and do not smell the fragrance of existence." Because existence is more inclusive than immutability, not every immutable thing requires the quality of existence. Thus, they are also immutable with respect to non-existence and are not qualified by existence. There are two aspects to *aʿyān-i thābita*. On the one hand, they are divine realities, based on the consideration that names and attributes are formal {i.e. take the visible form}. On the other hand, they are possible realities and supports {*mustanad*, phenomena of this world as "supported" by names; see Chittick, *ibid.*, p. 37}. According to the first hypothesis, immutable entities are the equivalent of bodies for souls and according to the second hypothesis are the equivalent of souls for bodies. The immutability in God's knowledge of *aʿyān-i thābita* results from "the most sacred spiritual effusion {*faiḍ-i aqdas*}," while the external appearance of the form-taking possibilities of the entities {*aʿyān*} results from "the sacred spiritual effusion {*faiḍ-i muqaddas*}." Because *aʿyān-i thābita* do not exist externally, they are not qualified by creation {*jaʿl*}. Those things that exist are forms of the *aʿyān* that appear because of sacred spiritual effusion in mirrors of the *aʿyān*. All the forms of existing things and manifestations of the contingent world are the forms of the *aʿyān-i thābita* or the divine names and attributes (*Fuṣūṣ sharḥī*, p. 15). {See *EI*[2], s.v. "ʿĀlam" (Tj. de Boer and L. Gardet)}.

29 While describing al-Ghazālī's ideas about Possible Existence in his note on Jalāl {divine majesty}, Gelenbevî İsmâʿîl Efendi provides important information on *waḥdat al-wujūd*. I consider it useful to cite it briefly in order to summarize clearly the subject of the self-disclosure of God {*tajallī*}: "What exists in reality is ascribed in the mind to something that exists thanks to existence itself. The Ṣūfīs considered it self-evident that there is no true existence apart from God. The ascription of existence to possibilities {of realities} is based on the connection of manifestation, for there are not various numerous existences of which some subsist with the Necessarily Existent {God} and others with the possibilities. There is only one existence and that is God. To say that possibilities exist is not to say that existence subsists with them but to say that possibilities have a certain relationship to the Necessarily Existent that exists by itself and subsists by its own essence. This attachment occurs at the moment of the self-disclosure of God in the immutable entities. And the immutable entities are the divine sapiential forms that are the opposite of the capacity {for subsistence in God} as required by the mutually divine names like *qābiḍ* {Contractor}, *bāsiṭ* {Expander},

raḥīm {Merciful}, and *qāhir* {Compellor}. No one except God knows how this self-disclosure occurs. The immutable entities, which are in mutual opposition with regard to the need and capacity for the Necessarily Existent {*dhāt-i wājib*}, are the manifestations of the divine self-disclosures. The essence and attributes of God appear in them by means of that capacity for manifestation and appear in the form of mutually opposed existence because of the difference in capacity. Now multiplicity comes into existence from capacity. For example, there are many mirrors but the image of one man is reflected in them. According to the capacity of the mirrors, that man appears differently in each one but none of these {different} accidental qualities and attributes exists in him. There is one true existence, but with its appearance during the self-disclosure of God, it expands over the existing possibilities. However, it does not mix with possibilities and is not incarnated in them. While this attachement remains, the possibilities are figuratively called existing by virtue of the attainment of manifestation. When attachment is stopped, there can be no attribution of existing either in reality or figuratively. Thus, the existing possibilities consist of immutable entities on condition of attainment of the self-disclosure of God. This means that nothing exists subsisting in itself. Therefore, existing cannot in fact be attributed to them. They are non-existent in past and future eternity. Therefore, it is said that immutable entities do not smell the fragrance of existence" (cited from Ferid Bey's treatise *Vahdet-i vücûd*, pp. 101–6). Certain aspects of this are explained in greater detail below.

30 According to Ṣūfī beliefs, the universe culminates in man, who is the central point. The things that exist in the universe can only reflect one or another of the divine attributes. Man, however, is the place of manifestation of all of them, for he is the manifestation of the greatest name {*ism-i aʿẓam*}. As ʿAbd Allāh Bosnawī, the commentator on the *Fuṣūṣ* states, "The universe is the aggregate of the individual objects through which are manifested the Divine Names; but as it was incapable of receiving the form of the Divine Totality, and as the manifesting of the manifestation of universality was not obtainable therethrough, God created Man, who is its soul, after the Divine image; so Man is the theatre of the Divine Names and the meeting-point of the Divine Attributes" {we have used Gibb's translation, *A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. 1, p. 62}. Because of this, man has collected in himself the personal reflections of the divine attributes that are scattered throughout the universe. He is thus also the perfect mirror of the image of God. Because man is the sum and epitome of the macrocosm outside himself, and its miniature, he is called the microcosm. A number of Ṣūfīs go beyond this, however, regarding man as the macrocosm and the universe as the microcosm. This lofty status of man is due to the heart, for the divine attributes are reflected there. Thus, in order to know God, one must first know oneself. The Ṣūfī principle من عرف نفسه فقد عرف ربه {Who knows himself knows his Lord} is derived from this {Köprülü again follows Gibb here, vol. 1, pp. 62–3}. Many examples of this can be found in the Persian and Turkish poets, in Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, Faiḍ-i Hindi, then Yūnus Emre, Ghaibī, Nesīmī, Olanlar Shaikhī Ibrāhīm Efendi, etc.

31 This ecstasy or rapture, which our Ṣūfīs call *ḥāl* {the mystical state}, has a very important place in Neoplatonism. Plotinus accepts the givens of the senses, but he places reason above them and above reason places ecstasy. Only this discloses Absolute Unity {God}, which the laws of reason do not have the ability to discover. Ecstasy is unification. In other words, it is the disappearance or the withdrawal of plurality, consciousness, and personality. It is the momentary absorption of the individual and the variable in absolute existence. In this state, the spirit, which is united with God, is no longer in the body. Indeed, in any ecstatic state, one is also separated from the soul, which drives and illuminates the body. The human body is then like an empty palace that is subject to the laws of organic nature. Therefore, ecstasy is a death in advance {of dying}, or, more correctly according to Plato's mystical principle of "to

die is to live," it is a life in advance {of living}. The problem now remains to discover its generative causes. Is it brought about through intellectual effort, or will, or love? The answer is quite simple. Love, which receives the help of intellectual effort and will, is the generative cause of ecstasy. Intellectual effort, by scattering some of the clouds that hide our spirituality, brings us face to face with unity. Will tries hard to escape from plurality and tear down the final cover that conceals absolute existence. And Love, which finally discovers the sole thing that will nourish it, leaps out like a flame and thus unification occurs. It is virtue and prayer that allow us to reach this ultimate happiness. Prayer, according to Plotinus, is the directing of an energetic and absolute love toward its object. In later Neoplatonism, as inspiration weakened, prayer and then mystical rites gradually took the place of Love. The lofty theories of Plotinus degenerated into superstition at the hands of Iamblichus (Franck (ed.), *Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques*, s.v. "Plotin" {Jules Simon}, p. 1347). Saint-Hilaire also critically analyzes the characteristics of this system (*De l'école d'Alexandrie*, p. xxxv). It appears from this entire account that the Neoplatonists' views of ecstasy are virtually identical with our Ṣūfīs' views of *ḥāl*.

In al-Qushairī's *al-Risāla*, there is a noteworthy description of our Ṣūfīs' views of *ḥāl* {cf. Michael Sells (trans. and ed.), *Early Islamic Mysticism*, (New York, 1996), p. 103; Rabia Harris (trans.), pp. 74–5}. According to the Ṣūfīs, *ḥāl* means "a feeling of joy and sorrow, contraction and expansion, ardor and awe, that reaches the heart as a gift bestowed by God." In this, human attainment and effort have no part. The stages {s. *maqām*, level of enlightenment}, however, are acquired by intellectual effort and ascetic exercises. The second distinguishing characteristic of *ḥāl* is transformation {taḥawwul} and variegation {*talawwun*}, i.e. instability. "Stages," on the other hand, are stable. So it is clear that the unstable and rarely appearing ecstasy that Plotinus presented as the product of love in particular is basically the same as the mystical "state" {*ḥāl*} of our Ṣūfīs. Our Ṣūfīs only expand on what Plotinus hinted at. They reject – in accord with Plotinus' idea of soul – the influence of intellectual effort and ascetic discipline {in attaining ecstasy} and designate not one ecstatic state but different degrees of *ḥāl*. Some of them, however, do teach the permanence and persistance of *ḥāl*, and consider those who dabbled in mystical experience as "not having attained the points of departure of the mystical states." According to most Ṣūfīs, however, *ḥāl* has no permanence other than the existence of time. In the opinion of the religious scholars, it is analogous to something accidental {*'araḍ*}. Ibn al-'Arabī explains this in Chapter 192 of his *Futūḥāt*. As expounded by the majority of the Ṣūfīs, this view is completely in accord with that of Plotinus, for he taught that ecstasy is momentary and fleeting. Thus, the mystical state that al-Junaid describes in the couplet

طوراق انوار تلوح اذا بدت \ فتظهر كتمانا وتخبر عن جمع

{Sudden gleams of light / when they appear, apparitions, / Revealing a secret,/ telling of union (Sells, trans. in *Early Islamic Mysticism*, p. 105)} is no different than the ecstasy of Plotinus (al-Qushairī, *al-Risāla*, {Turkish} trans., pp. 14–18).

32 The careful study of both of their *dīwāns* clearly shows this. For example, there is a great similarity between Yūnus Emre's *ghazal*

Bir sâkîden içtik şarâb 'arştan yüce meyhânesi
Ol sâkînin mestleriyüz cânlar anın peymânesi

{I drank wine at the hands of a cupbearer whose tavern is higher than the heavenly throne.
We are drunkards of that Cupbearer, our souls are His wine cup,}

and Mawlānā's *ghazal* that begins with the verse

بیش ازان کاندر جهان باغ رز وانگور بود \ از شراب لا یزالی جان ما مخمور بود

{Before vineyard and grape were yet in the world,
Our souls were drunk with the wine of everlastingness.}

In like manner, Yūnus Emre's hymn beginning with the verse *Bî-mekânem bu cihânda menzilim durağum anda / Bunda seyreyleyu geldim bâğçe ve bâğım anda* {cf. Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre: Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, p. 123; I have no place in this world: my abode is there / I have come here to sojourn: my garden is there} and Mawlānā's famous *ghazal*

دلا چه بستهٔ این خاکدان بر گذرانی ازین حظیره برون پر که مرغ عالم جانی

{O heart, why art thou a captive in the earth that is passing away? / Fly forth from this enclosure, since thou art a bird of the spiritual world; Nicholson (trans.), *Selected Poems from the Dīvāni Shamsi Tabrīz*, p. 175,} have almost the same meaning. Moreover Yūnus Emre's hymn *Ey âşıkân ey âşıkân aşk mezhebi dîndir bana / Gördü gözüm dost yüzünü yas kamu düğündür bana* {cf. Gölpınarlı, *ibid.*, p. 41; O lovers, O lovers; the creed of Love is my religion / My eyes have seen the loved one's face: for me funerals are weddings} has the same meaning as Mawlānā's poem ای عاشقان ای عاشقان {O lovers, O lovers; Nicholson (trans.), *Selected Poems*, p. 141}. On this subject, for which many other examples could be given, one should bear in mind that this influence originates from Mawlānā's general personality and outlook, not from this or that poem.

33 I stated above that those obsessed by divine love were not responsible for the deeds and words that issued from them. Aq Shams al-Dīn {d. 863/1459, see H. J. Kissling, "Aq Šems ed-Dīn: Ein türkischer Heiliger aus der Endzeit von Byzanz," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 44 (1951), 322–33, and *EI²*, s.v. "Aḳ Shams al-Dīn" (H. J. Kissling)} discusses this subject in a treatise and says that for the Ṣūfīs it is not permitted to reveal the {spiritual} truths to the people. He excludes those obsessed by divine love from this and says, "If obsession (*jadhba*) is overpowering then it is manifest involuntarily. Such *majdhūbs* (those obsessed by divine love) are those in whom God is acting freely. They witness the pole of the world. The pole of the world commands them. Whatever in the world is or will be, they are first to go about that task," (*Risāla-i Aq Shams al-Dīn*, from the MS in the Hâlis Efendi Library {in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul}). There is also a useful and succinct discussion of *majdhūbs* in the *Thamarāt al-fu'ād* {Istanbul, 1288/1871} of Sarı ʿAbd Allāh Efendi {d. *c.*1071/1661, see *EI²*, vol. 3, p. 711, and s.v. "Ṣarı ʿAbd Allāh Efendī (Cl. Huart [Kathleen Burrill])}. In much of the poetry of Yūnus Emre, the notion that {spiritual} truths cannot be revealed to the common people is repeated, but it is curious that he could not refrain from doing so.

34 This view is consistently found in all the Ṣūfīs from Abū Saʿīd Ibn Abī ʿl-Khair, who said in a quatrain

گر باتو بدم مجاز من جمله نماز \ گر بی تو بدم نماز من جمله مجاز

{With you my figurative speech becomes prayer / Apart from you my prayer becomes a mere figure. Muḥammad b. Munawwar, *The Secrets of God's Mystical Oneness*, trans. John O'Kane, p. 514}, to Mawlānā. The following passage from Mawlānā expresses the same meaning as the aforesaid quatrain of Abū Saʿīd:

اگر نه روی دل اندر برابرت دارم \ من این نماز حساب نماز نشمارم

ز عشق روی تومن رو بقبله آوردم \ وگرنه من ز نماز وزقبله بیزارم

{If the face of my heart is not directed toward you
I do not consider this prayer to be prayer.
I direct my face toward the *qibla* out of love for your face;
Otherwise, I have nothing to do with prayers and *qiblas.*}

We also constantly find passages with this meaning in Yūnus Emre. It appears that in such great Ṣūfīs as these, as in Plotinus, love {*'ishq*, ecstatic love of God} comes before everything and is the true goal of everything. Such passages as these express this notion; they do not mean that prayer and the other religious duties are unnecessary. Because Ṣūfīs subsequently gave more importance to asceticism and religious exercises, the importance of love has declined somewhat – as was the case in the last periods of decline of the Neoplatonists.

35 {Cf. Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre*: *Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, p. 203.}

36 There is much in the poetry of Yūnus Emre on love and the difficulties of love, as in, for example, the hymns beginning *Âşık-û mest-ü harâb etti bizi cânânemiz / Âlem içinde bu gün hoş söylenür efsânemiz* {Our Beloved made us lovers and drunkards, and ruined us / Today in the world our story is nicely told}; or *Gerçek âşık olanların işi âh ile zâr olur / Hasretinden ol dilberin gözü yaşı pınar olur* {The task of true lovers is to sigh and moan / Their tears flow like springs out of longing for the Beloved}; or *Dürlü dürlü cefânın adını aşk komuşlar / Bu cefâya katlanan dosta halvet irmişler* {"Love" is the name given to all sorts of cruelty / Those who bear this cruelty attain privacy with the Beloved}. Mawlānā, who says

عمر که بی عشق رفت هیچ حسابش مگیر \ آب حیات است عشق در دل وجانش پذیر

{Do not count a life as anything that has gone without Love / Love is the water of life: accept it into your heart and soul}, also reveals the difficulties of love in the following strophe:

ای بهر هناگامه دام عشق تو هناگامه گیر \ وی چکیده خون ما بر راه رهرو را نشان

صد هزاران زخم بر سینه نه زخم تیر عشق \ صد شکاری خسته و نه تیر پیدانه کمان

{Oh you who conjure love in every assembly,
And on whose path our blood drips to mark the road for travelers:
A hundred thousand wounds are in our breast, not wounds of Love's arrow;
A hundred fall prey, while there is no arrow visible and no bow.}

Because men who enter the field of love consider their own physical existence to be nothing and sometimes even give up their lives on that field, the Ṣūfīs frequently use the comparison of "ball and stick" {i.e. being knocked about like a ball} in regard to this subject. In a beautiful poem Mawlānā describes quite eloquently the ecstasy of those who drink the wine of {spiritual} love from the cup bearer of eternity. Other versions of this concept are frequently found in Yūnus Emre.

چه تدبیر ای مسلمانان که من خود را نمیدانم \ نه ترسا نه یهودم من نه گبرم نه مسلمانم
نه شرقیم نه غربیم نه بریم نه بحریم \ نه از کان طبیعیم نه از افلاك گردانم
نه از خاکم نه از آبم نه از بادم نه از آتش \ نه از عرشم نه از فرشم نه از کونم نه از کانم
نه از هندم نه از چینم نه از بلغار وسقسینم \ نه از ملك عراقینم نه از خاك خراسانم
نه از دنیی نه از عقبی نه از جنت نه از دوزخ \ نه از آدم نه از حوا نه از فردوس ورضوانم
مکانم لا مکان باشد نشانم بی نشان باشد \ نه تن باشد نه جان باشد که من از جان جانانم
دوئ از خود بدر کردم یکی دیدم دو عالمرا \ یکی جویم یکی دانم یکی بینم یکی خوانم
هو الاول هو الاخر هو الظاهر هو الباطن \ بجز یا هو ویا من هو کسی دیگر نمیدانم
زجام عشق سر مستم دو عالم رفته از دستم \ بجز رندی وقلاشی نباشد هیچ سامانم
اگر در عمر خود روزی دمی بی توبر آوردم \ ازان وقت وازان ساعت زعمر خود پشیمانم
اگر دستم دهد روزی دمی باتو درین خلوت \ دو عالم زیر پای آرم همی دستی بر افشانم
الا ای شمس تبریزی چنین مستم درین عالم \ که جز مستی وقلاشی نباشد هیچ دستانم

{What is to be done, O Moslems? for I do not recognize myself.
I am neither Christian, nor Jew, nor Gabr, nor Moslem.
I am not of the East, nor of the West, nor of the land, nor of the sea;
I am not of Nature's mint, nor of the circling heavens.
I am not of earth, nor of water, nor of air, nor of fire;
I am not of the empyrean, nor of the dust, nor of existence, nor of entity.
I am not of India, nor of China, nor of Bulgaria, nor of Saqṣīn;
I am not of the kingdom of 'Irāqain, nor of the country of Khorāsān.
I am not of this world, nor of the next, nor of Paradise, nor of Hell;
I am not of Adam, nor of Eve, nor of Eden and Riẓwān.
My place is the Placeless, my trace is the Traceless;
'Tis neither body nor soul, for I belong to the soul of the Beloved.
I have put duality away, I have seen that the two worlds are one;
One I seek, One I know, One I see, One I call.
He is the first, He is the last, He is the outward, He is the inward;
I know none other except '*Yā Hū*' and '*Yā man Hū*.'
I am intoxicated with Love's cup, the two worlds have passed out of my ken;
I have no business save carouse and revelry.
If once in my life I spent a moment without thee,
From that time and from that hour I repent of my life.
If once in this world I win a moment with thee,
I will trample on both worlds, I will dance in triumph for ever.
O Shamsī Tabrīz, I am so drunken in this world,
That except of drunkenness and revelry I have no tale to tell.

Nicholson (trans.), *Selected Poems from the Dīvāni Shamsi Tabrīz*, pp. 125, 127 (Köprülü omitted the fifth and seventh verses).} Yūnus Emre's famous poem that includes the

couplet *Ẓâhir suya girmedin el ayak depretmedin / Baş secdeye varmadın kılınur tâʿatimiz* {Our worship takes place without ablutions, without bodily movements, without bowing the head [Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre: Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, p. 169]} is basically identical with this.

The following *rubāʿī* is very important for showing the nature of spiritual love in Ṣūfīsm and is very beautiful:

از شبنم عشق خاك آدم گل شد \ شوری بر خاست فتنهٔ حاصل شد

سر نشتر عشق بر رگ روح رسید \ یك قطره از وچکید ونامش دل شد

{From the dew of Love, Adam's clay turned to mud;
A tumult arose, a commotion broke out.
The blade of the lancet touched the vein of the spirit,
One drop fell from it: it was named "heart."}

According to Yūnus Emre, in order "to go beyond duality and to distinguish *qāl* {book-learning} from *ḥāl* {mystical ecstasy}," the only way is love. Mawlānā, who says in the *Mathnawī* {Book 5, line 588}:

عشق آن شعله است کوچون بر فروخت \ هر چه جز معشوق باقی جمله سوخت

{Love is that flame which, when it blazes up, / Consumes everything else but the Beloved; Nicholson trans.}, subsequently explains how unity is manifest in plurality {Book 4, line 408, and Book 2, lines 184–7}:

مؤمنان معدود لیك ایمان یکی \ جسمشان معدود لیکن جان یکی

* * *

چون از یشان مجتمع بینی دویار \ هم یکی باشند هم ششصد هزار

بر مثال موجها اعداد شان \ در عدد آورده باشد بادشان

مفترق شد آفتاب جانها \ در درون روزن ابدانها

چون نظر در قرص داری خود یکیست \ وآنکه شد محجوب ابدان در شکیست

{Believers are numerous, but belief is one. Bodies are many, but the soul is one.

* * *

When you see two friends joined, they are both one and six hundred thousand.
Their number is like waves: it is wind that has brought them forth in number.
The sun of souls is separate inside the window of bodies,
When you look at the sun disc, it is one: but he who is screened by bodies is in doubt.}

37 {Cf. Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre*: *Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, p. 119.}

38 *Pes her şey ki zâtta vech-i küllî ve icmâlî üzre münderic ola, pes ol şey insân-ı kâmilde vech-i küllî ve icmâlî üzre münderictir ve ilm-i Hak-ta vech-i cüz'î ve tafsîl üzre zâhir olan şey pes ilm-i insân-ı kâmil'de vech-i cüz'î ve tafsîl üzre zâhirdir. Bil ki Hakk'ın ilmi, insân-ı kâmil'in ilmidir ve ânın zâtı, insân-ı kâmil'in zâtıdır, ittihâd ve hulûlsuz; zîrâ ittihâd ve hulûl mevcûdînden hâsıl olur ve hulûl dahî böylecedir; zîrâ Vücûd-ı vâhid'den gayrı vücûd yoktur; zîrâ eşyâ Hakk'ın vücûdi ile mevcûde, kendi nefsleriyle ma'dûmedir. Pes Hak'la nice müttehid olur şol şey ki ânın vücûdiyle mevcûd ola ve kendi nefsi ile ma'dûm ola* {Everything that is incorporated in the divine essence totally and in general is incorporated in the perfect man totally and in general, and everything that appears partially and in particular in the knowledge of God appears partially and in particular in the perfect man. Know that the knowledge of God is the knowledge of the perfect man and His essence is the essence of the perfect man, without "union" and without "incarnation" (see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ḥulūl" [L. Massignon-(G. C. Anawati)]). For union and incarnation result from those who exist, and incarnation is also like this; because there is no existence other than the existence of the One; because things exist by virtue of the existence of God and in themselves are non-existent. How could something be united with God which exists only by virtue of His existence and which by itself is non-existent?} ('Abd Allāh Bosnawī, commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ*, p. 16). Some conventional religious scholars {*'ulamā'*} have accused Ibn al-'Arabī, and many of the great Ṣūfīs who accepted his ideas, of *ḥulūl* {incarnation, indwelling}, but this allegation is completely false. *Ḥulūl* is sometimes understood as resulting naturally and sometimes as subsisting with a thing itself; whereas God, being pure existence, cannot subsist through another. Ibn al-'Arabī fully explains this point and then says, *Nûr-ı şems, bedr'de tecellî ettiğinde sâir gecelerdekinden başka olduğu gibi, iktidâr-i ilâhîde 'abdde tecellî ettiği vakıtta halktan birtakım ef'âl zuhûr eder. Bu her nekadar iktidâr-i ilâhî ile ise de, hükmü muhteliftir; zîrâ bu tecellî-i ilâhî, âyîne gibi meclâ vâsıtasıyle olmuştur; aklen mâlûm olacağı üzre, kamerin taayyününde kendisinde nûr-i şemsten hiçbir şey yoktur ve şems âna bizâtihâ intikâl dahî etmemiştir; ancak, kamer ona meclâ olmuştur. 'Abd de bunun gibi olur, Hâlık'ından kendisinde hiçbir şey olmadığı gibi, ânda hulûl dahî eylememiştir; ancak, o Hâlık'ın hassaten meclâ ve mazhârîdir. Şurasını da bilmeli ki, birşeyin diğer şeye meclâ olması, onun mahalli olması değildir; zîrâ mir'âttan zâhir olan, bizâtihî mir'âttan değildir; fakat mahalle nisbetle hâl böyle değildir; zîrâ hâl mahalde hâsıldır. Zuhûr, hulûl değildir* {Just as the light of the sun is different each night when it is manifest on the moon, so when divine power is manifest in man numerous actions appear from mankind. While all manifest divine power, the effect is different, for this divine manifestation occurs by means of reflection like a mirror. As is known by reason, the moon is visible only because the light of the sun is on it. The sun does not transfer anything of itself to it; the moon is only a mirror of it. Man is just like this. Not only is there nothing of the Creator in him, so there is no divine indwelling in him. Only he is especially the reflection and manifestation of God. Furthermore, the fact that something can be reflected in something else does not mean that it takes its place, because that which appears in the mirror is not in itself of the mirror, which is not the case with respect to place. To be manifest is not to be indwelling (cf. Chittick, *The Self-disclosure of God*, pp. 84–5)}. This is why Ibn al-'Arabī says الحق خلق وما الخلق حق {God is a creation but the creation is not a god} in Chapter 148 of his *Futūḥāt*. And هو عينها {He is their essence} in the expression سبحان من اظهر الاشياء وهو عينها {Praise be to Him who reveals things, He being their essence} is a true affirmation of this, for this means that God is the *'ayn-i ashyā'* {essence of things}. What is meant by things is existing forms {*ṣuwar-i mawjūda*}. And this is absolute existence, in relation to one of the special features {*khuṣūṣiyya*} that are necessary for the immutable entities. (Misunderstanding this, some have asserted that God is *lā bi-sharṭ-i shay'* {not conditioned by things}, that He is the same as the existence of things; but what is intended by absolute existence

here is "the totality of the absolute bound to the intrinsic special feature." Consequently, the statements of some – for example, Jāmī's statement in the *Muqaddima-i sharḥ-i Fuṣūs*, citing {Dāvūd} Kayserī – that God is the essence of everything in descending order, i.e. in the great chain of being {*Cenâb-i Hakk'ın mertebe-i tenezzülde ayn-i eşyâ*}, are unacceptable, because to explain the words هو عينها {He is their essence} as هو عين ما هيتها {He is the essence of their essence} is to contradict Ibn al-'Arabī, who explained that "the immutable entities that are the essences of all things do not exist in nature but are the others in immutability {*mâhiyât-ı eşyâ olan a'yân-ı sâbite'nin tabiî vücûtta değil, fakat sübûtta agyâr olduğunu*, see Chittick, *The Sufi Path of Knowledge*, p. 91}. How is it possible that Ibn al-'Arabī would assert that the thing he said was "other" was the "same"? 'Alā' al-Dawla Simnānī's many objections to this chapter disappear in light of this elucidation. In another work, Ibn al-'Arabī also rejects union {*ittḥād*}. He says that union is absurd, because the one next to you, with whom you want union, still says "I," and that is not union. Rather, it is not you who speaks, but He through you. Also, when you say انا فانت {I thus you} you have really said انا بانا نيتك {I by virtue of my intending to be you} or بانا نيتك {by virtue of intending to be you}. If you have said بانا نيتك {by virtue of intending to be you}, there is no union with respect to either meaning or forms. Because this is the way that most conventional religious scholars have understood this, they have attacked Ṣūfīsm. Abū Sa'īd Ibn Abī 'l-Khair, the author {not further identified} of *Bustān al-'ārifīn*, and Imām al-Suyūṭī both defended Ibn al-'Arabī against the conventional religious scholars on this point. In addition, Imām al-Ghazālī says in his *Munqidh* that the followers of the Ṣūfī path have progressed to the point that their words could be attributed to indwelling and union, but to accuse them of this would be a mistake. Qāḍī Mu'īn al-Dīn Ḥusain Yazdī {i.e. Muḥammad Yazdī, d. 789/1387, see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Mu'īn al-Dīn . . . Yazdī" (Angelika Hartmann)} and Qāḍī Yūnus 'Abd al-Mālik assert that those who relate the doctrines of Ṣūfism to indewlling and union are mistaken. Yūnus Emre's hymn *Sen'inle dirliğim Sen'den ayrılmaz / Hayât Sen'inledir Sen'siz dirilmez* {I live through you, not separate from you / Life is through you: without you there is no life} reveals complete conformity with Ibn al-'Arabī's view.

39 {Cf. Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre*: *Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, p. 97.}

40 İsmâ'îl Hakkı explicates this hymn by Yūnus Emre as follows: *Yuvadan maksadı âşiyâne-i ezelî ve âlem-i vahdettir ki, oradan bu âlem-i ebede ve kesrete pervâz eyleyib Tabduk Emre'nin irşâdiyle dâm-ı aşka giriftâr oldu ve ıztırâba düştü ve talim ile tûtî gibi bir lisân öğrendi ki bu kesret ilinde ânı ehl-i vahdetten gayrı kimse fethetmedi; zîrâ Yemen bâzirgânının getirdiği dürr-ü cevâhirin kıymetini karevî olanlar bilmez ve boncuk kadar rağbet kılmaz. Pes cümle ehl-i hakîkatin kelimâtı dahî böyledir. Ânın çin bu zevka mazhar olanlar ve bu sırrı bilenler na-ehle râz açmazlar ve nâdân yanından geçmezler* {By nest (*yuva*) he means pre-eternal home, the world of unity. He soared from there to the world of post-eternity and multiplicity and with the guidance of Tapduk Emre became caught in the snare of love and suffered anguish. He learned a language like a trained parrot, so that in this region of multiplicity no one but a member of the people of unity conquered him, for peasants (*karevî*) do not know the value of pearls brought by the Yemenī merchant – and do not desire them as much as beads. Moreover, the words of all the people of the truth (Ṣūfīs) are like this. Therefore, those who are exposed to this blissful perception of God's presence (*zevk*) and who know this secret do not reveal the mystery to the undeserving and do not associate with the ignorant} (commentary on the *Muḥammadiyya*, *bakiyye-i cildi evvel* {remainder of volume 1}, p. 112). Khujandī's couplet

باناصح بی درد نگویم غم عشق \ بیهوده سخن محرم آن راز نباشد

{I do not tell the pain of love to the unfeeling advisor: / The speaker of nonsense is not a confidant of that mystery} expressess the same meaning. These bird and nest

similes are quite famous among the Ṣūfīs. The following poem by Mawlānā is a very eloquent example of such comparisons:

دلا چه بستهٔ این خاکدان بر گذرانی \ از این حظیره برون پرکه مرغ عالم جانی

تو مرغ عالم قدسی ندیم مجلس انسی \ دریغ باشد اگر تو درین مقام بمانی

{O heart, why art thou a captive in the earth that is passing away?
Fly forth from this enclosure, since thou art a bird of the spiritual world.

Thou art a bird of the whole world, a boon-companion in the assembly of Love;
If thou wilt remain here, 'tis a pity

Nicholson trans., *Selected Poems from the Dīvāni Shamsi Tabrīz*, p. 175}.

41 {Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre*: *Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, p. 85.}

42 Ibn al-ʿArabī records his thoughts on this matter in the Bezel of Adam {Chapter 1 of Bezels of Wisdom (*Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*)} in particular. Bosnawī {in his commentary} explicates them as follows: *Kevn-i câmi'den mukaddem icâdolunan âvâlim ki ekvân-ı gayr-ı câmiʿayı câmiʿdir, insânsız şebh-i vücûdî gibi icâdolunmuştu. Ânın mezâhirinde olan rü'yet-i esmâ'îdir; hâlbuki kevn-i câmiʿ mazharında esmâ'-i hüsnânın aʿyânı rü'yetine meşiyyetin teallûkundan evvel Hak Teâlâ âlemin küllîsini şebh-i müsevvâ gibi ki ânda rûh yoktur, icâdetmişti. Pes âlem cilâ olunmamış âyîne gibi idi: zîrâ kevn-i câmiʿin icâdından mukaddem icâdolunan âlemin küllîsi, aʿlâ ve esfeli, zulmânî ve nûrânîsi ve âlem-i emri ve halkı olsun esmâ'i ilâhiyye mezâhiridir . . . İnsânsız âlemin kemâl-i zuhûra kâbiliyyeti yoktur, zâten ve sûreten ve cemʿan ve tafsîlen, zâhiren ve bâtnen Hakk'ın kemâl-i mazhariyyetinden kâsır olduğundan ötürü. Pes insândan evvel, âlem-i zuhûr-i küllî, insân rûhu için tesviye olunmuş bir cesed gibi idi ve insânın vücûdü cilâsı ile cilâ olunmağa kâbil cilâ olunmamış bir âyîne gibi idi . . . Pes Emr-i ilâhî ve Hükm-i Rabbânî, âlem mir'âtının cilâsın uktzâ eyledi; pes âdem ol mir'ât cilâsının ayni ve ol şebh-i müsevvâ sûretinin rûhu oldu; zîrâ âdem esmâ'-i ilâhiyye cemʿiyyetini câmiʿ olan Hazret-i ilâhiyyetin mazharıdır. Pes Hazret-i ilâhiyye, esmâ'i ilâhiyyeyi câmiʿa olub, ânınla zât beyninde vâsıta olmadığı gibi hazret-i insâniyye dahî esmâ'i ilâhiyye'yi câmiʿa olub zât-ı ehadiyyet ile ânın beyninde vâsıta yoktur. Hazret-i ilâhiyyet'te olan cemʿiyyet-i esmâ'iyye insânda zâhirdir. Pes âdem ahkâm-ı vücûbu câmiʿ oldu ve vücûd dahî hazret-i cemiʿden evvelî Hazret-i ilâhiyyet'e nüzûl etti; baʿdehû merâtib-i mümkinâtta suver-i nevʿiyye-i imkâniyye üzre fâiz olub, cemiʿ merâtib ile munsabığ olduğu hâlde, insâna müntehî oldu. Pes insân-ı kâmil cemiʿ merâtib-i imkâniyyenin zübdesini câmiʿ olmağla, ahkâm-ı imkâniyyeyi dahî câmiʿ oldu. Pes âlem ile kemâl bulub, ekmel sûrette Hak Teâlâ âlem üzre zâhir oldu; zîrâ âlem Sûret-i Hak üzre olan âdemin sûreti üzredir. Pes âlemin netîcesi ve semeresi âdemdir, zuhûr ciheti ile . . .* {The cosmos, which was created before the all-comprehensive thing (see Chittick, *The Self-disclosure of God*, p. 171, the perfect human being), is that which comprehends the non-comprehensive engendered things. It was created without man, like the corporeal form. In its manifestations is found the perception of the divine names, whereas, in the manifestation of the all-comprehensive thing are found the essences of the beautiful names of God. Before any connection with the desire to perceive it, God created the cosmos like an undifferentiated body, without a soul. Thus, the world was like an unpolished mirror; for the cosmos, which was created before the creation of the all-comprehensive thing, is the manifestation of the divine names – including highest and lowest, dark and light, the world of command and the world of creation (see Chittick, *ibid*., pp. 250ff.) . . . The world without man has no capacity for perfect appearance because it is incapable of the perfect manifestation of God, whether in essence or in form, whether in whole or in part, whether outwardly or inwardly. Thus, before man, the cosmos was like a body prepared for the human soul. It was like an unpolished mirror capable of being polished with the polish of the existence of

man . . . Then the divine command and divine judgment necessitated the polishing of the mirror of the world. Adam is identical to the polishing of that mirror and is the soul of that undifferentiated body. Adam is the manifestation of the divine presence that comprehends all of the divine names. Just as the divine presence comprehends the divine names and there is no intermediary between it and the essence (of God), so the human presence also includes the divine names and there is no intermediary between it and the *dhāt-i aḥadiyyat* (essence of unity). All of the names that are in the divine presence are manifest in man. Thus Adam became the totality of the properties of necessity. Existence first descended from the collective presence (of bringing together; cf. Chittick, *ibid.*, p. 179) to the divine presence and then became abundant according to the possible specific attributes in the stages of possible things. Existence was tinged with (has the appearance of) all the stages, but culminated in man. Thus, the perfect man included the quintessence of all the possible stages and also the possible properties. Thus he found perfection with the world and God appeared upon the world in the most perfect form, because the world (macrocosm) is in the form of man (microcosm) who is the image of God. Thus the end result and product of the world is man, from the point of view of appearance . . . } After this Ibn al-ʿArabī speaks at length about man being God's vicegerent and says that, if the perfect man were detached from the treasurehouse of the world, nothing would be left in the world that God would treasure with Himself. The reason that the all-encompassing thing is called man is due to the generality of his creation and the fact that he comprises the totality of the truths. The collective creation of the cosmos is summed up in man's creation, and man's creation is differentiated in the collective creation. The greatest *barzakhiyya* {intermediary realm} comprises all divine, created, and intermediary {*barzakhī*} truths with the truth of the unity of the cosmos.

43 {Cf. Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre*: *Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, pp. 107–8.}

44 It is clear that Yūnus Emre considered esoteric knowledge and not exoteric knowledge to be important. The reason for this dichotomy in knowledge is that God is both apparent and hidden. The dichotomy is necessary according to the Ṣūfīs because the apparent can only be known by the apparent and the hidden by the hidden. Those who regard only exoteric knowledge to be important cannot see God "with essential perception in rational degrees {*madārik*} and essential stages"; and those who regard only esoteric knowledge as important cannot see God "who is apparent in cosmic phenomena and sensory manifestations." Because the perfection of Muḥammad is in the joining of the apparent and hidden, and this is possible in the stage of *qāb-i qawsain* {being very close; see Chittick, *The Self-disclosure of God*, pp. 233–6}, which is the stage of the vicegerency {see Chittick; *The Sufi Path of Knowledge*, p. 286} and the perfect man, naturally it is not vouchsafed to everyone. Nevertheless, the Ṣūfī poets acted coldly and contemptuously not only toward the conventional religious scholars but also toward exoteric knowledge. Mawlānā's statement مرد خدانیست فقیه از کتاب {the man of God is not learned from books; Nicholson (trans.), *Selected Poems from the Dīvāni Shamsi Tabrīz*, p. 29} expresses this precisely.

45 The subject of *dawr* is explained briefly and quite well in the introduction of İbrâhîm Hakkı's *Maʿrifatnâme* {Istanbul, 1294/1877}, pp. 27–9. For greater detail, see {ʿAbd Allāh Bosnawī's} commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ*, especially the first *faṣṣ* {segment}. This subject is also briefly discussed in Sarı ʿAbd Allāh Efendi's *Thamarāt al-fu'ād* (p. 10). Creation poems {*dawriyyas*} dealing with the arc of descent {transformation of the divine light into the four elements} are termed "of the carpet" {*farshiyya*, i.e. earthly} and the others "of the throne" {*ʿarshiyya*, i.e. heavenly}. Niyāzī Miṣrī's *Dawriyya-i ʿarshiyya* and Üsküdarlı Hâshim Baba's *Dawriyya-i farshiyya* are very famous in our literature. In addition, there are many *dawriyyas* by the *tekke* poets beginning with Nesīmī and including those such as Ibrāhīm Efendi {i.e. Olanlar Shaikhi} and Qayghusuz,

and also in Bektashī poetry. There is a simple commentary on this theory in Qayghusuz's *'Abdālnāme* {MS in Köprülü's private library}, p. 16.

