



**HAL**  
open science

# The Perfect Man in Bektashism and Alevism : **Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's Kitāb-ı Mağlaḡa**

Zeynep Oktay Uslu

► **To cite this version:**

Zeynep Oktay Uslu. The Perfect Man in Bektashism and Alevism : **Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's Kitāb-ı Mağlaḡa**. Religions. Université Paris sciences et lettres, 2017. English. NNT : 2017PSLEP009 . tel-02091310

**HAL Id: tel-02091310**

**<https://theses.hal.science/tel-02091310v1>**

Submitted on 5 Apr 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# THÈSE DE DOCTORAT

de l'Université de recherche Paris Sciences et Lettres  
PSL Research University

Préparée à l'École Pratique des Hautes Études

L'Homme Parfait dans le Bektachisme et l'Alévisme :  
Le *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* de Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl

École doctorale de l'EPHE – ED 472

Spécialité : Études arabes et islamiques

Soutenue par :

**Zeynep OKTAY USLU**

le 02 Juin 2017

Dirigée par :

**Mohammad Ali AMIR-MOEZZI**

COMPOSITION DU JURY :

M. Mohammad Ali AMIR-MOEZZI  
École Pratique des Hautes Études  
Directeur

Mme Nathalie CLAYER  
École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales  
Rapporteur

M. Eric GEOFFROY  
l'Université de Strasbourg  
Membre du jury

M. Ahmet T. KARAMUSTAFA  
University of Maryland  
Rapporteur

M. Pierre LORY  
École Pratique des Hautes Études  
Président du jury

M. Thierry ZARCONI  
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique  
Membre du jury

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Résumé  | III |
| Acknowledgements  | XVI |
| Introduction  | 1   |
| PART ONE  |     |
| 1. The Layers of Religious Meaning and Social Context in the Works of<br>Ḳayğusuz Abdāl   | 27  |
| a) The Doctrine of the Four Gates   | 27  |
| b) <i>Farğ</i>  | 33  |
| c) <i>Hāl</i>   | 36  |
| d) <i>‘Aql</i>  | 40  |
| e) Changing Audiences: From Fear to Certainty   | 44  |
| f) Layers in the Doctrine of ‘Alī   | 48  |
| g) The Social Context   | 52  |
| h) Conclusion   | 57  |
| 2. Ḳayğusuz Abdāl’s Religious Doctrine  | 58  |
| a) Theophany  | 60  |
| b) Immanence and Transcendence  | 63  |
| c) Essence and Existence  | 70  |
| d) The Preeternal Pact and Eternal Paradise   | 74  |
| e) The Coincidence of Opposites   | 84  |
| f) The Perfect Man  | 89  |
| g) Muḥammad-‘Alī and the Twelve Imams   | 92  |
| h) Conclusion   | 95  |
| 3. Boundary-making and Genre-making: The Role of Dervish Piety in the Creation of a<br>Vernacular Islamic Tradition in Anatolia | 97  |
| a) Self-differentiation from Representatives of Religious Authority   | 99  |
| b) The Making of a Genre: How Folk Tradition and Sufi Tradition Come<br>Together in the Turkish <i>şatḥiyye</i>                 | 110 |
| c) Conclusion   | 125 |
| d) Appendix I   | 127 |
| e) Appendix II  | 128 |
| 4. Ḳayğusuz Abdāl’s Legacy: The Religious Doctrines of the <i>Abdāls</i> of <i>Rūm</i>  | 130 |
| a) Şādıḳ Abdāl’s <i>Dīvān</i>   | 131 |
| b) Yemīnī’s <i>Fazīlet-nāme</i>   | 142 |
| c) Şemsī’s <i>Deh Murğ</i>  | 154 |
| d) Vīrānī Abdāl’s <i>Risāle</i> and <i>Dīvān</i>  | 161 |
| e) Conclusion   | 172 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| PART TWO: <i>The Book of Prattle (Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa)</i> by K̄aygusuz Abdāl | 175 |
| 1. About the Present Edition  | 176 |
| a) Selected Manuscripts   | 176 |
| b) Other Manuscripts  | 178 |
| c) Stemma   | 182 |
| d) Principles of the Edition  | 183 |
| 2. Critical Edition   | 184 |
| 3. Translation  | 242 |
| 4. Commentary   | 285 |
| a) A True Dream or a Satanic nightmare?                                   | 287 |
| b) Social Criticism via Dreams  | 292 |
| c) Incessant Battle with Satan  | 299 |
| d) Dream and Wakefulness  | 303 |
| e) Dervishhood and Perfection   | 308 |
| f) Immanence  | 311 |
| g) Muḥammad and ‘Alī  | 314 |
| h) Preeternity and Afterlife  | 318 |
| i) Spiritual Travel   | 320 |
| j) The Microcosmos and the Microcosmos                                    | 322 |
| k) Imagination  | 324 |
| l) Symbolic Language  | 327 |
| m) Audience   | 330 |
| Conclusion  | 333 |
| Bibliography  | 339 |
| Sample Facsimiles   | 360 |

## Résumé

L'histoire de la piété Alévie est incarnée dans le grand corpus d'œuvres connues sous le titre de « la littérature Alevi-Bektachi », avec ses propres multitudes de genres, terminologie, symbolisme et conventions esthétiques. Bien que très peu étudiée et éditée, la formation de ce corpus est en fait essentielle pour notre compréhension du développement de la tradition religieuse vernaculaire en Anatolie. Notre connaissance des conceptions religieuses des premiers musulmans d'Anatolie, encore à ses débuts, est centrée en grande partie sur la production textuelle de l'élite urbaine. Des exceptions importantes à ce fait résident dans les premiers textes de la piété derviche, qui présentent une gamme de dynamiques illustrant comment les groupes religieux se sont formés et définis, en relation avec les rôles sociaux des groupes de derviches.

Ahmet T. Karamustafa définit les *Abdālān-ı Rūm* comme un groupe de derviches de tendances antinomiques affiliées de façon ténue qui faisaient partie d'un nouveau mouvement de renonciation apparu dans la période intermédiaire tardive (vers 600-900 / 1200-1500). Ce mouvement de renoncement s'est développé en réaction à l'institutionnalisation du soufisme à partir du 12<sup>e</sup> siècle, qui s'est accompagné d'un regard davantage séculier du soufisme, comme en témoigne les réseaux de relations des soufis avec l'élite politique et culturelle au pouvoir.