46 بانه پدر در هر فلك يكچند دوران كرده ام \ با اختران در بر جها من سالها گرديده ام

يكچند نا پيدا بدم با او بهم يكجا بدم \ در ملك اوادنى بدم ديدم هر آنچه ديده ام

مانند طفل اندر شكم من پرورش دارم زحق \ يكبار زايد آدمى من بارها زائيده ام

در خرقهٔ تن پارها بودم بسى در كارها \ وزدست خوداين خرقه را بسيار من بدريده ام

با زاهدان در صو معه شبها بروز آورده ام \ با كافران در بتكده پيش بتان خسپيده ام

هم دزد عياران منم هم رنج بيماران منم \ هم ابرو هم باران منم در باغها با ريده ام

بردا منم گرد فنا ننشست هر گز اى گدا \ در باغ وبستان بقا گلها فراوان چيده ام

{I turned a little in every sphere with the Nine Fathers
(F. Steingass, *Persian–English Dictionary* [1892; reprinted Beirut, 1975], p. 1437: the seven planets with the dragon's head and tail)

I turned for years in the constellations with the stars.

For a while I disappeared. I was at one place together with him.
I was the lowliest in His kingdom. I saw whatever I saw.

I get nourishment from divine Truth (God) like an embryo in the womb.
A man is born once: I have been born many times.

In the torn cloak of the body I was involved in many deeds,
And with my own hand I often tore this cloak apart.

I spent nights with monks in their cell.
I slept with infidels in their idol temple, next to the idols.

I am a thief of the rogues. I am the suffering of the sick.
I am both cloud and rain: I have rained into the gardens.

The dust of annihilation never settled on my shirt, O beggar!
I have picked roses in abundance in the garden of eternity.}

47 In Mawlānā's *Dīwān*, there is a *ghazal* beginning

هو نقش راكه ديدى جنسش زلا مكانست \ گر نقش رفت غم نيست اصلش چو جاودانست

{Every design that you see has its type in the One Without Place (God). / No matter if the design disappears: its original is eternal.} Here Mawlānā tries to explain the *dawr* theory in the following verses:

اول جماد بودى آخر نبات كشتى \ آنگه شدى تو حيوان اين بر توچون نهانست

گشتى ازان پس انسان با علم وعقل وايمان \ بنگر چه گل شد آن تن كو جزؤ خاكدانست

{First you were mineral, then vegetable.
You then became animal. How is this hidden from you?

Then you became human, with knowledge, reason, and faith.
See how that body, which is a part of the earth, turned into a rose.}

In his *Mathnawī*, Mawlānā presents this clearly as well {Book 4, lines 3637–9, and Book 3, lines 3901–6}:

آمده اول باقلیم جماد \ وزجمادی در نباتی او فتاد

سالها اندر نباتی عمر کرد \ وزجمادی یاد ناورد از نبرد

وز نباتی چون بحیوانی فتاد \ نا مدش حال نباتی هیچ یاد

....

از جمادی مردم ونامی شدم \ وز نما مردم بحیوان سر زدم

مردم از حیوانی وآدم شدم \ پس چه ترسم کی زمردن کمشدم

جملهٔ دیگر بمیرم از بشر \ تابر آرم از ملائك بال وپر

وز ملك هم بایدم جستن زجو \ کل شئ هالك الا وجهه

بار دیگر از ملك قربان شوم \ آنچه اندر وهم ناید آن شوم

پس عدم گردم عدم چون ارغنون \ گویدم کانا الیه راجعون

{He came first to the mineral realm.
From a mineral he turned into a vegetable.

He lived in the vegetable state for years,
And because of the opposition (between them) remembered nothing of the mineral state.

Then from a vegetable he turned into an animal,
And remembered nothing of the vegetable state.

. . .

I died as a mineral and became a plant.
I died as a plant and appeared as an animal.

I died as an animal and became a man.
So why should I fear that from dying I will be diminished?

Let me die completely as a man,
So that I may put forth angel's wings.

From the angels I must leap out of the air:
"Everything passes away exept His face" (Koran, 55:22).

Once again, as an angel, I will be sacrificed,
So that I may become what has never been imagined.

Then I will become non-being. Non-being says loud as an organ:
"To Him we shall return" (Koran, 2:156).}

48 In Nāṣir-i Khusraw's poem that begins

بگذشت زهجرت پس سیصد نود وچار \ بنهاد مرا ما در بر مرکز غبرا

{Three hundred ninety-four years had passed since the Hijra, / When my mother placed me in the center of the earth} this belief in *dawr* is quite obvious.

49 The famous strophe of Ibn Yamīn, the author of *Muqaṭṭa'āt* {Calcutta, 1865}, which begins

زدم از کتم عدم خیمه بصحرای وجود \ وزجمادی بنباتی سفری کردم ورفت

{From the concealment of non-being, I pitched a tent in the plain of being. / I journeyed from being mineral to being vegetable,} fully describes this theory.

50 Faiḍ-i Hindī's *Markaz al-adwār* is a good example of a *dawriyya*.

51 In the *Gulshan-i rāz*, the subjects of this *dawr* and the perfect man, and then that of the emanation and the self-disclosure of God, are clearly presented in a manner suitable to a didactic work. In order not to go beyond our subject, I will not cite it here.

52 I believe that the descriptions that I have given above of the views of the Muslim mystics on the subject of creation have shown that they could not include a belief in metempsychosis {*tanāsukh*} – just as they could not include a belief in indwelling {*ḥulūl*} or union {*ittiḥād*}. The author of *Gulshan-i rāz* thus rejects any possible imputation {of this} by saying

تناسخ نبود این از روی معنا \ ظهور اتیست در عین تجلا

{These circuits are not transmigrations of souls, for verily / They are manifested in the visions of Epiphanies; Whinfield (trans.), line 367, and in a footnote he explains "In metempsychosis one body perishes and another succeeds it as a receptacle of the soul, but in these circuits the truth may be manifested in teacher and disciple at once."}. We also find the belief in metempsychosis, which we first encounter as a philosophical view in Pythagorus and Plato, in the Neoplatonists. Their theory of emanation and self-disclosure of God did not lend itself to the belief in metempsychosis, because, in their opinion, the soul is an idea and matter is a negation. Consequently, the notion of metempsychosis entered Neoplatonism not as a corollary of their system, but as a remnant of the Pythagorean theories.

The first to try to reconcile this with the Neoplatonist system was the Syrian Porphyry {233–*c.*304}. According to him, the reason why our souls wear the garment of the physical body is punishment for sins that we committed in a previous life. The envelope that covers our soul is proportionally thick or thin according to our offense and punishment. Thus, some souls have been placed in an aerial body and some in the human body. They fulfill their duties with resignation and thus slowly approach God. This view is clearly nothing more than the extension of Plato's spiritualism indiscriminately to all mankind. Porphyry believed that animals possessed a soul, perception, and reason, but he did not include them in this system. Furthermore, in contrast to this ascending ladder that goes from man to God, he also accepts a descending ladder that goes from man to hell.

Among the cabalists, we find this theory assuming more of an ethical and spiritual quality. According to them, it is predestined for souls, like all existing things on the face of the earth, to return to the divine substance. In order to do this, it is necessary for the indestructible germ of perfection within the souls to acquire all the perfect

qualities. If the soul cannot acquire them in the first life, then it begins, in turn, the second and third and finds in each the means of reaching perfection that it was not able to find in the previous one. Finally, when our soul reaches such perfection that it perceives the bliss of divine unity, this cycle ends. Moreover, if we persist in not turning away from our sins, this cycle will continue until the day of resurrection {Köprülü's description of metempsychosis here is essentially a summary of an extract from Franck (ed.), *Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques*, s.v. "Métempsychose" (Adolphe Franck), pp. 1096–7}. It is clear that among the cabalists the cycle is restricted to humans.

In light of this entire account, the nature of the differences between our Ṣūfīs and the Neoplatonists and the cabalists on the subject of the cycle is easily understood. Our Ṣūfīs included in the cycle not only mankind but also inanimate objects, plants, and animals. The view of some Ṣūfīs that the "soul is brought down to the corporeal world in order to find perfection through life experience" is somewhat compatible with the ideas of Porphyry and the cabalists, but differs from them with respect to the system. The great Ṣūfīs basically explain the descent of the soul not in this manner but as "the divine will's desire to manifest its essence." All the Ṣūfī poets accepted this. İbrâhîm Hakkı's explanation of this in his *Maʿrifatnâme* is somewhat reminiscent of Porphyry and the cabalists, but when the Ṣūfī system of Ibn al-ʿArabī and Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī – and that of İbrâhîm Hakkı who follows them – is carefully examined, it becomes quite obvious that there is absolutely no inclination toward accepting the theory of metempsychosis. With respect to the origin of the belief in *dawr*, it did pass from the Neoplatonists and cabalists to our Ṣūfīs, but they changed its nature – broadening and refining it – and escaped from metempsychosis, which was not very compatible with their views. The manifestations of the beliefs in indwelling and union and metempsychosis in Islam constitute a separate subject that is of great importance.

53 {Cf. Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre: Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, p. 179; Mustafa Tatçı, *Yunus Emre Divânı* (Ankara, 1990) p. 161.}

54 There is this difference, namely that Aḥmad Yasawī was much more of an upholder of the religious law and a moralist, and had the spiritual influence of the founder of a *ṭarīqa*, while Yūnus Emre was only a mystic, a simple dervish who was influential for centuries as a passionate poet. Indeed, Yūnus Emre was superior to Aḥmad Yasawī not only as an artist but also as a Ṣūfī.

55 In his commentary {on Ibn al-ʿArabī's *Fuṣūṣ*}, ʿAbd Allāh Bosnawī provides a brief but fairly detailed description of how the Ṣūfīs perceive God (p. 11). If we compare it with Plotinus' theory of the three hypostases (i.e. unity, intelligence, and power) and his ideas about the essence of God and the creation of the universe, it becomes clear not only that our Ṣūfīs have essentially accepted the theory of Neoplatonism, but also how they have modified and deepened it within the framework of Islam. Yūnus Emre, who lamented *Ben bir kitâb okudum kalem onu yazmadı / Mürekkep eylerisem yetmeye yedi deniz* {I read a book not written with a pen. Seven seas of ink would not suffice for it}, maintained a view that was no different from that of Mawlānā, who cried out زنهار اگر بینی مرا باکس مگر من دیده ام {Beware! If you see me, tell no one. I have seen (Him)}, and Ibn al-ʿArabī. And he wrote orations that could be easily reconciled with *Sharīʿa* principles. Only by ignoring the rather subtle interpretations of Islamic mysticism and many of its other features can one consider Yūnus's beliefs contrary to those of the Sunnīs.

56 Rızâ Tevfîk says in an article, "Yūnus Emre was similar to other *bāṭinīs*. I consider them all to be proponents of religious doctrines that do not conform to conventional beliefs. His verse *Hakîkatin kâfiri şerʿin evliyâsıdır* {The infidel of divine Truth is the saint of the *Sharīʿa*} justifies including this beloved Turkish poet among this group, based on his own admission. His beliefs were no different from those of the Ṣūfīs of Iran and

India" ("Yûnus Emre hakkında biraz daha tafsilât," p. 183). As I have explained above, it would be completely mistaken to consider Yūnus Emre a *bāṭınī*, because he never went beyond a clear limit that, by means of interpretation, could be reconciled {with orthodoxy}. As for the above verse, it must be interpreted in a completely different sense. Otherwise, we must also not consider Mawlānā, if we take his words literally, to be a Muslim. The absurdity of this is obvious. If we do not carefully study the special features of Islamic mysticism and simply accept it as an imitation of Neoplatonism, we cannot escape such errors. A lengthy discussion here of these important Ṣūfī issues is beyond my expertise.

57 See the Ḥurūfī texts published by Huart, {*Textes persans relatifs à la secte des houroufis* (Leiden, 1909)}. There is a fairly detailed account of this in Khwāja İshak Efendi's *Kâşifü'l-esrâr ve dâfi'ü'l-eşrâr* {Istanbul, 1290/1873–4}. There is also some information in {Karakaşzâde Ömer Efendi's} *Nûrü'l-hüdâ li-men ihtadâ* {Istanbul, 1286/1869–70} and Rifat Ahmed Efendi's *Mir'âtü'l-makâsid* {Istanbul, 1293/1876}. Rızâ Tevfik's study is disorganized and full of historical gaps and errors, but it is still useful. The Ḥurūfīs, who accept epiphany, i.e. the appearance of God in the form of the sect's founder Faḍl Allāh, are one of many similar *bāṭınī* sects that arose from the bosom of Islam. In its origins, it is a curious and rudimentary mixture of Jewish cabala and Neoplatonist beliefs, plus a few religio-mystical traditions. Simply comparing it to other *bāṭınī* sects does not suffice to properly understand it. In addition, one should fully comprehend the milieu in which it developed, the places to which it spread, and its connection and relationship with other similar sects. Then a full explanation of it would be possible and its historical development would be discernable. I am preparing a study that will include some important notes, especially from the historical point of view, on the Ḥurūfīs among various other unorthodox *ṭarīqas* and groups that were spread among the Anatolian Turks for centuries. {This was never published. Köprülü was supposed to prepare something on this subject for the supplement to the *İA*, see bibliograpy, s.v. "Hurûfîlik" (ed.). Now see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ḥurūfiyya" (A. Bausani), and especially the works of Gölpınarlı listed in the bibliography of his *Hurûfîlik metinleri kataloğu*, and Bashir's "Enshrining Divinity."}

58 There are a fair number of Ḥurūfī poets in our literature. The aforementioned study will also include details on them. It would be a mistake, however, to consider every poet whose work included allusions to *asrār-i ḥurūf* {the secrets of the letters} to be a Ḥurūfī.

59 In the *Dīwān* of Yūnus Emre, who said, *Ne elif okudum ne cîm ne varlıktandır kelecim / Okumaz yüzbin müneccim tâli'im yılduzdan gelür* {I have read neither *alif* nor *jīm*, nor do my words concern the world / A myriad astrologers cannot read it: my horoscope comes from the stars (cf. Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre*: *Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân*, p. 51),} there are some important references to this issue of the letters. The following passages are examples of such references:

Yigirmisekiz hece okursun ucdan uca
Sen elif dersin hoca ma'nâsı ne demektir

{You read the twenty-eight letters from end to end
You say *alif*, teacher; but what does it mean?}

. . .

Dört Kitâb'ın ma'nâsı tamâmdır bir elifte
Bâ dedirmeniz bana ben bu yoldan azarım

Yedi Mushaf ma'nâsın okudum tamâm kıldım
Ya ne için karayı ak üstünde yazarım

{The entire meaning of the Four Books is in a single *alif*.
When you make me say *bā'*, I go astray.

I have read completely the meaning of the seven variant readings
(of the Koran).
So why do I write black on white?}

Rızâ Tevfik says, "According to authorities, there are clear references to the fact that Yūnus Emre was a Ḥurūfī." He uses two of these couplets as evidence of this and explains them as follows: "In these expressions, {the letter} *alif* is Adam. *Bā'* is the beginning of *b'ismillāh* {the invocation, in the name of God}, so that the dot beneath it is the source of existence, which is the origin of all letters. The meaning of *yedi mushaf* {seven variant readings of the Koran} is the seven basic facial lines of Adam. The expression *ak üstünde kara yazı* {writing black on white} is an allusion to *hutût-i ümmiyye* {the maternal lines} and *hutût-i ebiyye* {the paternal lines}. These are some of the fundamental beliefs of the Ḥurūfīs. There are many examples, references and explanations in my published work." Apparently Rızâ Tevfik considers Yūnus Emre to be a disciple of Faḍl Allāh Ḥurūfī. It is absolutely mistaken, however, to explain these four verses by Yūnus Emre, who lived a century before Faḍl Allāh, according to Ḥurūfī beliefs. The quatrain below, which belongs to the famous Ṣūfī Shaikh 'Izz al-Dīn Maḥmūd al-Kāshī, who wrote a commentary on {Ibn al-Fāriḍ's} *Qaṣīda-i tā'iyya* and translated {al-Suhrawardī's} *'Awārif al-ma'ārif*, has the same meaning as Yūnus Emre's line *Dört Kitâb'ın ma'nâsı tamâmdır bir elifde* {The entire meaning of the Four Books is in an *alif*}.

دل گفت مرا علم لدنی هوس است \ تعلیمم کن گرت بدین دسترس است

گفتم که الف گفت دگر گفتم هیچ \ در خانه اگر کس است یك حرف بس است

{My heart said to me: "I desire divine knowledge.
Instruct me if you have attained it."
"*Alif*," I said. "What else?" he asked. "Nothing," said I.
If someone is in the house, one word is enough.}

This Ṣūfī, who was definitely not a Ḥurūfī, also considered spiritual knowledge to be concentrated in the letter *alif*. This shows that it would be completely mistaken to attribute the aforesaid words of Yūnus Emre to Ḥurūfism and explain them in its terms.

60 In addition to the passage that I have mentioned, there are a few trifling things in the *Dīwān* concerning the secrets of the letters, but none of them bears the slightest evidence of Ḥurūfism or *faḍl* {i.e. Faḍl Allāh}.

61 To demonstrate the importance that genuine Ṣūfīs gave to the secrets of the letters, I will give verbatim the account of the commentator {'Abd Allāh Bosnawī} on the *Fuṣūṣ* – by Ibn al-'Arabī – concerning *ḥurūf* {letters} and *kalimāt* {words}: *Hurûf ile kelimât iki kısım üzredir. Birisi hurûf-i ilâhiyye ve kelimât-i ilâhiyye, birisi hurûf-i vücûdiyye ve kelimât-i vücûdiyye. Pes hurûf-i ilâhiyye; gaybı, gayb-ı guyûbda kâmin olan şân-i zâtîdir, nevât içinde şecere gibi. Pes şuûnât-i ilâhiyye te'ayyunât-i Hakk'ın a'lâ merâtibi oldukları i'tibâriyle ve sîga-yı vücûdiyye'den evvel Hakk'ın ilm-i zâtî'sinde eşyâ için te'akkulâtın esenn-i merâtibi oldukları i'tibâriyle ânlardan her bir şe'n hurûf-i gaybî ile tesmiye olunur. Sîga-yı vücûdiyye'den evvel her bir şe'ni ânın levâzimi ile te'akkul etmek i'tibâriyle ol şe'n kelime-i gaybiyye ile tesmiye olunur ve ol şe'n ile Hakk'ın zuhûru ve ânın levâzimi i'tibârîsiz Hakk'ın tecellîsî hükmünün insihâbi i'tibâriyle ol şe'n harf-i vücûdî ile tesmiye olunur ve ol tecellî hükmünün ol şe'n üzre ve ânın levâzimi üzre insihâbî*

i'tibâriyle ol şe'n kelime-i vücûdiyye ile tesmiye olunur. Pes hurûf-i gaybiyye şuûn-i zâtiyye olduğu i'tibâr üzre Hakk'ın aynidir, şecere, nevâtta, nevâtın ayni olduğu gibi te'ayyun ilmi ile hurûfun te'ayyunu ve te'addüd-i nisbî ile hurûfun te'addüdü i'tibâriyle ve hurûf-i eşyânın hakâyıkı ve üsûlu ve mebde'i ve menşe'i olduğu i'tibâriyle hurûf-i ayniyye Zât-ı Hakk'ın gayrıdır, temeyyüz-i nisbî ile ândan mütemeyyizedir, temeyyüz-i hakîkî ile değil. Pes hurûf-i gaybiyye, eşyânın te'ayyünâtı için mebâdî-i vâkı'a olur ve 's-selâm {Letters and words are divided into two catagories: one is divine letters and divine words and one is existing letters and existing words. Divine letters pertain to the invisible world. They are of the quality of the divine essence that is concealed in the most invisible of the invisible worlds. They are like the tree inside the seed. By virtue of the fact that the divine tasks are the highest stages of the entifications of God, and that before the existent form the oldest stages of comprehension for everything are in the divine essence of the knowledge of God, every divine task is named with the invisible letters. And by virtue of the fact that every divine task before the existent form is comprehended with its requirements, it is named with the invisible word. With respect to that task and the appearance of God being without regard to its requirements and the self-disclosure of God being with regard to the withdrawal of his property, that task is named with the existing letter. And with respect to that property of self-disclosure of God being withdrawn for that task and its requirements, that task is named with the existing word. With regard to the invisible letters being tasks of divine essence, they are the same as God, just as the tree in the seed is the same as the seed. With regard to the knowledge of entification and the entification of letters and relative multiplicity and the multiplicity of letters, and with regard to the letters of things being their true realities and their origin, beginning and source, the essential letters are different from God. They are distinguished from Him by relative distinction, not by true distinction. Thus, the invisible letters are the beginning occurrences for the entifications of things} (commentary on the *Fuṣūṣ*, p. 17). The visible and hidden letters of the word God {*Allāh*} and the symbols that they denote are explained at length in this commentary: . . . *Kezâlik nefes-i Rahmânî elif'i tecellî îcâdı bed'inde te'ayyün-i evvel'in kalbi bâtınından mümted olub, ilm-i zâtîde ehadiyyet cem'-i hazretinde olan cemi' şuûn-i zâtiyye ve a'yân-ı ilmiyye-i gaybiyye ve hakâyık-ı fi'liyye'yi ilâhiyye üzre Hazret-i imkân'ın gâyetine müntehî olunca mürûr etti. Pes tecellînin te'ayyünü için bir mahall-i tâm olmadığı eclden yine mebde'i olan te'ayyün-i evvel'in bâtınına rucû' etti. Pes devre-i tecellî tamâm oldu ve nefes-i Rahmânî elif'i hakâyık-ı vücûbiyye ve imkâniyyeyi ihâta edüb âhiri evveline muttasıl oldu. Pes Allâh Té'âlâ ilmen ve vücûden eşyânın küllîsini muhît oldu* { . . . Similarly, the divine breath was extended from the hidden heart of the first entification at the first manifestation of the creation of the *alif*. The oneness of God in the knowledge of the divine essence continued over all the tasks of the divine essence, the invisible and knowable entities, and the divine actual realities, which are in the total divine presence, culminate in the divine possibility. Then, because there is no perfect place for the entification of self-disclosure, it returned to the hidden part of the first entification, which is also its origin. Then the cycle of self-disclosure was complete and the divine breath encompassed the necessary and possible realities of the *alif* and its end is joined to its beginning. Thus God encompassed all things, both in knowledge and in being} (p. 27). All of this goes to show that the mystery of the letters was also included in the Muslim system of mysticism – as was the case in all other systems of mysticism beginning with those of India. İsmâ'îl Hakkı summarizes the significance of {I انا النقطة تحت الباء am the dot under the (Arabic) letter "b"} by citing Shaikh 'Alī's *Aswalat al-ḥikam* and other such books acceptable to the (conventional) religious scholars. His account also corroborates and further elucidates my views: *Vücûdun dört mertebesi vardır. Evvelkisi şu'ûnât-ı gaybiyye mertebesidir ki hurûf-î teheccî âna işârettir; ikincisi a'yân-ı ilmiyye mertebesidir ki ebced'e varınca olan hurûf-i mürekkebe âna işârettir; üçüncüsü âlem-i ervâh mertebesidir ki ebced âna işârettir; dördüncüsü âlem-i ecsâm mertebesidir ke sâir mürekkebât-ı kelâmiyye âna işârettir. Sıbyân ve*

ânların hükmünde olan ricâlin ibtidâ elif'ten bedʿ ettikleri Âlem-i zât karîb oldukları cehetten nefes-i Rahmânî-ye işârettir ki ol nefes-i elif gibi cemiʿ aʿyân-i mümkinât üzerine mümted olmuştur . . . Velhâsıl imtidâd-ı nefes-i Rahmânî ile ibtidâ teʿayyün-i zâtî vücûde geldi ki bâ'in tahtında olan nokta-i muvahhede âna işârettir ve sâniyen teʿayyün-i sıfâtî vücûde geldi ki tâ'nın febkinde olan noktateyn âna işârettir. Sâlisen teʿayyün-i efʿâlî sübût buldu ki sâ'nın fevkinde olan nikât-i selâse âna işârettir, yâni elif'in müşârün ileyhi olan imtidâd-ı nefes-i Rahmânî ile hâsıl olan teʿayyünât üç mertebe olmağla nokta dahî üç aded oldu; iki veya dört olmadı ve elsine-i sûfiyyede dâir olan âlem-i nûn noktaya işârettir ol âleme Ummü'l-Kitâb dahî derler; zîrâ asıl Kitâbü'l-vücûd'dür. Ol nûn'da midâd-i mevadd-i nukûş-i âlem müctemiʿ olmuştur. Pes Hazret-i Alî, Taht-i bâ'da olan nokta benim buyurduğu cemû merâtib-i ilâhiyye ve kevniyye'nin cemʿinden ibâret olan insân-ı kâmil lisânındandır, gerek nebî gerek velî olsun; zîrâ hakîkat-i Muhammediyye'nin teʿayyün-i evvel olması, hakîkat-i ʿaliyyenin teʿayyün-i evvel olmasını mânıʿ değildir, zîrâ insân-ı kâmil'in cümlesi saff-i evveldendir ve Vücûd'da müttehittir {There are four stages of existence. The first is the stage of invisible tasks. Spelling of the letters is an allusion to it. The second is the stage of noncorporeal entities. The composite letters as far as the *abjad* (an order of the alphabet, see *EI*², s.v. "Abd̲jad" [G. Weil-(G. S. Colin)]) formula are an allusion to it. The third is the word of souls. The *abjad* is an allusion to it. The fourth is the stage of the world of corporeal bodies. All composed words are an allusion to it. Because youths and men who are equivalent to them are near the world of divine essence, which they began from *alif*, they are an allusion to the divine breath of the All Merciful. Like the breath of the *alif*, they are extended to all possible entities. . . . In short, the first entification of the divine essence came into being with the extension of the divine breath. The single dot under the *bā'* is an allusion to it. Second, the entification of the attributes came into being. The two dots over the *tā'* are an allusion to it. Third, the entification of the acts was established. The three dots over the *thā'* are an allusion to it. In other words, the entifications that occur with the extension of the divine breath, which is the aforesaid *alif*, are three stages and the dots also number three. They are not two or four. The world of the *nūn*, which is found on the tongues of the Ṣūfīs, is an allusion to the dot. That world is also called *umm al-kitāb* (mother of the book), because it is the original book of existence. In that *nūn* is the ink of the matter for designing the world. It is on the tongue of the perfect man, who is the collective totality of all the divine and engendered stages, that his excellency ʿAlī said: "I am the dot below the *bā'*," whether one be prophet or saint. The fact that the reality of Muḥammad was the first entification does not prevent the reality of ʿAlī being the first entification, because the totality of the perfect man is of the first rank and is united in existence} (commentary on the *Muḥammadiyya*, vol. 1, part 2, pp. 132–3). In the couplet *Kudret, sûret yapmadan firiştehler tapmadan / Âlemi halk tutmadan ileri yola geldim* {Before power and form were made, before the angels worshipped, / Before creation seized upon the world, I came to the forward path}, Yūnus Emre uses "the forward path" (*ileri yol*) to mean the world of the dot that is the collective whole of the divine and engendered stages and the copy of the objective and subjective worlds. It is as meaningless to consider Yūnus Emre to be a Nuqṭawī {one who believed the earth was the starting point, *nuqṭa*, of all things; see *EI*², s.v. "Nuḳṭawiyya" (H. Algar)} based on this as it is to consider him a Ḥurūfī based on the couplets given above. {See "On Letter Symbolism in Sufi Literature" in Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, pp. 411–25.}

62 Comparable to some other *bātinī* beliefs, Ḥurūfism was a creed that held, in effect, that God was manifest in the form of Faḍl Allāh Ḥurūfī. In order to reach this absurd conclusion, however, the Ḥurūfīs advanced all kinds of lengthy preliminaries, which one encounters explicitly or implicitly in all Ḥurūfī literature from {Faḍl Allāh's} *Jāwidān* {MS in Köprülü's private library} to the works of Firishte-oghlu {d. 874/1469}, ʿAlī 'l-Aʿlā {d. 822/1419}, and the Ḥurūfī poets. This system includes several

points that are basically held in common with Islamic mysticism. For example, the secrets of the letters, the perfect man, the *dawr*, and esoteric interpretation {*ta'wīl*} were not inventions of Faḍl Allāh Ḥurūfī. They were taken from Islamic mysticism, but were absurdly stuck together with such things as metempsychosis, indwelling, and union, which cannot be reconciled with it, and with a number of childish interpretations {*ta'wīl*} that go to show that Faḍl Allāh is God. In this respect, Ḥurūfism was set up very awkwardly on the premises of Islamic mysticism and so, removed from the mooring of a consistent philosophical system, can be considered a hodgepodge of childish beliefs without any philosophical and ethical value. Putting its premises to one side, the fundamental belief of this system is as follows: God, who is manifest in the form of speech, is known with the letters. All of these letters have been made evident in the face of the perfect man. Therefore, it is possible to see in the face of man the twenty-eight letters that are the original elements of all created things. The highest knowledges teach us this. In the face of man are the seven maternal lines – four eylashes, two eyebrows, one hair line – which they call *sawād-i aʿzam* {the greatest mass}. There are also seven paternal lines that appear later: two beard whiskers, whiskers on the other side of the lines, two moustache whiskers and one whisker under the lip. Seven and seven make fourteen. If we multiply this with regard to condition and place, it makes twenty-eight. Faḍl Allāh, adding to them the Persian letters پ، چ، ژ، گ increased the number to thirty-two. The Ḥurūfīs interpret everything with this twenty-eight and thirty-two. Then, after removing the twenty-eight consonants occurring in the ambiguous verses of the Koran, they {Ḥurūfīs} call the remaining seventeen letters the incontrovertible letters and the others the ambiguous letters. They consider the verses that ordinary religious scholars consider ambiguous to be incontrovertible and the ones that these scholars consider incontrovertible to be ambiguous and they pretend to comment on them at length and in a childish manner. They make a great many strange interpretations. They say, for example, that ذلك فضل الله {"That is the bounty of God," Koran, 5:54, 57:21, 62:4} and الله ذو الفضل العظيم {"God is the possessor of bounty abounding," Koran, 2:105, 3:74, 8:29, 57:21, 57:29, 62:4} refer to Faḍl Allāh Ḥurūfī; the *miʿrāj* {Muḥammad's ascension to heaven} refers to looking at the lines in the human face; the *sidrat al-muntahā* {the lotus tree in seventh heaven} refers to the nostrils of Faḍl Allāh seen in the countenance of Adam; the *shābb-i amrād* {beardless youth} who appeared to the Prophet in the *miʿrāj* was Faḍl Allāh, and so forth. Such interpretations, which are usually forced, concerning the number and secrets of the letters are so childish and ridiculous that there is no need to comment on them. With such additions and interpretations, the Ḥurūfīs were also far removed from the philosophical views that constituted a basis for their system (summary of İshak Efendi's *Kâşifü'l-esrâr* and the works of Firishte-oghlu). Absolutely no such childish ideas are found in the poetry of Yūnus Emre, who was a genuine Ṣūfī like Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī.

63 Stryzgowski and his students, such as Glück, in their valuable studies on Turkish art have reached the same conclusions as I have on this feature of the Turkish artistic genius. In architecture, for example, the Turks adopted local elements, combined them with their own personalities, and then created completely new styles of art of a wholly unique nature. Many valuable works that in the past were assumed to have belonged to the milieu of Iranian art, and then Seljuk and Ottoman art, reveal these qualities in the full sense. Innovation means, in fact, not to create something from nothing, but to arrange existing elements in a new style according to a new sense of appreciation. This general character of early Turkish art was unknown until Stryzgowski, so that the products of that art were attributed to the Iranian milieu or, as was the case with Seljuk art, their originality was denied. Unfortunately, until now, no light has been shed on the originality of our popular Ṣūfī literature, of which

Yūnus Emre was the most powerful representative, and its distinctive features. Indeed, it too has been denied.

64 This story of the shepherd is described at length in the second volume of the *Mathnawī*. When Moses first encounters him, the shepherd is searching for God as follows:

دید موسی یك شبانی را براه \ کوهمی گفت ای کریم وای اله

تو کجایی تاشوم من چاکرت \ چارقت دوزم کنم شانه سرت

جامه ات شویم شپشهایت کشم \ شیر بیشت آورم ای محتشم

دستکت بوسم بمالم پایکت \ وقت خواب آید برویم جایکت

ای فدای توهمه بزهای من \ ای بیادت هی هی وههای من

زین نمط بیهوده میگفت آن شبان \ گفت موسی باکیست این ای فلان

گفت ما آنکس که ما را آفرید \ این زمین وچرخ ازو آمد بدید

گفت موسی های خیره سرشدی \ خود مسلمان ناشده کافر شدی

{Moses saw a shepherd on the way, who was saying, "O God who choosest (whom Thou wilt),
Where art Thou, that I may become Thy servant and sew Thy shoes and comb Thy head?
That I may wash Thy clothes and kill Thy lice and bring milk to Thee, O worshipful One;
That I may kiss Thy little hand and rub Thy little foot, (and when) bedtime comes I may sweep Thy little room,
O Thou to whom all my goats be a sacrifice, O Thou in remembrance of whom are my cries of ay and ah!"
The shepherd was speaking foolish words in this wise, Moses said, "Man, to whom is this (addressed)?"
He answered, "To that One who creates us; by whom this earth and sky were brought to sight."
"Hark!" said Moses, "you have become very backsliding (depraved); indeed you have not become a Moslem, you have become an infidel."

The Mathnawī, Book 2, lines 1720–7, Nicholson trans.}

This shepherd worshipped God with the cry, "O my God! Where are you? Let me serve you! Let me sew your sandals! Let me comb your hair! Let me wash your clothes! Let me bring you milk! When you are sleepy, let me make your bed! All of my hue and cry is for you." When Moses reproved him and accused him of unbelief, the poor shepherd rent his shirt collar from emotion and fled to the wilderness. But the word of God came at once to Moses: "You have separated one of my slaves from me. While you had come to unite {with me}, you have parted from me. Words and phrases have no importance. Look at the fire of love in the heart."

عاشقانرا هر نفس سوزید نیست \ برده ویران خراج وعشر نیست

که خطا گوید وراخاطی مگو \ وربود پرخون شهید اورا مشو

خون شهیدا نرا زآب اولی ترست \ این خطا ازصد صواب اولی ترست

در درون کعبه رسم قبله نیست \ چه غم ار غواض را پاچیله نیست

توز سر مستان قلاووزی مجو \ جامه چاکانرا چه فرمایی رفو

ملت عشق از همه دینها جداست \ عاشقا نرا ملت ومذهب خداست

{To lovers there is a burning (which consumes them) at every moment: tax and tithe are not (imposed) on a ruined village.
If he (the lover) speak faultily, do not call him faulty; and if he be bathed in blood, do not wash (those who are) martyrs.
For martyrs, blood is better than water: this fault (committed by him) is better than a hundred right actions (of another).
Within the Ka'ba the rule of the *qibla* does not exist: what matter if the diver has no snow-shoes?
Do not seek guidance from the drunken: why dost thou order those whose garments are rent in pieces to mend them?
The religion of Love is apart from all religions: for lovers, the (only) religion and creed is God.

The Mathnawī, Book 2, lines 1765–70, Nicholson trans.} Full of pain and grief as a result of this, Moses found the shepherd and gave him the good news in the following manner:

هیچ آدابی وترتیبی مجو \ هرچه میخواهد دل ننگت بگو

کفر تو دینست ودینت نورجان \ ایمنی وز تو جهانی درامان

ای معافی یفعل اللّه ما یشاء \ بی محابارو زبانرا بر کشا

{Do not seek any rules or method (of worship); say whatsoever your distressful heart desires.
Your blasphemy is (the true) religion, and your religion is the light of the spirit: you are saved, and through you a (whole) world is in salvation.
O you who are made secure by *God doeth whatso he willeth*, go loose your tongue without regard (for what you say).

The Mathnawī, Book 2, lines 1784–6, Nicholson trans.} This shepherd is a symbol of the sincere mystics who have gone beyond ordinary norms. If there are those who see thoughtlessness in certain passages of Yūnus Emre, the aforesaid words of Mawlānā are an excellent response to them.

65 All the specialists who have properly studied Turkish and Ottoman architecture are virtually unanimous in finding these qualities in it.

66 Read the hymns of Ziyâ Gökalp in his *Yeni hayât* {Istanbul, 1918}. The influence of Yūnus Emre is immediately apparent in them. With respect to inspiration and power of expression, they are examples that most closely approach the hymns in the most masterly style of Yūnus Emre. Because the style of Yūnus Emre is "inimitable simplicity," it is very difficult to imitate it successfully.

10

YŪNUS EMRE'S INFLUENCE ON TURKISH LITERATURE AND HIS IMITATORS

A Yūnus Emre's influence

The religious life in Anatolia from the seventh/thirteenth century to around the end of the tenth/sixteenth century offers a very important field of study. In this milieu – in which numerous great Ṣūfīs and Ṣūfī poets, beginning with Yūnus Emre, flourished – many sects and *ṭarīqas* that could be included in the *bāṭınī* group took form and spread, including those of the Bābā'īs, Abdāls, Bektashīs, Ḥurūfīs, Qızılbashes, Qalandarīs, and Ḥaidarīs. In addition, there occurred the uprising of the supporters of Badr al-Dīn {Ibn Qāḍī} Samāwnā, which was a reprise of the previous Bābā'ī uprising, and subsequent religio-political uprisings or isolated incidents of the same kind. During these four centuries, therefore, the Anatolian Turks experienced a life of continuous crisis. False prophets and new creeds, for which a great many adherents risked their lives, flourished. Because these events were influenced by many different factors and took many different forms, it would not be prudent to advance unreservedly a general and definitive idea about them.[1] The religio-Ṣūfī life, which, on the one hand, gave rise to *bāṭınī* currents like these that were contrary to the clear stipulations of the *Sharī'a* and, on the other, created with the same strength and vigor new *ṭarīqas* that conformed perfectly to *Sharī'a* principles, spread to every corner of the Ottoman Empire, indeed, as far as the borders of Rumelia and Bosnia. Simply for this reason, this period of Ottoman history reveals two contradictory phases. On the one hand, there were religious uprisings, sectarian movements led by isolated individuals, punitive actions {against rebellions}, killings, and executions. On the other hand, there were shaikhs who enjoyed the honor and respect of the most fanatical members of the official religious establishment and the palace, whose saintly charisma spread among the people, and who exercised great spiritual influence. Indeed, these two contradictory phases were the result of the same event, two different manifestations of the same thing. They reveal the importance of, and high regard for, the Ṣūfī movement among the people. In short, in the region of Anatolia, from the time of the Turkish settlement until the end of the tenth/sixteenth century, the Ṣūfī movement in various guises gradually increased in strength. Indeed, it never subsided and has continued up to the present.

The Ṣūfī poetry of Yūnus Emre spread very quickly in Anatolia and in a short time some rather important imitators appeared. Until the ninth/fifteenth century, Ottoman literature was under the influence of Persian Ṣūfī literature, and thus was thoroughly mystical in nature. Under the spell of Mawlānā, Sulṭān Walad, ʿAṭṭār, Sanā'ī, and Saʿdī, it adopted, with a success that grew daily, the Persian meters and {literary} forms. At the same time, however, it could not abandon the national style that Yūnus Emre had invigorated with his powerful personality. Thus it also followed his path. Yūnus Emre played a great role in the following of two such different courses of Ṣūfī inspiration, both of which derived from the same source. If he had not reinvigorated the national style and stamped it with his genius, our literature would have followed the other course exclusively and would have been influenced only by the great Persian Ṣūfīs. In fact, because no national genius like Yūnus Emre flourished in non-religious literature, that field was neglected for centuries and no national literature of the originality and esteem of the Ṣūfī literature that we call the Yūnus Emre style ever appeared in it.

We find the influence that Yūnus Emre vigorously maintained in contrast to the Persian Ṣūfī poets, {i.e.} the fact that the Ṣūfī inspiration followed two such different paths, first in ʿĀshıq Pasha, the son of a Turkish family from Khurāsān.[2] This poet, whose *Gharībnāme* was completed in 730/1329–30 under the direct influence of the *Mathnawī*, also wrote hymns in which the influence of Yūnus Emre is striking. But because he almost completely lacked the artistic genius of Yūnus Emre, his works are virtually indistinguishable from Yūnus's ordinary hymns, which incorporate none of his true artistic personality. The ability of an ordinary dervish like Yūnus Emre to have this much influence on such a Ṣūfī poet, who was directly under the influence of the Persian Ṣūfīs and especially Mawlānā, is very worthy of note.[3]

The earliest poet to understand the charm of Yūnus Emre's style and to write hymns in the same manner was Qayghusuz Abdāl, the *khalīfa* of Abdāl Mūsā. The Bektashīs consider him, like many other poets, to be a member of their *ṭarīqa*.[4] Although the legends and poetry of this man, whom the Egyptians call ʿAbd Allāh Maghārawī because he was buried in a cave {*maghāra*} in Egypt, have been established and are well known, his historical personality, indeed, whether or not he actually wrote the beautiful poetry attributed to him, still have not been determined with scholarly precision.[5] But whoever he was and whenever he lived, we must consider those fine poems of his that have come down to us to be among the most valuable works of the special expressive style that we call the style of Yūnus Emre. Exactly as with Yūnus Emre, his poems, which were written in the national meter and style, are characterized by being clearly and very forcefully expressed with a profound purity and sincerity that accords with their simplicity.[6]

The next oldest imitator of Yūnus Emre was the famous Ḥājjī Bayram Veli.[7] After him, the influence of Yūnus Emre became pervasive. On one hand, we find the imitators of Yūnus Emre among the members of the *ṭarīqas* that conformed

to *Sharī'a* principles and, on the other, we find them among the members of the *ṭarīqas* that, in fact, could be included among the esoteric *maslaks* {paths}. We even find them outside the *ṭarīqas* among the *saz* poets or *'āshıqs*, the continuators of the old Turkish minstrels. It is not possible to discuss here one by one and at length, or even briefly, all these imitators of Yūnus Emre. Instead of undertaking such an ambitious task, which would require a completely separate study, and which would not, with respect to scholarship, be useful compared to the effort required, I find it sufficient, and also necessary within the general framework of my book, to synthesize and describe briefly, and in global fashion, all of what we know about this influence.

B *Tekke* poetry

Beginning in the eighth/fourteenth century, i.e. after the death of Yūnus Emre, a number of *ṭarīqas* of various sizes were established throughout the Turkish regions {and spread among the Turks of Anatolia}. {At the same time,} *ṭarīqas* founded in other regions also spread among the Turks of Anatolia. It would require a completely separate and lengthy study to determine historically when these different *ṭarīqas* were founded, how they entered our country, and the extent to which they spread there. Hammer does give some rather brief information in his history on when the various *ṭarīqas* were established, but it cannot be regarded as wholly trustworthy. In any case, as *tekkes* and *zāwiyas* were thus founded throughout the Turkish regions and the principles of Ṣūfism were spread among the people, it was necessary to create a distinctive literature for each *ṭarīqa*. Indeed, one finds today in virtually every *ṭarīqa* works written for its members and describing its rules of etiquette and basic regulations, Ṣūfī principles, and the legends and miracles of its early shaikhs. In order to spread the Ṣūfī paths among the people and to win supporters among them, the Ṣūfīs resorted without fail to the medium of poetry – as was the case in almost the entire Muslim world, including the Arabs, Persians, and Central Asian Turks.[8] The notion of taking advantage of the popular affection for poetry encouraged the shaikhs to create an intellectual and artistic milieu in the *tekkes* in order to make them more appealing. For this reason, poetry, like music, occupied an important place in the religious services of the *ṭarīqas*.

I have stated above that Aḥmad Yasawī and his imitators wrote religious poems {*ḥikmats*} in order to arouse the people's love for Yasawism; that Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī composed his *Mathnawī* only for his disciples; and that later Sulṭān Walad and 'Āshıq Pasha resorted to Turkish in order to propagate Ṣūfī doctrine among the Turks who did not know Persian. Subsequent Ṣūfīs also wished to compose poems, hymns, and books for the same reason. They then found before them the pure, simple, powerful hymns of Yūnus Emre that he had written in the popular meter and language. These works, for which the people had great affection and respect because they were suited to their own taste, and also the

fact that both the people and the Ṣūfīs considered Yūnus Emre to be a "spokesman of the unseen world," encouraged later Ṣūfīs to follow suit. In this manner, they would both observe a semi-sacred tradition and would present works in a style understood and enjoyed by the mass of the people. The fact that, after ʿĀshıq Pasha and Qayghusuz, a great shaikh like Ḥājjī Bayram wrote a number of poems in the style of Yūnus Emre caught the attention of the *tekke* poets, so that later Ṣūfīs, indeed, right up to the present, wrote the great majority of their hymns in this style. Almost all these Ṣūfīs were men who understood Persian literature and were able to write almost faultless works in the *ʿarūḍ* meter. Indeed, many of them did write in this style as well. But writing unlettered, simple, and insightful poems in the style of Yūnus Emre had become such a firmly rooted tradition in all the *tekkes* that it was virtually impossible to avoid. The fact that the national meter and forms won such a prominent and important place among our Ṣūfī poets, indeed, the fact that even some poets whom we could not really consider to be true Ṣūfīs occasionally wrote only on Ṣūfī subjects, are consequences of this.[9] The style of Yūnus Emre, which inspired many imitators, was well received in all the *ṭarīqas* that flourished in the Ottoman Empire except the Mawlāwiyya. It was not, compared to the others, able to win a place in Mawlawī *tekkes*. We can attribute this to the supremacy of Persian over Turkish language and culture in those circles because of {Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī's} *Mathnawī* and *Dīwān-i kabīr*.[10]

There are many *tekke* poets who wrote hymns in the style of Yūnus Emre, but few whose works are somewhat reminiscent of his. Beginning with Eşrefoğlu Rūmī of Iznik (d. 873/1469),[11] son-in-law of Ḥājjī Bayram Veli, author of *Muzakkī ʿl-nufūs*, and founder of the Eşrefiyye branch of the Qādiriyya *ṭarīqa*, the poets whose works more or less call to mind Yūnus Emre are Ibrāhīm Ummī Sinān (d. 958/1551–2),[12] founder of the Sināniyya branch of the Khalwatiyya *ṭarīqa*; Aḥmad Sārbān (d. 952/1545–6)[13] of the Malāmiyya-i Bayramiyya; Eroghlu Nūrī Efendi of Elmalı;[14] Idrīs Mukhtafī (d. 1024/1615–16),[15] a member of the Malāmiyya-i Bayramiyya; Sayyid Saif Allāh Khalwatī (d. 1010/1601–2);[16] Naqshī Aq Kirmānī (d. 1062/1651–2);[17] Ibrāhīm Efendi (d. 1066/1655–6),[18] known as Olanlar Shaikhi; and his disciple Ṣunuʿ Allāh Ghaibī (d. after 1072/1661–2),[19] author of the famous *dawriyya* known as *Kashf al-ghiṭā'*. Because each of them had his own personality, one should not consider them merely as imitators of Yūnus Emre. Still, it can definitely be claimed that none of them was able to approach the artistic level of Yūnus Emre. There are many other *tekke* poets, such as Uftāda {d. 988/1580–1}, Hüdā'ī {d. 1038/1628–9}, and Niyāzī {d. 1105/1694}, but Yūnus's influence on them is not as obvious as it is on those mentioned above. As a final observation, we can say that the influence of Yūnus Emre's style on *tekke* poetry, with few exceptions, was confined to form and meter, i.e. to its external nature, and was not able to affect its true spirit to the same extent.[20] Those who understood the true features of this style, its true taste, and appropriated it were the Bektashīs, Ḥurūfīs, and Qızılbashes.

C Bektashī poetry

I have stated above that the Bektashiyya, which was founded and took root in the ninth/fifteenth century, acquired a *bāṭinī* character in the very early years of its establishment. It was a *ṭarīqa* that came into existence from a mixture of three different *Ṣūfī* sects, namely those of the Bābā'īs, Akhīs, and Abdāls, and then fell under the influence of Ḥurūfism. It acquired no other features.[21] It is just because the poetry of Yūnus Emre was clearly expressed in an unrestrained and bold manner and was able to reach the lowest level of society that it became very important in the eyes of the Bektashīs, who reserved a major place for Turkish even in their rituals and litanies. The Bektashī *bābās*, like the other shaikhs, did not receive an extensive *madrasa* education and the Bektashī dervishes were also, for the most part, plain and simple souls who grew up among the people.[22] For this reason, they held the national language and literature in high regard instead of prizing and slavishly imitating Persian language and literature. It is for this reason too that the poets who thrived among them – most of whom had no *madrasa* education but were cognizant of the national taste – had a mentality capable of subtle and elegant thought, yet primitive to the extent of gullibility, and superstitious; and while they usually employed the *ʿarūḍ* meter and forms in a very poor and defective manner,[23] they wielded the national meter and forms in a manner perfectly suited to the Turkish taste. These Bektashī *bābās*, whose taste was not corrupted by the awe and enthusiasm that we feel toward sublime examples of Persian literature and who thus preserved the simplicity and originality unique to the people, naturally had the best sense of Yūnus Emre's taste and were the most successful in approaching it.

The original and truly esteemed examples of Bektashī poetry written in the national meter and forms are known as *nefeses* and are recited in the *tekkes* with specific melodies, analogous to the *ilāhīs* {hymns} and *nuṭuqs* {orations} in the other *ṭarīqas*, and the *ḥikmets* among the Yasawīs. There are also eulogies, elegies, *dastāns*, and *dawriyyas* concerning ʿAlī or other members of the family of the Prophet Muḥammad, all composed in the syllabic meter. For example, the *dawriyya* of Shīrī {ʿAlī Bey Hersek-Zāde, *fl.* first half of tenth/sixteenth century}, the *dastān* of Mir'ātī Bābā and the *nefeses* of dervishes from various periods, such as Turābī, Shamʿī, Ajrī, Perīshānī, Pīr Sulṭān, Qalandar Abdāl, Qul Nasīmī, Ḥamdī, Delī Shükrü, Shāhī, Ibrāhīm Bābā, Niyāzī, Güvench Abdāl, Saḥar Abdāl, Kemterī, Khaṭā'ī, Qul Himmat, Rumūzī, and Veli Bābā, are in the syllabic meter and in a style modeled completely after that of Yūnus Emre, or even more lively, allusive, and refined. To be sure, it is virtually impossible to make precise assertions about the time, place, ideas, and beliefs of these poets. Some of them, such as Khaṭā'ī,[24] Qul Himmat, Rumūzī, and Veli Bābā, not only accepted Ḥurūfism and the divinity of Faḍl Allāh Ḥurūfī, but also associated with many poets who belonged to the Qızılbash, who were distinct from, but connected with, the Bektashīs. Qalandarī and Ḥaidarī poets were also associated with them. So, while we are discussing Bektashī poetry and poets,

we have to discuss at the same time those who wrote Qızılbash,[25] Qalandarī, Ḥaidarī, and Ḥurūfī[26] poetry in the national meter, and the influence of Yūnus Emre on them. These *bāṭinī* sects held a number of basic beliefs more or less in common, so that the poetry of one of them was always accepted and read with pleasure by the others.

In these poems, which we call Bektashī poetry and which in fact provide commentary and musical expression for a *mélange* of obscure beliefs – including Bābā'ī, Akhī, Abdāl, Ḥurūfī, Qızılbash, Qalandarī, and Ḥaidarī doctrines – we find much concerning love {*'ishq*, *maḥaabba*}, the trinity of God, Muḥammad, and 'Alī, Āl-i 'Abā' {the people of the cloak, Muḥammad and his family}, the divinity of Faḍl Allāh Ḥurūfī, the secret meanings of the letters, Ḥājjī Bektash Veli being indistinguishable from Muḥammad and 'Alī, the difficulties of the mystic path, ritual ceremonies, the legendary deeds of Pīr-i Abdālān and Sayyid Ghāzī, and of the great Bektashīs like Qızıl Deli Sulṭān, and Bālım Sulṭān, and the abominable deeds of Yazīd. With respect to style, the influence of Yūnus Emre is so pervasive that one sometimes comes across the same topics, indeed, even the same lines of verse. Nevertheless, Bektashī poetry is generally more unrestrained, more elegant, more subtle and refined than his. Yet this poetry lacks the power of conviction that is found in Yūnus Emre. It is not only less convincing but also conveys flashes of profound irony {*istihzā*} mixed with skepticism.[27] Yūnus Emre possessed a lofty Ṣūfī philosophy, as did Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī and Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. The Bektashīs, on the other hand, held a number of childish beliefs – such as metempsychosis, indwelling, and union – that are barely reconcilable and far from a coherent system. This could account for their irony and skepticism. But however little value this mixture of beliefs has as a system of Ṣūfī thought, with regard to method, taste, and style Bektashī poetry is the branch of literature that is certainly the most Turkish and perhaps the most influenced by Yūnus Emre.[28] Perhaps more than anything else, this plain beautiful poetry, which suited the national taste and was simple enough for everyone to understand, helped to spread so forcefully the strange ideas that appeared under the names of Bektashism, Qızılbashism, and Ḥurūfism among the people.

D *'Āshıq* literature

I discussed above {in Chapters 6 and 7} the *ozans*, the earliest popular poets of the Turks, and especially the popular literature that they created as they sang to the accompaniment of the *kopuz*. These *saz* poets, who were the principal minstrels of the Turks of Anatolia from their first appearance in that region, continued their poetic activities during the eighth/fourteenth and ninth/fifteenth centuries. In the course of the ninth/fifteenth century, we find that, even in the palaces, an important place was still given to the *ozans*. After the *ṭarīqas* had multiplied and the Ṣūfī movement had spread and became thoroughly established among the people, almost all the *ozans* attached themselves to a *pīr* and tried to

give a Ṣūfī flavor to their work. At that point, instead of using the name *ozan*, which conjured up the pre-Islamic period, i.e. the memory of Korkut Ata and the traditions of the *Oghuznāme*, they adopted the title of *ʿāshıq*, which meant Ṣūfī poet, and the term *ozan* began to be used to mean a "prattler."[29] One could strongly argue that this differentiation took place in the second half of the ninth/fifteenth century, or, more likely, in the tenth/sixteenth century. By that time, significant works of *ʿāshıq* literature, the particular forms and rules of these works, important and famous *ʿāshıqs*, the *ʿāshıq* life and *ʿâshıq* organization, and the place of *ʿāshıqs* in public life are all very well known. Because I have published a detailed study on this special style of literature, I will not mention here even briefly the many aspects of this broad topic.[30]

This *ʿāshıq* literature, which was established to fulfill the artistic needs of a certain class by a kind of division of labor, is completely separate from classical literature, *tekke* literature, and even folk literature, which is included in the analytical framework of folklore. Although it derived its original tradition from the older folk literature, a number of elements from both the Persian-style classical literature, which fulfilled the needs of the upper class, and Ṣūfī literature, which thrived in the *tekkes*, mingled with it; *ʿāshıq* literature, or what we call *saz* literature, was created from all these elements. In its early period of development, it conformed completely to the old folk literature with respect to meter and form. Later, however, after Fuḍūlī {d. 963/1556}, it also tried to apply the rules of Persian versification – in a very defective and elementary manner – under the influence, on one hand, of classical literature and, on the other, of *tekke* literature, which had been subject to strong Persian influence. However, because it was a literature that spoke directly to the popular masses and to the popular taste, the rules of Persian poetry could not make it neglect the Turkish tradition. The national meter and national forms remained as a fundamental element of *ʿāshıq* literature.

The influence of Yūnus Emre on *ʿāshıq* literature was indirect rather than direct. Because virtually all *ʿāshıqs* were associated with *ṭarīqas*, indeed, because most of them were in fact Bektashīs who flourished among the janissaries, *ʿāshıq* literature was very strongly influenced by the national Ṣūfī poetry of the Bektashī poets and thus they {i.e. *ʿāshıq* and Bektashī literature} had many features in common. I have already discussed at length the relationship of the *ʿāshıqs* with the Bektashīs and the causes and consequences of this very close relationship. Now, as I explained a moment ago, Yūnus Emre had a striking influence on Bektashī poetry with regard to spirit and style. This influence, passing through that particular literary style into *ʿāshıq* literature, reveals itself in the *ʿāshıq* poetry that has a more or less Ṣūfī nature, and even in some *tekerlemes* {jingle, playful formula used in folk narratives} that are reminiscent of Yūnus's satirical writings. This influence is obvious to various degrees according to the personality and level of mystical capacity of each great *ʿāshıq*. Therefore, while studying a given *ʿāshıq*, one should never disregard the influence of Yūnus Emre among the elements that contributed to his art.

E Conclusion

I have described how popular Ṣūfī literature, by combining elements from various sources, appeared among the Turks in a form that was peculiar to the people. I have done so by examining at length the causes and consequences of this process from the origins of the Ṣūfī movement among the Central Asian Turks and Aḥmad Yasawī, who was our first great popular Ṣūfī poet, to Yūnus Emre, the greatest Ṣūfī poet of the Western Turks, and his imitators. Now, having reached the end of my investigation, it may be useful to pause a moment and reflect on the long and difficult road that we have traveled. We can thus recapitulate, albeit briefly, in synthetic fashion and with greater clarity, the entire scope of my study. The many secondary details that I have given while passing from point to point may have tired my readers and my lengthy analyses may have made it somewhat difficult for a general synthesis to emerge in their minds.

We have seen that a Ṣūfī literature whose major elements derived from popular literature and the national taste began with Aḥmad Yasawī and continued to Yūnus Emre, and beyond him to the present day in the form of a long chain connecting one poet to another. This literature, which won the favor of the people from its first appearance because it was very closely related to our pre-Islamic popular literature, helped to spread the principles of Ṣūfism among the Turks. The development of Ṣūfī sentiments and perceptions among the Turks later caused this literature to thrive for centuries among the people, and it has maintained its initial spiritual influence even today among the Central Asian Turks who have not yet undergone a renaissance or entered the modern world. The literature, and the Ṣūfī movement that brought it forth, took a broader, more unrestrained, and more profound form as soon as it entered the milieu of the Western Turks and was transformed from a system of asceticism and piety into a philosophy of divine love. This difference did not simply result from the differences between the personalities of Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre. The free environment of Anatolia, which was conducive to the philosophy of *panthéism idéaliste* {*wujūdiyya-i khayāliyya*} under the influence of two such great Ṣūfīs as Muḥyī 'l-Dīn Ibn al-'Arabī and Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī, cast the well defined, dry, orthodox, and pietistic views of Aḥmad Yasawī into a broad, fluid system of divine love and unity of being characteristic of Yūnus Emre. While Aḥmad Yasawī was basically the founder of a great *ṭarīqa* and a legal scholar almost completely lacking in poetic ability, Yūnus Emre, to the contrary, was an inspired poet and a simple dervish who embraced Ṣūfism out of his spiritual need. This explains the dignified, rather dull and dry style of the one and the simple and unlettered sincerity of the other.

If we compare the inherent value of their works, i.e. with respect to their aesthetic nature, we can say that Yūnus Emre was an artistic genius and that his work can be read with pleasure even today, whereas Aḥmad Yasawī's *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* can only be read by dervishes who believe in its sanctity. It is clear that although Yūnus Emre was directly or indirectly under the spiritual influence of

this early Turkish saint from the steppes of Kirgizistan, he greatly surpassed him as a literary genius. But if we leave aside this measure of inherent value and compare only the external influences of Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre, it is impossible not to be astounded by the greatness of both men. First of all, Aḥmad Yasawī, who founded a vigorous *ṭarīqa* that spread to all the countries of the Turks, created a popular Ṣūfī literature, a style of religious poems {*ḥikmat*}, within the literature of Central Asia and thus set an example for the Ṣūfī poets of that region who have flourished up to the present. In other words, he created a *tekke* literature that bore the stamp of his own personality. The primary centers of this literature are the *tekkes* of the Naqshbandīs. As for Yūnus Emre, unlike his master he did not found a new *ṭarīqa*, but like him he created an original literature, a Ṣūfī popular literature called the Yūnus style that we still read with pleasure and that still affects us. This literature was a major factor in {the development of} all *tekke* poetry, in Bektashī poetry, and even in *ʿāshuq* literature. In contrast to the *ḥikmat* style, which prevails mainly in the Naqshbandī dervish convents in Central Asia, the preference for the Yūnus style is most striking in Bektashī poetry. The artistic genius of Yūnus Emre in particular created a special, and the most national and original, form of Turkish literature, the like of which never appeared in the other Islamic literatures. This form, which was able to represent the epitome of national taste for centuries, has an incomparable value for the history of Turkish literature. Those who, faced with the contemporary progress of the positive sciences, find no pleasure in Ṣūfī philosophy, or those who, for whatever reason, wish to cut the ties to the past, may claim that they are not affected by the works of Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre. After all, everyone is free to enjoy whatever literature he wishes. Still, it is impossible to deny that these two great personalities exerted an unparalleled influence on the general development of Turkish literature. These two names, Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre, will live forever as immortal chapters in the history of Turkish literature.

NOTES

1 Unfortunately, these phases of the religious history of the Anatolian Turks have hardly been studied. Among the sects mentioned here – Abdālism, Bektashism, Ḥurūfism, Qalandarism, and Ḥaidarism – only two, Bektashism and Ḥurūfism, have attracted the attention of the Western scholarly world and have been studied to some degree. But even these studies, as I have shown in various connections in this book, are very defective. In fact, with respect to Bektashism, they are completely erroneous. By not doing serious studies on the Bābāʾīs, Akhīs, Yasawīs, and Abdāls, indeed, by not even seeing the need to acknowledge their existence, these researches on Bektashī history, undertaken with the few limited sources that are available, are doomed to failure. In what milieu did Bektashism arise and what factors influenced it? To what changes was it subject? How was it viewed? What status did it acquire across the centuries with respect to the extent of its development and spread? With what *ṭarīqas* did it have connections and ties? In order to comprehend properly all such questions, one has to study the Ṣūfī systems and doctrines in Anatolia and Bāṭinism as a whole. In this regard, we can say that the studies of Dr Jacob and others on Bektashism are very

defective and erroneous, and that on Ḥurūfism no historical study has been done at all. I plan to publish gradually the studies that I am preparing on these unanswered questions concerning Bektashism and Ḥurūfism as well as those on Akhism, Abdālism, Qalandarism, and Ḥaidarism. I hope that these studies, whatever shortcomings they may have, will prepare a new foundation for the synthetic works that will be written in the future on the religious history of Anatolia, and, by correcting current errors, will also provide a sound and reliable course for such studies. For now, see "Mısır'da bektaşîlik," *TM*, 6 (1936–9), 13–40, and *İA*, s.v., "Bektâş" {M. Fuad Köprülü}. {As mentioned earlier, Köprülü's work on the Ḥurūfīs was never published. See the studies by Gölpınarlı listed in the bibliography of his *Hurûfîlik metinleri kataloğu*. Much work has recently been done on Ṣūfism and heterodoxy in Anatolia. On the Bābā'īs and Qalandarīs, see Ocak, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda marjinal sûfilik: Kalenderîler* and Ahmet Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*. On Akhism, see Çağatay, *Bir Türk kurumu olan ahilik*. See also Ocak, *Osmanlı topumunda zındıklar ve mülhidler* (*15.–17. yüzyıllar*) (Istanbul, 1998). On Badr al-Dīn Ibn Qāḍī Samāwnā, see Michel Balivet, *Islam mystique et révolution armée dans les Balkans ottomans: vie du Cheikh Bedreddîn le "Hallâj des turcs"* (*1358/9–1416*) (Istanbul, 1995).}

2 Because he was the child of a family that came from Khurāsān, Rızâ Tevfik considered this poet to be of Iranian origin. This claim is completely erroneous. Many Turks, especially Oghuz Turks, lived scattered about, or in large groups, sometimes as tribes, in several places in Khurāsān. I have discussed this subject in various places in the present work, so there is no need to repeat it here. It is in this respect that we must consider ʿĀshıq Pasha to be an Oghuz Turk. There is considerable information on ʿĀshıq Pasha in the early Ottoman histories, in Laṭīfī's *Tadhkira*, {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq*, the introduction to ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde's *Tawārīkh-i āl-i ʿuthmān*, in Mehmed Tâhir's article {"Aşık Paşa"} in the first issue of *Türk Derneği* {1327/1911, pp. 12–19}, and in E. J. W. Gibb's {*A History of Ottoman Poetry*, vol. 1, pp. 176–200}, but a detailed analysis of the literary and linguistic nature of his work has not been done. The poems that Mehmed Tâhir attributes to ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde Elvan Chelebī in his *Osmanlı müellifleri* all belong to Shaikh Elvan Shīrāzī, the {Turkish} translator of {Maḥmūd Shabistarī's} *Gulshan-i rāz*. Thúry also confused these two Elvan Chelebīs. The only samples of the poetry of ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde Elvan Chelebī to come down to us are in {Hacı Kemal's} *Jāmiʿ al-nazā'ir* {see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "ʿĀṣḥıḳ Paṣha" (Fahir İz) and the introduction to Ocak and Erünsal (eds), *Menâkıbu 'l-Kudsiyye*}.

3 In his *Jāmiʿ al-nazā'ir*, Hacı Kemal of Eğridir records a number of hymns of ʿĀshıq Pasha as imitations of the poetry of Yūnus Emre. Even without this explicit reference, however, the influence is easy to see.

4 In his *Osmanlı müellifleri*, Mehmed Tâhir also accepts this theory of the Bektashīs and considers both him and Abdāl Mūsā to be early Bektashīs. Because the Bektashī *ṭarīqa* had not been established at that time, this claim does not conform to reality. As can be understood from their names, they belonged to the group of Abdāls who were rather widespread in Anatolia at that time. Qayghusuz's *Abdālnāme* also shows this {better known as *Budalānāme*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel in *Kaygusuz Abdal'ın mensur eserleri* (Ankara, 1983), pp. 49–74}. There is no reference to the Bektashism of Abdāl Mūsā in either ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde's {*Tawārīkh-i āl-i ʿuthmān*} or {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq*. During the establishment of Bektashism in the ninth/fifteenth century, when it borrowed elements from Akhism, Bābā'ism, and Qalandarism, it also appropriated many features of the *ṭarīqa* of the Abdāls, which was a branch of Bābā'ism. It is for this reason that Abdāl Mūsā and his *khalīfa* were considered to be Bektashīs. I have described in various places above how Bektashism appropriated to itself those individuals whose legends and miracles were famous among the people, even though they did not have a close relationship with it. I will provide extensive details in the

study that I mentioned on Abdālism and its relationship to Bektashism. {See his article "Abdal" in *Türk halk edebiyatı ansiklopedisi*.}

5 There is detailed information in the legends of Qayghusuz Abdāl about his relationship with Abdāl Mūsā and how he later went to Egypt (MS of *Manāqib-i Qayghusuz Abdāl* in my private library). At the end of this collection of legends there is also a very famous poem that is a kind of satire in which Qayghusuz mimics Yūnus Emre. As an example of Qayghusuz's work, we can give this famous passage that best describes his personality:

Yücelerden yüce gördüm	*Erbâbsın Sen koca Tanrı*
Âlem okur kelâm ile	*Sen okursun hecâ Tanrı*
Âsî kullar yaratmışsın	*Varsın şöyle dursun deyu*
Anları koymuş orada	*Sen çıkmışsın uca Tanrı*
Kıldan köprü yaratmışsın	*Gelsün kullar geçsün deyu*
Hele biz şöyle duralım	*Yiğit isen geç a Tanrı*
{Highest of the high, I have seen:	You are the Lord, mighty God.
The world recites with speech:	You recite letters, O God.
You created rebellious servants,	sending them on their way;
You put them there	and went out to the edge, O God.
You created the bridge, as thin as a hair,	and told Your servants to come across.
Well, let us stay here	and You cross if You're so brave, O God!}

This poem, the latter parts of which are too unrestrained to ever please the conventional upholders of religious law, is obviously somewhat livelier and bolder than the style of Yūnus Emre, but it is still under his influence. Qayghusuz's influence on later Bektashī poets, or, more correctly, on establishing the special style that we call Bektashī poetry, is very great {see *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ḳaygẖusuz Abdāl" (Fahir İz)}.

6 There is a noteworthy point in this respect. Aḥmad Sārbān, whom I will discuss briefly below, also had the byname Qayghusuz. Like Yūnus Emre, he had a broad view of unity of being. Although he did produce works along these lines, his style is very different from that of the older Qayghusuz.

7 See the following sources for the biography of this great Ṣūfī – who was the founder of the Bayramiyya *ṭarīqa* and died in 833/1429–30 – and for the characteristics of his *ṭarīqa*: {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq*, {Turkish} trans.; İsmâ'îl Hakkı's *Silsilanāme-i jalwatī* {lithograph edn, n.p., 1291/1874}; Jāmī's *Nafaḥāt*, {Turkish} trans.; La'līzāde 'Abd al-Bāqī's *Risāla-i malāmiyya-i bayrāmiyya* {Istanbul, n.d.}; {Ḥarīrī-Zāde's} *Tibyān-i wasā'il al-ḥaqā'iq*; Aq Shams al-Dīn's *Risālat al-nūriyya* {or *Risâle-i Akşemseddin*} and *Sharḥ-i Aqwāl-i Ḥājjī Bayrām Walī*; Ibrāhīm Tennūrī's poem *Gulzār-i ma'nawī* {see Ali Karabulut and Ramazan Yıldız, *Gülzâr-i ma'nevi ve İbrahim Tennuri* (Kayseri?, 1978)}; 'Abd al-Raḥīm Bayrāmī's treatises *Munyat al-abrār* and *Waḥdatnāme*; the *tarīqatnāmes* of Du'āci Oghlu and Himmat Dede; the second and third volumes of Evliyā Chelebi's *Seyāḥatnāme*; and Tâhir's *Osmanlı müellifleri* and treatise entitled *Ḥājjī Bayrām Walī* {Istanbul, 1329/1911}. {See *İA*, s.v. "Bayramiye" (Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı), and *EI*^{2}, s.v. "Ḥādjdjī Bayrām Walī" (V. L. Ménage).} Ḥājjī Bayram's three major hymns are well known. The first begins *Bilmek istersen seni cân içinde ara cânı / Geç cânından bul Anı sen seni bil sen seni* {If you wish to know yourself, seek the Soul within the soul / Give up your soul and find Him. Know that you are you}. The second begins *Hiç kimse çekebilmez güçtür felekin yayı / Derdine gönül verme birgün götürür vâyı* {No one can draw the bow of fate, it is too hard / Do not give your heart over to grief: one day He will remove your sighs}. His most famous hymn was the third, for which İsmâ'îl Hakkı, Muḥammad Ṣuḥufī al-Brusawī, 'Abd al-Ḥayy Üsküdârî, and Sayyid Khwāja

Muḥammad Nūr al-'Arabī all provided commentaries. In order to give an idea of its form and style, I will cite it verbatim.

Çalabım bir şâr yaratmış iki cihân arasında
Bakıcak dîdâr görünür ol şârın kenâresinde

Nâgehân ol şâr'a vardım ol şâr'ı yapılır gördüm
Ben dahi bile yapıldım taş u toprak arasında

Ol şâr'dan oklar atılır gelir ciğere batılır
Ârifler sözü satılır ol şâr'ın bâzâresinde

Şâkirdleri taş yonarlar yonup üstâda sunarlar
Çalab'ın ismin anarlar o taşın her pâresinde

Bu sözü ârifler anlar câhiller bilmeyib tanlar
Hacı Bayram kendi bânlar ol şâr'ın menâresinde

{My Lord created a city between the two worlds.
If you look you'll see His face at the edge of that city.

At once I went to that city and saw that it was built.
I too was built together with it, in the midst of stone and mortar.

Arrows are shot from that city and penetrate the heart.
The words of mystics are sold in that city's marketplace.

Apprentice masons carve stones and present them to the master.
On every piece of stone, they carve the Lord's name.

Mystics understand these words; fools are bewildered by them.
Ḥājjī Bayram himself gives the call to prayer in that city's minaret.}

It is obvious that this style is identical with that of Yūnus Emre.

8 The traveler Ibn Baṭṭūṭa says that when he was a guest in the *zāwiya* of Saif al-Dīn Bākharzī in the suburb of Fatḥ Ābād in Bukhārā, the shaikh of the *zāwiya* Yaḥyā al-Bākharzī, a descendant of Saif al-Dīn, arranged a banquet for him and invited the leading men {of the city}. The Koran readers recited, the preachers gave sermons, and songs were sung melodiously in Turkish and Persian (*Seyāḥatnāme*, {Turkish trans.,} vol. 1, p. 416 {Gibb trans., vol. 3, p. 554}). Indeed, if we consider the Islamic world at that time, we see that literature, music, and free thinking could only find refuge in the *tekkes* in opposition to the dry and cold fanaticism of the ascetics. The *tekkes* and Ṣūfism provided a place of refuge and a source of intellectual and artistic activity for the Islamic world for centuries. The Mawlid gatherings {to celebrate the birthday of the Prophet}, in which religious poetry and music coalesced, were extremely popular among the Turks in particular because of the people's nostalgia for the old *şölens*, i.e. for aesthetic assemblies. In contrast to the fanatical asceticism and piety represented by the *madrasas*, the *tekkes* provided an outlet where one could breathe an atmosphere of artistic and intellectual freedom. This is why the Ṣūfīs and poets attacked the conventional religious scholars and the *madrasas*, which represented them, for centuries. {Mawlid gatherings do not appear to be attested among the Turks in the eighth/fourteenth century. See N. Kaptein, *Muḥammad's Birthday Festival: Early History in the Central Muslim Lands and Development in the Muslim West until the 10th/16th Century* (Leiden, 1993).}

9 Sultan Murād III {1574–95}, for example, who was disposed to Ṣūfism, wrote a famous hymn in the syllabic meter beginning *Uyan ey gözlerim gafletten uyan* {Awake, my eyes, from heedlessness, awake!} (*Müstaqīm-Zāde mecmuası*, MS 3397 in the Esad Efendi

Library, now in the Süleymaniye Library in Istanbul). In addition, it is known that Meḥmed Giray IV, the *khān* of Crimea who died in 1085/1674–5, wrote some hymns and some poetry in the syllabic meter under the pen name ʿĀrif. I chanced upon an example in an anthology in my library (*Gülbün-i khānān – al-sabʿ al-sayyār* {Istanbul, 1287/1870–1}). This poem, beginning *Bu dehrin hâline eyledim nazar / Her biri bir derde giriftâr ancak / Kemâle erince hâr ile gülzâr / Bülbülün âdeti âh-u zâr ancak* {I considered the state of the present age / Everyone is in bondage to some concern / When thorn and rose reach perfection / The nightingale's preoccupation is with sighs and moans}, is a fine work expressing mystical ecstasy. We should not forget, however, that such examples are relatively rare. [Köprülü later published the remainder of this poem {in "XVII. asır saz şairlerinden kâmil kırım hanı IV. Mehmet Giray"} in *Hayat Mecmuası*, 1928, no. 134, an article in which he pointed out that the pen name of Meḥmed Giray IV was not ʿĀrif but Kāmil. This article was reprinted in Orhon F. Köprülü (ed.), *Köprülü'den seçmeler*, pp. 93–8.]

10 Although the Mawlawī *ṭarīqa* was established by a Turk in a Turkish milieu, it acquired a clearly Iranian hue under the influence of Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. Mawlawī litanies {*wird*}, orations, and most of the major works of the *ṭarīqa* are in Persian. Later, beginning with Jalāl Arghūn, poets who wrote in Turkish also flourished, but all of them strove to apply the Persian meters and forms. Thāqib Dede, in his *Safīna-i mawlawiyān* {or *Sefine-i nefise-i mevleviyan* (Cairo, 1283/1866)}, and Esrār Dede {d. 1211/1796–7}, in his *Tadhkirat-i shuʿarā'* (MS in my private library), both of which discuss the leading Mawlawī personalities and poets, provide a clear view of this. Among the great Mawlawīs, the only one who held the national style in high regard was the famous Ādem Dede. Ṣafā'ī {d. 138/1725}, the author of the *Tadhkira*, mentions his hymn beginning *Dert ehli libâsını aşk ile giyen gelsün / Zehrini şeker gibi zevk ile yiyen gelsün* {Let him come who wears the cloak of the people of pain, with Love / Let him come who eats its poison like sugar, with pleasure} and reports that *Azîz-i mûmâileyhin terennümât-ı ney-pâre-i kalemi mutâbık-ı usûl-i sûfiyâne ve eşʿâr-i halet-şiʿârı bî-tekellüf ve âşıkâne* {the songs of the aforesaid saint were in conformity with the Ṣūfī style; and his poetry was characterized by a lack of formality and ecstatic love of God} (Ṣafā'ī, *Tadhkira*, MS. 2549 in the Esad Efendi Library). In Thāqib Dede's book there is also a hymn with the refrain *Kurtar bizi nefs elinden* {Save us from the clutches of the carnal self} (*Safīna-i mawlawiyān*, vol. 2, p. 50). Esrār Dede says of this Ṣūfī, who died in Egypt while performing the pilgrimage to Mecca in 1063/1652–3: "Most of his poetry consists of hymns and divinely inspired orations {*ilhâmât*}; his *beste* hymns in the Ṣūfī style are now employed for *dhikrs* and Ṣūfī litanies" (*Tadkhira*, pp. 4–6). He also mentions his fine poetry written in the *ʿarūḍ* meter and even some noteworthy poems in Persian.