Comme les Bektachis, les *Abdāls* de *Rūm* se distinguaient initialement des autres groupes derviches d'Anatolie par un choix du turc vernaculaire comme véhicule d'expression de leur littérature. Ce groupe est devenu plus identifiable par ses tenues et pratiques dans la seconde moitié du 15<sup>e</sup> et la première moitié du 16<sup>e</sup> siècle et a progressivement été intégré à l'ordre officiel Bektachi au 17<sup>e</sup> siècle. Les *Abdāls* de *Rūm* sont devenus l'un des constituants du Bektachisme, si ce n'est son constituant principal. Comme les preuves le suggèrent, avant le 16<sup>e</sup> siècle, les *abdāls* étaient un groupe plus large et plus important que les Bektachis. D'autre part, en dépit de la représentation de la littérature hérésiographique du 16<sup>e</sup> siècle et malgré la rivalité entre *abdāls* et *bektāşīs* dans certaines hagiographies, la différence entre ces groupes n'était pas toujours claire. En fait, tous les derviches dont les travaux sont examinés dans cette étude étaient affiliés aux deux groupes.

Depuis les années 1990, peut-être en parallèle avec ce qu'on appelle le renouveau Alévi, un grand nombre d'aspects de l'histoire Alévi-Bektachi ont été étudiés par des chercheurs. Un aspect de cette histoire qui demeure dans l'ombre est celui de l'évolution historique des doctrines Bektachi et Alévi. En raison du manque de focalisation sur les œuvres des Bektachis et des *abdāls* primitifs, les descriptions de l'évolution de la doctrine Bektachi ont gardé une hypothèse fondamentale : l'adoption des croyances shi'ites par les Bektachis date du 16<sup>e</sup> siècle, et ce

en raison de l'interpénétration avec les Kızılbâş. La soi-disant « Shi'itisation » des Bektachis a ainsi conduit à l'introduction des croyances shi'ites « extrémistes » et duodécimaines. Ma recherche démontrera l'erreur présente dans ce calendrier, en établissant que les éléments du Shi'isme « extrémiste » et du Shi'isme duodécimaine existaient en fait chez les *abdāls* et les Bektachis dès le 14<sup>e</sup> siècle.

Le travail développé ici constitue en une tentative d'étude du mouvement derviche des *Abdālān-ı Rūm* à travers des sources écrites directement par ces derviches, en se concentrant exclusivement sur les aspects doctrinaux de leur pensée, ce qui n'a jamais pour l'heure été traité en profondeur. Pour cela, mes sources sont les œuvres littéraires des *abdāls*, qui incluent les *mesnevīs*, les traités, les collections de poésie, les œuvres épiques, les œuvres en prose de fiction. Les études historiographiques sur les mouvements de derviches anatoliens se sont concentrées sur les documents officiels de l'ère ottomane, les hagiographies et les sources telles que les dictionnaires biographiques, qui souvent disent peu sur de tels mouvements de derviche. Malgré un certain niveau de problématisation, toutes ces sources ont été envisagées avant tout comme des « documents », tandis que leurs aspects littéraires et doctrinaux ont été considérés comme secondaires.

L'objectif de cette étude est de combler l'écart créé par les différentes priorités de diverses disciplines, en combinant les perspectives historiques, doctrinales et littéraires. Une telle approche méthodologique pose des questions de premier plan telles que le choix du genre, le public visé et la relation organique entre les dispositifs littéraires et les compréhensions doctrinales. En raison du manque d'études approfondies antérieures sur les œuvres des *abdāls* et *bektāşīs*, j'ai dû remonter aux origines: le premier *abdāl* et *bektāşī* à produire des œuvres littéraires majeures, Kaygusuz Abdāl.

Kaygusuz Abdāl, qui est un saint toujours vénéré de l'Alévisme, a vécu dans la deuxième moitié du 14<sup>e</sup> siècle et la première moitié du 15<sup>e</sup> siècle. Il était le représentant plus célèbre et plus prolifique des *Abdālān-ı Rūm*. Ses œuvres ont joué un rôle clé dans la formation du genre ultérieurement appelé « la littérature Alévi-Bektachi ». En effet, Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, le fameux savant turc l'appelle à juste titre « le fondateur de la littérature Alévi-Bektachi ». La position sacrée accordé à Kaygusuz Abdāl dans la tradition Alévi-Bektachi, la quantité d'écriture qu'il a produite, et l'influence qu'il avait sur ses successeurs indiquent que nous avons affaire à une figure historique majeure.

Plusieurs points de référence nous aident à contextualiser l'importance de Kaygusuz Abdāl pour l'histoire Bektachi. Non seulement il était le premier *abdāl* à écrire abondamment, il était aussi le premier derviche connu à se qualifier de Bektachi dans son œuvre. Nous pouvons lier Kaygusuz Abdāl à Hacı Bektāş (m. vers 669 / 1270-71) à travers son maître Abdāl Mūsā,

qui fut l'adepte de Hātūn Ana (ou Qadıncık Ana), la fille spirituelle de Hacı Bektāş. Abdāl Mūsā est également connu pour sa participation à la conquête de Brusa qui, selon la légende, l'attache à la Bektachisation des Janissaires. Selon la tradition Bektachi, Qayğusuz Abdāl a initié l'utilisation du couvre-chef Qalandarī à douze plis. Qayğusuz et son maître sont titulaires des noms de deux des douze sièges cérémoniels en peau de mouton (*pūst*) dans le *meydān* (salle de cérémonie) Bektachi, les reliant aux devoirs de *naķīb* (registraire, assistant du maître) et *ayaķçı* (gardien des chaussures, en charge des tâches domestiques telles que le nettoyage) dans la cérémonie Bektachi (*cem*). Le couvent de Qayğusuz en Egypte, qui perdura jusqu'en 1965, était l'un des quatre couvents des Bektachis détenant le rang de *khalīfa*.

Les déclarations de Qayğusuz Abdāl sur sa préférence de la langue turque ainsi que ses opinions antinomiques du soufisme traditionnel le placent directement au cœur des mouvements des derviches renonçants d'Asie Mineure. Les ouvrages de Qayğusuz Abdāl constituent notre premier témoignage des doctrines des Bektachis et des *Abdālān-ı Rūm*, à l'exception des *Maķālāt* attribués à Hacı Bektāş. Ils éclairent ainsi une variété de questions concernant la formation du Bektachisme, telles que l'évolution de la doctrine de 'Alī, de la doctrine des Quatre Portes (*dört kapı*) et d'autres éléments, la nature et la durée de l'influence Hūrūfī et les enseignements qui marquent la continuité et la différence des doctrines primitives avec le Bektachisme institutionnalisé et la pensée *abdāl* des derniers siècles.