11 In addition to his published *Muzakkī 'l-nufūs* {Istanbul, 1281/1865} and unpublished *Ṭarīqātnāme*, Eşrefoğlu, who received instruction first from Ḥājjī Bayram Veli and then from Ḥusain Ḥamawī, a descendant of ʿAbd al-Qādir Jilānī, also has a *dīwān* printed in Istanbul in 1286 {see *EI*^{2}, supplement, s.v. "Eshrefoghlu" (Fahir İz)}. Even a superficial examination of this *Dīwān*, which, on the basis of manuscript copies, is rather defective, shows that he was under the influence of Yūnus Emre. This *Dīwān*, despite the unreliability of the imprint, recalls Yūnus Emre in several of its linguistic and stylistic features. It reveals Eşrefoğlu to us as a pantheist Ṣūfī completely under the influence of Yūnus Emre and ʿĀshıq Pasha. The passages written in the *ʿarūḍ* meter are very defective, exactly like those of ʿĀshıq Pasha. As for those written in the syllabic meter, while lacking Yūnus's sincerity and power they nevertheless show a striking resemblance to his work. As is the case with Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān*, this one too includes unrestrained *dawriyyas*, exhortations on the need for ecstatic love of God and spiritual knowledge, and counsels on the need to be attached to a shaikh. In Eşrefoğlu,

however, there are passages indicating that he was the shaikh of a *ṭarīqa* and summoning the people to him.

Aşk sayrusu olanlara gelsinler tîmâr eyleyem
İçürem aşk şerbetini dosttan haberdâr eyleyem

Açar bâtınî gözünü göre kendi kendözünü
Dosta döndürem yüzünü âlemden bîzâr eyleyem

Söyündürem nefsi od'ın bozam tılısmının bendin
Götürem benliği seddin ol dosta yular eyleyem

Ol taş olmuş gönüllere vuram aşkın külünküni
Âb-i hayât'ı akıtam gönlünde pınar eyleyem

Ben dostu görüp gelmişem devrânım sürüp gelmişem
Dost dostlara gelsün dedi geldim ki haber eyleyem

{Let those come who are sick with Love: I will treat them.
I'll give them love potion to drink. I'll inform them of the Beloved.

He shall open his inward eye and see himself.
I'll turn his face to the Beloved and make him sick of the world.

I'll put out the fire of his carnal self. I'll break the talismanic spell.
I'll remove the barrier of his self and make him a halter (?) for the Beloved.

I'll strike Love's pickaxe upon those hearts turned to stone.
I'll cause water-of-life to gush forth from his heart.

I've seen the Beloved and come back. I've spent my time of fortune and come back.
The Beloved told the lovers to come: I've come to tell the others.}

It is clear that this work is also completely in the style of Yūnus Emre. Among the factors that shaped the personality of Eşrefoğlu, the influence of Yūnus Emre is strikingly greater than that of 'Āshıq Pasha. Eşrefoğlu's language is somewhat more technical than that of Yūnus Emre because of the difference in time between them, but given his complete lack of consideration for art, his use of half rhyme for the most part instead of rhyme, and his subject matter, Eşrefoğlu is Yūnus's most faithful imitator. With the exception of Qayghusuz, we can consider him to be the most important imitator of Yūnus Emre. In the following passage from one of his *dawriyyas*, the influence of Yūnus Emre is immediately apparent:

Gâh denizlere düşerem mevc urup taşra taşaram
Nâdân eline düşerem kem bahâya alınuram

Gâh çıkaram bu göklere dönerem çarh ile bile
Gâh ay ile bedr oluram gâh gün ile dolanuram

Gâh 'Arafât'a çıkaram lebbeyk urub baş açaram
Gâh kurbân yerine gelüp koç olub boğazlanuram

Gâh hânkâhta sûfîyem gâh meyhânede fâsıkam
Gâh raksa girüb dönerem gâh sâz olub çalınuram

Gâh onaram gâh azaram bu halk içinde gezerem
Gâh şâh olub şahbâz olub şikâr edüb avlanuram

Gâh deniz gâh göl oluram gâh sultân gâh kul oluram
Gâh bahâr gâh gül oluram elden ele yelinürem

Ne menzil vardır ne makâm ne vücud vardır ne ʿadem
Hak'tan gayrı yok ve'sselâm ya ben kande dolanuram

{Now I plunge into the sea and emerge as a wave,
Or I fall in the hands of a fool and am sold at a small price.

Now I rise up to heaven and turn with the spheres;
I am crescent moon or full moon, or I turn with the sun.

Now I go out to Arafat as a pilgrim and bare my head,
Or come to the place of sacrifice as a ram and am slaughtered.

Now I'm a Ṣūfī in the dervish convent, or a reprobate in the tavern,
Or I twirl in the dance, or become a *saz* and am strummed.

Now I go aright, now astray: I wander amidst the people.
Now I am king, or else the king's falcon in the hunt.

Now I'm the sea, or a lake; now sultan, or slave.
Now spring, or a rose passed from hand to hand.

Neither halting-place nor station, neither being nor non-being:
Nothing but God, that is all: so where shall I turn now?}

12 The following hymn of Ummī Sinān is completely reminiscent of Yūnus Emre's style:

Erenlerin sohbeti ele giresi değil
Ikrâr ile gelenler mahrûm kalası değil

Ümmî Sinan yol ʿayân olubdur her şey beyân
Dervişlik yolu hemen tâc ve hırkası değil

{Conversing with the saints cannot be brought under control.
Those who come confessing will not be left deprived.

Ummī Sinān, the way is clear and everything is evident.
The way of the dervish is not just tall cap and patched cloak.}

13 Many of the hymns of this person, who sometimes used the pen name Aḥmadī and sometimes Qayghusuz in his poetry, are recorded in Müstaqīm-Zāde's treatise *Aḥwāl-i Malāmiyya-i Bayrāmiyya* and in Laʿlīzāde's {*Risāla*}, and a copy of his *Dīwān* is in the Selim Ağa Library in Üsküdar. In order to give an idea of the hymns in the syllabic meter of this Ṣūfī, who also wrote quite a few poems in the *ʿarūḍ* meter, I will cite a very noteworthy and personal work of his concerning his view of the {spiritual} pole {*quṭb*}.

Evliyâya eğri bakma
Mülke hükmün süren oldur

Sen anı şöyle sanursun
Evliyâ'nın sırrı vardır

{Do not look askance at the saints:
It is they who govern the kingdom:

You should consider each of them
The saints have a secret:

Kevn ü mekân elindedir
İki cihân elindedir

Sencileyin bir âlemdir
Gizli ʿayân elindedir

the universe is in their hands.
both the worlds are in their hands.

as a world equivalent to you (?).
the concealed and the evident are in their hands.}

Rızâ Tevfik believed the original Qayghusuz Abdāl and Aḥmad Sārbān were the same person and deduced a number of things from this ({article in the literary supplement to the newspaper} *Peyâm*, no. 35, 8 May, 1330/1912); but this is clearly mistaken. The doctrine and mystical ideas of Aḥmad Sārbān and Qayghusuz are both well known and their writing styles are noticeably different.

14 This person who is buried in the village of Eroğlu between the districts of Kula and Eşme has a *dīwān* and a work in Turkish concerning mysticism called *Mir'āt al-'āshiqīn*. His hymn, beginning *Nidâ ettim gelsin âşık olanlar / Hakk'a gidenlerin yoludur Tevhîd / Aşkın dersin bundan aldı alanlar / Hem ledün ilmi'nin dilidir Tevhîd* {I summoned those who are lovers / *Tawḥīd* is the path of those going to divine Truth / Those who learned the lesson of Love learned it from this / *Tawḥīd* is the language of the science of divine nearness}, is only slightly reminiscent of Yūnus Emre. This man is not, in fact, a particularly important personality ({Mehmed Tâhir,} *Osmanlı müellifleri*, vol. 1, p. 26).

15 Originally from Tırhala, he came to Istanbul and trained a number of great personalities, including Sarı 'Abd Allāh Efendi, the commentator on the *Mathnawī*. His hymns vaguely recall those of Yūnus Emre. His famous oration beginning *İş bu dem'e erince üç kez doğdum anadan* {Until I reached this moment, I was born again three times} was expounded upon by several shaikhs ({Mehmed Tâhir,} *Osmanlı müellifleri*, vol. 1, p. 24).

16 This person, whose *Dīwān* has been published, has many other works, most notably a famous treatise entitled *Miftāḥ-i waḥdat-i wujūd*. He was a *khalīfa* of Ummī Sinān. In addition to a number of poems in the *'arūḍ* meter, he wrote hymns in the style of Yūnus Emre. The following passage from one of his hymns is reminiscent of Yūnus Emre:

Kıyamazsan başa câna / *Irak dur girme meydâna*
Bu meydânda nice başlar / *Kesilir hiç sorar olmaz*

Bak şu Mansûr'un işine / *Halkı üşürmüş başına*
Ene'l-Hakk'ın firâşına / *Düşenlere tîmâr olmaz*

Seyfu'llâh sözünde mesttir / *Şeyhinden aldığı dest'dir*
Dîvânerâ kalem nîstdir / *Ne söylese kanar olmaz*

{If you cannot sacrifice your life, do not enter the arena.
In this arena many heads are cut off and no one questions it.

Look what happened to Manṣūr al-Ḥallāj: the people gathered against him.
There is no treatment for those who enter the sick bed of "I am the Truth."

Saif Allāh is intoxicated in his speech: It is the permission he received from his shaikh.
Madmen have no pens: Whatever they say does not convince.}

Some shaikhs have written commentaries on this hymn.

17 He was from Divriği and was a leading member of the Khalwatī *ṭarīqa*. Because he went to Aq Kirmān to provide mystical guidance and was buried there, he is known as Aq Kirmānī. In addition to his published *Dīwān*, which was printed under the mistaken title of *Dīwān-i Shāh Naqshband*, he has a number of Ṣūfī works in verse and prose. I will cite as an example a hymn in the syllabic meter, although much of his poetry is in *'arūḍ*.

Aşkın şarâbın içmeyen / *Mest olub hayrân olur mu*
Zincîr-i aşka düşmeyen / *Soyunub uryân olur mu*

Akıt gözlerinden yaşı / *Gör kimdir işleyen işi*
Kul olur ise bir kişi / *Bu mülke sultân olur mu*

Aşka ciğerin yakmayan
Bahr-i Muhît'e akmayan
Mürşide doğru bakmayan
Göl iken ummân olur mu

Gönül gel geçirme çağın
Gülleri bitmeyen bağın
Ko yansın yürekte yağın
Bülbülü nâlân olur mu

Nakşî açıldı çün gözün
Lâkin bilmem uş bu sözün
Hakk'ı görür oldu özün
Münkire îmân olur mu

{One who does not drink wine and become drunk: can he be amazed?
One who does not suffer the chains of Love: can he strip and be naked?

Let the tears flow from your eyes. See who is doing the deed.
If a man is a slave, can he be sultan of this kingdom?

One who does not kindle his heart with Love; one who does not look toward his spiritual master;
One who does not flow toward the sea, but remains a lake: can he become the sea?

Come, heart, do not waste your days. Let the fat on your heart burn off.
If roses do not bloom in the garden, will nightingales sing?

When Naqshī opened his eyes, he seemed to see God in himself.
But I don't know whether these words of his will be a creed for one who denies.}

18 This person wrote two famous poetic works, *Dil-i dānā* and *Mufīd-u mukhtaṣar*. He was a *khalīfa* of Ḥaqīqī-Zāde Osman Efendi, a *khalīfa* of Sayyid Saif Allāh Efendi. In addition, he studied under Hüdā'ī, ʿAbd al-Aḥad Nūrī and Ḥusain Lāmekānī. According to Ghaibī, who was a *khalīfa* of Ibrāhīm Efendi and collected accounts of his legendary deeds and his sayings in a work entitled *Bīʿatnāme* or *Ṣuḥbatnāme*, he also was a *khalīfa* of Ṭab Ṭab Shāh ʿAlī, a *khalīfa* of Aḥmad Sārbān. In addition to the poems that he wrote in the *ʿarūḍ* meter, he composed quite powerful works in the style of Yūnus Emre, but in slightly more artful and technical fashion.

Yayan yerde ne gezersin gel âdeme ir bu deme
Hayvân gibi ne yelersin gel âdeme ir bu deme

Nüsha-i Vahdet âdemdir nefha-i kudret bu demdir
Âdemden gayrı ʿademdir gel âdeme ir bu deme

Âyine-i Hak âdemdir gören görünen bu demdir
Her nefes İsm-i aʿzam'dır gel âdeme ir bu deme

* * *

Bu ilmin beyânını bir kâmil insândan sor
Cânım cân haberini cân içinde cândan sor

Yarın ne olacağın bugün bilmek istersen
Uykuya vardığında gördüğün seyrândan sor

Yârin zülfü içinde ne başlar oynadığın
Erenler meydânında top ile çevgândan sor

Geçen hod geçti gitti geleceği neylersin
Her nefesin neş'esin bu demle bu ândan sor

İbrâhim'in gönlünün gönkleğini bilmeğe
Cân ile tâlib isen gel ʿArş-ı Rahmân'dan sor

{Walker, why do you walk on the ground? Come to Adam, to Adam's breath.
Runner, why do you run like an animal? Come to Adam, to Adam's breath.

Adam is the copy of Unity; his breath is the afflatus of power.
Aside from Adam is non-being. Come to Adam, to Adam's breath.

Adam is the mirror of Truth: his breath is what sees and what is seen.
Every breath is the Greatest Name. Come to Adam, to Adam's breath.

* * *

Inquire the explanation of this science from a perfect man.
My dear: inquire for news of the soul from the soul within the soul.

If you wish to know today what will be tomorrow.
Go to sleep and inquire of your dream.

What heads are dangling in the Beloved's locks?
Inquire of the polo stick and ball in the arena of True Men.

What's past is past, and what can you do about what's to be?
Inquire the joy of every breath from every passing moment.

What is the shirt on the bosom of Abraham?
If you really want to know, inquire of the Throne of the Merciful.}

In these poems Ibrāhīm Efendi is clarifying the theory of the "Perfect Man" and Mawlānā's notion of "breath," which he expounded in the couplet {*Mathnawī*, Book 1, line 133}

صوفی ابن الوقت باشد أی رفیق \ نیست فردا گفتن از شرط طریق

{The Ṣūfī is the "child of the moment," my friend.
It is not the rule of the Way to say "Tomorrow."}

Another of his poems is reminiscent of some passages from Yūnus Emre that I cited above:

Âlimem dersin ammâ âlemden bî-habersin
Bu ândan bu nefesten bu demden bî-habersin

Söze gelince gerçi eylemişsin kıl gibi
Kalbine Hak'tan olan hemdemden bî-habersin

Bu esrâr duymağa gerçekler nazarında
Âriflerin dediği nağmeden bî-habersin

Dört Kitâb'ı okursan yine bilmiş olmazsın
Benim cânım mâdam ki âdemden bî-habersin

{You say, "I know," but you know nothing of the world.
You know nothing of this moment, this breath.

When you start to talk, you split hairs, but
You know nothing of your breath that God has provided as companion to your heart.

To hear these mysteries, in the view of realities, (?)
You must know the song sung by the mystics: You know nothing about it.

Even if you read the Four Books you still will know nothing,
My dear, as long as you know nothing of Adam (or, Man).}

In his work on Ḥurūfism, Rızâ Tevfik says that this Ibrāhīm Efendi was known as Oğlan Shaikh and that during the reign of Süleyman the Magnificent he was condemned to death while only twenty-two years old by a *fatwā* from Ibn Kemāl (*Études sur la religion des Houroûfis* [Leiden, 1909], p. 254); later in an article that he published on Ṣūfī literature in the literary supplement {to the newspaper} *Peyâm*, he repeats that he was a shaikh during the reign of Süleyman. We can conclude from this that Rızâ Tevfik confused Olanlar Shaikhi and the famous Oğlan Shaikh with each other. This poet Ibrāhīm Efendi lived long after the reign of Süleyman, so he was not the one who was executed. Oğlan Shaikh Ismā'īl Ma'shūqī, who was executed along with twelve of his *murīds* in front of the fountain at the Hippodrome on the authority of Ibn Kemāl's *fatwā*, was the son of Pīr 'Alī Efendi of Aksaray, a Bayramī shaikh. He was born in 914/1508–9 and was killed in 935/1528–9 (for details, see {Hâfiz Hüseyin Ayvansarayî,} *Ḥadīqat al-jawāmi'* {Istanbul, 1281/1864}, vol. 1, pp. 35, 253, vol. 2, p. 125 {English trans. Howard Crane as *The Garden of the Mosques: Hafiz Hüseyin al-Ayvansarayî's Guide to the Muslim Monuments of Ottoman Istanbul* (Leiden, 2000)}; La'līzāde, *Risāla*, pp. 27–9; the supplement to {Tashköprü-Zāde's} *al-Shaqā'iq*, vol. 1, p. 89; and Ghaibī, *Ṣuḥbatnāme*, the most important source on Olanlar Shaikhi). La'līzāde says that Oğlan Shaikh also composed a number of hymns.

19 Ghaibī was the *khalīfa* of Olanlar Shaikhi. In addition to the *Ṣuḥbatnāme* and *Kashf al-ghiṭā'* {MS in Köprülü's private library} he wrote a number of short treatises, poetry in the *'arūḍ* meter, and many elegant and sincere hymns in the style of Yūnus Emre. Among the imitators of Yūnus Emre, Ghaibī was a great poet superior even to his shaikh Ibrāhīm Efendi. For some reason, Rızâ Tevfik, again in his work on the Ḥurūfīs, presents Ghaibī as a Ḥurūfī poet, but this claim is based on absolutely no evidence, only on hearsay. Ghaibī, who was absolutely faithful to the system of *panthéism idéaliste* {*wujūdiyya-i khayāliyya*}, was, exactly like Yūnus Emre, a genuine Ṣūfī and especially an esteemed poet. The following example can give us an idea of his art and his personality:

Tâc ma'rifet tâcıdır sanma gayri tâc ola
Taklîd ile tok olan hakîkatte ac ola

Düşe düşüp aldanma kendin hayrete salma
Senden özke ne vardır ta'bire muhtâc ola

Sana âlem görünen hakîkatte Allâh'tır
Allâh birdir va'llâhi sanma ki birkaç ola

Bir ağaçtır bu âlem meyvesi olmuş âdem
Meyvedir maksûd olan sanma ki ağaç ola

Bu âdem meyvesinin çekirdeği sözündür
Sözsüz bu âdem âlem bir ânda târâc ola

Bu sözlerin me'âli kişi kendin bilmektir
Kendi kendin bilene hakîkat Mi'râc ola

Hak denilen özündür özündeki sözündür
Gaybî özin bilene rübûbiyyet tâc ola

{The crown (or, dervish cap) is the crown of mystical knowledge: don't think there is any other.
One who is replete with imitation is in truth hungry.

Don't deceive yourself with dreams. Don't let yourself go in bewilderment.
Whatever exists beside yourself requires interpretation.

What seems to you to be the world is in truth God.
God is One: by God, don't think that He is many.

This world is a tree and Adam (or Man) is its fruit.
The goal is the fruit: don't think it is the tree.

The nut (or core) of the fruit of Adam (or Man) is your speech.
If Adam is speechless, the world is pillaged in an instant.

The sum of human speech is that a man should know himself.
To know oneself is to earn the true Ascension.

What is called "Truth" is yourself, your speech in your self.
To know Ghaibī's self is to earn the crown of Lordship.}

This fine poem, which explains the secret of من عرف {reference to the *Ḥadīth* "who knows himself knows his Lord"; see, for example, Annemarie Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*, p. 189} and the theological notions common to all Ṣūfīs, could never be interpreted according to Ḥurūfī beliefs.

20 The poets of the other *tekkes*, apart from a very small number, like Qayghusuz, Ghaibī, and Ibrāhīm Efendi, were bound to much more ascetic and pious views and could not display the same sincerity and broadmindedness as Yūnus Emre. Indeed, even the language of Ghaibī and Ibrāhīm Efendi is more technical and their style is less sincere. Yūnus Emre's mode of expression, both clear and allusive, can be seen only among the Bektashī poets.

21 See the various explanations that I have given of this matter in different places in this book. For more detailed information on these subjects, see my series of articles entitled "Anadolu'da islâmiyet: {Türk istilâsından sonra Anadolu tarih-i dinîsine bir nazar ve bu tarihin menbaları," in *Dârülfünûn Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 2 (1922), 281–311, 385–420, 457–86; English trans. Gary Leiser as *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion* (Salt Lake City, 1993).}

22 A detailed account of this phenomenon and analysis of the various factors that gave rise to it are outside our subject. The Abdāls were also of this nature. This was a major factor in both their influence and that of the Bektashīs on the popular masses. Because they flourished among the people, the Bektashī *bābās* knew their psychology better than anyone and, indeed, in many respects were no different from them, and thus had all the qualities necessary to spread Bektashī propaganda among the broadest masses of the people. Detailed accounts of this subject will be found in my {forthcoming} work {never published. See his article "Bektaş" in *İA*.}

23 The works of the Bektashī poets, which were long written in the *ʿarūḍ* meter – beginning with {Muḥyī 'l-Dīn's} poem *Khaḍirnāme* which I mentioned briefly above – are for the most part faulty and defective, in short, they are very inept. That is the rule, with very rare exceptions. This fact is immediately obvious when looking through anthologies {s. *cönk*} of poems belonging to Bektashīs. Also in these *cönks* are a number of works by Ḥurūfī poets like Nesīmī and Shīʿī poets like Fuḍūlī {d. 963/1556}, all of which should not be included within the scope of Bektashī literature. It is beyond our subject to go into detail here on Bektashī poets, the form and nature of Bektashī poems, their ties to music, the musical value of such forms as *dīwān* and *qalandarī*, and so forth. {For collections of Bektashī poetry, see Sadettin Nüzhet Ergun, *Bektaşi edebiyatı antolojisi* (Istanbul, 1955–6) and Gölpınarlı, *Türk tasavvuf şiiri antolojisi* (Istanbul, 1972).}

24 According to the common tradition in all the biographies of the poets, Khaṭāʾī was the pen name of the Safavid Shāh Ismāʿīl. One should not, however, conclude that all

works attributed to Khaṭā'ī belong to Shāh Ismā'īl. Just as among our classical poets several men may have the same pen name, so it is among these *tekke* poets. Because of the paucity of historical documents on the Bektashīs in particular, it is not possible to resolve such problems completely. I stated above that even the names Yasawī and Yūnus were used by all kinds of people – whose personalities are unknown – and I gave the reasons for this.

25 There were a great many Qızılbash poets, beginning with Shāh Ismā'īl, but it is virtually impossible to do a thorough historical study of them. Nevertheless, because we have in our possession various works of several Qızılbash poets, we can definitely state that this literature is no different from that of the Bektashīs.

26 I mentioned that a large proportion of the Bektashī poets who wrote these kinds of works in the national meter and under the influence of Yūnus Emre's style were Ḥurūfīs. But the Ḥurūfīs had an important literature in the *'arūḍ* meter even before this style was established. I hope to publish in the future a separate study on this literature which includes several important poets, beginning with Nesīmī and Rafī'ī, the author of the *Bashāratnāme*. For now suffice it to say that Bektashī literature adopted the *'arūḍ* meter and that style of poetry from the Ḥurūfīs and Qalandarīs and the syllabic meter and the style of Yūnus Emre and Qayghusuz from the Abdāls. The latter won much greater esteem and importance among the people and had greater prestige in Bektashī poetry. Thus the products of Bektashī-Ḥurūfī literature that were in the *'arūḍ* meter, while at first having greater esteem and importance, subsequently lost pride of place. The fine poem of Qayghusuz Abdāl given below is one that belongs wholly to the Abdāls. It also passed to the Bektashīs, and, in fact, Bektashī poetry was able to acquire its distinctive features via the influence of Abdāls such as Qayghusuz.

Rûm Abdâllar(ı) gelür 'Alī dost deyu
Hırka giyer abâ deyu post deyu
Hastalara gelür dermân isteyu
Sağlar gelür Pîr'im Abdâl Mûsâ'ya

Hind'den bâzirgânlar gelür yayınur
Âşık olan bu meydânda soyunur
Pişer lokmaları aşlar toyunur
Toklar gelür Pîr'im Abdâl Mûsâ'ya

Ikrârıdır koç-yiğitin yuları
Fakîhleri çeksem gelmez ileri
Ak-pınar'ın yeşil güllü suları
Çağlar gelür Pîr'im Abdâl Mûsâ'ya

{The Abdāls of Rūm (Anatolia) come crying "'Alī! Friend!"
They don the patched cloak and call it *abā* and *post*.
They come to the sick seeking a cure.
They come in health to my Pīr Abdāl Mūsā.

From India merchants come and disperse.
The Lover strips in this arena.
He is cooked, and gobbets of him are consumed.
Those who are full come to my Pīr Abdāl Mūsā.

His confession is the champions' halter.
If I pull the legal scholars they won't come forward.
The streams of Aq-pınar with their green roses
Come flowing to my Pīr Abdāl Mūsā.}

When I publish my future studies on the Abdāls, I will provide detailed information on the other works of Qayghusuz {as mentioned, never published.}. All of Bektashī literature clearly shows the influence of Qayghusuz Abdāl. Nothing resembling his style, which is completely Turkish exactly like that of Yūnus Emre, is found in Persian or Arabic literature.

27 This feature derived directly from the influence of Qayghusuz. The resulting mixture of beliefs of Bektashism, which were filtered through many different sources, naturally perpetuated this influence among Bektashī poets. The poem given below is a Ḥurūfī-Bektashī composition that shows the unity of God, Muḥammad, ʿAlī, and Faḍl Allāh Ḥurūfī. There are many like it.

Gönlüme gözüme gelen surûru — *Fazl Hak Muhammed 'Ali'den bildim*
Cemâline muştâk gılmân ve hûrî — *Fazl Hak Muhammed 'Ali'den bildim*

Tâlibine lutfet ey kerem kânı — *Lebin kevseriyle gel kandır cânı*
Adâlet etmenin geldi zamânı — *Fazl Hak Muhammed 'Ali'den bildim*

{The joy that comes to my heart and my eyes I know is from Faḍl, God, Muḥammad, ʿAlī.
The male and female denizens of paradise who long for Your beauty I know are From Faḍl, God, Muḥammad, ʿAlī.

Show favor to Your seeker, O mine of generosity. Come quench the soul with the Kawthar (name of a river in Paradise) of your lips.
The time has come to do justice. I know it from Faḍl, God, Muḥammad, ʿAlī.}

Likewise, the following passage taken from one of Khaṭā'ī's poems also has this meaning and is clearly Ḥurūfī in nature:

Şerî'at yolunu Muhammed açtı — *Tarîkat gülünü Şâh 'Alî seçdi*
Bu dünyâdan yüzbin erenler geçti — *Anlar ittifâkta Mehdî yoldadır*

Şâh Hatâyı'm eydür sırrın duyurma — *İde-gör niyâzı kazâya koma*
Yalancı dünyâda hiç sağım deme — *Muhammed Fazlu'llâh şimdi yoldadır*

{Muḥammad opened the path of the *Sharīʿa.* Shāh ʿAlī selected the rose of the *Ṭarīqa.*
Myriads of saints have passed through this world: they are, by agreement, on the path of the Mahdī.

Shāh Khaṭā'ī says: Do not divulge your secret. Perform the supplication, do not postpone it.
In this false world don't say: "I am true." Muḥammad and Faḍl Allāh are now on the way.}

It is obvious that the notions of indwelling and union are continuously encountered in Bektashī poetry.

28 This *nefes* is an example of the most beautiful and sincere passages of Bektashī poetry:

Vardım kırklar meydânına gel beri hey cân dediler
İzzet ile selâm verdim geç otur hey cân dediler

Kırklar yerinde durdular yerlerinden yer verdiler
Meydâna sofra serdiler lokmaya sun cân dediler

Kırkların gönlü uludur mü'minler kalbin eridir
Gelişin kanden beridir söyle be hey cân dediler

Kalk semâ'da bile oyna silinsün pâk olsun ayna
Kırk yıl bir kazanda kayna dahi çeksin cân dediler

Düşme dünyâ kisvetine tâlib ol Hak Hazreti'ne
Âb-ı Kevser şerbetine parmağını ban dediler

Gördüğünü gözün ile beyân etme sözün ile
Bir gececik bizim ile olasın mihmân dediler

Şâh Hatâyı'm nedir hâlin Hakk'a şükret kaldır elin
Kese-gör gybetten dilin olasın sultân dediler

{I went to the field of the Forty. They said: "Come this way, O soul!"
I paid my respects. They said: "Come, sit down, O soul!"

The Forty stood up and gave me a place among them.
They laid out a spread in the field and said: "Help yourself, O soul!"

The Forty have a great heart that causes the believers' hearts to melt.
They said: "Where are you from? Tell us, O soul!"

"Get up and join us in the mystical dance (*samā'*). Let the mirror (of your heart) be wiped clean.
Boil in a cauldron for forty years and let your soul suffer," they said.

"Do not put on the garment of this world. Be one who seeks Divine Truth.
Dip your finger in the sherbet of the stream of Kawthar," they said.

"What you see with your eyes do not utter with your lips.
Be our guest for a single night," they said.

"Shāh Khaṭā'ī: what is your condition? Raise your hands and give thanks to God.
Keep your tongue from calumny and you will be the Sultan," they said.}

Poems of an ethical nature like this are also common among the Bektashīs. The ethical view of the Bektashīs is very important with respect to both its nature and sources. (There is a long chapter on this subject in my work on the Bektashīs {again, never published}.)

29 We find that the word *ozan* was used in the tenth/sixteenth century, in Lāmi'ī, for example, with the meaning of "talkative," "garrulous," "prattler."

30 In my full-length article entitled "Sazşâirleri: Türklerde âşık edebiyatı'nın menşe' ve tekâmülü," some parts of which were published in abbreviated form {in the newspaper *İkdam*, see bibliography}, there is detailed information on this subject and many examples are given. For further information, see my *Türk sazşâirleri* (Istanbul, 1940; reprinted Ankara, 1962–5), vol. 1, pp. 9–49.

APPENDIX 1

Chains of authority

Chain of authority of the Yasawiyya

Based on the following sources: Ḥazīnī, *Jawāhir al-abrār*; Ṣafī, *Rashaḥāt*; Ḥarīrī-Zāde, *Tibyān-i wasā'il al-ḥaqā'iq*
↻ = New, independent *ṭarīqa* ····· = Relationship historically uncertain * = Branch of a major *ṭarīqa*
{Cf. commentary in Chapter 4, nn.1, 2, 4, 5}



Chain of authority from Zangī Ata

Based on Ḥazīnī, *J̌awāhir al-abrār*
(Supplement to the Chain of Authority of the Yasawiyya)
{See commentary in Chapter 4, n.30}



APPENDIX 2

Some hymns of Yūnus Emre

These hymns of Yūnus Emre were, according to Köprülü, still sung in the *tekkes*. We have followed the 1st edn, which differs very slightly from the 3rd edn, because of the rhyme.

Number I

Hicaz İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Düyek

Composer unknown

Gönül hayran olupdur aşk elinden
Ciğer püryan olupdur aşk elinden

The heart is wonderstruck because of love
The liver is roasted because of love

Number 2

Uşşak İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Düyek

Composer unknown

Ey dervişler ey kardeşler
Ne acep derdim var benim
Mecnun olmuşdur görenler

Oh dervishes, oh brothers
What a strange pain of love I feel
Those who have seen have gone mad

Number 3

Nevrûz İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Evsat

Composer unknown



Edelim cevlân cevlân
Kılalım seyran aman
Mest olup hayran hayran
Şeyh eşiğinde

Let us wander around
Let us stroll about
Intoxicated, wonderstruck
At the threshold of the shaikh

Number 4

Beyâtî İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Nimevsat

Composer unknown

Ben bu aşka düşeli	Ever since I fell into this love
Allâhla bilişeli	Ever since I became acquainted with God
Eli yeşil asalı	With green staves in their hands
Bize dervişler geldi	The dervishes have come to us
Bize has kullar geldi	God's special slaves have come to us

Number 5

Evç İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Düyek

Composer unknown

Tehi sanman siz beni
Dost yüzün görüp geldim
Baki devlet ruzigâr

Don't consider me lightly
I have come having seen the face of the Friend
Time is fortune everlasting

Number 6

Uşşak İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Düyek

Composer unknown



Allâh emrin tutalım
Rahmetine batalım
Bülbül gibi ötelim
Allâh Allâh kerim Allâh
Rahim Allâh aman Allâh
Diyelim yahu

Let us keep God's command
Let us sink into His mercy
Let us sing like nightingales
God, God, generous God
Merciful God, o mercy God
Let us say “Oh He!”

Number 7

Nevâ İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Düyek

Composer unknown

A sultanım sen var iken
Ya ben kimi yalvarayım
İsmin gani settar iken
[Ya ben kimi yalvarayım]

Oh my Sultan, while You exist
Whom else should I implore?
While Your name is All Possessor and Veiler of Sins
[Whom else should I implore?]

Number 8

Beyâtî İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Sofyan

Composer unknown

Mecnun sordular Leylâ nic'oldu
Leylâ gitti a dediler de kaldı

They asked Majnūn, "What happened to Laylā?"
"Laylā went away," he said and sighed

Number 9

Mâhûr İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Düyek

Composer unknown

Ayırma beni senden yaradan
Düşüp ölürüm dostlar ben bu yaradan

Do not separate me from You, my Creator
Oh friends, I will fall and die from this wound

Number 10

Mâhûr İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Düyek

Composer: Hacı Nâfiz Bey



Yar yüreğim yar gör ki neler var
Bu halk içinde bize gülen var
Gülenler gülsün dost bizim olsun

Split my heart, Beloved, and see what is there
Among these people are those who laugh at us
Let them laugh, as long as the Friend is ours

Number 11

Hicaz İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Evsat

Composer unknown

Rumda Acemde âşık olduğum
Yemen ellerinde Veysel Karanî
Allâhın habibi dostum dediği

He whom I love, in Turkey, in Persia
Uways al-Qaranī in the country of Yemen
God's beloved, whom He has called his friend

Number 12

Acempuselik İlâhî

Rhythmic pattern: Düyek

Composer: Balat Şehyi Kemal Efendi

Ben yürürem yane yane
Aşk boyadı beni kane
Ne âkilem de divane
Gel gör beni aşk neyledi

I wander burning
Love dyed me with blood
I am neither rational nor mad
Come see what love has done to me

{Grace Smith, *The Poetry of Yūnus Emre* (Berkeley, CA, 1993), p. 138}

GLOSSARY

ādāb	rules, etiquette, protocol
abdāl	dervish
akhī	member of a mystical professional organization (cf. *futuwwa*)
ʿalam	standard, badge
ʿālim, pl. *ʿulamāʾ*	religious scholar
alp	hero
amīr	commander, officer
arbaʿīn	forty, i.e. forty-day retreat for religious exercises
ʿārif, pl. *ʿurafāʾ*	knower of God, mystic (cf. *maʿrifa*)
ʿarūḍ	the Arabo-Persian quantitative metrical system
ʿāshuq	lover of God; minstrel, *saz* poet
bāb	spiritual leader
bābā	"father," honorific title used especially in dervish circles
bakhshi	saint, sorcerer, popular poet
bāṭinī	esoteric, Shīʿī
bey	tribal chief, lord
chilla-khāne	place where religious devotees shut themselves up for a forty-day retreat (= *chilla*)
cönk	miscellany, anthology of folk poetry
dargāh	dervish convent
dastān	a type of long strophic poem; ballad or epic
dawr	cycle of existence
dawriyya	creation poem
dhikr	remembrance of God; Ṣūfī séance
dīwān	collection of poems of a poet
er	man, saint
erenler	saints, Ṣūfī spiritual leaders
fanāʾ	annihilation, passing away from self and its replacement by a pure consciousness of God
faqīh	jurist
faqīr	dervish

Fātiḥa	opening *sūra* of the Koran
fatwā	religious opinion, judicial order
futuwwa	a semi-religious fraternity with a chivalrous code of behavior, often associated with guilds (cf. *akhī*)
ghāzī	warrior, warrior for the faith
Ḥadīth	Prophetic tradition
ḥākim	judge
ḥāl, pl. *aḥwāl*	mystical state
ḥaqā'iq	realities of God
ḥikmat	"wisdom": name given to quatrains in the Yasawiyya poetic tradition
ḥukm, pl. *ḥukūm*	religious norms
ḥulūl	indwelling of God in a creature
ḥūrī	female denizen of paradise
iḥrām	garb of pilgrims going to Mecca
ijāza	permission to teach a work on the authority of its author
ilāhī	hymn
imām	supreme leader of Twelver Shī'ism; founder of one of the four Sunnī *madhhabs*
iqṭā'	estate, land grant
'ishq	ecstatic love of God
ittiḥād	union with God
jihād	struggle for the faith, war against unbelievers
kalām	scholastic theology
karāma	saintly miracle
khalīfa	deputy or spiritual successor of a shaikh/*pīr*
khalwa	solitary religious devotions
khān	ruler
khānqāh	dervish convent
khilāf	divergences in law
khirqa	dervish patched cloak
khuṭba	Friday sermon
khwāja	master
kopuz	ancestor of the *saz*
koşma	a type of strophic verse
ma'rifa	experiential knowledge of God (cf. *'ārif*)
madhhab	school of law; sect
madrasa	Islamic law school
maḥabbat	love
mahdī	an eschatological figure similar to a messiah
majdhūb	one obsessed with divine love
majlis	religious assembly, course of instruction
majmū'a	miscellany, anthology
manāqib	legendary deeds of Ṣūfī saints

manẓūma	poem, verse
maqām, pl. *maqāmāt*	stage on the mystical path; musical mode; tomb; a literary genre
maslak	path, especially mystical path
mathnawī	rhymed couplets
miḥrāb	prayer niche indicating the direction of Mecca
mudarris	professor of law at a *madrasa*
muftī	one who gives formal legal opinions (*fatwās*)
mulamma‘	macaronics, half in one language and half in another
mulḥid	heretic, unbeliever
munājāt	extempore prayers, intimate conversations with God
murīd	novice, disciple
murshid	spiritual guide
nefes	"breath": name given to religious poems in the Bektashī tradition
ozan	troubadour poet-singer
pīr	(s.v. shaikh) Ṣūfī master, elder
post	sheepskin, symbol of spiritual succession
qāl	speech, doctrine, book-learning
qubba-i alif-tāj	dome-shaped Bektashī headgear
radīf	repetition of word or phrase at the end of each couplet
Rāfiḍī	Shī‘ī, heretic
Rūm	Anatolia, Byzantium
sabq	precedence
ṣadr	paramount person, leader
sagu	elegy
sajjāda	prayer rug
samā‘	Ṣūfī séance with music
sancak	district
saz	Turkish stringed instrument
shaikh	Ṣūfī master, elder
Sharī‘a	Islamic law
sığır	"hunt," royal battue
sipāhī	cavalry soldier
silsila	chain of authority, genealogy of spiritual affiliation
sofra	tablecloth
şölen	public banquet
subaşı	police chief, constable
ṣudūr	emanation
sunna	any saying or action of the Prophet
sūra	chapter of the Koran
tafsīr	exegesis, especially Koranic
tāj	crown, dervish headgear
tajallī	the self-disclosure of God

takwīn	creation
ṭarīqa	Ṣūfī brotherhood, path
tawḥīd	proclaiming the unity of God
tekke	dervish lodge
tezkireci	Ottoman biographer
timar	military land grant
töre	customary law (cf. *yasa*)
türbe	mausoleum
türkü	folk song
'ulamā'	religious scholars
uṣūl al-fiqh	the "roots" or bases of Islamic jurisprudence
'uzla	withdrawal for religious exercise
waḥda	unity (of God)
waḥdat al-wujūd	unity of being (the metaphysical system associated with Ibn al-'Arabī)
waqf	pious endowment
wujūdiyya khayāliyya	*panthéism idéaliste*
yargu	court of interrogation
yarlığ	edict
yasa	law, tribal custom (cf. *töre*)
zāwiya	Ṣūfī lodge
zindīq	heretic

BIBLIOGRAPHY

As described at the beginning of this book, the third edition of *Early Mystics* did not include a proper bibliography. Instead, selective works were incorporated in the index, sometimes by title and sometimes by author. In some cases this bibliographic information was incomplete, and in other cases it was combined with annotations. The bibliography given below includes all works cited in the text. We have retained those annotations that might still be of interest. All works cited by Orhon Köprülü or Fevziye Tansel in their prefaces, or added to the text by Orhon Köprülü, are in brackets [ ]. All works added by the translators are in braces {}. All Turkish works published before 1929 are in the Arabic alphabet. English translations are given of the titles of all Turkish works published after 1900, of all Russian works, and of one Qazaq work. Finally, it should be noted that Köprülü's private library is now in the possession of Yapı Kredi Bankası. Much of it is housed and catalogued in the Yapı Kredi Sermet Çifter Kütüphanesi, İstiklal Caddesi, No. 285 Beyoğlu, Istanbul.