Les ouvrages de Qayğusuz consistent en : plus de 530 poèmes, trois *meşnevīs* longs, trois *meşnevīs* courts, un livre de poésie (*Gülistān*), trois œuvres en prose (*Delīl-i budalā*, *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, et *Vücūd-nāme*), deux œuvres en vers et prose (*Dil-güşā* et *Serāy-nāme*). Ils contiennent les premières références aux éléments doctrinaux d'origine shi'ite constitutifs du Bektachisme et de l'Alévisme, à l'instar de la vénération de 'Alī, des douze imams, des *ahl al-bayt*, la doctrine de Muḥammad-'Alī, traités dans leurs aspects doctrinaux ainsi que ritualistes. Ensemble, ces références doctrinales sont les tout premiers dans l'histoire Alévi-Bektachi et établissent Qayğusuz Abdāl comme une figure fondamentale pour le Bektachisme et l'Alévisme.

La première partie de cette étude est consacrée en grande partie à l'étude des ouvrages de Qayğusuz Abdāl, à l'exception du chapitre trois, qui traite également de Yūnus Emre, et du chapitre quatre qui traite des doctrines religieuses des *abdāls* qui suivent Qayğusuz. Dans le premier chapitre, j'instaure une méthodologie spécifique pour l'évaluation des œuvres de Qayğusuz Abdāl, en mettant l'accent sur la doctrine des Quatre Portes (*dört kapı*). Celle-ci est une doctrine essentielle du Bektachisme et de l'Alévisme, élaborée pour la première fois dans les *Maķālāt*. La doctrine des Quatre Portes fournit une structure d'ensemble pour les différentes étapes de la voie spirituelle. Les Portes sont classées par rapport au niveau de connaissance et

de perfection, comme celles de la Loi (*ṣerī'at*), la Voie (*ṭarīkat*), la Vérité (*ḥaḳīkat*) et la Connaissance (*ma'rifet*). Je montre que les enseignements de Ẓayğusuz Abdāl changent de contenu et de vocabulaire selon le niveau spirituel de son public, dont la hiérarchie est établie selon la doctrine des Quatre Portes. Les changements fréquents dans le public créent un œuvre à plusieurs perspectives qui parle à tous les niveaux spirituels simultanément. Je relie cette qualité des œuvres de Ẓayğusuz à sa personnalité sociale et montre comment il adopte différentes positions vis-à-vis de la société, afin de nier l'existence d'une identité sociale singulière.

L'identification du public auquel chaque texte ou chaque passage est adressé nous permet de systématiser le corpus pluriel et non organisé des enseignements de Ẓayğusuz Abdāl. Cela permet à la fois de lire avec précision les changements doctrinaux de Ẓayğusuz. Les enseignements de Ẓayğusuz peuvent être catégorisés selon quatre niveaux hiérarchiques, dirigés vers trois types de public : l'adhérent laïc, le novice et l'adepte. Cette catégorisation nous rappelle qu'il n'est pas dans l'intérêt de l'enseignant spirituel antinomien de renoncer à l'adhérent laïc ; le *pīr* doit plutôt attirer les *'avāmm*, les laïcs représentatifs de la société en général, et peut-être même les persuader d'entrer dans le chemin. C'est cette dynamique qui exige que Ẓayğusuz Abdāl déplace sa position sociale selon le segment de la société avec lequel il souhaite interagir.

Aussi secs et didactiques qu'ils soient, les enseignements moraux orthodoxes occupent cependant la plus grande partie du corpus de Ẓayğusuz Abdāl. Ce n'est que lorsque nous nous interrogeons sur le «pourquoi» et «pour qui» que nous commençons à comprendre pourquoi son humour profond et ses interprétations doctrinales uniques, qui sont facilement visibles dans ses poèmes individuels et le *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, ne tiennent pas davantage de place dans son corpus. À cet égard, la hiérarchie des Quatre Portes incarnée dans la langue de Ẓayğusuz nous offre un moyen de classer ses enseignements et de déterminer l'audience ciblée de chacun. Le décalage qui en résulte entre certains enseignements, tels que ceux concernant l'au-delà et la divinité de 'Alī, devrait donc être examiné dans son contexte social. Dans ce sens, nous pouvons interpréter la coexistence de couches différentes dans les enseignements de Ẓayğusuz Abdāl, en plus de ses différentes tendances sociales, en tant qu'un jeu entre ce qui est acceptable et ce qui ne l'est pas, entre ce qu'est « l'orthodoxie » et la « hétérodoxie », où Ẓayğusuz joue et redéfinit les limites de chacun.

Dans le deuxième chapitre, je mène une évaluation approfondie de la doctrine religieuse de Ẓayğusuz Abdāl en m'appuyant sur toutes ses œuvres, y compris un manuscrit ancien jusque là inconnu contenant sa collection de poésie la plus complète. J'analyse les œuvres de Ẓayğusuz par deux voies majeures: 1) La relation entre l'immanence et la transcendance de Dieu et



comment ces deux aspects se manifestent par rapport au niveau d'enseignement (la Porte spirituelle). 2) La relation entre l'ésotérique (*bāṭin*) et l'exotérique (*ẓāhir*) et les changements dans cette relation par rapport aux Portes.

Dans ses fréquentes adresses à ses publics de différents niveaux spirituels, Ḳayḡusuz ne nous permet jamais de perdre de vue que le but de ses écrits est l'éducation du disciple. Pourtant, à maintes reprises, le mot « doctrine » nous trompe dans l'explication de ses écrits qui racontent son expérience personnelle intime de la sainteté de manière aussi visionnaire que Rūzbihān Baqlī. Bien qu'il se réfère parfois au pôle (*ḳutb*), on a généralement l'impression que Ḳayḡusuz ne croit pas à l'existence d'une hiérarchie parmi ceux qui ont atteint la perfection. Les saints et les prophètes sont tout simplement des manifestations de l'essence Muhammadienne, qui est à chaque instant le seul véritable acteur. Pour Ḳayḡusuz, la réalisation de cette vérité est la même que la réanimation de sa mémoire, la mémoire du temps de l'unité où l'existence n'était pas masquée par une dimension exotérique.

En effet, Ḳayḡusuz ne tente pas d'historiser son œuvre. Il ne se réfère pas aux saints musulmans le précédant, il cite rarement le Coran et les hadiths, il ne montre aucun respect pour l'ordre historique des prophètes qui ne sont pas distinctifs ontologiquement des personnages de fiction comme Majnūn et Rustam. Pour lui, le temps et l'espace ne sont que des concepts appartenant à des êtres créés, et dont il s'est libéré. Il obtient sa connaissance directement de la source, ce qui correspond à son propre individu.

Pour Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, la sainteté n'est pas la proximité de Dieu telle qu'elle est comprise par l'école Akbarienne. La proximité implique néanmoins une hiérarchisation des niveaux de sainteté. La sainteté n'est pas non plus définie par la manifestation de l'Imam au cœur de son dévot, ce qui impliquerait une hiérarchie ontologique entre les deux titulaires de la *walāya*. Bien que Ḳayḡusuz soit constamment préoccupé par l'apocalypse comme il se manifeste dans le monde exotérique et au cœur du saint, il se réfère au Mahdi uniquement quand il veut signifier que le Mahdi n'est que le derviche lui-même. Encore une fois, le moi est le seul sauveur et le seul maître spirituel du saint.

D'autre part, nous devons admettre que, à un certain niveau, le *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṭa* rompt avec cette perspective générale, car dans cet ouvrage, 'Alī apparaît (à la fois) comme le guide intérieur du derviche et le *ẓāt* (le soi / l'essence) de Dieu. Nous pourrions donc parler d'une influence « extrémiste » (*ghulāt*) sur la doctrine de Ḳayḡusuz, bien que cela ne s'étende pas à toutes ses œuvres.

Cela dit, même le *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṭa* corrobore totalement le mépris total de Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl pour tous les intermédiaires entre lui et Dieu. Dans cette optique, son écriture à plusieurs perspectives qui se déplace librement entre différentes positions doctrinales peut aussi être lue

comme un commentaire sur la nature de la révélation, qu'il estime être au-delà de toute sorte d'ordre conféré par le temps et l'espace. Lorsqu'il est considéré parallèlement avec ses proclamations fréquentes affirmant l'assimilation de sa parole à celle de Dieu, on pourrait dire que ̘aygusuz a cherché à imiter la structure même du Coran, avec ses multiples voix et ses significations juxtaposées. Cela devient plus explicite dans le troisième chapitre, lorsque j'étudie les paroles paradoxales de ̘aygusuz Abdāl et les confronte à l'indéniable influence de celles de Yūnus Emre.

Le langage de ̘aygusuz est un exemple remarquable de la futilité de maintenir une division stricte entre l'islam des savants et l'islam populaire, définis par des pratiques visibles. Comme le montre le chapitre suivant, ̘aygusuz était l'un de ces mystiques qui ont fait le plus grand effort possible pour se dissocier de toute affiliation à la haute culture.

Dans le troisième chapitre, j'étudie le rapport entre le choix d'écrire en turc vernaculaire et le contexte social, en particulier la façon dont le milieu derviche se situe vis-à-vis les représentants officiels de la religion. J'utilise ici comme point de départ la formation de la *ṣaṭḥiyye* turque, créée par Yūnus Emre (m. 720/1320-21) et poursuivie par ̘aygusuz Abdāl. Je lis la *ṣaṭḥiyye* turque comme un moyen de transition entre le genre de *shatḥ* dans le Soufisme classique et les genres de la littérature orale, tels que le *tekerleme* (énigme humoristique) et le *maṣal* (conte populaire). Je soutiens que ce genre reformulait les connaissances soufies dans un langage et une expérience populaires dans lesquels ceux qui n'avaient pas d'éducation islamique pouvaient néanmoins participer. Dans le même temps, ce genre excluait les représentants de l'islam exotérique en raison de son contenu expérientiel. En conséquence, il créait une limite entre son public et les représentants officiels de l'islam, empêchant ainsi les accusations de ces derniers d'avoir l'effet désiré sur le public. Ceci permettait l'acceptation de la prétention des auteurs à la sainteté.

Avec des figures comme Sulṭān Valad (m. 712/1312), 'Āṣıḳ Paṣa (m. 733/1332) et Gülṣehrī (m. après 717/1317), Yūnus Emre appartient à la toute première génération d'auteurs connus pour avoir écrit en turc occidental, dont les exemples écrits ne peuvent remonter qu'à la fin du 13<sup>e</sup> / début du 14<sup>e</sup> siècle. Yūnus Emre est le véritable ancêtre de la poésie mystique et lyrique en turc anatolienne. Malgré son caractère unique, la poésie de ̘aygusuz a été fortement influencée par celle de Yūnus Emre, à la fois dans son contenu et sa langue. Dans un de ses poèmes, ̘aygusuz exprime ouvertement cette influence et son effort pour trouver sa propre voix: « *Ben kendü sözüüm söyleyem ṣi 'r-i Yūnusı terk idem* [Je dois parler ma propre parole; Je dois arrêter d'imiter la poésie de Yūnus]. »

J'analyse la poésie des deux mystiques, en particulier leurs *ṣaṭḥiyyes*, à partir de plusieurs angles complémentaires : Tout d'abord, j'examine comment cette poésie est utilisée

pour créer une délimitation entre l'élite religieuse et le milieu derviche, ce dernier s'étendant au peuple. Deuxièmement, j'étudie le rôle que cette délimitation joue dans la création d'un genre littéraire. Pour cela, je me concentre sur la création du genre de la *şaṭhiyye* turque – différente du *şah* classique - de Yūnus Emre et de son successeur Ḳayğusuz Abdāl. Je montre comment le genre comble l'écart entre les concepts soufis classiques et les genres de la littérature folklorique (orale à cette époque). Je démontre que la fabrication des limites et le transfert culturel et religieux sont des aspects complémentaires de la même dynamique, qui sont mis en évidence en fonction du contexte. Mon objectif plus large est d'offrir une approche multidimensionnelle basée sur le contexte qui permettra de mieux appréhender le rôle de la piété derviche dans la formation des croyances et des pratiques Alévi-Bektachi. Celle-ci éclairera aussi la dynamique de l'émergence d'une tradition religieuse vernaculaire, dans l'exemple du domaine littéraire turc d'Anatolie.