ʿAbd Allāh Anṣārī al-Harawī. *Munājāt*. Istanbul, 1301/1883–4. {English trans. Lawrence Morris and Rustam Sarfeh as *Munājāt: The Intimate Prayers of Khwajih ʿAbd Allāh Anṣārī*. New York, 1975.}

ʿAbd Allāh Bosnawī. *Tajalliyāt ʿarā'is al-nuṣūṣ*. Commentary in Turkish on Ibn al-ʿArabī's *Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*. Būlāq, 1252/1836–7. Also Istanbul, 1873. {English trans. Bulent Rauf *et al.* as *Ismail Hakki Bursevi's Translation of, and Commentary on, Fusus al-hikam by Muhyiddin Ibn ʿArabi (attributed to ʿAbd Allāh Bosnawī)*. 4 vols. Oxford, 1986.}

ʿAbd al-Ghaffār b. Ḥasan Kirimī. *ʿUmdat al-tawārīkh wa 'l-akhbār*. Unique MS 2331 in the Esad Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul. According to Köprülü, this abridged work, which is composed of 327 folios, on each page of which are twenty-three lines of about fourteen words each, is a general history of Islam. The author, who states that he was a member of the *ʿulamā'*, incurred the wrath of Selīm Giray b. Kaplan Giray, the Khān of Crimea, in 1157/1744–5. He was banished first to the village of Ṣafā Qongrati, which was his farm, from there to his home in the small town of Qānṣū, and from there to the fortress of Soghujaq. In the latter, he wrote his history during the reign of Sultan Maḥmūd b. Muṣṭafā. This work, which includes bits of important information on history and literature {in general}, is primarily a detailed account of the history of Crimea, and in this respect is without equal. Beginning on folio 294, the author describes Devlet Giray and in the course of this description mentions the wars in which he was engaged and the circumstances in which he was killed in battle (martyred). The information that he gives on the well known poet Thābit, for example,

is very valuable. The following are the works that he says were his sources: al-Ṭabarī, *Shāhnāme*, *Jihānnumā*, Ibn Shiḥna's *Rawḍat al-munāẓarā*, *Rawḍat al-ṣafā*, *Murūj al-dhahab*, *Taqwīm al-buldān* of Sulṭān ʿImād al-Dīn al-Ḥamawī, *Ẓubdat al-taʾrīkh*, ʿĀlīʾs *Kunh al-akhbār*, *Taʾrīkh-i Hezārfen*, Luṭfī Pasha, *Taʾrīkh-i Suhailī-i Miṣrī*, *Nizām al-tawārīkh* of al-Baiḍāwī, *Taʾrīkh-i dost-i Sulṭān-i Özbegī*, *Taʾrīkh Apūshqā-yi Jangīzī*, *Taʾrīkh-i Jihān-Gushāyi* of ʿAlī ʿl-Yazdī, *Jamʿiyyāt-i Khair al-Dīn-zāde Muḥammad al-Shīrīnī*. Because the *ʿUmdat al-tawārīkh* is based on these sources, some of which are very useful and unknown to us, it is a very important work for Turkish history.

ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Lāhawrī. *Pādishāhnāme*. 3 vols. Calcutta, 1866–72.

Abū ʿl-Fidā. *Mukhtaṣar taʾrīkh al-bashar*. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1286/1869–70.

Abū ʿl-Ghāzī Bahādur Khān. *Shajara-i Turk*. According to Köprülü, J. J. P. Desmaisons collated various MSS of this work and then published an annotated edition of the text and a French translation as *Histoire des Mogols et des Tatars*. 2 vols. St Petersburg, 1871–4. Ahmed Vefik Pasha translated part of it into Turkish. Subsequently, Rıza Nur published an abridged Turkish translation of the first part of the French translation.

Abū Ḥayyān al-Gharnāṭī. *Kitāb al-Idrāk li-lisān al-atrāk*. Istanbul, 1309/1893. {Superseded by Ahmed Caferoğlu's edn. Istanbul, 1931; and especially A. Melek Özyetgin as *Ebû Ḥayyân, Kitâbu'l-İdrâk li Lisâni'-Etrâk*. Ankara, 2001.}

Abū ʿl-Wafā-yi Baghdādī. *Manāqib-i Tāj al-ʿĀrifīn*. MSS in Köprülü's private library and MS 2427 in the Esad Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul.

Aflākī. *Manāqib al-ʿārifīn*. French trans. Cl. Huart as *Les Saints des derviches tourneurs*. 2 vols. Paris, 1918–22. {Ed. Tahsin Yazıcı. 2 vols. Ankara, 1976–80; English trans. John O'Kane as *The Feats of the Knowers of God*. Leiden, 2002.}

(Ağa) Aḥmad ʿAlī Aḥmad. *Risāla-i tarāna*. Calcutta, 1867.

Aḥmad ʿIzzī-Zāde Sayyid ʿAbd al-Laṭīf. *Khulāṣat al-wafayāt*. MS in the Hâşim Pasha Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul. Not further identified.

Aḥmad Yasawī. *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat*. Istanbul, 1299/1881–2. 3rd Kazan edn, 1311/1893–4. {Ed. Hayatı Bice. Ankara, 1993. Facsimile edn. Yusuf Azmun. Istanbul, 1994.}

Aḥmad b. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Kāsānī. See Makhdūm-i Aʿẓam.

Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd Yüknekī. *ʿAtabat al-ḥaqāʾiq*. Ed. Necib Âsım inder the mistaken title of *Hibetül'-Ḥaḳâyık*. Istanbul, 1334/1918. {Superseded by R. R. Arat (ed.) as *Atebetü'l-hakayık*. Istanbul, 1951.}

Ahmed Rifat. *Lughât-i taʾrîkhiyya ve jughrâfiyya*. 7 vols. Istanbul, 1299/1881.

Ahmed Vefik Pasha. *Lehce-i osmânî*. 2nd edn. Istanbul, 1306/1890.

{Akar, Metin. "Şeyyad Hamza hakkında yeni bilgiler" [New information on Shayyād Ḥamza]. *Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2 (1986), 1–14.}

{Akhmetgaleeva, Ia. S. *Issledovanie tiurkoiazychnogo pamiatnika "Kisekbash kitaby"* [Research on the Turkic-language monument "Kisek-bash kitabï"]. Moscow, 1979.}

Aq Shams al-Dīn. *Risāla-i Aq Shams al-Dīn*. MS in the Hâlis Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul. Same work under the title *Risālat al-nūriyya* MS 989 in the Millet Library in Istanbul.

{Algar, Hamid. "The Naqshbandī Order: A Preliminary Survey of Its History and Significance." *Studia Islamica*, 44 (1976), 123–52.}

{—— "A brief history of the Naqshbandî order." Marc Gaborieau, Alexandre Popovic, and Thierry Zarcone (eds), *Naqshbandîs: cheminements et situation actuelle d'un ordre mystique musulman*. Istanbul, 1990, pp. 3–44.}

{—— "Kubrā." *EI²*.}

{—— "Nadjm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya." *EI²*.}
{—— "Naḳshband." *EI²*.}
{—— "Nuḳṭawiyya." *EI²*.}
{—— "Sayf al-Dīn Bākharzī." *EI²*.}
{—— "Barāq Bābā." *EIr*.}
{—— "Bektāš." *EIr*.}
{—— "Bektāšīya." *EIr*.}
{Algar, Hamid *et al*. "Naḳshbandiyya." *EI²*.}
[Alî Emirî. "Cevap." A response to a letter by Alî Rızâ criticizing Köprülü's *Yeni Osmanlı tarihi-edebiyatı* (Istanbul, 1916) in *Tarih ve Edebiyat Mecmuası*, year 3, no. 25, March 31, 1336/1918, pp. 635–49.]
ʿĀlī, Muṣṭafā b. Aḥmad. *Kunh al-akhbār*. 5 vols. Istanbul, 1861–9.
ʿAlī Raʾīs b. Ḥusain, Sayyidī. *Mirʾāt al-mamālik*. Istanbul, 1313/1895–6. {English trans. A. Vambéry as *The Travels and Adventures of the Turkish Admiral Sidi Ali Reʾis in India, Central Asia and Persia in the Years 1553–1556*. Edn of 1899. Reprinted Lahore, 1975. New edn Mehmet Kiremit. Ankara, 1999.}
{Alpay, Günay. "Ḥakīm Ata." *EI²*.}
{Ambros, Edith. "Surūrī." *EI²*.}
{—— "Türkü." *EI²*.}
{—— "Yazıdjı-oghlu." *EI²*.}
{—— "Yūnus Emre." *EI²*.}
Amīn al-Dīn Bābā b. Dāʾūd Faqīh. *Risāla-i qudsiyya*. Unique MS in the possession of Kilisli Rifat Bey.
Andreas, F. C. *The Book of Mainyo-i-khard* . . . Kiel, 1882.
{Andrews, Walter. *An Introduction to Ottoman Poetry*. Minneapolis, 1976.}
{Arat, R. Rahmeti. "Kutadgu Bilig." *İA*.}
van Arendok, C. "Futuwwa." *EI¹*.
ʿĀshıq Chelebi. *Mashāʿir al-shuʿarāʾ*. Also referred to as his *Tadhkira*. MS in Köprülü's private library. {Ed. G. M. Meredith-Owens. London, 1971.}
ʿĀshıq Pasha. *Gharībnāme*. MS 333 in the Beyazıt Umumi Library in Istanbul. {Ed. Kemal Yavuz as *Âşık Paşa, Garib-nâme*. 4 vols. Istanbul, 2000.}
ʿĀshıq Pasha-Zāde. *Tawārīkh-i āl-i ʿuthmān*. Ed. ʿĀlī Bey. Istanbul, 1332/1914. {Ed. H. Nıhal Atsız as *Tevarih-i âl-i Osman, Âşıkpaşaoğlu tarihi*. Ankara, 1985.}
Âsım, Necib. *Türk tarihi*. Istanbul, 1316/1898–9.
—— *Millî arûz* [The national (literary) meter]. Istanbul, 1329/1911.
Âsım, Necib and Mehmed Ârif. *Türk tarihi-i umûmisi* [A general history of the Turks]. Istanbul, 1325/1907.
—— *Osmanlı tarihi* [A history of the Ottomans]. Istanbul, 1335/1916–17.
{Aslanapa, Oktay. *Turkish Art and Architecture*. New York, 1971.}
[Ateş, Ahmed. "Muhyi-d-Din Arabî." *İA*.] {Abridged in *EI²* as "Ibn al-ʿArabī."}
{—— "Senâʾî." *İA*.}
{Atil, Esin (ed.). *Turkish Art*. Washington, DC, 1980.}
ʿAṭṭār, Farīd al-Dīn. *Tadhkirat al-awliyāʾ*. Ed. R. A. Nicholson. London, 1905–7.
—— *Manṭiq al-ṭair*. Köprülü used an edition published in Iran. In his time all Turkish translations were in MS. {English trans. Afkham Darbandi and Dick Davis as *The Conference of the Birds*. London: Penguin Books, 1984.}
ʿAwfī, Muḥammad. *Lubāb al-albāb*. Ed. E. G. Browne and M. Qazvīnī. 2 vols. London, 1903–6.

{Babadžanov, Baxtiyor, M. "On the History of the Naqšbandīya Muğaddidīya in Central Māwarā'annahr in the Late 18th and Early 19th Centuries." Michael Kemper, Anke von Kügelgen, and Dmitriy Yermakov (eds), *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*. Berlin, 1996, pp. 385–413.}

{Babinger, F. *Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke*. Leipzig, 1927.}

{—— "Nesīmī." *EI²*.}

{—— "Niyāzī." *EI²*.}

Bābur, Ẓahīr al-Dīn. *Dīwān*. MS in Köprülü's private library. Partially published by Köprülü in "Zahiruddin Muhammad Bâbur Şah'ın 'Risâle-i vâlidiye'" [The *Risāla-i wālidiyya* of Ẓahīr al-Dīn Muḥammad Bābur Shāh]. *MTM*, 1 (1331/1915), 113–24, 235–56, 464–80, and 2 (1331/1915), 308–26. {Ed. Bilâl Yücel as *Bâbür Dîvânı*. Ankara, 1995. This edn includes Bābur's verse translation of the *Risāla-i wālidiyya*, pp. 95–119. English trans. A. J. E. Bodrogligeti as "Bābur Shah's Chaghatay Version of the *Risāla-i Vālidīya*: A Central Asian Turkic Treatise on How to Emulate the Prophet Muhammad." *Ural-altaische Jahrbucher*, 56 (1984), 1–61.}

—— *Bāburnāme*. Facsimile ed. A. S. Beveridge as *The Bábar-náma*. Leiden, 1905. {Ed. Eiji Mano as *Bâbur-nâma (Vaqâyi') I: Critical Edition Based on Four Chaghatay Texts; II: Concordance and Classified Indexes*. 2 vols. Kyoto, 1995–96. English trans. Wheeler Thackston. Oxford, 1996.}

Badā'ūnī, 'Abd al-Qādir. *Muntakhab al-tawārīkh*. Calcutta, 1868. {Partial English trans. of the 1925 Calcutta edn by George Ranking *et al.* 3 vols. Karachi, 1976–8.}

Baḥr al-wilāya. MS in Hâlis Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul. According to Köprülü, this is an elementary work of no importance.

[Bala, Mirza. "Kopuz." *İA*.]

Al-Balādhurī. *Futūḥ al-buldān*. Leiden, 1866. {English trans. Philip Hitti and F. C. Murgotten as *The Origins of the Islamic State*. 2 vols. New York, 1914–24.}

{Baldick, J. "Uways al-Ḳaranī." *EI²*.}

{Balivet, Michel. *Islam mystique et révolution armée dans les Balkans ottomans: vie du Cheikh Bedreddîn le "Hallâj des turcs" (1358/59–1416)*. Istanbul, 1995.}

[Banarlı, N. S. *Resimli Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (An illustrated history of Turkish literature). Istanbul, 1948.]

Barbier de Meynard, C. A. (ed.). *Dictionnaire géographique, historique et littéraire de la Perse et des contrées adjacentes*. Paris, 1861.

—— *Le Boustan, ou Verger; poem persan de Saadi; traduit pour la premièr fois en français* . . . Paris, 1880.

Barthold, W. *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*. Russian edn 2 vols. St Petersburg, 1898–1900. {English trans., 1928; revised, London, 1968.}

—— "Balāsāg̲h̲ūn." *EI¹*.

—— "Bu̲k̲hārā." *EI¹*.

—— "Burhān." *EI¹*.

—— "Fārāb." *EI¹*.

—— "G̲huzz." *EI¹*.

{Barthold, W. and B. Spuler. "Awliyā Ata." *EI²*.}

{—— "Farāb." *EI²*.}

{Başgöz, İlhan. "From Gosan to Ozan." *International Journal of Central Asian Studies*, 2 (1997), 5–13.}

{Bashir, Shahzad. "Enshrining Divinity: The Death and Memorialization of Faẓlallāh Astarābādī in Ḥurūfī Thought." *Muslim World*, 90 (2000), 289–308.}

{Bausani, A. "Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī." *EI²*.}
{—— "Ḥurūfiyya." *EI²*.}
{Bayram, Mikâil. *Ahi Evren ve ahi teşkilâtının kuruluşu* [Akhī Evren and the establishment of the Akhī organization]. Konya, 1991.}
{—— *Tarih ışığında Nasreddin Hoca ve Ahi Evren* [Nāṣir al-Dīn Khwāja and Akhī Evren in the light of history]. Istanbul, 2001.}
{Bayram, S. "Selçuklu vakfiyeleri üzerine bazı düşünceler" [Some thoughts on Seljuk *waqfiyyas*]. In *IV. Milli Selçuklu Kültür ve Medeniyeti Semineri Bildirileri*. Konya, 1995, pp. 135–47.}
{Baysun, Cavid. "Evliya Çelebî." *İA*.}
{Beldiceanu-Steinherr, I. "Hüdā'ī." *EI²*.}
Berezin, I. *Recherches sur les dialectes musulmans*. Kazan, 1848.
{Bernardini, Michele. "Solṭan Jomjome et Jesus le Paraclet." Benjamin Lellouch and Stéphane Yerasimos (eds), *Les traditions apocalyptiques au tournant de la chute de Constantinople*. Paris, 1999, pp. 35–53.}
Beyâtî Shaikh Mahmûd. *Jām-i jam āyīn*. Composed from the *Oghuznāme*. Pub. Alî Emîrî Efendi. Istanbul, 1331/1913. {A modern Turkish trans. is included in Atsız, *Osmanli tarihleri*. Istanbul, 1949.}
Bianchi, T. *Dictionnaire Turc-Français*. 2 vols. Paris, 1871.
{Blachère, R. *et al.* "Ghazal." *EI²*.}
Blochet, E. *Introduction à l'histoire des mongols*. *Gibb Memorial Series*, Old Series vol. 18. London, 1911.
—— "Études sur l'histoire religieuse de l'Iran: (1) De l'influence de la religion mazdéenne sur les croyances des peuples turcs. (2) L'ascension au ciel du prophète Mohammed." *RHR*, 38 (1898), 26–63; 40 (1899), 1–25, 203–36. Turkish trans. of the first part as "Mazda'izmin Türk kavimlerinin i'tikadları üzerinde tesiri." *MTM*, 1 (1331/1913), 125–61.
{—— "Christianisme et mazdéisme chez les Turks orientaux." *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 27 (1929–30), 31–125.}
{De Boer, Tj. and L. Gardet. "'Ālam." *EI²*.}
{Bombaci, Alessio. *Storia della letteratura turca*. Milan, 1956.}
[Boratav, Pertev. "Battal." *İA*.]
{—— "Māni." *EI²*.}
{—— "Ozan." *EI²*.}
{Borovkov, A. K. "Ocherki po istorii uzbekskogo iazyka (Opredelenie iazyka khikmatov Akhmada Iasevi)" [Studies on the history of the Uzbek language (Determination of the language of the *ḥikmats* of Aḥmad Yasawī]. *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie* [Soviet Oriental Studies], 5 (1948), 229–50.}
{Bosworth, C. E. *The New Islamic Dynasties*. New York, 1996.}
{—— "Saldjukids." *EI²*.}
{—— "Sıghnāḳ." *EI²*.}
{—— "Ṭarāz." *EI²*.}
{—— "Asfīdjāb." *EIr*.}
{—— "Balāsāgūn." *EIr*.}
[Bouvat, L. "La Presse Ottomane." *Revue du Monde Musulman*, 38 (1920), 217–44.]
{Böwering, G. "Abū Sa'īd . . . Abī'l-Ḵayr." *EIr*.}
{—— "Baqā' wa Fanā'." *EIr*.}
{Bregel, Yu. "Mangıshlak." *EI²*.}

Brockelmann, C. *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*. 2nd edn. Leipzig, 1909.
—— *'Ali's Qissa'i Jusuf, der älteste Vorläufer der osmanischen Litteratur*. In *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, no. 5. Berlin, 1917.
{—— "Newa'is Biographien türkischer und zeitgenössischer Mystiker." J. Fück (ed.), *Documenta Islamica Inedita (Festschrift R. Hartmann)*. Berlin, 1952, pp. 221–49.}
{—— "Kalīla wa-Dimna." *EI²*.}
{De Bruijn, J. T. P. "Sanā'ī." *EI²*.}
{Buhl, Fr. "Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya." *EI²*.}
[Buluç, Sâdettin. "Şeyyad Hamza." *İA*.]
Al-Burghāzī, Yaḥyā Ibn al-Khalīl. *Futuwwatnāme*. MS in Köprülü's private library. Another in the possession of Mehmed Ârif.
{Burrill, Kathleen. "Sheyyād Ḥamza." *EI²*.}
{Çağatay, Neşet. *Bir Türk kurumu olan ahilik* [The *akhīs*, a Turkish association]. Ankara, 1989.}
Çaghatay-Farsî lugati. MS in the Istanbul University Library copied from a MS in the Pest Academy Library.
{Cahen, Cl. *Pre-Ottoman Turkey*. New York, 1968.}
{—— "Note sur les débuts de la futuwwa d'an-Nāṣir." *Oriens*, 6 (1953), 18–22.}
{—— *et al*. "Futuwwa." *EI²*.}
{—— *et al*. "Ghuzz." *EI²*.}
Cahun, Leon. *Introduction à l'histoire de l'asie, les turcs et les mongoles*. Paris, 1896.
{Calmard, Jean. "Ḏū'l-Faqār." *EIr*.}
{Calmard, J. *et al*. "Ṣadr." *EI²*.}
[Canard, M. "Al-Baṭṭāl." *EI²*.]
Capus, G. *A travers le royaume de Tamerlan* . . . Paris, 1892.
Carra de Vaux, Bernard. *Avicenne*. Paris, 1900. {Reprinted Amsterdam, 1974.}
—— *Gazali*. Paris, 1902.
—— "Djalāl al-Dīn Rūmī." *EI¹*.
Cemâlü'd-Dîn Velidî Efendi. *Tatar edebiyatnın barışı* [The reconciliation of Tatar literature]. Orenburg, 1912.
{Çetin, Nihad M. "Laṭīfī." *EI²*.}
Chavannes, E. *Documents sur les Tou-Kioue (Turcs) occidentaux*. St Petersburg, 1903.
{Chittick, William. *The Sufi Path of Knowledge*. Albany, NY, 1989.}
{—— *The Self-disclosure of God*. Albany, NY, 1998.}
{—— "Ṣadr al-Din al-Ḳūnawī." *EI²*.}
{—— "Waḥdat al-Shuhūd." *EI²*.}
{Cler, J. "Saz." *EI²*.}
{Cunbur, Müjgân. "Evliyâ Çelebi Seyâhatnâmesi'nde Ahmed Yesevî" [Aḥmad Yasawī in the *Seyāḥatnāme* of Evliyā Chelebi]. *Erdem*, vol. 7, no. 21 (1995), 887–917.}
{Dankoff, Robert. *An Evliya Çelebi Glossary*. Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 1991.}
{—— "Kāshgharī on the Tribal and Kinship Organization of the Turks." *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 4 (1972), 23–43.}
{—— "Three Turkic Verse Cycles Relating to Inner Asian Warfare." *Harvard Ukranian Studies*, 3–4 (1979–80), part 1, pp. 151–65.}
{—— "On Nature in Karakhanid Literature." *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 4 (1980), 27–35.}
{—— "Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥādjib." *EI²*.}
Darmesteter, J. *Les Origines de la poésie persane*. Paris, 1887.

Davids, Arthur Lumley. *A Grammar of the Turkish Language*. London, 1832. French trans. Sarah Davids as *Grammaire turke*. London, 1836.

Dawlat-Shāh. *Tadhkirat al-shuʿarā'*. Ed. E. G. Browne. London, 1901.

Dede Korkut (or Korkut Ata). *Kītāb-ı Dede Korkut*. Ed. Kilisli Rifat. Istanbul, 1334/1916. {Ed. Muharrem Ergin as *Dede Korkut Kītâbı*. Ankara, 1964. Best edn Semih Tezcan and Hendrik Boeschoten as *Dede Korkut Oğuznameleri*. Istanbul, 2001. English trans. Geoffrey Lewis as *The Book of Dede Korkut*. Harmondsworth, 1974.} According to Köprülü, the Rifat edition was copied from the Berlin MS. He adds that it is obvious that Korkut Ata was not a historical figure and that this book can be considered a remnant of the old *Oghuz Destanı*. Only tradition attributes it to Dede Korkut. He states that after ordering a copy of the original Dresden MS of *Kītab-ı Dede Korkut*, he had wanted to publish a corrected version of it together with one or two other sections of the *Oghuznāme* that he had obtained. Indeed, he had done the necessary preliminary work for this, writing a long introduction that included extensive historical information on the *Oghuz Destanı* and a detailed bibliography. He had also prepared a separate glossary of the old Turkish words in this work. Unfortunately, he was never able to complete this project.

{Dedes, Y. *Battalname*. English trans. and Turkish transcription. Cambridge, MA, 1996.}

Defrémery, C. "Fragments de géographes et d'historiens arabes et persans inédits relatifs aux anciens peuples du Caucase et de la Russie méridionale." *JA*, 4th series, 13 (1849), 457–522; 14 (1849), 447–513; 16 (1850), 50–75, 153–201; 17 (1851), 105–62.

{DeWeese, Devin. *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition*. University Park, PA, 1994.}

{—— "Yasavian Legends on the Islamization of Turkistan." Denis Sinor (ed.), *Aspects of Altaic Civilization III*. Bloomington, IN, 1990, pp. 1–19.}

{—— "Bābā Kamāl Jandī and the Kubravī Tradition among the Turks of Central Asia." *Der Islam*, 71 (1994), 58–94.}

{—— "The Descendants of Sayyid Ata and the Rank of Naqīb in Central Asia." *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 1115 (1995), 612–34.}

{—— "The Mashā'ikh-i Turk and the Khojagān: Rethinking the Links between the Yasavī and Naqshbandī Sufi Traditions." *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 7 (1996), 180–207.}

{—— "Yasavī Šayḫs in the Timurid Era: Notes on the Social and Political Role of Communal Sufi Affiliations in the 14th and 15th Centuries." Michele Bernardini (ed.), *La civiltà timuride come fenomeno internazionale*. Rome, 1996, pp. 173–88.}

{—— "The Politics of Sacred Lineages in 19th-century Central Asia: Descent Groups Linked to Khwaja Ahmad Yasavi in Shrine Documents and Genealogical Charters." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 31 (1999), 507–30.}

{—— "The Yasavī Order and Persian Hagiography in Seventeenth-century Central Asia: ʿĀlim Shaykh of ʿAlīyābād and his *Lamaḥāt min nafaḥāt al-quds*." Leonard Lewisohn and David Morgan (eds), *The Heritage of Sufism*, vol. 3, *Late Classical Persianate Sufism (1501–1750), The Safavid and Mughal Period*. Oxford, 1999, pp. 389–414.}

{—— "Dog Saints and Dog Shrines in Kubravī Tradition: Notes on a Hagiographical Motif from Khwārazm." Denise Aigle (ed.), *Miracle et karāma: Hagiographies médiévales comparées*. Turnhout, Belgium, 2000, pp. 459–97.}

{—— "Sacred Places and 'Public' Narratives: The Shrine of Aḥmad Yasavī in Hagiographical Traditions of the Yasavī Sufi Order, 16th–17th Centuries." *Muslim World*, 90 (2000), 353–76.}

{—— "Aḥmad Yasavī and the Dog-Men: Narratives of Hero and Saint at the Frontier of Orality and Textuality." Proceedings from a conference on "Theoretical Approaches

to the Transmission and Edition of Oriental Manuscripts" (Orient-Institut der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Istanbul. Forthcoming.}

{Doğramacı, Baha. *Niyazi-yi Mısri hayatı ve eserleri* [Niyāzī Miṣrī, his life and works]. Ankara, 1988.}

Dozy, R. *Essai sur l'histoire de l'Islamisme*. Leiden, 1879. {Reprinted Amsterdam, 1966.} Turkish trans. Abdullah Cevdet as *Tarih-i islâmiyet*. 2 vols. Cairo, 1908.

Dubeux, Louis. *Tartarie, Béloutchistan, Boutan et Népal*. Paris, 1848.

Edhem, Halil. *Kayseriye şehri* [The city of Kayseri]. Istanbul, 1334/1915–16.

Editors. "Baṭṭāl." *EI*[1].

[Editors. "Hurûfîlik." *İA*.]

{Elwell-Sutton, L. P. "'arūż." *EIr*.}

{Eraslan, Kemal. *Ahmed-i Yesevî, Dîvân-ı Hikmet'ten seçmeler* [Selections from the *Dīwān-i Ḥikmat* of Aḥmad Yasawī]. Ankara, 1983.}

{—— "Yûsuf Hâs Hâcib." *İA*.}

{Ergun, Sadettin Nüzhet. *Bektaşi edebiyatı antolojisi* [Anthology of Bektashī literature]. 3 vols. Istanbul, 1955–6.}

{Ernst, Carl W. *Words of Ecstasy in Sufism*. Albany, NY, 1985.}

Eşrefoğlu. *Muzakkī'l-nufūs*. Istanbul, 1281/1865. {Modern Turkish trans. Abdullah Uçman as *Müzekki'n-Nüfûs*. Istanbul, 1996.}

—— *Dīwān*. Istanbul, 1286/1869–70.

{Esin, Emel. "Ahmed Yesevî Külliyesi" [The Aḥmad Yasawī complex]. *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul, 1988.}

Esrār Dede. *Tadhkirat-i shu'arā'*. MS in Köprülü's private library.

Ethé, H. *Die Fahrten des Sajjid Battâl*. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1871.

—— *Catalogue of Persian, Turkish, Hindustani and Pushtu Manuscripts* (in the Bodleian). Part 13, vols 1, 3. Oxford, 1889–1954.

Evliyā Chelebi. *Seyāḥatnāme*. 6 vols. Istanbul, 1314–18/1896–1900. {Books 1–3, Bağdat Köşkü MSS 304–5, Topkapı Sarayı, Istanbul.}

{—— *Evliya Çelebis Anatolienreise aus dem dritten Band des Seyahatname*. Ed. and German trans. Korkut Bugday. Leiden, 1996.}

[Eyice, Semavi. "Çorum'un Mecidözü'nde Âşık Paşa-Oğlu Elvan Çelebi zâviyesi" (The *zāwiya* of 'Āshıq Pasha-Oghlu Elvan Chelebi at Mecidöz near Çorum). *TM*, 15 (1969), 211–44.]

Faḍl Allāh Ḥurūfī. *Jāwidān*. MS in Köprülü's private library.

Fâik, Reşad. *Tarih-i edebiyat-ı osmâniyye* [A history of Ottoman literature]. Istanbul, 1329/1911.

{Fakhr al-Dīn 'Irāqī. *Lama'āt*. English trans. William Chittick and Peter Lamborn Wilson as *Divine Flashes*. New York, 1982.}

Faqīrī. *Risāla-i ta'rīfāt*. MS in Köprülü's private library.

{Farah, C. E. "Ibn al-Naḏjḏjār." *EI*[2].}

{Faroqhi, Suraiya. *Der Bektaschi-Orden in Anatolien*. Vienna, 1981.}

{—— "The Life Story of an Urban Saint in the Ottoman Empire." *Tarih Dergisi*, 32 (1979), 655–78.}

{Feldman, Walter. "Interpreting the Poetry of Mäkhtumquli." Jo-Ann Gross (ed.), *Muslims in Central Asia: Expressions of Identity and Change*. Durham, NC, 1992, pp. 167–89.}

Ferid Bey. *Vahdet-i vücûd* [Unity of being]. Istanbul, 1331/1913.

Ferîdûn Bey. *Müşeat-ı selâtîn* [The writings of the sultans]. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1274/1857–8.

{Fernandes, Leonor. *The Evolution of a Sufi Institution in Mamluk Egypt: the Khanqah*. Berlin, 1988.}

Firdawsī. *Shāhnāme*. Text and French trans. J. Mohl as *Le Livre des rois* . . . 7 vols. Paris, 1838–78. Translation alone, 1876–8.

Fīrūzābādī, Muḥammad b. Yaʿqūb. *Al-Qāmūs al-muḥīṭ*. Turkish trans. Ahmed Âsım Ayintabi as *al-Ūqiyānūs al-basīṭ fī tarjamat al-qāmūs al-muḥīṭ*. 3 vols. Istanbul, 1268–72/1851–5.

Fleischer, H. *Kleinere Schriften*. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1885–8.

{Flemming, Barbara. "Yūsuf and Zulaykhā," part 2, Turkish Literature. *EI²*.}

{Fletcher, J. "Aḥmad Kʿājagī b. Jalāl-al-Dīn." *EIr*.}

Flügel, G. *Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der Kaiserl.-Königl. Hofbibliothek zu Wien*. 3 vols. Vienna, 1865–7.

{de Fouchecour, C.-H. *et al*. "Rubāʿī." *EI²*.}

Foy, K. "Die ältesten osmanischen Transscriptionstexte in gothischen Lettern; zugleich eine Beitrag zur altosmanischen Literatur." *Berlin Universität, Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, Mitteilungen, Westasiatische Studien*, 4 (1901), 230–77; 5 (1902), 233–93.

Fraehn, C. *Indications bibliographiques relatives pour la plupart à la littérature historico-géographique des arabs, des persans et des turcs* . . . St Petersburg, 1845.

Franck, Adolphe. *Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques*. 2nd edn. Paris, 1875.

{Frank, Allen J. *Islamic Historiography and "Bulghar" Identity among the Tatars and Bashkirs of Russia*. Leiden, 1998.}

{—— "Islamic Shrine Catalogues and Communal Geography in the Volga–Ural Region: 1788–1817." *Journal of Islamic Studies*, 7 (1996), 265–86.}

{Franke, Patrick. *Begegnungen mit Khidr*. Beirut, 2000.}

Galib, İsmail. *Takvîm-i meskûkât-i selçûkiyye* [Catalogue of Seljuk coins]. Istanbul, 1309/1891.

{Gandjeï, T. *Il Canzoniere de Šāh Ismāʿīl Ḫaṭā'ī*. Naples, 1959.}

{—— "Ismāʿīl I: His Poetry." *EI²*.}

Ghaibī, Ṣunʿ Allāh. *Suḥbatnāme-i Ghaibī*. MS in Hâşim Pasha Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul.

—— *Kashf al-ghiṭā'*. MS in Köprülü's private library.

Ghujduwānī, ʿAbd al-Khāliq. *Maqāmāt-i Yūsuf Hamadānī*. Appended to Ḥarīrī-Zāde's *Tibyān-i wasā'il al-ḥaqā'iq*. Ibrahim Ağa MS 432 in the Fatih Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul.

Gibb, E. J. W. *A History of Ottoman Poetry*. 6 vols. London, 1900–9. Turkish trans. Fuad Raif five folios of the first volume as *Eş'âr-i osmânîye tarihi*. Abdü'l-Ahad Dâvud translated the section on Yūnus Emre.

Giese, F. "Türk elsine ve tarihine dâir bazı yeni alman neşriyatı" [Some recent German publications on Turkish languages and history]. *Dârülfünûn Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 1 (1332–4), 286–94.

Glück, Heinrich. *Türkische Kunst*. Budapest and Constantinople, 1917. Turkish trans. Ahmed Cemal as "Türk sanʿatı." *YM*, 1918, no. 59, pp. 129–32; no. 60, pp. 149–52; no. 61, pp. 168–72.

Gobineau, J. A. *Les Religions et les philosophies dans l'asie centrale*. Paris, 1866. {Reprinted Paris, 1953.}

de Goeje, M. J. *Bibliotheca Geographorum Arabicorum*. 8 vols. Leiden, 1870–94.

Gökalp, Ziyâ. *Yeni hayât* [Modern life]. Istanbul, 1918.

{Gökyay, Orhan. *Dedem Korkudun kitabı* [The book of Dede Korkut]. Istanbul, 1973.}

{—— "Cönkler üzerine" [On *cönks*]. *Folklor ve Etnografya Araştırmaları*, (1984), 107–65.}

{Golden, Peter. *An Introduction to the History of the Turkic Peoples*. Wiesbaden, 1992.}

{—— "The Migrations of the Oğuz." *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 4 (1972), 45–84.}

{—— "Sayrām." *EI²*.}

{Gölpınarlı, Abdülbâki. *Yunus Emre: Risâlat al-nushiyya ve Dîvân* [Yūnus Emre: the *Risalāt al-nushiyya* and *Dīwān*]. Istanbul, 1965.}

{—— *Türk tasavvuf şiiri antolojisi* [Anthology of Turkish mystical poetry]. Istanbul, 1972.}

[—— *Hurûfîlik metinleri kataloğu* (Catalogue of Ḥurūfī texts). Ankara, 1973.]

{—— "Les Organisations de la Futuvvet dans les Pays Musulmans et Turcs et ses Origines." *Revue de la Faculté des sciences économiques de l'Université d'Istanbul*, 11 (1949–50), 5–49. Longer version as "İslam ve Türk illerinde fütüvvet teşkilâtı ve kaynakları." *İstanbul Üniversitesi Iktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 11 (1949–50 [1953]), 3–354.}

{—— "Hurûfîlik ve Mîr-i 'alam Celâl Bek'in bir mektubu" [Ḥurūfism and a letter of Mīr-i 'ālem Jalāl Bek]. *TM*, 14 (1965), 93–110.}

{—— "Bayramiye." *İA*.}

{—— "Djilwatiyya." *EI*^{2}.}

La Grande Encyclopédie. 31 vols. Paris, 1886–1902.

Grenard, F. *Le Turkestan et le Tibet*. Part 2 of J.-L. Dutreuil de Rhins (ed.), *Mission scientifique dans la haute asie*. 3 vols. Paris, 1897–8.

—— "La légende de Satok Boghra Khân et l'histoire." *JA*, 9th series, 15 (1900), 5–79.