La vision des groupes de derviches en tant que porteurs de l'islam dans l'environnement « rural » de l'Anatolie et parmi les tribus turkmènes en particulier, mise en avant par Fuad Köprülü et développé par ses successeurs, connaît plusieurs lacunes : cet auteur a établi une dichotomie stricte entre les modes de piété urbains et ruraux, malgré les preuves du contraire ; il a décrit la piété derviche comme une représentation inadéquate de l'islam, un syncrétisme fondé principalement sur les croyances pré-islamiques, bien que la production textuelle des mêmes groupes de derviches ne présentait aucun signe de croyance pré-islamique. Les poètes derviches ont écrit en turc simple, non parce qu'ils manquaient du type d'éducation qui leur permettrait d'utiliser des mots persans et arabes, mais parce que leur relation avec leur public l'exigeait. Cette relation les a également amenés à participer à un repositionnement de leur connaissance et de leur expérience religieuse dans le contexte de la tradition populaire qui les entourait. Cela a été rendu possible par une fusion des genres et des concepts de la littérature soufie classique avec ceux de la tradition folklorique. Une langue vernaculaire de l'islam a donc été formée non seulement comme un simple acte de traduction d'une langue à l'autre, mais comme un transfert d'une forme de connaissance mystique et d'expérience dans ses parallèles les plus proches du domaine folklorique.

En outre, le paradigme de Köprülü oubliait une dynamique principale : les limites qu'il percevait entre les compréhensions légalistes et mystiques de l'islam en Anatolie n'étaient ni territoriales ni essentielles. Elles ont été continuellement mises en œuvre par des acteurs des deux côtés, ouverts aux changements en fonction du contexte immédiat. En ce sens, les premiers exemples de la *şaṭhiyye* turque montrent que le transfert de la connaissance soufie dans le domaine de la littérature populaire a également formé et réalisé une frontière : il a permis au peuple de participer à une sorte d'expérience mystique dont les autorités islamiques étaient

exclus *de facto*. Cette interaction dynamique de l'inclusion et de l'exclusion était au cœur de l'émergence du domaine turco-islamique, ainsi que le fondement poétique de ce qui deviendra plus tard la littérature Alévi-Bektachi.

Le quatrième chapitre est une analyse doctrinale des œuvres de quatre *abdāls* allant du début du 15<sup>e</sup> au début du 17<sup>e</sup> siècle : Le *Dīvān* de Şādiķ Abdāl (fin du 14<sup>e</sup> et 15<sup>e</sup> siècles) ; le *Fazīlet-nāme* de Yemīnī (m. après 925/1519), le *Deh Murğ* de Şemsī (m. après 919/1513), et le *Risāle* et le *Dīvān* de Vīrānī (fin du 16<sup>e</sup> et début du 17<sup>e</sup> siècle). Ce chapitre montre l'hétérogénéité colorée des positions doctrinales des *abdāls*, dont le système d'affiliation libre a permis une diversité de doctrines et de pratiques. Bien sûr, une autre raison de la diversité donnée est l'influence du genre et du public, ce qui nous rappelle l'importance de tenir compte d'une évaluation littéraire lors de la détermination du contenu doctrinal.

Notre étude approfondie des œuvres de Kaygusuz Abdāl nous a montré que dans le milieu vernaculaire de la tradition *abdāl*, la forme et l'auditoire sont essentiels à l'établissement du contenu. Ainsi, en tant qu'étudiants de religion, nous devons coupler notre approche historique avec une compréhension littéraire. Le genre n'est pas simplement une coquille vide que l'auteur remplit de sa pensée. En instituant ou en rompant la convention, en établissant un type d'audience, le genre crée du contenu.

Mon choix des travaux susmentionnés résulte de la disponibilité de leurs éditions, de la taille des œuvres qui fournissaient une quantité suffisante de matériel à étudier, de leur public et de leurs périodes. Une étude comparative de ces textes, étant la première de son genre pour le milieu *abdāl*, nous confronte avant tout à la grande hétérogénéité des doctrines religieuses de ce milieu. La déification de 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib dans un texte peut être remplacée par l'établissement du rang supérieur de Muḥammad dans un autre. L'importance accordée aux miracles dans certains textes peut être complètement ignorée dans d'autres.

Certaines de ces différences résultent du public et du genre sélectionnés. Le *Dīvān* de Şādiķ Abdāl consiste principalement en poésies didactiques enseignant aux adhérents laïcs et aux novices les piliers du chemin Bektachi. Ainsi, bien qu'il ne soit pas destiné à ceux qui sont dans le rang spirituel le plus élevé, il ne parle pas à la société en général, mais plutôt à ceux qui ont une relation avec le milieu Bektachi. D'autre part, le *Fazīlet-nāme* de Yemīnī est une œuvre épique écrite pour le grand public : les guerriers saints et ceux qui aiment la famille du Prophète. Le *Deh Murğ* de Şemsī est un ouvrage de littérature classique consacré à un sultan ce qui conduit nécessairement l'auteur à adopter des propos mesurés et prudents. Le *Risāle* de Vīrānī Abdāl est un traité didactique écrit pour le voyageur. Son *Dīvān* est un témoignage intime du voyage spirituel de Vīrānī qu'il partage avec ceux d'un rang spirituel aussi élevé. La différence

entre le *Dīvān* de Vīrānī et son *Risāle* montre alors peut-être par-dessus tout l'importance du genre dans l'établissement des points de doctrine.

Face à son corpus divergent et riche, les intentions de ce chapitre restent néanmoins humbles: il vise à n'être qu'un échantillon des perspectives doctrinales et sociales circulant dans le milieu *abdāl* de la fin du 14<sup>e</sup> au début du 17<sup>e</sup> siècle. En plus d'un certain nombre d'autres textes qui attendent d'être étudiés, le grand corpus de poèmes individuels d'auteurs avec l'appartenance *abdāl* ou Bektachi dans des collections de poésie reste pratiquement intact. Pour cette raison, je ne vise pas à parvenir à une conclusion définitive sur l'évolution de la pensée et de la pratique *abdāl*, bien que certaines de mes conclusions préliminaires à cet égard seront expliquées ici.

Je souhaite me concentrer ici sur les points de différence et de continuité entre les textes qui permettront une évaluation de l'évolution doctrinale de la pensée *abdāl*. Pour commencer, Le *Dīvān* de Şādīk Abdāl met l'accent sur la sainteté et désigne 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib comme le visage de Dieu et la dimension ésotérique de tous les saints, tout en écartant des références spécifiques à Muḥammad ou des doctrines qui lui sont liées. D'autre part, le *Fazīlet-nāme* de Yemīnī dépeint 'Alī comme un héros épique et souligne son rôle de vecteur de l'islam. L'ouvrage établit la supériorité de Muḥammad sur 'Alī à plusieurs reprises, tout en se concentrant sur leur unité essentielle. Alors que le traitement de Yemīnī sur la *nubuwwa* et la *walāya* montre l'influence shi'ite, des éléments tels que l'admiration de 'Alī par les trois califes suggèrent que Yemīnī cherchait aussi un terrain d'entente avec le public sunnite.

Yemīnī mentionne les pratiques *abdāl* de rasage de tous les poils du visage, de l'ascétisme extrême et de voyage. Ses références à la fraternité religieuse (*muṣāhiblik*) indiquent que cette importante institution Alévi existait au début du 16<sup>e</sup> siècle. Alors que le *Dīvān* de Şādīk Abdāl ne fait aucune référence aux concepts du *tawallā* et du *tabarrā*, ces concepts sont répandus dans le texte de Yemīnī. Compte tenu de l'absence de ces notions dans les textes de Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, nous pouvons affirmer que ces concepts ne sont pas venus au centre de la doctrine *abdāl* avant la fin du 15<sup>e</sup> siècle. Şādīk Abdāl et Yemīnī critiquent tous les deux l'hypocrisie des savants religieux, soufis et ascétiques. Cela semble donc être une tendance commune qui s'est créée dès le début, ainsi que le suggère le troisième chapitre. Ni Şādīk Abdāl ni Yemīnī n'évoquent la possibilité d'une union avec l'essence de Dieu, ce qui était pourtant un aspect répandu dans l'œuvre de Ḳaygusuz. Cet aspect de la pensée de Ḳaygusuz devrait probablement être considéré comme original.

Le *Deh Murğ* de Şemsī dépeint les *abdāls* comme l'un des nombreux groupes. Les éléments *abdāls* illustrés dans son ouvrage sont donc les traits qui correspondent à l'image publique des *abdāls* et pas nécessairement les vues de Şemsī en tant qu'*abdāl*. Comme c'était

le cas pour Şādīk Abdāl, dans l'ouvrage de Şemsī, *abdāl* et *bektāşī* constituent la même catégorie. Les *abdāls* sont des adeptes de 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, Imām Ḥusayn, et du Maḥdī. Ils pratiquent le *tawallā* et le *tabarrā*. Ils pleurent pendant Āshūrā'. Ils consomment du cannabis et de l'alcool, ignorent les devoirs religieux et considèrent ce monde comme le seul lieu de salut. Ces caractéristiques rappellent l'auto-représentation de Ḳayğusuz Abdāl. Comme c'était le cas pour Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, les *abdāls* du début du 16<sup>e</sup> siècle étaient également attaqués pour leurs croyances et leurs pratiques considérées comme des innovations.

Vīrānī était à la fois *abdāl* et *bektāşī*. Il diffère de ses prédécesseurs par son affiliation Ḥurūfī. L'œuvre de Vīrānī nous offre de nombreux détails sur les pratiques des *abdāls*. À la fin du 16<sup>e</sup> siècle et au début du 17<sup>e</sup> siècle, les *abdāls* continuaient à consommer du cannabis et de l'alcool, à pratiquer les quatre coups et à vénérer les descendants de 'Alī. Ils n'accumulaient pas de richesse. Leur panoplie comprenait des casquettes, des ceintures, des haches et des lames, que complétaient les capes et les peaux d'animaux portés depuis le temps de Ḳayğusuz. Comme ses prédécesseurs, Vīrānī critique les hypocrites soufis, ascétiques et religieux. Il met également l'accent sur l'importance de l'abandon du monde. D'autre part, on ne peut pas dire qu'il ignore complètement la *sharī'a*, car il fait de nombreuses références à la prière quotidienne et au jeûne.

Vīrānī est le seul des quatre auteurs à traiter la doctrine des Quatre Portes. Son traitement montre l'influence de Ḥacı Bektāş et Ḳayğusuz Abdāl. Tandis que le *Risāle* de Vīrānī exprime l'unité de la prophétie et de la sainteté par l'unité de Muḥammad et 'Alī, le *Dīvān* est largement consacré à la vénération de 'Alī, dont la déification a atteint un degré imprévisible à la lecture des auteurs précédents.

Comme nous l'avons déjà mentionné, notre discussion dans ce chapitre démontre l'hétérogénéité du mouvement *abdāl* qui, en raison de sa structure d'appartenance lâche, a laissé plus de place à l'expression individuelle du tempérament et de la croyance. Cette diversité est également le résultat de la vaste gamme d'outils et de genres littéraires à la disposition des membres du mouvement, en fonction de leurs éducations, de leurs milieux sociaux, de leurs publics sélectionnés et de leurs tempéraments. En outre, nos quatre auteurs nous montrent que la cohabitation des mouvements *abdāl* et *bektāşī* n'était pas un épiphénomène spécifique à Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, mais un caractère répandu dans l'histoire *abdāl*, jusqu'à la dissolution complète du mouvement *abdāl* dans le Bektachisme.

Pour ma recherche, dans la première partie, j'utilise une combinaison de textes édités et non édités, en m'appuyant presque exclusivement sur des sources primaires. Étant donné que la majeure partie du matériel fait l'objet d'une analyse approfondie pour la première fois, je compléterai ma lecture rapprochée des textes par des citations fréquentes, en essayant ainsi d'établir un équilibre entre une vision de l'ensemble et une précision détaillée.

Tout en espérant être un point de départ important, l'étude donnée ne prétend pas être un compte-rendu exhaustif des doctrines des *Abdālān-ı Rūm*. Un travail aussi étendu ne peut être réalisé qu'une fois que tous les travaux existants des *abdāls* ont été édités et étudiés en profondeur. Néanmoins, j'espère présenter ici une méthodologie pour une telle enquête, qui vise à unir ce que les *abdāls* disent dans leurs travaux en intégrant le « comment » et le « pourquoi ». Ces questionnements sont profondément liés et ne peuvent trouver de réponse que par une unification des approches historiques, doctrinales, philologiques et littéraires.