{Gross, Jo-Ann. "Multiple Roles and perceptions of a Sufi Shaikh: Symbolic Statements of Political and Religious Authority." Marc Gaborieau, Alexandre Popovic, and Thierry Zarcone eds. *Naqshbandîs: cheminements et situation actuelle d'un ordre mystique musulman*. Istanbul, 1990, pp. 109–21.}

{Gross, Jo-Ann and Asom Urunbaev. *Letters of Khwājah 'Ubayd Allāh Aḥrār and His Associates*. Leiden, 2002.}

de Guignes, J. *Histoire général des huns, des turcs, des mongols et des autres tartares occidentaux*. 4 vols. Paris, 1756–8.

Gülbün-i khānān. Istanbul, 1287/1870–1.

Gülshehrī. *Manṭiq al-ṭair*. MSS in the Istanbul Archeology Museum Library and Hâlis Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul. Facsimile edn Ankara, 1957.

Guyard, St. "Fragments relatifs à la doctrine des ismaélis." *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, 22 i (1874), 177–428.

{Güzel, Abdurrahman. *Kaygusuz Abdal'ın mensur eserleri* [Qaygusuz Abdāl's prose works]. Ankara, 1983.}

{—— *Abdal Mûsâ Velâyetnâmesi*. Ankara, 1999.}

{Haarmann, U. "Turkish Legends in the Popular Historiography of Medieval Egypt." *Proceedings of the VI Congress of Arabic and Islamic Studies . . . 1972*. Uppsala, 1975, pp. 97–107.}

Habîb Efendi. *Düstûr-i suhan*. Istanbul, 1309/1891–2.

Hacı Kemal. *Jāmi' al-nazā'ir*. Unique MS in Beyazıt Umumi Library in Istanbul.

{Hacıeminoğlu, M. Necmettin. *Kutb'un Husrev ü Şirin'i ve dil hususiyetleri* [The books of Khusraw and Shīrīn and their linguistic features]. Istanbul, 1968.}

Hâfiz Hüseyin Ayvansarayî. *Ḥadīqat al-jawāmi'*. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1281/1864. {English trans. Howard Crane as *The Garden of the Mosques: Hafiz Hüseyin al-Ayvansarayî's Guide to the Muslim Monuments of Ottoman Istanbul*. Leiden, 2000.}

Ḥāfiẓ-i Abrū. *Zubdat al-tawārīkh* (or *Majma' al-tawārīkh*). MS in Damad Ibrahim Pasha Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul.

Ḥājjī Bektash Veli. *Velâyetnâme-i Ḥājjī Bektash Veli*. MS in Köprülü's private library. {German trans. E. Gross as *Das Vilâyet-nâme des Haggi Bektasch*. Leipzig, 1927. Ed. A. Gölpınarlı as *Manakib-i Hacı Bektaş-i Veli "Vilâyet-Nâme."* Istanbul, 1958.} Versified version by Nihānī also in Köprülü's library.

Ḥājjim Sulṭān. *Velāyetnāme-i Ḥājjim Sulṭān*. Ed. R. Tschudi as *Das Velayet-name des Hadschim Sultan*. Leipzig, 1914.

Ḥakîm Ata. See Sulaimān Ata.

Ḥakîm Ata kitâbı. (Anonymous). Kazan, 1901.

{Halasi-Kun, Tibor. *La Langue des Kiptchaks d'après un manuscrit arab d'Istanbul*. Budapest, 1942.}

Al-Ḥallāj, Manṣūr. *Kitāb al-Ṭawāsīn*. Ed. L. Massignon. Paris, 1913. French trans. by Massignon in vol. 3 of his *La Passion d'al-Ḥusayn-ibn-Manṣour al-Ḥallāj*. Paris, 1922.

Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī Qazwīnī. *Ta'rīkh-i guzīda*. Facsimile ed. E. G. Browne. Leiden, 1910. {New edn ʿAbd al-Ḥusayn Navā'ī. Tehran, 1362/1983 or 1984.}

von Hammer(-Purgstall), Joseph. *Geschichte der Assasinen*. Stuttgart, 1818. French trans. J. Hellert as *Histoire de l'ordre des assasins*. Paris, 1833.

—— *Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches*. 10 vols. Budapest, 1827–35. Turkish trans. Mehmet Ata as *Devlet-i osmaniyye tarihi*. 10 vols. Istanbul, 1329–37/1911–19.

—— *Geschichte der osmanischen Dichtkunst bis auf unsere Zeit*. 4 vols. Budapest, 1836–8.

—— *Geschichte der Ilchane* (a trans. of Juvainī). 2 vols. Darmstadt, 1842–3.

Ḥarīrī-Zāde, Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad. *Tibyān-i wasā'il al-ḥaqā'iq fī bayān salāsil al-ṭarā'iq*. Ibrahim Ağa MSS 430–2 in the Mulhak Fatih Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul. Arabic MS in three large volumes. The author's biography and his works are given in Bursalı Tâhir's *Osmanlı müellifleri*, vol. 1, pp. 155–9. According to Köprülü, this is a very valuable work that gives the biographies of the *pīrs* of some 150 Ṣūfī *ṭarīqas* and describes the nature of the *ṭarīqas* that they founded. If published, it would be a fundamental source for the history of Ṣūfism.

{van Harnack, Adolf and John Malcolm Mitchell. "Neoplatonism." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1955.}

{Hartmann, Angelika. *an-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (1180–1225): Politik, Religion, Kultur in der späten ʿAbbāsidenzeit*. Berlin, 1975.}

{—— "Muʿīn al-Dīn . . . Yazdī." *EI²*.}

{—— "Al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh." *EI²*.}

Hartmann, M. "Der čaghataische Diwan Huwedas herausgegeben und übersetzt von M. Hartmann." *Berlin Universität, Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, Mitteilungen, Westasiatische Studien*, 5 (1902), 132–55.

{—— "Mešreb der weise Narr und fromme Ketzer: Ein zentralasiatisches Volksbuch." *Der islamische Orient*. Vol. 5. Berlin, 1902.}

Ḥashmet. *Sanad al-shuʿarā'*. MS in Köprülü's private library.

Hātifī. *Tīmūrnāme* (or *Ẓafarnāme*). Many MSS. Köprülü says he describes the author and his work in his *Timurlular devrinde orta-asya Türk edebiyatı* [Central Asian Turkish literature in the Tīmūrid period], but no work under that title was ever published. {See Storey-Bregel', *Persidskaia literatura*, vol. 2, pp. 808–12.}

Hayrullâh Efendi. *Tarih-i âl-i osmân* (rather, *Dawlat-i ʿaliyya-i ʿuthmāniyya ta'rīkhi*). 18 vols. Istanbul, 1271–92/1854–75.

Ḥazīnī. *Jawāhir al-abrār min amwāj al-biḥār*. Unique MS in the Hâlis Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul {now in the Istanbul University Library, MS TY 3893}. {Ed. Cihan Okuyucu. Kayseri, 1995.} According to Köprülü, this work is a primary source on Aḥmad Yasawī, and even more on the special rules of etiquette of the Yasawiyya, but was completely unknown to date {1918} to the scholarly world. He goes on to state that this important work is not mentioned in Kâtib Chelebi's *Kashf al-zunūn*. The manuscript was copied in a beautiful *thulth* style by Maḥmūd b. Ḥasan b.

Shaikh al-Naqshbandī. He completed it on a Saturday in Rabīʿ al-awwal 1002/1593. It is a book composed of 324 large pages and is divided into two sections. One section of 221 pages is in Turkish. The other, some pages of which are missing, is in Persian. This work was written during the reign of Murad III {1574–95} by a Yasawī Dervish named Ḥazīnī. Both sections are on the same subject. This work describes the legendary deeds of Aḥmad Yasawī, the rules of etiquette of his *ṭarīqa*, and then of his Ṣūfī path {*suluk*}. The first part of the Persian section is written completely in verse. According to what Köprülü gleaned from this work, Ḥazīnī was in fact a Turkistanī Turk. He lived at a time when the Ṣūfī movement was at the height of its strength in Central Asia and he was overcome with mystical ecstasy when only twelve years old. Shortly thereafter he met Sayyid Manṣūr Qashıq-tırâsh and studied under him. He read the legendary deeds of the Ṣūfī saints and learned the rules of the Ṣūfī path. Finally, when he was nineteen years old, he received permission from his shaikh to don the *tāj* {dervish headgear}, *kemer* {girdle}, and *khirqa* {dervish patched cloak} and to write the legends of the saints. In the Persian section, there are many legends and stories about this Sayyid Manṣūr al-Balkhī, then {*thumma*} al-Ḥiṣārī and al-Bukhārī {i.e. he had resided in each of these places}, who, indirectly, had been a *murīd* of Shaikh Süleyman Ghaznawī. Ḥazīnī lived in various places in Transoxiana but then, for some reason, decided to leave. In the reign of Selim II, he went to Istanbul and settled there. Aware of the esteem and respect given to the Ṣūfīs during the reign of Murad III, Ḥazīnī wrote this book in order to present it to the sultan. Köprülü did not find him mentioned in any source from that period. According to Köprülü, Ḥazīnī also states that the title of the book, *Jawāhir al-abrār min amwāj al-biḥār*, points to the date of writing it (i.e. constitutes a chronogram). In any case, this work is an extremely important source for our subject. Köprülü attached to the present work a chart showing Ḥazīnī's chain of authorities for the Yasawī *ṭarīqa* starting with Zangī Bābā.

—— *Mecmua-i Hazînî*. Tashkent, 1329/1911.

Hezārfenn Ḥusain. *Tanqīḥ tawārīkh al-mulūk*. MS in Köprülü's private library. {See *EI*[2], s.v. "Ḥusayn Hezarfenn" (V. L. Ménage).}

{Hillenbrand, Carole. "Muʿīn al-Dīn Parwāna: the Servant of Two Masters?" F. de Jong (ed.), *Miscellanea Arabica et Islamica: Dissertationes in Academia Ultrajectina prolatae anno MCMXC*. Leuven, 1993, pp. 267–74.}

{Hillenbrand, Robert. "The Mausoleum of ʿĀ'isha Bibi and the Central Asian Tradition of Funerary Architecture." *Journal of Turkish Studies*, 18 (1994), 111–20.}

{Hofman, H. F. *Turkish Literature, a Bio-bibliographical Survey. Section III. Moslim Central Asian Turkish Literature Being in the Main a List of "Chaghatayan" Authors and Works in "Chaghatay" as Registered in Professor M. F. Köprülü's Article: "Çagatay edebiyatı," İA. Vol. 3 (270–) with some additions (Navāʾīāna, however, excepted)*. Utrecht, 1969.}

{—— "Maḵẖdūm Ḳulī." *EI*[2].}

Houtsma, Th. (ed.) *Tarjumān-i turkī wa ʿarabī* as *Ein türkisch-arabisches Glossar*. Leiden, 1894.

—— "Ein alttürkisches Gedicht: (eine vorislamische Bearbeitung des biblischen Romans von Joseph und Zulaika; aus der Dresdner Handschrift herausgegeben und überstetzt)." *ZDMG*, 43 (1889), 69–98.

Howorth, H. *History of the Mongols*. 4 vols. London, 1880–8.

Huart, Cl. *Konia: La Ville des derviches tourneurs*. Paris, 1897.

—— *Histoire de la littérature arab*. Paris, 1902. {English trans. *A History of Arabic Literature*. London, 1903. Reprinted Beirut, 1966.}

—— *Textes persans relatifs à la secte des houroufis*. Leiden, 1909.

—— *Histoire des arabes*. 2 vols. Paris, 1912–13.
—— "Les Zindîqs en droit musulman." *Actes du 11^e Congrès International des Orientalistes (1897)*, 3rd section, pp. 69–92.
—— "Perse." *La Grande Encyclopédie*.
—— A review of R. A. Nicholson, *The Kashf al-mahjúb. The Oldest Persian Treatise on Ṣúfism*. *JA*, 11th series, 3 (1914), 186–8.
[—— "Les Anciens derviches turcs" (a review of *Early Mystics*). *Journal des Savants*, new series, 20 (1922), 5–18. Turkish trans. Râgıp Hulûsî in *TM*, 1 (1925), 267–80.]
[—— Another review of *Early Mystics*. *JA*, 202 (1923), 146–50.]
{Huart, Cl. and Kathleen Burrill. "Ṣarı ʿAbd Allāh Efendi." *EI²*.}
[Hulûsî (Sayman), Şerif. *Ord. Prof. Dr Fuad Köprülü'nün yazıları için bir bibliyografya (1913–1934)* (A bibliography of the writings of Ordinarius Prof. Dr Fuad Köprülü [1913–1934]). Istanbul, 1934. 2nd edn as *Ord. Prof. Dr Fuad Köprülü'nün yazıları için bir bibliyografya (1912–1940)*. Istanbul, 1940.]
Ḥusām al-Dīn Muslimī. *Risāla-i tawārīkh-i bulghāriyya*. Kazan, 1902. According to Köprülü, it was written in the tenth/sixteenth century and it is composed entirely of legends. Şihabü'd-Dîn Mercânî severely criticized it in his *Mustafād al-akhbār*, vol. 1, pp. 210–24.
Ḥusām Kātib. *Ḥikāyat-i jamjama sulṭān (Kesikbaş hikâyesi)*. Versified in Chagatay in 777/1375–6. MS in Köprülü's private library.
Hüseyin Dâniş. *Ser-Âmedân-ı Suhan*. Istanbul, 1327/1909.
Hüseyin Hüsâmeddin. *Amasya tarihi* [The history of Amasya]. 5 vols. Istanbul, 1328/1910.
Hüsing, Georg. *Beiträge zur Rostahmsage (Sajjid Battâl)*. Leipzig, 1913.
Ibn Abī Uṣaybiʿa. *'Uyūn al-anbā' fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā'*. Köprülü apparently used the Cairo edn, 1299/1882.
Ibn al-Athīr. *Al-Kāmil fī 'l-ta'rīkh*. Thornberg (ed.). 12 vols. Cairo, 1303/1885–6.
Ibn Baṭṭūṭa. *Al-Riḥla*. Turkish trans. Şerîf Pasha as *Seyāhatnāme*. 3 vols. Istanbul, 1333–5/1914–17. Köprülü also cites the edn by C. Defrémery and B. R. Sanguinetti, *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*. 4 vols. Paris, 1853–8. {English trans. H. A. R. Gibb as *The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa*. 3 vols in 2. Cambridge, 1956–72.}
Ibn Bībī. See Yazıcı-oğlu ʿAlī.
Ibn al-Dawādārī. *Ta'rīkh-i mukhtaṣar*. MS 913 Damad Ibrahim Pasha Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul.
—— *Durar al-tijān*. MS in Istanbul. {Ed. Gunhild Graf as *Die Epitome der Universalchronik Ibn ad-Dawadaris*. Berlin, 1990.}
{—— *Kanz al-durar*. Vol. 7. Ed. Saʿīd ʿAbd al-Fattāḥ ʿĀshūr. Cairo, 1972.}
Ibn al-Faqīh al-Hamadānī. *Kitāb al-buldān*. Ed. M. J. de Goeje. Leiden, 1885.
Ibn Ḥawqal. *Al-Masālik wa 'l-mamālik*. Ed. M. J. de Goeje. Leiden, 1873. {Superseded by J. H. Kramer's edn. Leiden, 1938–9.}
Ibn ʿInaba. *Kitāb 'umdat al-ṭālib*. Bombay, 1318/1900–1.
{Ibn al-Jawzī. *Ṣafwat* (*Ṣifat*) *al-ṣafwa*. 2 vols. Cairo, 1411/1991.}
Ibn Jubair. *Al-Riḥla*, 2nd edn. M. de Goeje. Leiden, 1907.
Ibn Kamāl. See Kemāl Pasha-Zāde.
Ibn Khaldūn. *Muqaddima*. Turkish trans. Pirî-Zâde Mehmed Sâhib Efendi. Beginning through the fifth chapter, 2 vols. Cairo, 1275/1858–9. With sixth and final chapter trans. Ahmet Cevdet, 3 vols. Istanbul, 1277/1860–1. {English trans. Franz Rosenthal. *The Muqaddimah*. 3 vols. Princeton, NJ, 1967.}
—— *Kitāb al-'ibar* (Ibn Khaldūn's history that follows the *Muqaddima*). Turkish trans. Subhî Pasha as *Miftâh ül-iber*. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1276/1859–60.

Ibn Khallikān. *Wafayāt al-aʿyān*. Būlāq, 1299/1881–2. {Ed. Iḥsān ʿAbbās. 8 vols. Beirut, 1968–72. English trans. MacGuckin de Slane as *Ibn Khallikān's Biographical Dictionary*. 4 vols. Paris, 1842–71.}

Ibn Niẓām al-Ḥusaini. *Al-ʿUrāḍa fī ʿl-ḥikāya al-saljūqiyya*. Ed. K. Süssheim as *Das Geschenk aus der Seldschukengeschichte*. Leiden, 1909. Partial Turkish trans. Şerefeddin Yaltkaya. *MTM*, 1 (1331/1915), 257–304, 481–96.

{Ibn al-Ṭiqṭaqā. *Kitāb al-fakhrī*. Published as *Taʾrīkh al-duwal al-islāmiyya*. Beirut, 1960.}

Ibn Yamīn. *Muqaṭṭaʿāt*. Calcutta, 1865.

İbrâhîm Hakkı. *Maʿrifatnâme*. Istanbul, 1294/1877.

Ibrāhīm Tennūrī. *Gulzār-i maʿnawī*. {See Ali Karabulut and Ramazan Yıldız, *Gülzâr-i maʿnevi ve İbrahim Tennûri*. [Kayseri?], 1978.}

{Iqbal, Afzal. *The Life and Work of Jalal-ud-din Rumi*, 3rd rev. edn. Lahore, 1974.}

{Isfarāʾinī, Nūr al-Dīn ʿAbd al-Raḥmān. *Le Révélateur des mystères (Kâshif al-Asrâr)*. Ed. Hermann Landolt. Paris, 1986.}

İshak Efendi. *Kâşifü'l-esrâr ve dâfiʿü'l-eşrâr*. Istanbul, 1290/1873–4.

Ishıq Shamsī. *Dih-mürgnāme*. According to Köprülü, this was written during the reign of Selim and subsequently presented to Süleyman the Magnificent after a few changes and some additions were made. One of the two copies in our possession was written during the reign of Selim and the other during the reign of Süleyman. The information given in the biographical dictionaries {*tadhkiras*} on this work is mistaken.

İsmâʿîl Belig Bursalı. *Güldeste-i riyâz-ı irfân*. Bursa, 1302/1884.

İsmâʿîl Hakkı Bursalı. *Sharḥ-i rumūzāt-i Yūnus Emre*. MS in Köprülü's private library.

—— *Faraḥ al-rūḥ* (*Sharḥ al-muḥammadiyya al-mawsūm bi-Faraḥ al-rūḥ*). Commentary on Yazıcıoğlu Mehmed's *Muḥammadiyya*. Būlāq, 1252/1836.

—— *Silsilanāme-i jalwatī*. Lithograph edn. n.p., 1291/1874.

Iṣṭakhrī. *Masālik al-mamālik*. Ed. M. de Goeje. Leiden, 1870. {Reprinted Leiden, 1927.}

{Ivanov, A. A. "O bronzovykh izdeliiakh kontsa XIV v. iz mavzoleia Khodzhi Akhmeda Iasevi" [On the bronze articles from the end of the fourteenth century from the mausoleum of Khwāja AḥmadYasawī]. B. A. Litvinskii (ed.), *Sredniaia Aziia i ee sosedi v drevnosti i srednevekov'e* [Central Asia and its neighbors in Antiquity and the Middle Ages]. Moscow, 1981, pp. 68–84.}

{İz, Fahir. "Āshıḳ Pasha." *EI²*.}

{—— "Dede Ḳorḳut." *EI²*.}

{—— "Eshrefoghlu." *EI²*, *Supplement*.}

{—— "Ḳayghusuz Abdāl." *EI²*.}

ʿIzzī-Zāde Sayyid ʿAbd al-Laṭīf, Shaikh. *Khulāṣat al-wafayāt*. MS in the Hâşim Pasha Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul.

Jacob, Georg. *Die Bektaschijje im ihrem Verhältnis zu verwandten Erscheinungen*. Munich, 1909.

{Jahn, Karl. *Die Geschichte der Oġuzen des Rašīd ad-Dīn*. Vienna, 1969.}

Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī. *Dīwān-i kabīr* (or *Kulliyyāt-i Shams-i Tabrīz* or *Dīwān-i Shams al-ḥaqāʾiq*). Lucknow, 1302/1885 and Jawnpore, 1912. {Ed. Badīʿ al-Zamān Furūzānfar as *Kulliyāt-i Shams, ya Dīvān-i kabīr*. 10 Vols. Tehran, 1977.} English trans. R. A. Nicholson as *Selected Poems from the Dīvāni Shamsi Tabrīz*. Cambridge, 1895. {Reprinted Cambridge, 1952.}

—— *Mathnawī*. Ed. and English trans. R. A. Nicholson. 8 vols. London, 1925–40.

—— *Fīhi mā fīh*. {Ed. B. Furūzānfar. Tehran, 1338 sh./1959. English trans. A. J. Arberry as *Discourses of Rumi*. London, 1961; and W. Thackston as *Signs of the Unseen: The Discourses of Jalaluddin Rumi*. Putney, VT, 1994.}

Jāmī. *Nafaḥāt al-uns*. Calcutta, 1859. Turkish trans. by Lāmi'ī, who made some additions to the text. Istanbul, 1289/1872–3. {Maḥmūd ʿĀbidī ed. Persian text. Tehran, 1370/1991.}

—— *Silsilat al-dhahab*. Bombay, 1289/1872–3. At the end of *Nafaḥāt al-uns*.

{Jandī, Mu'ayyad al-Dīn. *Sharḥ Fuṣūṣ al-ḥikam*. Ed. Sayyid Jalāl al-Dīn Āshtiyānī. Mashhad, 1361/1982.}

{—— *Nafaḥāt al-rūḥ*. Ed. Najīb Māyil Haravī. Tehran, 1362/1403/1983.}

{Jaubert, Amódée. "Notice d'un manuscrit turc, en charactèrs ouigours, envoyé par M. de Hammer à M. Abel-Rémusat." *JA*, 6 (1825), 39–52, 78–95.}

{Jürgen, Paul. *Die politische und soziale Bedeutung der Naqšbandiyya in Mittelasien im 15. Jahrhundert*. Berlin, 1991.}

{—— "Scheiche und Herrischer im Khanat Čaġatay." *Der Islam*, 67 (1990), 278–321.}

Juvainī. *Ta'rīkh-i Jahān-Gushā*. Ed. Mīrzā Muḥammad Qazvīnī, *Gibb Memorial Series* vol. 16. 3 vols. London, 1912–37. {English trans. J. A. Boyle as *The History of the World Conqueror*. 2 vols. Manchester, 1958.}

{Kahle, P. "Die Futuwwa-Bündnisse des Kalifen en-Nāṣir (d. 622/1225)." Theodor Menzel (ed.), *Festschrift Georg Jacob*. Leipzig, 1932, pp. 112–27.}

{Al-Kalābādhī. *Taʿarruf li-madhhab ahl al-taṣawwuf*. English trans. A. J. Arberry as *The Doctrine of the Sufis*. Cambridge, 1935. Reprinted Lahore, 1966.}

Kamāl al-Dīn Ḥusain Tabasī Gāzurgāhī, Amīr. *Majālis al-ʿushshāq*. Jawnpore, 1897 and MS 4238 in the Aya Sofya Library in Istanbul.

{Kaplan, Mehmed. "Ḥashmet." *EI*^{2}.}

{Kaptein, N. *Muḥammad's Birthday Festival: Early History in the Central Muslim Lands and Development in the Muslim West until the 10th/16th Century*. Leiden, 1993.}

{Kara, Mustafa. *Niyazi-i Mısri*. Ankara, 1994.}

Karakaşzâde Ömer Efendi. *Nûrü'l-hüdâ li-men ihtadâ*. Istanbul, 1286/1869–70.

{Karamustafa, Ahmet T. *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period 1200–1550*. Salt Lake City, 1994.}

Al-Kāshgharī, Maḥmūd. *Dīwān lughāt al-turk*. 3 vols. Istanbul, 1333–5/1915–17. {English trans. Robert Dankoff and James Kelly as *Compendium of the Turkic Dialects*. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA, 1982–5.}

Kāshifī. See Ṣafī.

{Katanov, N. "Materialy k izuchniiu kazansko-tatarskago narechiia" [Materials for the study of the Kazan Tatar dialect]. *Uchenye zapiski Kazanskago Universiteta*, 7–8 (1898).}

Kātib Chelebi. *Jihān-numā*. Istanbul, 1145/1732. {Reprinted Istanbul, 1967.}

—— *Kashf al-zunūn*. According to Köprülü, the Būlāq edition of 1274/1857 in 3 vols is more reliable than the subsequent Istanbul edition.

{Kaya, Idris Güven. *Derviş Şemsi ve Deh Murg Mesnevisi* [Dervish Shamsī and his *Deh Murg Mathnawī*]. Cambridge, MA, 1997.}

Kemāl Pasha-Zāde. *Mohaçnāme* (book 10 of his *Tarih-i āl-i osman*). Ed. and French trans. Abel Pavet de Courteille as *Histoire de la campagne de Mohacz par Kemal Pachazadeh*. Paris, 1859.

Kemal, Mehmed Nâmık. *Tahrîb-i harâbât*. Istanbul, 1301/1883–4 and again in 1304/1886–7. A criticism of the first vol. of Ziya Pasha's anthology *Harâbât* (Istanbul, 1291–2/1874).

{Kemper, Michael. *Sufis und Gelehrte in Tatarien und Baschkirien, 1789–1889: Der islamische Diskurs unter Russischer Herrschaft*. Berlin, 1998.}

"Khalwa," an article signed by "T" and published in the Russian journal *Shūrā* (Orenburg) in March, 1914.

Khaṭā'ī (Shāh Ismā'īl I). *Manāqib al-asrār, bahjat al-aḥrār*. MS in Köprülü's private library. Köprülü states that this work, which includes very important information on the beliefs of the Qızılbash, does not in fact belong to Shāh Ismā'īl.

Khuda Bakhsh, S. "Saifuddīn Bākharzī." *ZDMG*, 59 (1905), 345–54.

Khwāndamīr. *Ḥabīb al-siyar*. 4 vols. Bombay, 1273/1857. {Partial English trans. Wheeler Thackston as *Habibu's-siyar, Tome Three. The Reign of the Mongol and Turk*. 2 vols. Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 1994.}

Khwārazmī. *Maḥabbatnāme*. MSS in the Alî Emirî Efendi Library, which is in the Fatih Millet Library in Istanbul, and in the British Museum. {Ed. A. M. Shcherbak as *Oguz-nāme. Mukhabbat-nāme* (in Russian). Moscow, 1959.}

Kınalı-Zâde 'Ali Chelebi. *Akhlāq-i 'alā'ī*. Būlāq, 1248/1833.

Kınalı-Zâde Hasan Chelebi. *Tadhkirat al-shu'arā'*. MS TY 1737 in the Istanbul University Library. {Ed. İbrahim Kutluk, Ankara, 1979–81.}

{Kirmānī, Awḥad al-Dīn Ḥāmid b. Abī 'l-Fakhr. *Manāqib*. Ed. Badī' al-Zamān Furūzānfar. Tehran, 1347/1969.}

{Kissling, H. J. "Aq Šems ed-Dīn: Ein türkischer Heiliger aus der Endzeit von Byzanz." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 44 (1951), 322–33.}

{—— "Aḳ Shams al-Dīn." *EI²*.}

{Knysh, Alexander D. *Ibn 'Arabi in the Later Islamic Tradition: The Making of a Polemical Image in Medieval Islam*. Albany, NY, 1999.}

{Köhbach, M. "Vom Asketen zum Glaubenskampfer: Geyiklü Baba. Ein Beitrag zur osmanischen Hagiographie." *Journal of Ottoman Studies*, 3 (1982), 45–51.}

{Köksal, Hasan. *Battalnâmelerde tip ve motif yapısı* [The formation of types and motifs in the *Baṭṭālnāmes*]. Ankara, 1984.}

{Komaroff, Linda. *The Golden Disk of Heaven: Metalwork of Timurid Iran*. Costa Mesa, CA, 1992.}

{"Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad." *Türk Dili ve Edebiyat Ansiklopedisi* [Encyclopaedia of Turkish Language and Literature]. Istanbul, 1982–98.}

Köprülü, M. Fuad. *Nasrettin Hoca*. Istanbul, 1918.

—— *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* [The history of Turkish literature]. Istanbul, 1920–1, again in 1926 {and reprinted Istanbul, 1981.} Köprülü cites a 1928 edn.

[—— *Türk dil ve edebiyatı hakkında araştırmalar* (Research on Turkish language and literature). Istanbul, 1934.]

[—— *Les Origines de l'Empire Ottoman*. Paris, 1935. Turkish trans. as *Osmanlı devleti'nin kuruluşu*. Ankara, 1959.] {English trans. Gary Leiser as *The Origins of the Ottoman Empire*. Albany, NY, 1992.}

—— *Türk sazşâirleri* [Turkish *saz* poets]. 3 vols. Istanbul, 1940. {Reprinted Ankara, 1962–5.}

[—— *On the Way to Democracy*. Trans. Tibor Halasi-Kun. London, 1964.]

[—— *Edebiyat araştırmaları* (Research on [Turkish] literature). Ankara, 1966.] {2nd edn Ankara, 1986.}

[—— "Şeyh Gâlibe" (Shaikh Gâlibe). *Mehâsin Mecmuası*, issue no. 1, Sept. 1324/1908.]

[—— "Türk edebiyatı tarihinde usûl" (Method in the history of Turkish literature). *Bilgi Mecmuası*, 1 (1329/1913), 3–52.]

—— "Ahmed Yesevî ve çagatay ve osmanlı edebiyatları üzerinde te'sirleri" [Aḥmad Yasawī and his influence on Chagatay and Ottoman literature]. *Bilgi Mecmuası*, 1 (1330/1914), 611–45.

—— "Sazşâirleri: Türklerde âşık edebiyatı'nın menşe' ve tekâmülü" [*Saz* poets: the origin and development of minstrel poetry among the Turks]. Some parts abridged and published in the newspaper *İkdam*, April 3, 7, 11, 16, 19, 25; May 2, 7, 9, 31; June 6, 1914. The introduction was published in *MTM*, 1 (1331/1915), 5–46. See the next entry.

—— "Türk edebiyatında âşık tarzının menşe' ve tekâmülü hakkında bir tecrübe" [An essay on the origin and development of Turkish minstrel poetry]. *MTM*, 1 (1331/1915), 5–46. {Reprinted in his *Edebiyat araştırmaları*.}

—— "Türk edebiyatının menşe'i" [The origin of Turkish literature]. *MTM*, 2 (1331/1915), 5–78. {Reprinted in his *Edebiyat araştırmaları*.}

—— "Türk edebiyatı tarihine medhal" [Introduction to the history of Turkish literature]. No such work was ever published, but the first part of it appeared as "Türk edebiyatının menşe'i." Köprülü also refers to this as a book. See the preceding entry.

—— "Selçukiler zamanında Anadoluda Türk medeniyyeti." *MTM*, 2 (1331/1916), 193–232. {English trans. Gary Leiser as "Turkish Civilization in Anatolia in the Seljuk Period." *Mésogeios*, 9–10 (2000), 37–82.}

—— "X. asır hayatına âit bir vesika" [A document on life in the tenth century]. *İkdam* newspaper, June 10, 12, 1332. Reprinted as "Onuncu asıra âit vesikalar: Fakîri'nin Risâle-i tarîfâti" [Documents on life in the tenth century: Faqīrī's *Risāla-i ta'rīfāt*]. *Hayat Mecmuası*, 1 (1927), 22–3.

—— "Harâbât" [The tavern, in the mystical sense of where a novice becomes absorbed in God's glory]. *YM*, 1 (1917), 186–8.

—— "Islâm edebiyatında mersiye" (real title "Bizde mersiye ve mersiyecilik" [Elegies and elegy composition among us]). *YM*, 1 (1917), no. 16, 305–8; no. 17, 324–8; no. 18, 344–8; no. 19, 364–7; no. 20, 384–6.

—— "Osmanlı edebiyatının başlangıçı" [The beginning of Ottoman literature]. *YM*, 3 (1918), 85–8.

—— "Anadolu'da islâmiyet: Türk istilâsından sonra Anadolu tarih-i dinîsine bir nazar ve bu tarihin menbaları" [Islam in Anatolia: A review of the religious history of Anatolia after the Turkish invasion and the sources for this history]. *Dârülfünûn Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 2 (1922), 281–311, 385–420, 457–86. {English trans. Gary Leiser as *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion*. Salt Lake City, 1993.}

[—— "Anatolische Dichter in der Seldschukenzeit, i. Šejjād 'Hamza." *Körösi Csoma Archivum*, 1 (1921–5), 183–90. Turkish trans. in *Türk Yurdu*, 1 (1340/1921–2), 27–34.]

[—— "XVII. asır saz şairlerinden Kâmil Kırım Hanı IV. Mehmet Giray" (Kāmil, the Crimean Khān Mehmet Giray IV, a seventeenth-century *saz* poet). *Hayat Mecmuası*, 1928, no. 134. Reprinted in *Köprülüden seçmeler* (Selections from Köprülü), ed. Orhan Köprülü. Istanbul, 1972, pp. 93–8.]

—— "Bizans müesseselerinin osmanlı müesseselerine te'siri hakkında bâzı mülâhazalar." *Türk Hukuk ve İktisat Tarihi Mecmuası*, 1 (1931), 165–313. {English trans. Gary Leiser as *Some Observations on the Influence of Byzantine Institutions on Ottoman Institutions*. Ankara, 1999.}

—— "Mısır'da bektaşîlik" [Bektashism in Egypt]. *TM*, 6 (1936–39), 13–40.

{—— "Osmanli İmparatorluğunun etnik menşei mes'eleleri" [Poblems of the ethnic origin of the Ottoman Empire]. *Belleten*, 7 (1943), 219–313.}

[—— "Anadolu selçukluları tarihinin yerli kaynakları" (Local sources for the history of the Seljuks of Anatolia). *Belleten*, 7 (1943), 379–458.] {English trans. Gary Leiser as *The Seljuks of Anatolia: Their History and Culture According to Local Muslim Sources*. Salt Lake City, 1992.}

{—— "Kay kabilesi hakkında yeni notlar" [New notes on the Qay tribe]. *Belleten*, 8 (1944), 421–52.}

[—— "Gürcü âlimlerine cevap – I. Tarih, yalancı şâhit olmaz" (A reply to the Georgian scholars – I. History does not give false testimony); "II. Tarih değil, efsâne" (II. Not history, myth); "III. Efsâne değil, tarih" (Not myth, history). A series of articles in the newspaper *Vatan*, December 17, 19, 20, 1946, respectively.]

[—— "Türk onomastique'i hakkında" (On Turkish onomastic). *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Dergisi*, 1 (1950), 221–36.]

{—— "Orta-Asya Türk dervisliği hakkında bazı notlar" [Some notes on Turkish dervishes in Central Asia]. *TM*, 14 (1964), 259–62.}

—— "Abdal." *Türk halk edebiyatı ansikopedisi*. Istanbul, 1935.

[—— "Abdal Mûsâ." *Türk halk edebiyatı ansiklopedisi*. Istanbul, 1935. Second part in *Köprülüden şeçmeler*. Istanbul, 1972. Reprinted in *Türk Kültürü*, 11 (1973), 198–207.]

[—— "Ahmed Yesevî." *İA*.]

[—— "Alp." *İA*.]

{—— "Arûz" (Iran and Türk). *İA*.}

[—— "Âşık Çelebi." *İA*.]

—— "Âzerî." *İA*.

[—— "Bahşı." *İA*.]

[—— "Bektaş." *İA*.]

—— "Çagatay edebiyatı." *İA*.

—— Review of the Turkish trans. of Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Naqqāsh's *'Ajā'ib al-laṭā'if: Hatây* (i.e. Khaṭā'ī) *seyâhatnâmesi* by Çelebi-Zâde Âsım. *MTM*, 2 (1331/1915), 351–68.

[Köprülü, Orhan. "Tarihî kaynak olarak XIV. ve XV. asırlardaki bâzı Türk menâkıbnâmeleri" (Some legendary deeds of Turkish of saints of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as historical sources). Dissertation, Istanbul University, 1951.]

{—— *Fuad Köprülü*. Ankara, 1987.}

[—— "Prof. Fuad Köprülü için yazılmış bibliyografyalar ve bunlara bâzı ilâveler" (Bibliographies of [the works of] Prof. Fuad Köprülü and some additions to them). *Türk Kültürü*, 8 (1970), 616–20.]

[—— "Fuad Köprülü bibliyografyasına yeni ilâveler" (Recent additions to the bibliography of [the works of] Fuad Köprülü). *Türk Kültürü*, 10 (1972), 1242–5.]

[—— "Köprülü bibliyografyasında yeni gelişmeler" (Recent developments in the bibliography of [the works of] Koprülü). *Türk Kültürü*, 14 (1975), 52–5.]

Kouznietsov, Pierre. *La Lutte des civilizations et des langues dans l'asie centrale*. Paris, 1912.

{Köymen, Mehmet. "Selçuklu devri kaynakları olarak vakfiyeler" [Waqfiyyas as sources for the Seljuk period]. In *Studi preottomani e ottomani*. Naples, 1976, pp. 153–63.}

{Koz, M. Sabri. "The Dervish Cönk," "An 'Istanbul' Cönk," and "Two Cönks from the First Half of the 19th Century." *4th Floor, The Bulletin of the Yapı Kredi Sermet Çifter Research Library*, no. 1 (2001), 18–23; no. 3 (2001), 16–22; no. 4 (2002), 10–16.}

Kräelitz, F. "İlk osmanlı padişahlarının ısdar etmiş oldukları bazı beratlar" [Some *berats* issued by the first Ottoman sultans]. *TOEM*, no. 28 (1330/1912), 242–50.

{Krenkow, F. and G. Lecomte *et al.* "Ḳaṣīda." *EI*^{2}.}

{Krupp, Alya. *Studien zum Menāqybnāme des Abu l-Wafā' Tāǧ al-'Ārifīn, part 1, Das historische Leben des Abu l-Wafā' Tāǧ al-'Ārifīn*. Munich, 1976.}

[Kufralı, Kasım. "Gucduvânî." *İA*.]

{von Kügelgen, Anke. "Die Entfaltung der Naqšbandīya Muǧaddidīya im mittleren Transoxanien vom 18. bis zum Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts: Ein Stück Detektivarbeit."

Anke von Kügelgen, Michael Kemper, and Allen J. Frank (eds), *Muslim Culture in Russia and Central Asia from the 18th to the Early 20th Centuries*, vol. 2, *Inter-Regional and Inter-Ethnic Relations*. Berlin, 1998, pp. 101–51.}

Kúnos, I. "Egy ó-török nyelvemlek." *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*, 22 (1892), 480–97.

{Kut, Günay. "Ismāʿīl Ḥaḳḳī." *EI²*.}

{—— "Mukhtārāt." *EI²*.}

Kuun, Géza (ed.). *Codex Cumanicus*. Budapest, 1880. {Reprinted Budapest, 1981.} According to Köprülü, in light of Bang's criticism, this edition is not reliable.

—— "Gurdēzī a törökökröl." *Keleti Szemle*, 2 (1901), 1–5; 3 (1902), 32–44, 81–94, 253, 61; 4 (1903), 17–40, 129–41, 257–83; 5 (1904), 130–52.

Lagus, J. J. W. (ed.). *Ijmāl-i aḥwāl-i āl-i saljūq ber mūjib-i naql-i oghuzname-i Sayyid Luqmān*. Helsinki, 1854. For a MS in Vienna, see Flügel's catalogue.

Lāhawrī, Ghulām Sawar Muḥammad. *Khazīnat al-asfiyā'*. Lucknow, 1322/1904–5.

Laʿlīzāde, ʿAbd al-Bāqī. *Risāla-i malāmiyya-i bayrāmiyya* (or *Tarikat-i bayramiyyeden taife-i melâmiyyenin an'ane-i iradetleri*). Istanbul, n.d.

{Landolt, H. "Khalwa." *EI²*.}

Laṭīfī. *Tadhkira*. Ed. Ahmed Cevdet as *Tadhkira-yi Laṭīfī*. Istanbul, 1314/1896.

Lavisse, E. and Rambaud, A. *L'Europe féodale, les croisades, 1095–1270* and *Formation des grands états, 1270–1492*, which are vols 2 and 3 respectively of *Histoire générale du IV^e siècle à nos jours*. 12 vols. Paris, 1893–1901.

Le Bas, Ph. *Asie mineure*. Paris, 1864.

{Leiser, Gary. "Ṣarı Ṣalṭūḳ Dede." *EI²*.}

{Lentz, Thomas and Glenn Lowry. *Timur and the Princely Vision: Persian Art and Culture in the Fifteenth Century*. Los Angeles, 1989.}

Levshin (or Levchin), A. I. *Description des hordes et des steppes des Kīrghiz-Kazaks ou Kīrghiz-Kā'issaks*. Trans. from the Russian by Ferry de Pigny. Paris, 1840.

{Lewis, Franklin. *Rumi, Past and Present, East and West. The Life, Teachings and Poetry of Jalâl al-Din Rumi*. Oxford, 2000.}

{Lindner, Rudi. *Nomads and Ottomans in Medieval Anatolia*. Bloomington, IN, 1983.}

{Lowry, Heath. "The 'Sword of Roland' and the 'Sword of Abdal Murad'; A Note on the History of Brusa (Bursa) in the Light of Six Centuries of Travellers' Accounts (1325–1925)." In Çiğdem Kafescioğlu and Lucienne Thys-Şenocak (eds) *Essays in Honour of Aptullah Kuran*. Istanbul, 1999, pp. 233–52.}

Lykoshin, N. "Premudrost' Khazrat-Sultana Arifin-Khodzha-Akhmada Iassavi (mogila ego v mecheti g. Turkestana)" [The Wisdom of Ḥaḍrat Sulṭān al-ʿārifīn Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī (whose grave is in the mosque of the city of Turkestan)]. *Sbornik materialov dlia statistiki Syr-Dar'inskoi oblasti* [Collection of materials for the statistics of the Syr-Darya district], vol. 9, part 2, 1901, pp. 76–105. Mentioned by Barthold on p. 44 of "Russische Arbeiten über Westasien. Jahresberichte für 1901." *Berlin Universität, Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, Mitteilungen, Westasiatische Studien*, (1902), 25–47.

{Madelung, Wilferd. "Yūsuf al-Hamadānī and the Naqšbandiyya." *Quaderni de Studi Arabi*, 5–6 (1987–8), 499–509.}

Maḥmūd Shabistarī. *Gulshan-i rāz*. Ed. and English trans. E. H. Whinfield as *Gulsha I Raz: The Mystic Rose Garden of Sa'd Ud Din Mahmud Shabistari*. London, 1880. {Reprinted Lahore, 1978.} According to Köprülü there was a Turkish trans. by Shaikh Elvan Shīrāzī. He adds that there are many Persian and Turkish commentaries on this work, which was written to answer the questions of the famous Ṣūfī Ḥusainī Sādāt Amīr.

Makhdūm-i Aʿẓam (Aḥmad b. Jalāl al-Dīn al-Kāsānī). *Risāla-i bāburiyya*. MS in the Bağdadlı Vehbî Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul.

{Man'kovskaia, L. Iu. "K izucheniiu priemov sredneaziatskogo zodchestva kontsa XIV v. (mavzolei Khodzhi Akhmada Iasavi." *Iskusstvo zodchikh Uzbekistana*, 1 (1962), 93–142. Paraphrased English trans. Lisa Golombek as "Towards the Study of Forms in Central Asian Architecture at the End of the Fourteenth Century: The Mausoleum of Khvāja Aḥmad Yasavī." *Iran*, 23 (1985), 109–27.}

{Mansuroğlu, Mecdut. *Sultan Veled'in türkçe manzumeleri* [The Turkish verses of Sulṭān Walad]. Istanbul, 1958.}

{Manz, Beatrice Forbes. *The Rise and Rule of Tamerlane*. Cambridge, 1989.}

{Al-Maqrīzī. *Al-Khiṭaṭ*. 2 vols. Būlāq, 1870.}

Marquart, J. "Ǧuwaini's Bericht über die Bekehrung der Uiguren." *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1 (1912), 486–502.

—— "Über das Volkstum der Komanen." Chapter 2 of Marquart and W. Bang, *Osttürkische Dialektstudien*, which is vol. 13 of *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*. Berlin, 1914.

{Massé, H. "ʿIrāḳī." *EI²*.}

{Massignon, Louis. *The Passion of al-Hallāj*. English trans. Herbert Mason. Princeton, NJ, 1982.}

{Massignon, L. and G. C. Anawati. "Ḥulūl." *EI²*.}

{Massignon, L. and F. Radtke. "Taṣawwuf." *EI²*.}

{Masson, M. E. *Mavzolei Khodzha Akhmeda Iasevi* [The Mausoleum of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī]. Tashkent, 1930. Reprinted in K. M. Baipakov (ed.) *Goroda Turkestana: Sbornik nauchnykh statei* [The City of Turkestan: A collection of scholarly articles]. Almaty, 1999, pp. 9–29.}

{McCarthy, R. J. *Deliverance from Error . . . and Other Works of al-Ghazali*. Louisville, KY, n.d.; reprint of Twayne, 1980.}

Mehmed Alî Aynî. *Hüccetü'l-islâm-ı Gazâlî*. With additions and corrections to Carra de Vaux's book *Gazali*. Istanbul, 1908.

Mehmed Şâkir Pasha. *Yeni osmanlı tarihi* [Modern Ottoman history]. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1911–12.

{Meier, Fritz. *Abū Saʿīd-i Abū l-Ḫayr (357–440/967–1049): Wirklichkeit und Legende*. Leiden, 1976.}

{Mélikoff, Irène. *Hadji Bektach un mythe et ses avatars*. Leiden, 1998.}

[—— "Al-Baṭṭāl." *EI²*.]

{—— "Ewrenos." *EI²*.}

{—— "Oḡuz-nāme." *EI²*.}

Melioransky (Melioranskii), P. "K voprosu o znachenii i proiskhozhdenii slov 'chäläb' (chalap) i 'chälābi' v turetskom iazyke" [On the question of the meaning and origin of the words "chalab" (chalap) and "chalabi" in the Turkish language]. *ZVO*. (St Petersburg), 15 (1902–3), 36–43.

—— "Aḥmed Yesewī." *EI¹*.

{Ménage, V. L. "Ḥādjdjī Bayrām Walī." *EI²*.}

Mendel, Gustave. "Les Monuments Seldjoukides en asie mineure." *La Révue de l'Art Ancien et Moderne*, 23 (1908), 9–24, 113–27. Turkish trans. Vahid as "Anadolu'da selçuk âbîdeleri," *YM*, 1917, no. 19, 369–74; no. 20, 389–91; no. 21, 409–15.

[Menzel, Th. "Die ältesten türkischen Mystiker." *ZDMG*, new series, 4 (1925), 269–89.]

[Meriç, Rıfkı Melûl. "Hurûfîlik" (Ḥurūfism). Graduate thesis, Istanbul University, Edebiyat Fakültesi, 1936, library no. 305.]

{Minorsky, V. *Abū Dulaf Misʿar ibn Muhalhil's Travels in Iran (circa AD 950): Arabic Text with an English Translation and Commentary*. Cairo, 1955.}

{—— "The Poetry of Shāh Ismāʿīl I." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies*, 10 (1940–2), 1007–53.}

Mir-Salikh-Bekchurin. "Opisanie mecheti Azreta, nakhodiashcheisia v Turkestane." *Voennyi sbornik*, 9/8 (1866), 209–19. French trans. L. Leger as "Description de la Mosquée de Hazret (Khodja Ahmed Yessevy)" in *Recueil d'itineraires et de voyages dans l'Asie Centrale et l'Extrême-Orient*. Paris, 1878, pp. 245–58.

Mīrkhwānd. *Rawḍat al-ṣafā*. Ed. Riḍā Qulī-Khān. 6 vols. Tehran, 1270–4/1853–6. {New edn, 10 vols. Tehran, 1338–9 sh./1960.}

{Mojaddedi, Jawid A. *The Biographical Tradition in Sufism: The* Ṭabaqāt *Genre from al-Sulamī to Jāmī*. Richmond, Surrey, 2001.}

Mordtmann, A. D. "Die Dynastie der Danischmende." *ZDMG*, 30 (1876), 467–86.

Mordtmann, J. H. "Türkisches zu Foy's 'älteste osmanische Transscriptionstexte.'" *Berlin Universität, Seminar für Orientalische Sprachen, Mitteilungen, Westasiatische Studien*, 5 (1902), 161–9.

—— "Evliyā Čelebi." *EI*[1].

[—— Review of Köprülü's *Early Mystics*. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 26 (1923), 122–9. Turkish trans. Mübârak Galib in *TM*, 1 (1925), 281–7.]

Muallim Cevdet. "Oğuz-nâme – Kitâb-ı Dede Korkut." In special issue of *YM* on Çanakkale (Gallipoli), 5 March, 1331, pp. 89ff.

Muḥammad Ḥusain Ibn Khalaf al-Tabrīzī. *Burhān-i qāṭiʿ*. Turkish trans. Ahmed Âsım. Istanbul, 1214/1799–1800.

Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ. *Shaibānīnāme*. Ed. and German trans. A. Vambéry as *Die Sheïbaniade*. Vienna, 1885. {New ed. E. Shādīev, Tashkent, 1989.}

Muḥammad b. Munawwar. See John O'Kane.

Muḥyī ʿl-Dīn. *Khaḍirnāme*. Unique MS in Köprülü's private library. Mullā Mūsā b. Mullā ʿĪsā Sairāmī. *Taʾrīkh-i amanīyya*. {Prepared by N. N. Pantusov under the title *Taarikh-i èmènie, Istoriia vladetelei Kashgarii: Sochinenie Mully Musy, ben Mulla Aisa, Sairamtsa*.} Kazan, 1905.

Müneccim-başı. *Jāmiʿ al-duwal*. MS 131 in the Beyazıt Umumi Library in Istanbul, an excellent Arabic text. According to Köprülü, the Turkish translation by a committee that included Ahmed Nedîm, as *Ṣaḥāʾif al-akhbār*, Istanbul, 1285/1868–9, is not as reliable as the Arabic text {it is considerably abbreviated}. {The section on the Ottomans from the Arabic original has been published with a modern Turkish trans. by Ahmed Agirakça. Istanbul, 1995.}

Al-Muqaddasī. *Aḥsan al-taqāsīm fī maʿrifat al-aqālīm*. Ed. M. de Goeje. 2nd edn. Leiden, 1906. {English trans. Basil Anthony Collins as *The Best Divisions for Knowledge of the Regions*. Reading, UK, 2001. The English trans. is not always reliable. Cf. André Miquel's partial trans. as *La Meilleure répartition pour la commaissance des provinces*. Damascus, 1963.}}

{Mustafina, R. M. *Predstavleniia, kul'ty, obriady u kazakhov (V kontekste bytovogo islama v Iuzhnom Kazakhstane v kontse XIX–XX vv.)* [Conceptions, cults, and rites among the Qazaqs (In the context of everyday Islam in Southern Kazakhstan in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries]. Alma-Ata, 1992.}

Müstaqīm-Zāde. *Müstaqīm-Zāde mecmuası*. MS 3397 in the Esad Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul.

{Naficy, S. "Ghudjduwānī." *EI²*.}

{Nafīsī, Sa'īd. *Justujū dar aḥvāl va āthār-i Farīd ad-Dīn 'Aṭṭār Nishābūrī*. Tehran, 1320/1942.}

{—— (ed.) "Risalāh-i ṣāḥibīyah." *Farhang-i Īrān-zamīn*. 1 (1332/1953), 70–101.}

Nā'ib al-Ṣadr Shīrāzī, Muḥammad Ma'ṣūm. *Ṭarā'iq al-ḥaqā'iq*. Tehran, 1318/1900.

Na'īmā. *Ta'rīkh-i Na'īmā*, 2nd edn. Istanbul, 1280/1863–4.

Najm al-Dīn Rāzī Dāya. *Mirṣād al-'ibād*. Turkish trans. Karahisarlı Qāsim b. Muḥammad as *Irshād al-murīd ilā 'l-murād* for presentation to Murad II. MSS in the Istanbul University Library, the Königlichen Bibliothek in Berlin, and elsewhere. {English trans. Hamid Algar as *The Path of God's Bondsmen from Origin to Return*. Delmar, NY, 1982.}

{*Nāmah-i dānishvarān*. 9 vols. Tehran, 1338/1959–60.}

{Nasafī. *Zubdat al-ḥaqa'iq*. A. E. Bertel's edn in *Piat' filosofskikh traktatov na temu "Āfāq va anfus" (O sootnosheniiakh mezhdu chelovekom i vselennoi)* [Five philosophical treatises on the theme of *"Āfāq wa anfus"* (On the correlations between man and the universe)]. Moscow, 1970, pp. 90–207. Also Ḥaqq-virdī Nāṣirī edn. Tehran, 1405/1363/1985.}

Nāṣirī, 'Abd al-Qayyūm. *Fawāgih al-julasā'*. Kazan, 1884.

Naṣr Allāh Efendi. *Risāla-i bahā'iyya*. Istanbul, 1328/1910.

Nawā'ī, 'Alī Shīr. *Maḥbūb al-qulūb*. Ed. Vefik Pasha. Istanbul, 1889. Selections published by M. Belin in *Caractèrs, maximes et pensées de Mir Ali Chîr Névâii*. Paris, 1860.

{—— *Nasā'im al-maḥabba*. Ed. Kemal Eraslan. Istanbul, 1979. 2nd edn, Ankara, 1996.}

Németh, J. Critique of C. Brockelmann's *Ali's Qissai Jusuf. Túrán*, 2 (1918), 111–18.

[—— Review of Köprülü's *Early Mystics*. *Körösi Csoma-Archivum*, 1 (1924), 330–2. Turkish trans. Ahmed Cemal in *TM*, 1 (1925), 288–9.]

New'ī-Zāde 'Aṭā'ī. *Khamsa*. MS in Köprülü's private library.

—— *Kitāb-i nafaḥāt al-azhār der jawāb-i maḥzan al-asrār*. MS in Köprülü's private library.

{Nicholson, R. and G. C. Anawati. "Ittiḥād." *EI²*.}

Nişânci-Zâde, Mehmed b. Ahmed. *Mir'āt al-kā'ināt*. MS 2420 in the Nuruosmaniye Library in Istanbul.

Nithārī Bukhārī, Bahā' al-Dīn Ḥasan. *Mudhakkir-i aḥbāb*. According to Köprülü, an important Persian biographical dictionary describing the poets of Central Asia after Nawā'ī. Excellent MS in the Königliche Bibliothek in Berlin. {Ed. Najīb Māyil Haravī. Tehran, 1377/1999.}

Niyāzī Miṣrī, Muḥammad. *Dīwān*. Būlāq, 1254/1838–9. {Ed. Kenan Erdoğan as *Niyazî-i Mısrî ve Divanı*. Ankara, 1998.}

—— Commentary on the margins of Yūnus Emre's *Dīwān*, *Sharḥ-i nuṭuq-i Yūnus Emre*.

Niẓām al-Mulk. *Siyāsatnāme*. Ed. and French trans. Ch. Schefer. 2 vols. Paris, 1891–3. {English trans. H. Darke as *The Book of Government, or Rules for Kings*. London, 1960.}

{Noyan, Bedri. *Fîrdevsî-i Rûmî, manzûm Hacı Bektâş Veli Vilâyetnâmesi* [Firdawsī-i Rūmī, the versified version of the *Velāyetnāme* of Ḥājjī Bektash Veli]. Aydın, 1986.}

Nūr Allāh al-Shustarī. *Majālis al-mu'minīn*. Tehran, 1268/1851–2.

{Nurmuhammedoğlu, Naim-Bek. *Hoca Ahmed Yesevî türbesi* [The *türbe* of Khwāja Aḥmad Yasawī]. Ankara, 1991.}

{Nwiya, P. "Ishāra." *EI²*.}

{Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *İslâm-Türk inançlarında Hızır yahut Hızır-İlyâs kültü* [The cult of Khaḍir or Khaḍir Ilyās in Turco-Islamic beliefs]. Ankara, 1985.}

{—— *Türk folklorunda Kesik Baş* [Kesik Baş in Turkish folklore]. Ankara, 1989.}

{—— *La Revolte de Baba Resul* . . . Ankara, 1989.}

{—— *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda marjinal sûfilik: Kalenderîler* [Marginal Ṣūfism in the Ottoman Empire: the Qalandarīs]. Ankara, 1992.}
{—— *Türk sufiliğine bakışlar* [Interpretations of Turkish Sufism]. Istanbul, 1996.}
{—— *Osmanlı toplumunda zındıklar ve mülhidler (15.–17. yüzyıllar)* [Heretics and unbelievers in Ottoman society (15th–17th centuries)]. Istanbul, 1998.}
{—— *Sarı Saltık*. Ankara, 2002.}
{—— "Un cheik Yesevī et Babaī dans la première moitié du XIII^{e} siècle en Anatolie: Emīrci Sulṭān (Şerefu'd-Dīn İsma'īl b. Muḥammed)." *Turcica*, 12 (1980), 114–24.}
{Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar and İsmail Erünsal (eds) Elvan Chelebi's *Menâkıbu'l-Kudsiyye*. 2nd edn, Ankara, 1995.}
{O'Kane, John. Trans. *The Secrets of God's Mystical Oneness or the Spiritual Stations of Shaikh Abu Sa'id [Asrār al-Towḥid fi maqāmāt al-šeyk Abi Sa'id] by Moḥammad Ebn-e Monavvar*. Costa Mesa, CA, 1992.}
Olanlar Shaikhi Ibrahim Efendi. *Dil-i Dânâ*. MS in Köprülü's private library.
{Önder, M. *Mevlâna bibliografyasi* [A bibliography of works about Mawlānā]. Ankara, 1973.}
Ouseley, G. *Biographical Notices of Persian Poets*. London, 1846.
[Özderim, S. N. "F. Köprülü'nün yazıları, 1908–1950" (The works of F. Köprülü, 1908–1950). Hasan Eren and Tibor Halasi-Kun (eds) *Türk dili ve tarihi hakkında araştırmalar – I* (Research on Turkish language and history). Ankara, 1950, pp. 159–248.]
[—— "Bibliografya – F. Köprülü'nün yazılarına ek ve bâzı düzeltmeler" (A supplement and some corrections to the bibliography of the works of F. Köprülü). *Belleten*, 30 (1966), 661–5.]
{Park, George. "The Life and Writings of Mehmet Fuad Köprülü." Dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, 1975.}
Pārsā, Muḥammad. *Faṣl al-khiṭāb*. MS in the Istanbul University Library.
Pavet de Courteille, Abel. *Dictionnaire Turc-Oriental*. Paris, 1870.
—— *Mirâdj-nâmeh: Récit de l'ascension de Mahomet au cièl*. Paris, 1882. {Reprinted Amsterdam, 1975.}
{Pekolcay, Neclâ and Emine Sevim. *Yunus Emre şerhleri* [Commentaries on Yūnus Emre]. Ankara, 1991.}
{Pellat, Ch. "Djuḥā." *EI^{2}*.}
{Pellat, Ch. *et al.* "Madjnūn Layla." *EI^{2}*.}
Pertsch, W. *Verzeichniss der türkischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Berlin, 1889.
{Pritsak, O. "Alp." *EI^{2}*.}
{Privratsky, Bruce G. *Muslim Turkistan: Kazak Religion and Collective Memory*. Richmond, Surrey, 2001.}
Qayghusuz. *'Abdālnāme*. MS in Köprülü's private library.
—— *Manāqibi-Qayghusuz Abdāl (Sulṭān)*. MS in Köprülü's private library. {Ed. Abdurrahman Güzel as *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alâeddin Gaybî) menâkıbnamesi*. Ankara, 1999.}
Al-Qazwīnī, Zakāriyyā' b. Muḥammad. *Āthār al-bilād*. Ed. F. Wüstenfeld. 2 vols. Göttingen, 1848. {Reprinted Wiesbaden, 1967.}
{Qoylaqï, Safi ad-Din Orïn. "*Nasab-nama*." Ed. Äshirbek Qŭrbanŭli Muminov and Zikiriyä Zamankhanŭlï Jandarbekov. Turkistan, 1992.}
Quatremère, É. "Notice de l'ouvrage qui a pour titre *Mesalek Alabsar fi Memalek Alamsar*, Voyages des yeux dans les royaumes de différentes contrées." *Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du Roi*, 13 (1838), 151–348.

Al-Qushairī. *Al-Risāla*. Turkish trans. Nâfî Efendi as *Risâle-i Kuşayrîye*. Istanbul, 1307/1889–90. {Ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥalīm Maḥmūd *et al.* as *al-Risāla al-Qushairiyya*. 2 vols. Cairo, 1966; English trans. Rabia Harris as *The Risalah: Principles of Sufism*. Distributed by KAZI Publications [Chicago], 2002.}

Radloff, W. (or Radlov, V). *Proben der Volkslitteratur der türkischen Stämme Süd-Siberiens*. 10 vols. St Petersburg, 1866–70. {Reprinted Leipzig, 1965.}

—— *Das Schamanenthum und sein Kultus, eine Untersuchung*. Leipzig, 1885.

—— "Über alttürkische Dialekte: (1) die seldschukischen Verse im Rebâb-Nâmeh." *Mélanges Asiatiques*, 10 (1890–4), 17–77.

Rashīd al-Dīn. *Ǧāmiʿ al-tawārīkh*. Ed. and Russian trans. I. Berezin of the introduction on Turkish and Mongol tribes and the history of Jenghiz Khan in *ZVO*, 5 (1858), 7 (1861), 13 (1868), 15 (1888). Berezin's work is old and defective. E. Blochet corrected Berezin and translated the introduction into French in the *GMS*. London, 1911. See above. {Ed. A. A. Alizade. Moscow and Baku, 1957–80. Also ed. Bahman Karīmī. Tehran, 1338/1959–60. English trans. W. Thackston as *Rashiduddin Fazlullah's Jamiʿu't-tawarikh – Compendium of Chronicles. Part 1*. Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, 1998.}

Rāzī, Amīn Aḥmad. *Haft iqlīm*. MS in the Hâlis Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul. {Ed. Javād Fāḍil, 3 vols. Tehran, 1960.}

Reclus, É. (ed.) *Nouvelle géographie universelle*. 19 vols. Paris, 1881–94.

{Reichl, Karl. *Turkic Oral Epic Poetry*. New York, 1992.}

{—— *Singing the Past: Turkic and Medieval Heroic Poetry*. Ithaca, NY, 2000.}

Remzî, Mehmed. *Talfīq al-akhbār wa tanqīh al-āthār fī waqāʾiʿ-i Qazān wa Bulghār wa mulūk al-tātār*. 2 vols. Orenburg, 1325/1907. In Arabic.

Riḍā Qulī Khān. *Safarnāme-yi Khwārazm*. Ed. and French trans. Ch. Schefer. Paris, 1879.

Rieu, Charles. *Catalogue of Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum*. London, 1888.

Rifat Ahmed Efendi. *Mirʾâtü'l-makâsıd*. Istanbul, 1293/1876.

Risāla-i bektāshiyya. Minor Bektashī treatises of unknown authorship. Several MSS in Köprülü's private library.

[Ritter, H. "Celâleddin Rûmî." *İA*.]

{—— "ʿAṭṭār." *EI²*.}

Rızâ Tevfik. *Études sur la religion des Houroûfis*. Leiden, 1909.

—— "Yûnus Emre'yi ziyâret" [Visiting the tomb of Yūnus Emre]. In the literary supplement to the newspaper *Peyâm*, June 19, 1329/1911.

—— Unidentified article in the literary supplement to the newspaper *Peyâm*, no. 35, May 8, 1330/1912.

—— "Yûnus Emre hakkında biraz daha tafsilât" [A few more details on Yūnus Emre]. *Büyük Duygu*, nos 10–13, 1 (1331/1913).

{Saadi, A. "Novyi material po istorii tatarskoi literatury drevnei èpokhi" [New material for the history of Tatar literature in the ancient (sic) period]. *Vestnik nauchnogo obshchestvo tatarovedeniia*, no. 7 (1927), 149–56.}

Saʿd al-Dīn. *Tāj al-tawārīkh*. 2 vols. Istanbul, 1280/1863–4.

Ṣādiqī Kitābdār. *Tadhkira* (*Majmaʿ al-khawāṣṣ*). MS 3720 in the Nuruosmaniye Library in Istanbul. According to Köprülü, this work was written around the end of the tenth/sixteenth century and describes the poets, calligraphers, and painters who lived in Azerbaijan, Turkistan, and especially in the area under the control of Iran. The author Ṣādiqī (or Sâdıkî) was the librarian of Shāh ʿAbbās. He wrote in beautiful Chagatay

and in imitation of Nawā'ī. {Ed. and Persian trans. 'Abd al-Rasūl Khayyāmpūr. Tabriz, 1327/1948. See Hofman, *Turkish Literature*, vol. 5, pp. 273–7.}

Ṣafā'ī. *Tadhkirat al-shu'arā'*. MS 2549 (Köprülü gives this number in the text, but gives MS 1750 in his index) in the Esad Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul.

Ṣafī, 'Alī b. Ḥusain Wā'iẓ Kāshifī Baihaqī. *Rashaḥāt-i 'ain al-ḥayāt*. Lucknow, 1308/1890. {Ed. 'A. A. Mu'īniyān. Tehran, 2536/1977–8.} According to Köprülü this work, which describes the Naqshbandī Khwāja 'Ubaid Allāh Aḥrār, is very famous among the Naqshbandīs. There are many MSS of it. Written in 903/1497–8, it was, according to Kātib Chelebi, translated into Turkish with additions by Mehmed Ma'rūf of Trebizond while he was *qāḍī* of Izmir in 993/1585. Then it was presented to Sultan Murad.

—— Turkish translation of the *Rashaḥāt*. Istanbul, 1291/1874. According to Köprülü, it was first published in Egypt (i.e. Būlāq) in 1236/1820–1. There is also a Kazan edition. According to the MS in his private library, "in 1149/1736–7, when Mawlānā Niyāz, who was called Shāh-i Mashāyikh {King of the shaikhs}, Shaikh al-Islām Naqshband, Chagatay Bey and more than 500 Hindī, Sindī, Özbeg, and Afghan *abdāls* arrived on the pretext of going to Anatolia, the Khwārazm Sultan Muḥammad Bahādur Khān had this work translated into Turkish because it was in Persian." Nevertheless, adds Köprülü, this cannot be considered trustworthy. He goes on to say that we possess various copies of Ma'rūf Efendi's translation, but even if we did not, Kātib Chelebi's testimony would suffice to reject the aforesaid assertion.

Sa'īd Pasha (Diyarbekirli). *Mir'āt al-'ibar*. Istanbul, 1304/1886–7.

Saint-Hilaire, Jules Barthélemy. *De l'école d'Alexandrie; rapport à l'Academie des sciences morales et politiques, précédé d'un essai sur la méthode des Alexandrins et le mysticisme, et suive d'une traduction de morceaux choisis de Plotin*. Paris, 1845.

{Sakaoğlu, Saim. "Battâl-name." *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı: Belleten*, (1992), 67–74.}

Sakib Dede. See Thāqib Dede.

Şâkir Pasha. *Yeni osmanlı tarihi* [Modern Ottoman history]. Istanbul, 1911–12.

Saladin, Henri. *Manuel d'art musulman: I. L'Architecture*. Paris, 1907.

Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Ibn Mubārak al-Bukhārī. *Maqāmāt Muḥammad Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshband*. Turkish trans. Süleyman Azmî. Istanbul, 1328/1910. {Actually entitled *Anīs al-ṭālibīn*. Ed. Khalīl Ibrāhīm Ṣārī Oghlī. Tehran, 1371/1992.}

Salemann, C. "Noch einmal die seldschukischen Verse: (Sultan Veled *Rebabname*)." *Bulletin Scientifique de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St Pétersbourg*, N.S., 2 (= 34, 1892), 293–365. Also in *Mélanges Asiatiques*, 10 (1894), 173–245.

Salmon, Georges. "Soufisme." *La Grande Encyclopédie*.

Al-Sam'ānī. *Al-Ansāb*. Facsimile (ed.), D. S. Margoliouth. London, 1912. {Ed. Al-Mu'allimī *et al.* 13 vols. Hyderabad, Deccan, 1952–82.}

Samoilovich, A. N. "Materialy po sredneaziatsko-turetskoi literature" [Materials on Turkish literature in Central Asia]. *ZVO*, 19 (1909), 1–30; 22 (1913–14), 127–53; *ZKV*, 2 (1927), 257–74.

{Sapabekŭlï, Sadïq. "Türkïstandaghï tarikhi ziyarat" [A historical pilgrimage in Turkistan]. Ed. Khamid Imanzhanov and R. Zhüzbaeva in the collective vol. *Yäsaui taghïlïmï* [Yasawï's teaching]. Ed. Mekemtas Mirzahmetŭlï. Turkistan, 1996, pp. 123–32.}

Sarı 'Abd Allāh Efendi. *Thamarāt al-fu'ād*. Istanbul, 1288/1871.

{Scharlipp, Wolfgang. *Die frühen Türken in Zentralasien*. Darmstadt, 1992.}

{Schimmel, Annemarie. *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*. Chapel Hill, NC, 1975.}

{—— *The Triumphal Sun*. London, 1978.}

{Schmitz, Andrea. *Die Erzählung von Edige: Gehalt, Genese und Wirkung einer heroischen Tradition*. Wiesbaden, 1996.}

{Schubert, Gudrun. "Sulṭān Walad." *EI*^{2}.}

Schuyler, Eugene. *Turkistan, Notes of a Journey in Russian Turkistan, Khokand, Bukhara, and Kuldja*, 6th edn. 2 vols. London, 1877. {Abridged reprint London, 1966.} Turkish trans. Ahmet Efendi as *Musavvar Türkistan tarihi ve seyâhatnâmesi*. Istanbul, 1294/1878.

{Sells, Michael. *Early Islamic Mysticism*. New York, 1996.}

Şerefeddin (Yaltkaya), Mehmed. "Eski Türk memleketlerinde" [In the countries of the ancient Turks]. *YM*, no. 59, August 29, 1918, 134–6.

—— "Sencer ve Gazzâlî [Sanjar and al-Ghazālī]. *Darülfünûn İlâhiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 1 (1341/1925), 39–57.

—— "Selçukiler devrinde mezâhib" [Muslim sects in the Seljuk period]. *TM*, 1 (1925), 101–8.

{—— "Mevlânâ'da türkçe kelimeler ve türkçe şiirler" [Turkish words and poetry in Mawlānā]. *TM*, 4 (1934), 111–67.}

{Şeşen, Ramazan. *İslâm coğrafyacılarına göre Türkler ve Türk ülkeleri* [The Turks and Turkish countries according to Muslim geographers]. Ankara, 1985.}

{Shafi', Moḥammad. "Ratan." *EI*^{2}.}

Shahrastānī. *Al-Milal wa 'l-niḥal*. Turkish trans. Nūh b. Muṣṭafā. Cairo, 1263/1847 and Istanbul, 1279/1862. {French trans. D. Gimaret *et al.* as *Livre des religions et des sectes*. 2 vols. Louvain, 1986–93.}

Shaikh Süleyman. *Lughat-i chaghatay ve türkî-yî 'osmânî*. Istanbul, 1298/1882.

Shaikh-oghlu. *Kanz al-kubarā'*. Unique autograph MS in Köprülü's private library. According to him, this work is very important with respect to Turkish linguistic and literary history.

Shams al-Dīn Ibn Qays al-Rāzī (or Shams-i Qays). *Al-Mu'jam fī ma'āyīr ash'ār al-'ajam*. Leiden, 1909. {Ed. Muḥammad Qazvīnī *et al.* Tehran, 1314/1935.}

Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Nūr Muḥammad al-Ṭāhirī. *Köylü îmânı* [Peasant faith]. Kazan, 1903.

Shams al-Dīn Sāmī. *Qāmūs al-a'lām*. 6 vols. Istanbul, 1889–98. {Reprinted Ankara, 1996.}

Shams al-Dīn Sīwāsī. *Sharḥ-i ghazal-i Mawlānā*. MS in Köprülü's private library.

Shams Kāshānī. *Shahnāme-i Chingīzī*. Lala Vakfı MS 354 in the Hamidiye Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul. According to Köprülü, this is an excellent copy embellished with valuable miniatures. He adds that Edgar Blochet, in his *Introduction à l'histoire des Mongols de Faḍl Allah Rashid ed-Din*, mistakenly claims that this work exists only in a single copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Kātib Chelebi also saw this work. He reported it under the title *Ta'rīkh-i Ghāzān Khān* and adds that the poet of this work died around 730/1329–30 during the reign of Abū Sa'īd. {See Storey-Bregel', *Persidskaia literatura*, vol. 2, pp. 767–8.}

Sharā'iṭ al-īmān. Kazan, 1901.

Al-Sha'rānī, 'Abd al-Waḥḥāb. *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-ṣūfiyya*. Cairo, 1305/1887–8. {Published as *al-Ṭabaqāt al-kubrā*, Cairo, 1898. Reprinted Cairo, 1965.}

Shaw, Robert Barkley. *A Sketch of the Túrkí Language as Spoken in Eastern Túrkistán Káshghar and Yarkand, Together with a Collection of Extracts*. Lahore, 1875.

Shikārī. *Karaman tarihi* (or *Şukârî tarihi*). Turkish trans. by Shikārī of *Āl-i Qaramān shāhnāme*, a Persian poem of unknown author. MS in the possession of Tâhir al-Brusawî. [Ed. Mesut Koman. Konya, 1946.]

{Shpall, William. "A Note on Najm al-Dīn al-Rāzī and the *Baḥr al-Ḥaqā'iq*." *Folia Orientalia*, 22 (1981–4), 69–80.}

{Silay, Kemal. *Nedim and the Poetics of the Ottoman Court*. Bloomington, IN, 1994.}

Simon, Jules. *Histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie*. 2 vols. Paris, 1845.

—— "Plotin," in Adolphe Franck (ed.) *Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques*, 2nd edn. Paris, 1875.

Sinān Pasha. *Tadhkirat al-awliyā'*. MS in the Beyazıt Umumi Library in Istanbul. {Ed. Emine Gürsoy. Ankara, 1987.}

Sipahsālār, Farīdūn b. Aḥmad. *Manāqib-i ḥaḍrat-i Khudāwandigār*. Turkish trans. Midhat Bahârî Hüsâmî. Istanbul, 1331/1913. According to Köprülü, this work had not attracted the attention of Western scholars. It is the oldest source for Mawlānā and the early Mawlawīs. {Ed. Sa'īd Nafīsī as *Risāla-i Sipahsālār*. Tehran, 1325/1947.}

Smirnov, V. D. "Les vers dits 'seldjouk' et le christianisme turc." *Actes du 11^e^ Congrès International des Orientalistes (1897)*. Paris, 1899, 3rd section, pp. 143–57.

{Soysal, M. Orhan. *Eski Türk edebiyatı metinleri* [Early Turkish literary texts]. Ankara, 1978.}

Spencer, Herbert. *The Principles of Sociology*, 3rd rev. edn. New York, 1890.

{Stein, Heidi. "Das türkische Sprachgut im 'Tractatus de Moribus, Condictionibus et Nequicia Turcorum' (1481) des Georg von Ungarn." *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 14 (1995/6), 39–78; 15 (1997), 89–118.}

{Steingass, F. *Persian–English Dictionary*. 1892; reprinted Beirut, 1975.}

{Storey, C. A. *Persian Literature*. Russian trans. Iu. È. Bregel' as *Persidskaia literatura: Bio-bibliograficheskii obzor*. Moscow, 1972.}

Strzygowski, J. *Altai-Iran und Völkerwanderung*. Leipzig, 1917.

Ṣūfī Allāhyār. *Fawz al-najāt*. Istanbul, n.d., and Kazan, 1895.

Al-Suhrawardī, Shihāb al-Dīn. *'Awārif al-ma'ārif*. 2 vols. Būlāq, 1289/1872–3. On the margins of al-Ghazālī's *Iḥyā'ulūm al-dīn*. {Cairo, 1973. German trans. Richard Gramlich as *Die Gabender Erkenntnisse des 'Umar as-Suhrawardī*. Wiesbaden, 1978.}

Şükrullâh. *Bahjat al-tawārīkh*. MS 3059 in the Nuruosmaniye Library in Istanbul. According to Köprülü, this work was written for Maḥmūd Pasha, a vizier of Mehmet II. It is a brief but noteworthy history of Islam that describes the Ottomans up to the reign of Mehmet II. {A modern Turkish trans. of the section on the Ottomans is included in Atsız, *Osmanlı tarihleri*. Istanbul, 1949. The Persian text of the same section and a German trans. have been published by Theodor Seif as "Der Abschnitt über die Osmanen in Šükrullāh's persischer Universalgeschichte." *Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte*, 2 (1923–6), 63–128.}

Sulaimān Ata Bāqirghānī (Ḥakīm Ata). *Bāqirghān kitābı*. Attributed to Sulaimān but actually the work of later Yasawī poets. Kazan, 1857. Reprinted Kazan, 1883–4. {New eds Ibrahim Häqqul and Säyfiddin Räf'iddin. Tashkent, 1991.}

Surūrī. *Baḥr al-ma'ārif*. MS in Köprülü's private library.