La deuxième partie de ma thèse est consacrée à l'édition critique, la traduction et le commentaire de l'ouvrage plus fascinant de Kaygusuz Abdal : le *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*. Le *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* est un texte en prose écrit à la troisième personne qui raconte le *teferrüc* (voyage) d'un derviche qui se trouve tout seul au désert. Lors de son voyage, il rencontre plusieurs personnages bibliques et après chaque épisode, il se trouve encore une fois tout seul dans un désert, se rendant compte qu'il rêvait. Ainsi fait-il le va-et-vient entre l'état d'éveil et l'état de rêve. Dans ses rêves, il combat Satan à côté des prophètes bibliques, sauve les prophètes, rencontre Muḥammad et 'Alī, et participe au banquet au paradis. Dans son état d'éveil, il comprend que toute la réalité fait partie de son propre corps et qu'il n'existe que lui. Cette découverte est exprimée en couplets.

Le *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* est le seul texte de Kaygusuz Abdāl où il élabore théoriquement des éléments d'origine shi'ite, tels que la dualité entre Muḥammad et 'Alī, exprimé en tant que prophétie / sainteté (*nübüvvet / velāyet*), intellect / aptitude à l'amour (*'akl / iṣk*), exotérique / ésotérique. 'Alī est l'Imām par excellence et le derviche voit 'Alī cligner des yeux derrière les yeux des personnages bibliques. Ainsi 'Alī fait un signe au derviche qui indique qu'il est en effet l'Homme Parfait, l'archétype de tous les hommes parfaits, et aussi qu'il est le guide intérieur du derviche. Un niveau plus profond de l'œuvre révèle 'Alī comme l'auto-manifestation de Dieu.

La plupart de ces éléments doctrinaux seront élaborés dans les deux premiers chapitres de la thèse. D'autre part, le commentaire est consacré à deux éléments essentiels pour notre compréhension du *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* : l'idée que l'auteur se fait de Satan et la notion du rêve. Tout en étant en dialogue avec la tradition soufie en la subvertissant en même temps, Kaygusuz joue constamment avec les notions des rêves véridiques et mensongers.

Le *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* peut être qualifié de point culminant de l'œuvre de Kaygusuz Abdāl. C'est pourquoi plusieurs des sujets abordés dans ce commentaire évoluent parallèlement et complètent les discussions dans les chapitres précédents. Dans cet ouvrage, Kaygusuz Abdāl nous offre deux modes d'interprétation majeurs. L'un d'entre eux constitue l'aspect doctrinal de sa pensée, tandis que l'autre présente les caractéristiques d'un commentaire social. Ces deux

modes sont profondément liés, à travers les critiques de ̘aygusuz Abdāl sur les vues courantes sur les rêves, le chemin vers la perfection et les notions concernant Satan, entre autres. ̘aygusuz crée également un équilibre complexe entre les aspects intellectuels et les aspects expérientiels de son texte, combinant ainsi plusieurs des sujets doctrinaux traités au deuxième chapitre avec les caractéristiques expérimentales de la *ṣaḥiyye* étudiées dans le troisième chapitre.

Le commentaire envisage une lecture approfondie qui nous permettra d'évaluer les caractéristiques structurelles et littéraires du *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* conjointement à son positionnement social et doctrinal. Je commence par une discussion sur la façon dont ̘aygusuz joue avec les notions islamiques de rêves envoyés par Dieu et de rêves sataniques. Je démontre comment il renverse les notions de rêves communément acceptées afin de créer l'aspect expérientiel de son récit tout en fournissant un commentaire social. Ce dernier est particulièrement prononcé dans la représentation que ̘aygusuz dresse des érudits religieux, des ascètes et des soufis. J'étudie la représentation de Satan dans le *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* et comment cela se rapporte aux notions d'ego (*nefs*) et de perfection de ̘aygusuz. J'examine la relation entre les aspects formels du texte et la construction des états de rêve et d'éveil auxquels son protagoniste participe. Je montre que tout au long du texte, le protagoniste oscille entre le rêve et l'éveil, la prose et la poésie, la peur et la certitude, ainsi que l'ignorance et la connaissance, tandis que pour chacune de ces paires, les deux pôles opposés fusionnent au fur et à mesure que le texte progresse.

J'enquête ensuite sur plusieurs aspects doctrinaux du texte, qui reflètent de près les sujets abordés dans le deuxième chapitre. Ces discussions se concentrent sur les concepts de perfection et d'immanence, les représentations de Muḥammad et 'Alī, les notions de prééternité et d'au-delà, les représentations des voyages spirituels, la relation entre le microcosme et le macrocosme, et enfin le concept d'imagination. Je conclus le commentaire avec une discussion sur le langage symbolique de l'ouvrage, en mettant l'accent sur la façon dont il reproduit plusieurs des aspects de la *ṣaḥiyye* turque abordée dans le troisième chapitre.

Le *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* est un texte unique dans sa relation avec la littérature classique sur les rêves, à laquelle il se confronte vivement. L'ouvrage nie avec véhémence certains aspects de cette littérature, tout en respectant fidèlement les autres. Cette dualité sert à créer une ambiguïté de sens, utilisée comme un outil à la fois littéraire et doctrinal. ̘aygusuz empêche son lecteur de s'appuyer sur les normes sociales établies pour décider du niveau spirituel de son protagoniste. En tant que tel, la formation du jugement est continuellement reportée. À sa place, la certitude émerge lentement car le lecteur abandonne progressivement l'interrogation du récit et s'ouvre à l'expérience de la vérité qu'il transmet.



Ḳaygusuz représente la perfection comme une bataille sans fin avec son ego, au cours de laquelle son vrai soi est révélé comme étant ontologiquement identique à l'essence de Muḥammad. Il dépeint cette révélation comme un retour au moment prééternel de l'unité avec Dieu, qui est le même que l'unité dans l'au-delà. Le retour à Dieu est un voyage spirituel rendu possible par le dévoilement de la mémoire de l'union. Dans ce dévoilement, Dieu se révèle être identique à 'Alī.

La dualité entre le rêve et l'éveil, la multiplicité et l'unité, l'ignorance et la connaissance expérientielle se reflète sous la forme du texte qui oscille entre des visions de rêve souvent confus racontées en prose et des déclarations de l'unité exprimées par la poésie. À mesure que le texte progresse, les deux réalités opposées commencent à fusionner en conduisant à l'expression parfaite de leur unité: un pauvre derviche qui se trouve au coin d'un four à bain.