Al-Ṭabarī. *Ta'rīkh* (*Ta'rīkh al-rusul wa 'l-mulūk*). Leiden, 1879–1901. The abridged Persian version was translated into Turkish. L. Debeux and then after his death H. Zotenberg translated the Persian version into French as *Chronique d'Abou Djafer Mohammed b. Djarir Ṭabarī*. 4 vols. Paris, 1867–74. {English trans. of the original Arabic under the general editorship of Ehsan Yarshater as *The History of al-Ṭabarī*. 39 vols. Albany, New York, 1985–. We have cited vol. 32, trans. C. E. Bosworth as *The Reunification of the 'Abbāsid Caliphate*. 1987.}

Al-Ṭabarī, Muḥibb al-Dīn Aḥmad. *Al-Riyāḍ al-naḍira*. 2 vols. Cairo, 1327/1909.

{Taeschner, Fr. *Zünfte und Bruderschaften im Islam: Texte zur Geschichte der Futuwwa*. Zurich, 1979.}

{—— "Akhī." *EI²*.}

[—— "Akhī Ewrān." *EI²*.]

{—— "Gülshehrī." *EI²*.}

Tâhir, Bursalı Mehmed. *Aydın vilâyetine mensûb ricâlin terâcim-i ahvâli* [Biographies of notables associated with the province of Aydın]. Izmir, 1324/1906. {Ed. M. Akıf Erdoğru as *Aydın vilâyetine mensûb meşâyih, ulemâ, şuarâ, müverrihin ve etibbânın terâcim-i ahvâli* [Biographies of shaikhs, *'ulamā'*, poets, historians, and physicians associated with the province of Aydın]. Izmir, 1994.}

—— *Ḥājjī Bayrām Walī*. Istanbul, 1329/1911.

—— *Osmanlı müellifleri* [Ottoman authors]. 3 vols. Istanbul, 1334–43/1916–25.

—— "Aşık Paşa." *Türk Derneği*, 1 (1327/1911), 12–19.

[Tansel, Fevziye Abdullah. "Memleketimizin aci kaybı Prof. Dr Fuad Köprülü" (A painful loss for our country, Prof. Dr Fuad Köprülü). *Belleten*, 30 (1966), 633–5.]

[—— "Prof. Dr Fuad Köprülü yazıları için basılmış bibliyografyalar" (Published bibliographies of the writings of Prof. Dr Fuad Köprülü). *Türk Kültürü*, 6 (1968), 543–56.]

{—— "Cümcüme Sultan: Ottoman Translations of the Fourteenth Century Kipchak Turkic Story." *Archivum Ottomanicum*, 2 (1970), 252–69.}

{Taşağıl, Ahmet. *Gök-Türkler*. Ankara, 1995.}

Tashköprü-Zāde. *Al-Shaqā'iq al-nu'māniyya*. On the margins of Ibn Khallikān's *Wafayāt al-a'yān*. Būlāq, 1300/1882. Turkish trans. Mecdî, Istanbul, 1269/1852–3. Supplements, as *Ḥadā'iq al-ḥaqā'iq*, Istanbul, 1268/1852, and *Ḥadā'iq al-shaqā'iq*, Istanbul, 1269. {New edn of the original Arabic, Ahmed Furat. Istanbul, 1985.}

—— *Mawḍū'āt al-'ulūm*. Turkish trans. Istanbul, 1313/1895–6. {The title of the Arabic original is *Miftāḥ al-sa'āda*.}

de Tassy, Garcin. *La Poésie philosophique et religieuse chez les persians d'après le Mantic uttaïr* . . . Paris, 1860.

—— *Histoire de la littérature hindoui et hindoustani*, 2nd rev. edn. 3 vols. Paris, 1870–1.

{Tatçı, Mustafa. *Yunus Emre Divânı*. 2 vols. Ankara, 1990.}

{—— *Âşık Yunus ve diğer Yunusların şiirleri* [The poetry of 'Āshıq Yūnus and the other Yūnuses]. Ankara, 1991.}

{Tekin, G. A. "Sehī Bey." *EI²*.}

{Tekin, Talât. "Yunus Emre'nin gotik harfleriyle iki manzumesi" [Two verses by Yunus Emre in Gothic script]. *Erdem*, 3 (1987), 367–92.}

{Terzioğlu, Derin. "Sufi and Dissident in the Ottoman Empire: Niyazi-i Misri (1618–1694)." Dissertation, Harvard University, 1999.}

{Teubner, J. K. "'Abd Allāh b. Abī Bakr al-Miyānadjī." *EI²*, *Supplement*.}

{—— "'Ayn al-Ḳuḍāt al-Hamadhānī." *EI²*, *Supplement*.}

Tevhid, Ahmed. *Meskûkât-i kadîme-i islâmiyye kataloğu* [Catalogue of early Islamic coins]. Vol. 4. Istanbul, 1321/1903–4.

—— "Rum selçuki devletinin inkiraziyle teşekkül eden tevâif-i mülûkdan Kara Hisar-i Sahibde Sahib Ata Oğulları" [One of the petty states that arose with the collapse of the Seljuk State of Rum: the Sahib Ata-Oghullari at Kara Hisar-i Sahib]. *TOEM*, 9 (1327/1909), 563–8.

—— "Ankara'da ahiler hükûmeti" [The government of the *akhīs* in Ankara]. *TOEM*, no. 19 (1328/1910), 1200–4.

{Tezcan, Semih. "Anadolu Türk yazınının başlangıç döneminde bir yazar ve çarh-name'nin tarihlendirilmesi üzerine" [Concerning an author of the initial period of Anatolian Turkish literature and the dating of the *Çarh-name*]. *Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları*, 3 (1994), 75–88.}

Thāqib Dede (or Sakib Dede). *Safīna-i mawlawiyān* (or *Sefine-i nefise-i mevleviyan*). Cairo, 1283/1866.

Tholuck, F. A. D. *Sufismus*. Berlin, 1821.

Thomsen, V. "Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées." *Mémoires de la Société Finno-ougrienne*. Helsinki, 5 (1896), 1–224.

—— "Sur le système des consonnes dans la langue ouïgoure." *Keleti Szemle*, 2 (1901), 241–59.

—— "Ein Blatt in türkischer 'Runen' Schrift aus Turfan." *Sitzungsberichte der (Berliner, d.h.) Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1910, pp. 296–306.

Thorning, H. *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des islamischen Vereinswesens auf Grund von Madad-et-Taufiq*. Published as part 16 of *Türkische Bibliothèque*. Berlin, 1913.

Thúry, Jozef. "Ondördüncü ʿasır sonlarına kadar Türk dili yâdıgârları" [Monuments of the Turkish language up to the end of the fourteenth century]. Trans. from the Hungarian by Râgıp Hulûsî in *MTM*, 2 (1331/1913), 81–133.

{Tietze, Andreas and Talât Tekin. "Tarama Sözlüğü üzerine bazı açıklamalar" [Some clarifications concerning the *Tarama Sözlüğü*]. *Erdem*, 5 (1989), 285–93.}

[Timurtaş, Faruk. *Yûnus Emre Divanı*. Istanbul, 1972.] {3rd edn, Ankara, 1986.}

Togan, Ahmed Zeki Velidi. *Türk-Tatar tarihi*. Vol. 1, Kazan, 1912. Vols 1–2, Kazan, 1915–17.

{—— "Yesevîliğe dair bazi yeni malûmat" [Some new information on the Yasawiyya]. In Osman Turan *et al.* (eds) *60 Doğum yılı münâsebetiyle Fuad Köprülü armağanı* (*Mélanges Fuad Köprülü*). Istanbul, 1953, pp. 523–9.}

{—— "Gazan-Han Halil ve Hoca Bahaeddin Nakşbend." In *Necati Lugal armağanı*. Ankara, 1968, pp. 775–84.}

[—— "Balasagun." *İA*.]

{Tosun, Necdet. "Yesevîliğin ilk dönemine âid bir risâle: Mir'âtü'l-kulûb" [A treatise from the early period of the Yasawiyya: *Mir'āt al-qulūb*]. *İLAM Araştırma Dergisi*, 2 (1997), 41–85.}

{Troitskaia, A. L. "Zhenskii zikr v starom Tashkente." *Sbornik Muzeia antropologii e ètnografii AN SSSR*, 7 (1928), 189–92.}

Tschudi, R. "Bektāsh." *EI*[1].

{Tulum, Mertol. *Tarihi metin çalışmalarında usul: Menâkıbu'l-Kudsiyye üzerinde bir deneme* [Method in the study of historical texts: an essay on the *Manāqib al-Qudsiyya* (of Elvan Chelebi)]. Istanbul, 1989.}

{Turan, Osman. *Selçuklular zamanında Türkiye tarihi* [A history of Turkey in the Seljuk period]. 2nd edn, Istanbul, 1984.}

[—— "Fuad Köprülü'nün ilmî neşriyatı" (Fuad Köprülü's scholarly publications). In Osman Turan *et al.* (eds) *60 Doğum yılı münâsebetiyle Fuad Köprülü armağanı* (*Mélanges Fuad Köprülü*). Istanbul, 1953, pp. xxvii–1.]

Tūzūkāt-i Tīmūrī (Tīmūr-Tūzūkāt). This work is also known as *Vâki'ât-i Timûr*. Turkish trans. Qāḍī Makhdūm Nabī Jān Khāṭif Khujandī. Tashkent, 1308/1890–1. It was translated from Chagatay to Persian under the title *Malfūzāt-i Tīmūrī*. French trans. L. M. Langlès as *Institutes politiques et militaires de Tamerlan, proprement appellé Timour . . .* Paris, 1787. {English trans. and Persian text by Major Davy as *Institutes, Political and Military*.

1783. Reprinted Tehran, 1342/1963.} See W. Pertsch, *Verzeichniss der persischen Handschrifen der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, vol. 4. Berlin, 1888. {See Storey-Bregel', *Persidskaia literatura*, vol. 2, pp. 791–7.}

Ujfalvy, C. *Le Syr-Daria* . . . Paris, 1879.

Üsküplü ʿAṭā. *Tuhfat al-ʿushshāq*. MS in Köprülü's private library.

{Usmanov, M. A. *Tatarskie istoricheskie istochniki XVII–XVIII vv* [Tatar historical sources of the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries]. Kazan, 1972.}

Vacherot, Étienne. *Histoire critique de l'école d'Alexandrie*. 3 vols. Paris, 1846–51. {Reprinted Amsterdam, 1965.}

Vambéry, Arminius (Hermann). *Čagataische Sprachstudien*. Leipzig, 1867.

—— *Voyages d'un faux derviche dans l'asie centrale de Téhéran à Khiva, Bokhara et Samarkand*. 2nd edn, Paris, 1873. {English trans. as *Travels in Central Asia*. London, 1864. Reprinted New York, 1970.}

—— *History of Bokhara*, 2nd edn. London, 1873. {Reprinted New York, 1973.}

—— "Eine legendäre Geschichte Timurs." *ZDMG*, 51 (1897), 215–32.

{—— "Muhammadanism (in Central Asia)." *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. Reprinted New York, 1961. Vol. 8, pp. 885–8.}

Veled Chelebi {İzbudak}. Unidentified article in a special joint issue of the Istanbul daily newspaper *Tercümân-ı hakîkat* and the illustrated weekly *Servet-i fünûn*, 1313/1895–6.

Visdelou, C. *Bibliothèque orientale de messieurs C. Visdelou et A. Galland contenant les observations sur ce queles historiens arabes & persiens rapportent de la Chine & de la Tartarie dans la Bibliothèque orientale de M. d'Herbelot*. Maestricht, 1780.

{Vryonis, Speros. *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century*. Berkeley, CA, 1971.}

{Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York, 1947.}

{Weil, G. and G. S. Colin. "Abdjad." *EI²*.}

{Weischer, B. M. "Kirmānī." *EI²*.}

{Wensinck, A. J. "Khaḍir." *EI²*.}

{Woodhead, Christine. "Sinān Pasha, Khodja." *EI²*.}

Al-Yāfiʿī, ʿAbd Allāh b. Asʿad. *Mirʾāt al-janān wa ʿibrat al-yaqẓan fī maʿrifat ḥawādith al-zamān*. 9 vols. Hyderabad, 1337–9/1918–21. {Beirut, 1984.}

Yaltkaya. See Şerefeddin.

Yaḥyā b. al-Khalīl b. al-Chūbān al-Yaḥyā Fatā ʿl-Burghāzī. *Futuwwatnāme*. MS of {the historian} ʿÂrif Bey. According to Köprülü, another MS of this work had come into his possession. It differed somewhat from the other following the section on the Akhīs. It was in his private library. He promised to provide extensive and critical information on these MSS in a special analytical work that he was preparing on the Akhīs, but it never appeared. {Ed. Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı as "Burgazi ve Fütüvvetnamesi." *İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası*, 15 (1953–5), 76–153. German trans. by Fr. Taeschner in *Zünfte und Bruderschaften im Islam*, using Köprülü's MS.}

Yāqūt. *Muʿjam al-buldān*. Ed. F. Wüstenfeld. 6 vols. Leipzig, 1866–73.

Yazdī, Sharaf al-Dīn. *Ẓafarnāme-i Tīmūr*. 2 vols. Calcutta, 1887–8. Chagatay trans. Muḥammad ʿAlī b. Darwīsh ʿAlī Bukhārī, MS 3268 Nuruosmaniye Library in Istanbul. French trans. of the Persian MS Pétis de la Croix as *Histoire de Timur-Bec*, Paris, 1722. {English trans. as *The History of Timur-Bec* . . . London, 1723; new Persian ed. Muḥammad ʿAbbāsī. Tehran, 1336/1957.}

Yazıcı-oğlu ʿAlī. *Saljūqnāme (Mufaṣṣal Saljūqnāme)*. MS in the Topkapı Sarayı Revan Köşkü Library. There is another good MS in the Hâlis Efendi Library in the Süleymaniye in Istanbul. According to Köprülü, Necib Âsım began to publish this work, but was not able to finish it. Ed. Th. Houtsma as vol. 3 of *Recueil de textes relatifs à l'histoire des seldjoucides*. Leiden, 1902.

Yūnus Emre. *Dīwān-ı ʿāshıq Yūnus Emre*. Istanbul, 1320/1902–3. MS in Köprülü's private library. Commentary on his hymn *Çıktım erik dalına* by Bursalı Ismāʿīl Hakkı. MS in Köprülü's private library. Commentary on the same by Niyāzī Miṣrī as *Sharḥ-i ghazal-i Yūnus* on the margins of Yūnus's *Dīwān*.

{Yurt, Ali. *Akşemseddin, 1390–1459: hayatı, eserleri* [Ak Shams al-Dīn, 1390–1459: His life and works]. Istanbul, 1994.}

{Yūsofī, G. Ḥ. "Abū Moslem . . . Ḵorāsānī." *EIr.*}

Yusuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib. *Kutadgu Bilig*. Text and German trans. W. Radloff as *Das Kudatku-Bilik* . . . 2 vols. St Petersburg, 1891–1910. [Ed. and Turkish trans. R. R. Arat. Ed. Istanbul, 1947; trans. Ankara, 1959.] {English trans. Robert Dankoff as *Wisdom of Royal Glory*. Chicago, 1983.}

{Zajaczkowski, Ananiasz. *Najstarsza wersja turecka Ḫusräv u Šīrīn Quṭba*. 3 vols. Warsaw, 1958–61.}

Zakī Pasha, Ahmad. *Mémoire sur les moyens propres à déterminer en Égypte une renaissance des lettres arabes*. Cairo, 1910.

{Zaleman, K. G. (ed. and trans.). "Legende pro Khakim-Ata." *Izvestiia Akademii nauk* (SPb.), 9/2 (1898), 105–50.}

{Zarcone, Th. "Zangī Ātā." *EI²*.}

{—— "Ḵẖwāḏjagān." *EI²*, *Supplement*.}

Zaydān, Jurjī. *Medeniyyet-i islâmiyye tarihi* [The history of Islamic civilization]. Turkish trans. of the Arabic original. 5 vols. Istanbul, 1328–30/1910–12.

Ziyâ Pasha (ed.). *Kharābāt* (or *Harâbât*). 3 vols. Istanbul, 1291–2/1874.

INDEX

ʿAbbāsids 5, 9, 17n30, 197
ʿAbd Allāh Baraqī 60–3, 73n9, 77n30
ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Jīlānī 7
Abdāl Mūsā 31, 49n50, 363, 371n4, 372n5
Abū Saʿīd Ibn Abī ʿl-Khair 8, 139, 166n55, 343n34, 348n38
Abū Saʿīd Mīrzā 29
Abū Yazīd al-Bistāmī 7, 118n42, 241n48
ahl-i ḥāl 273
ahl-i qāl 273, 306
Aḥmad Sārbān 365, 376n13, 378n18
Aḥmad Yasawī: in Bektashī legend 32–5; children and grandchildren 64–5; in his *chilla-khāne* 26–8, 63; compared with Yūnus Emre 369–70; death date xvii, 62, 71n3; early fame 22–4; family xvii; historical childhood 57–8; *khalīfas* 24–6, 89–94; *khalīfas* among the Qipchaqs 30–1; *khalīfas* among the Western Turks 31–2; legendary childhood 20–2; life as Ṣūfī teacher xviii, 136–40; life in Yasī 61–4; literary influence of 171–5; miracles 22–4, 26–8, 47n42; miracles after his death 28–30; poetry xix–xxiii; shrine 81n49, 82n51, 83n53, n56–7, 86n61; and Soviet ideology vii, xiv, xxiii; spiritual training xviii; *ṭarīqas* originating from 102–5; *türbe* and mosque 65–70; and the Yasawī order xix
akhī(s) 200–1, 230n34, 235n39, 238n43, 239n44–5, 281n2, 364
Akhī Ören (Evren) 270
Āl-i Burhān 58
ʿAlī 8, 20, 71n5
ʿAlī Lālā, Shaikh 62, 78n32, n34, 79n35
ʿĀlī, Muṣṭafā xv
ʿĀlim Shaikh of ʿAlīyābād xii
alp 210–11, 213, 258n90, 260n94
Amīr Sulṭān 284n15
Amu Darya 4–5
Anatolia 37, 104, 107, 123n62, 177–8, 198–200, 206–10, 213, 216n3–4, 230n34, 235n39, 257n86, 268, 281n4, 286n19, 362–4, 321; *see also* Rūm
ʿAnbar Ana 89, 91–4, 108n3, 111n15
Ankara 239n45
Arab(s) 4–5, 9
Argu 130–1, 133, 155n33, 157n35
ʿārif 22
Arslan Bābā xvii–xviii, 8, 20–1, 38n3–4, 39n5, 40n10, 46n32, 57–8, 70n1, 92, 108n1
ʿarūḍ meter xxvi n16, lii, 9–10, 135, 159n42, 173–5, 181n8, 209, 252n77, 254n80, 279, 305–7, 332n18–19, 381n23, 382n26
ʿāshuq 174, 178, 183n17, 258n87, 279, 367–8
ʿĀshıq Pasha 210, 247n66, 250n75, 257n86, 270, 277, 326n2, 327n4, 340n29, 363, 371n2–3
Avshar Bābā 31
Azerbaijan 31, 37, 191 ñ 3
Azerī 177–8, 182n12, 186n27, 266n108, 303, 328n8

bāb, *bābā* 7–8, 366
Bābā Māchīn 24–5, 39n4, 43n18, 128
Bābā'ī uprising 200, 230n35
Badakhshān 34
Baghdad 58–9, 74n12

Bahā' al-Dīn, Shaikh 26
bakhshi 174, 177, 182n10, n12, 185n21
Balāsāghūn 6, 133, 153n26, 154n28, 155n33, 156n34
Balkh 4
Bāqirghān 90–2, 109n5, 110n9, 112n17
Bâqirghân kitâbı 175, 183n17, 184n18
Barāq Bābā 200, 233n37, 234n38
Bashqird 130–1
Basmıl 130
bāṭinī 230n34, 232n35–6, 234n38, 239n43, 320, 354n56, 362
Baṭṭāl Ghāzī 207, 249n74
Bayrāsh b. Ibrāsh Ṣūfī 30
Bektashī, Bektashiyya xvi, xix, 39n8, 49n50, 53n66, 54n68, 55n72, 56n73, 102, 104, 120n54, 122n60, 123n62, 233n36, 239n43, 257n87, 268–70, 277, 280n1, 281n4, 366–8, 370n1, 371n4, 382n26
Bughrā Khān 10–11, 30, 89–91, 111n15, 156n34
Bukhārā 5, 7–8, 22, 28, 36, 43n19, 58–61, 63, 72n8, 73n9, 74n12, 77n28, n30, 93, 132, 146n14, 191
Bulghar Turks 36
Burhān al-Dīn Tirmidhī 202–4, 208, 240n47

Chaghatay, 130, 134, 157n39, 159n41, 177–8, 179n2, 184n19, 185n20
Charuq 130–1
Chelebi Ḥusām al-Dīn 204, 206, 247n64, 248n69
Chigil 130–1
China 4–5, 9, 11, 17, 50n52, 147n15, 150n21, 152n24
Chomul 130–1
creation: Ṣūfī view of 339n28

dastān 17n31, 160n45
dawriyya 318–19, 350n45, 366, 375n11
Dede Korkut 15n19, 18n33, 187n27, 211–12, 264n107, 265n108, 405
deyiş 211, 261n99
Dīwān of Yūsuf Emre 302–3, 324n1, 327n4, 328n7; linguistic character of 303–4; literary character of 304–7
Dīwān-i Ḥikmat xix–xxiv, 127–30, 137–8, 159n41, 171–3, 175–7, 179n2, 180n3; date of 141n4; editions of 142n6; linguistic character of 130–4; literary character of 134–6; manuscripts of 142n4

elegies 11
erens 213; of Khurāsān 23, 33–5
Eşrefoğlu 365, 374n11
ethics 333n20, 334n23, 335n24, 336n25
existence: Ṣūfī view of 341n29
Evliyā Chelebi xv, 31–2, 64

Faḍl Allāh al-Na'īmī Astarābādhī Ḥurūfī 321, 358n62; *see also* Ḥurūfī
fanā' 14n9, 117n40, 311
Fārāb 6, 154n28, 132
Farghānā 4–8
Farīd al-Dīn 'Aṭṭār 15n18, 28, 139–40, 161n47, 167n56, 168n57, 202, 248n68
folk literature 210–11
futuwwa 200, 235n39, 236n40, 238n43

Gawhar Shahnāz 20, 57, 64
Geyikli Bābā 31, 49n49–50, 231n35, 266n111, 270
ghazal 9, 220n11
al-Ghazālī 7, 198, 348n38
Ghaibī, Ṣunu' Allāh 365, 378n18, 380n19
Ghujduwānī, 'Abd al-Khāliq xviii, 22, 41n12, 47n43, 59–61, 73n9, 75n20, 77n24, n30, 103–4, 119n49, 222n18
Gıjgıj Dede 32
Göktürks 4, 132, 146n14, 147n15, 151n23, 152n24; *see also* Qarakhānids
Gülshehrī 209, 239n44, 251n77, 256n84, 257n85, 326n2
Gurgān 5

Hacı Kemal 302, 327n3, 328n6
Ḥaḍrat-i Turkistan 30, 57; *see also* Yasī
Ḥājjī Bayram 284n15, 289n23, 363, 365, 372n7
Ḥājjī Bektash 32–5, 37, 39n8, 48n47–8, 49n50, 50n51, n53, 51n61, 52n65–6, 54n68–9, 55n71, 104, 121n59, 122n60, 123n61, 198, 229n30, 239n43, 268–70, 201n3
Ḥājjim Sulṭān 35
Ḥakīm Ata, Sulaimān xii, xiv, 24–7, 42n17, 87n65, 89–92, 108n4–5, 109n7, 110n13–14, 111n15, 112n17, 128, 173, 175–6, 183n17, 287n21
Ḥakīm Sanā'ī 74n18, 79n34, 139, 167n56, 168n57, 248n68

ḥāl 342n31
al-Ḥallāj 7, 22, 137, 163n50, 311
Hamadān 58, 73n9
Ḥanafī, Ḥanafism 8, 58–9, 63, 75n20, 77n28, 79n37, 137, 232n36; and the Turks 15n17
Ḥasan Andāqī, Khwāja 60, 63, 73n9, 77n30
Ḥasan-oğlu 178, 186n25–6
Ḥazīnī xi, xiii, xv, xvii, xix, 37n1, 40n10, 116n31, 169n58, 409
Herat 7, 43n19, 51n61, 59, 74n14
Hidāyat Allāh Āfāq 31, 47n40
Hindal Mīrzā 29
Horos Dede 31, 50n51
Ḥubbī Khwāja 91–2
Humāyūn 29, 46n33, 107
Ḥurūfī, Ḥurūfism 104, 123n62, 230n34, 321, 355n57, 356n59, n61, 358n62, 367, 370n2, 382n26, 383n27; *see also* Faḍl Allāh al-Naʿīmī Astarābādhī Ḥurūfī
Hüveyda, Chimyanlı 134, 175

Ibn al-ʿArabī 197–9, 221n16, 309, 320, 348n38, 350n43, 356n61
Ibn al-Fāriḍ 198
Ibn al-Najjār 59, 74n15, n19
Ibrāhīm Efendi 365, 378n18; *see also* Olanlar Shaikhi
Ibrāhīm Sulṭān, Ḥājjī 268, 280n1
Idrīs Mukhtafī 365
Imām Marghuḍī 24–6
Īqāniyya 105, 120n54
ʿIrāqī, Fakhr al-Dīn 198, 202, 227n24, 242n51
Isfījāb 5, 133, 155n32
Isḥāq Khwāja xii–xiii

Jahriyya 30–1
Jāmī xv
al-Jandī, Muʾayyad al-Dīn 198, 228n28
Jumjuma sulṭān 177, 185n20

Kademli Bābā Sulṭān 31
Kamāl Shaikh 94, 101
Kāmil Shaibānī, Shaikh 26, 43n19
Kāshghar 6, 10–11, 130–1
kayabaşı 211, 261n100
Khaḍir 20, 23, 26, 28, 39n6, 41n12, 60, 73n9, 90, 101, 119n49, 175, 183n16
khalq liii, lvii n2
khalwa 99–100, 118n44
Khalwatiyya 293n37
Khāqāniyya Turkish 131–3, 146n14, 149n19, 151n23, 153n26, 156n33, 158n39
kharābāt 170n59
Khaṭāʾī (Shāh Ismāʿīl I) 278, 266, 298n55, 366, 381n24
Khudāidād xiii
Khurāsān 4, 7–11, 23–4, 29, 33–7, 48n47–8, 50n52, 53n67, 59, 62, 76n22, 77n28, 90, 104, 107, 132, 193
Khwājagān(ī) xii, xviii
Khwārazm 23, 25, 37, 78n32, 89, 107, 112n17, 201, 230n33
Kirmānī, Awḥad al-Dīn 198, 226n23–4
Konya 208, 228n27, 229n32
Köprülü, M. F.: academic and scholarly career xxviii–xxxi; method and approach to research xiv–xvii
kopuz 3, 12, 185n21, 210–11, 258n87–8, 264n107, 367
Korkut Ata 8; *see* Dede Korkut
koşma 211, 260n97, 261n98, 307
Kutadgu Bilig 10–12, 16n27–8, 127, 133–5, 140, 153n26–7, 157n39, 159n42, 174, 179n2, 306

Lāhawrī, Ghulām Sarwar xvii
love: Ṣūfī view of 311, 344n34, n36, 346n36
Luqmān-i Paranda 33–4, 51n61, 122n59

madrasa 11–12
Maḥabbatnāme 177, 184n19
Maḥmūd of Ghazna 17n31, 215n2
Maḥmūd Ḥairānī 268, 280n1
Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī 130–3, 306
Maḥmūd Shabistarī 164n50, 170n59, 318, 353n52
Makhdūm Qulī 177, 186n24
Manṣūr Ata 29, 46n32, 89
Marw 4, 7, 25, 58–9, 74n18
Mathnawī (of Rūmī) 205–6, 209, 247n64–5, 248n69, 318
mathnawī 10–11
Mawlānā *see* Rūmī
metempsychosis 318, 353n52
Muḥammad Baghdādī, Shaikh 26, 43n19
Muḥammad Dānishmend 24–5, 27, 42n17, 90, 109n7, 118n42

Muḥammad Ibn al-Ḥanafiyya 33, 35, 57, 66, 70n1, 71n5, 87n66, 116n32, 250n74
Muḥammad Sharīf of Bukhārā xiii
Mühlbacher 270, 278, 284n14, 302–3, 324n2
Muʿīn al-Dīn Parwāna 198, 206, 227n24–5
al-Muʿtaṣim 5–6
Muʿtazilī(sm) 8

Najm al-Dīn Dāya 198, 227n26
Najm al-Dīn Kubrā 43n19, 47n43, 62, 78n32, 197, 223n19, 225n21, 227n26, 243n54
Naqshbanī(yya) xi–xii, xix, 36–7, 51n61, 56n73, 65, 73n9, 75n20, 77n31, 80n44, n46, 94, 102–4, 106–7, 120n54, 125n70, n75
Naqshī Aq Kirmānī 365, 377n17
al-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh 236n40
Nāṣir-i Khusraw 318
Nawā'ī, ʿAlī Shīr xii, xxi, 134, 158n39, 172–4, 181n8
Neoplatonism 203, 244n58, 309, 318, 336n25, 337n26, 341n31, 353n52
Nesīmī 321, 381n23, 382n26
Nīshāpūr 7, 33, 43n19
Nithārī Bukhārī, Ḥasan xi, 38n4, 64, 108n1
Niyāzī Miṣrī 278, 285n17, 294n39, 297n51

Oghuz 5–6, 39n7, 131–3, 145n13, 149n19, 150n23, 153n27, 154n28, 155n29 ñ 30, 156n34, 186n27, 191–3, 195, 207, 211–12, 214n1, 215n2, 257n87, 264n106, 264n107, 303
Oghuz menkabesi 12, 17n33
Oghuznāme 18n33, 185n21, 211–12, 262n104, 263n105–6, 264n107, 265n108
Olanlar Shaikhi 278, 365, 380n18–19; *see also* Ibrahim Efendi
Orhan, Sultan 31, 49n49, 48n46–7, 50n53, 52n66, 255n83, 270
Orkhon Inscriptions 132, 146n14, 151n23, 153n27, 214n1
ozan 8, 174, 185n21, 210–11, 257n87–8, 266n108, 266n109, 367–8, 384n29

Pantheism 244n58, 309
perfect man 318, 347n38, 349n42
Persian literature 9–11, 135, 159n42, 174, 207–8, 214, 219n11, 363
Pīr Dede 31
poets 299n56

Qādirī (*ṭarīqa*) 271, 286n19
qaṣīda 9, 220n11
Qara Khiṭāy 58
Qarachuq Mountain 21–2, 39n7, 154n28
Qaraja Aḥmad 268, 270, 281n4, 283n11
Qarakhānids 8, 10–11, 17n31, 58, 77n28; *see also* Göktürks
Qarluqs 5–6, 132, 145n13, 148n16, 150n23–4, 152n25–6, 155n29, n33, 156n34, 157n35, 158n39, 215n2
Qay 130, 146n15
Qayghusuz 49n50, 277, 332n17, 350n45, 363, 365, 372n5, 374n11, 377n13, 383n26–7
Qayı 146n15
Qāzān Khān 27
Qazaqs 31, 36, 69–70, 85n60, 87n67, 88n69, 113n17, 125n76, 127, 173
Qipchaqs 18n33, 30, 130–1, 133, 149n19, 153n27, 155n29, 158n39, 173, 177, 185n21
Qızılbash 201, 278, 362, 365, 367, 382n25
al-Qūnawī, Ṣadr al-Dīn 198, 227n24, n26, 228n27, n29, 243n54, 249n71
al-Qushairī, Abū 'l-Qāsim 7
Qutaiba b. Muslim 4–5
Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaidar 52n62
Qutham Shaikh 103, 121n55

Rashīd al-Dīn 17n33, 262n104
Rifāʿī 198, 233n36, 286n19
Rūm 35–6, 45n30, 48n46–7, 49n50, 50n52, 53n67, 268; *see also* Anatolia
Rūmī, Jalāl al-Dīn 161n46, 162n48–9, 163n50, 165n52, 167n56, 170n59, 201–6, 222n18, 227n26, 228n27, 229n32, 235n38, 240n46, 243n53–5, 244n56, 245n60–1, 247n67, 256n84, 261n99, 274, 278, 280n1, 309, 311, 316, 318, 320, 331n17, 340n28, 343n32, 345n36, 349n40, 351n47, 360n64

Saʿd al-Dīn, Shaikh 26
Ṣadr Ata 93–4, 113n18
Ṣadr-i Jihān 58

Ṣadrs of Bukhārā 77n28
sagu 160n45
Saʿīd Ata 89
Saif Allāh Khalwatī 365, 377n16, 378n18
Saif al-Dīn Bākharzī 26, 43n17, n19, 62
Sairām 20–2, 57, 70n1, 114n21, n26, 133, 145n12, 150n20, 155n32
Sakarya River 270–1, 275, 285n16
samāʿ 203, 243n54
Sāmānids 5–6, 77n28, 130
Samarqand 4, 8, 23, 29, 36, 45n28, 58, 60–1, 64, 73n91, 76n20, 76n23, 145n14
Sanjar, Sultan 60–2, 76n22, 77n28, 132, 223n18
Sarı Ismāʿīl 268, 281n3
Sarı Saltuk 35–6, 53n68, 55n72, 266n110
Sāsānids 4, 6, 9
Savrān 27, 44n25, 69, 154n28, 155n29
Sayyid Aḥmad (Ata) 93–4, 104, 111n16, 112n17, 114n23
Sayyid Manṣūr 29, 46n32, 115n30
Sayyidī ʿAlī Raʾīs 64–5, 104n17
saz 3, 174, 178, 182n12, 270n11, 364, 367–8
Seljuk(s) 8, 15n17, 17n30, 77n28, 191–5; art 220n13; civilization in Anatolia 195–6, 210, 216n4, 217n5; court 258n88, 259n91
Shāh Ismāʿīl I, *see* Khaṭāʾī
Shaikh Ibrāhīm 20–2, 57
Shaikh Nuṣrat 32
Shams al-Dīn Tabrīzī 202–4, 226n23, 241n48–9, 242n52–3
Sharīʿ and the Ṣūfīs 273, 292n33–4, 308, 311
Shāsh 5–6, 36, 110; *see also* Tashkent
Shayyād Ḥamza 208, 253n79, 257n85
Shīʿī(sm) 8, 15n18, 77n28, 162n49
sigir 3, 216n4
Sivrihisar 270, 282n7, 285n16, 300n57
Soghdia 4–6, 145n14
şölen 3, 110n12, 216n4
Ṣūfī movement 197–201
Ṣūfīs 166n54, 168n57; biographies of 14n10
Ṣūfism in Turkistan 7–9; origins of 7
al-Suhrawardī, Shihāb al-Dīn xvii, 7, 118n44, 224n19, 226n23, 234n38, 333n20
al-Suhrawardī al-Maqtūl 7
Sulaimān Turkmānī 200, 234n38
Sulṭān Ibrāhīm-i Thānī 34
Sulṭān Walad 208–9, 245n60, 248n67, 254n80, 255n82, 256n84, 257n85, 326n2, 328n10
Ṣūrī 27, 45n26
syllabic meter xxvi n16, 3–4, 135, 160n44, 181n8, 209, 254n80, 261n98, 302, 305, 307, 329n13
Syr Darya 5, 8, 36–7, 39n7, 62, 65, 69, 107, 132–3, 145n14, 152n25, 154n28, 191

tajaltī 315, 340n29
Talas 5, 72n6, 146n14, 150n20, 152n25, 154n28, 155n32, 155n33
Tapduk Emre 268–9, 271–2, 275, 277, 282n5, n7, 286n18, 287n20, n22
Ṭarāz *see* Talas
Tashkent 29, 62, 65, 92–4, 107, 113n20, 114n23, 132; *see also* Shāsh
Tatars 130
tekke 110n8; poetry 364–5, 373–8
Tīmūr 28, 36–7, 65–8, 81n47–8, 82n51, 83n57
Tokhsi 130–1
Toquz Oghuz 5, 132, 145n13, 148n16, 152n26, 191, 214n1
Transoxiana 4–5, 7, 9–10, 23–4, 58–9, 77n28, 94, 104, 107
T'u-chüeh 148n15, 155n32; *see also* Turks, Eastern
Türgesh 5
Turkish literature 255n83, 258n87, 261n98; influence of Iran on 9–11; popular literature 11–12, 159n43; pre-Islamic 3–4; Western Turkish literature 206–10, 369–70
türkmānī 211, 260n96, 261n97
Turks 215n2; in Anatolia 191–5, 250n74; as described by Maḥmūd al-Kāshgharī 130–4; Eastern 4–5, 37, 41n14, 64, 127, 149n16–17, 153n27, 156n33; Islamization of 4–5; Northern 31, 36–7, 47n43, 69, 89, 127, 177; pre-Islamic 4–5; pre-Islamic survivals of 110n12, 111n14, 118n46, 259n91; Western 4–6, 31–2, 37, 52n66, 53n68, 152n25
türkü 17n31, 178, 186n26, 211, 260n95, 261n97

ʿUbaid Allāh Aḥrār 29, 93–4, 101, 105, 114n23, 119n51

Uftāda, Shaikh 278, 296n47–8, 365
Ughraq 130–1
Uighur(s) 9, 11, 17n30, 130–2, 146n15, 150n21, 152n24, n26, 154n28, 157n39, 179n2, 184n19, 214n1, 263n105–6; *see also* Toquz Oghuz and Turks, Eastern
Umayyads 5
Ummī Sinān 365, 376n12
Urgench 25
Ushrūsana 6
Uways al-Qaranī 289n23, 295n42
ʿuzla 118n44

varsağı 211, 260n97

waḥdat al-wujūd 221n16, 305, 309–11, 338n27, 340n29

Yabaqu 130
Yaghma 130–1
Yarkand 31
Yasawī *ṭarīqa*: and Bektashī tradition xix; presence in Anatolia xix; rules of 94–9
Yasī 22–3, 25–7, 29, 36, 44n25, 57, 61–2, 64–5; present-day 69–70, 70n1, 72n6
Yedi-Su 5
Yimak 130–1
yoğ 3
Yūnus Emre: and *ʿāshuq* literature 367–8; in Bektashī tradition 268–9; and Bektashī poetry 366–7; compared with Aḥmad Yasawī 369–70; early life of 269–72; his burial place 274–7; his fame among Ṣūfīs and others 277–80; his influence 362–4; his illiteracy 272–7, 291n31, 306; his work 302–3; and Ḥurūfism 321; as moralist 307–9; origin of his name 280n2; as Ṣūfī 309–20; and *tekke* poetry 364–5
Yūsuf Hamadānī xviii, 22–3, 41n12, 73n9, n11–12, 74n15–19, 75n20, 77n27, 79n34, 104, 119n49, 122n59, 124n64, 165n51; in Bukhārā 58–61; his *khalīfas* 63
Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib 10–11; *see also Kutadgu Bilig*
Yūsuf u Zulaikhā 173, 181n8

Zangī Ata (Bābā) 42n17, 89, 92–4, 111n15, 113n20, 289n24
Zarkūb, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn 203–4, 245n60