Pour conclure, cette étude vise à être une analyse herméneutique des ouvrages de Ḳaygusuz Abdāl et des *abdāls* qui l'ont suivi. Elle a l'intention de prendre en compte le rôle du contexte social dans le contenu de cette littérature. Elle met en évidence les conventions de genre, les outils littéraires et les différentes traditions disponibles pour les auteurs, qui sont tous liés à la sélection de la langue vernaculaire turque comme moyen. Elle tente donc de combler une lacune importante dans notre compréhension de l'histoire des groupes derviches en Anatolie, ainsi que l'histoire de la formation du Bektachisme et de l'Alévisme.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to begin by thanking Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi for his unfailing support as director throughout the years, for directing me towards the critical edition and commentary of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* and proposing the two-part plan for my thesis. I would also like to thank Ahmet T. Karamustafa for his invaluable aid as the second unofficial director and the many skype sessions in which he provided me with important advice. His works and support have been the primary catalyst in the accomplishment of this project. I would like to thank Nathalie Clayer and Ahmet Karamustafa for their supportive reports and the other members of the jury, Pierre Lory, Eric Geoffroy and Thierry Zarcone, for the time they took to read and evaluate my dissertation. I would like to thank all the members of the jury for their positive and highly informative comments, which will serve me greatly in the revision of this dissertation in the form of a book.

I would like to thank my good friend Frantz Chaigne for his invaluable help throughout the years, ranging from a close reading of my work in French to the procurement of secondary sources from libraries in France. I would like to thank my friends Ekin Akalın and Alexandre Quach for their priceless aid during the application process and their strong support at the time of the defense. I would like to thank Paul Ballanfat for his strong assistance during the early phases of my dissertation.

I would like to thank Andrew Peacock, my project coordinator on the ERC funded research project “The Islamisation of Anatolia, c. 1100-1500,” where I worked as a research fellow for two years. My work in this project, which included extensive manuscript research and the writing of short encyclopedic articles (templates) for over sixty authors, gave me an invaluable background on the time period and social context of my dissertation. I would like to thank my fellow colleague on the project, Sara Nur Yıldız, for her extraordinary help in editing one of my articles, which served as a basis for the first chapter of my dissertation. I would like to thank both Andrew and Sara for their valuable feedback on Chapter 2.

The critical edition of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, due to the work’s vernacular nature and the difficult traits of its numerous manuscripts, led me to consult several experts in the field on numerous occasions. I would like to thank my beloved professor Günay Kut for her help in establishing the stemma of the manuscripts, which contained unforeseen new challenges. I would also like to thank her for her help in clarifying certain questions I had regarding the edition. My fellow colleague during my time at Istanbul Medeniyet University, Ahmet Şefik Şenlik, was an extraordinary help to me in clarifying the readings and meanings of several archaic words and phrases, which resulted from the specific vernacular quality of the Old

Anatolian Turkish at hand. I thank him wholeheartedly for his assistance and extraordinary expertise. In the same vein, I would also like to thank Elif Namođlu, Sadık Yazar, and Emine Yeniterzi for their help with certain problems I had regarding the edition. I would like to thank Mehmet Ölmöz for clarifying for me a possible similarity between certain traits of the text and Eastern Turkish. I would like to thank Hatice Karagöz from the Süleymaniye Library for her help in examining the manuscripts at the library for their description.

For the last three years of my PhD, I taught part-time at the Department of Turkish Language and Literature. The five courses which I taught at the department, which included Ottoman Turkish, Sufism, and Folk Literature, all benefited my dissertation process greatly. Moreover, the act of teaching which I deeply enjoyed gave me an additional motivation to continue the strenuous process of dissertation writing. For this reason, I would like to thank Zehra Toska, who invited me to teach, and all the professors of the department for their warm welcome and continuous support.

My advisor in my master's thesis, Zeynep Sabuncu, has been a constant aid to my academic career throughout the years. My first initiation to Sufism was in her classes, and my first acquaintance with Kaygusuz Abdal was in my thesis work with her. For this reason, I thank her wholeheartedly for her part in my academic formation. On a similar vein, I would like to thank Emine Yeniterzi for her extraordinary support during the time I spent as a research assistant at Istanbul Medeniyet University, which greatly helped my motivation to work on my dissertation. I would like to thank Devin deWeese for providing me with a number of sources which helped my research.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband Mehmet Fatih Uslu, whose infallible support and unconditional love have been my main source of motivation in this meticulous process.

## Introduction

The history of Alevi piety is embodied in the large corpus of works known under the title of ‘Alevi-Bektashi literature,’ with its own multitude of genres, terminology and symbolism, as well as its own aesthetic conventions. Though largely unstudied and unedited, the formation of this corpus is in fact vital for our understanding of the development of vernacular religious tradition in Anatolia. Our knowledge of the religious conceptions of early Anatolian Muslims, still in its infancy, is centered largely on the textual production by the urban elite. Important exceptions to this are the early texts of dervish piety, which display a range of dynamics showing how religious groupings are formed and defined, and how this relates to the social roles of dervish groups.<sup>1</sup>

For most of the twentieth century, the Islamization of Anatolia was understood largely through the lens of early Republican scholar Fuad Köprülü. Despite recent critical studies exposing its lack of objectivity,<sup>2</sup> what is now called the ‘Köprülü paradigm’<sup>3</sup> still holds sway in

---

<sup>1</sup> The word dervish denotes a type of mystic who practices spiritual poverty. For the etymology and history of the word, as well as a concise account of dervish practices, see Alexandre Papas, “Dervish,” *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*, Kate Fleet, et al. (eds.), Consulted online on 18 August 2017 <[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912\\_ei3\\_COM\\_25986](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_25986)> First published online: 2011.

<sup>2</sup> See Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, “The Vefâ’iyye, the Bektashiyye and Genealogies of ‘Heterodox’ Islam in Anatolia: Rethinking the Köprülü Paradigm,” *Turcica* 44 (2012): 279-282; Devin DeWeese, *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition* (University Park, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994), 17-39; Devin Deweese, “Foreword,” in Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *Early mystics in Turkish Literature*, ed. and trans. Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff (London-New York: Routledge, 2006); Markus Dressler, “How to Conceptualize Inner-Islamic Plurality/Difference: ‘Heterodoxy’ and ‘Syncretism’ in the Writings of Mehmet F. Köprülü (1890-1966),” *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 37/3 (2010): 241-260; Markus Dressler, *Writing Religion: The Making of Turkish Alevi Islam* (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 19-23; 153-287.

<sup>3</sup> See Köprülü, *Early mystics in Turkish Literature*; Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, “Anadolu’da İslamiyet: Türk İstilasından sonra Anadolu Tarih-i Dinisine bir Nazar ve Bu Tarihin Menbaları,” *Darülfünun Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 2 (1922): 281-311, 385-420, 457-486, translated into English by Gary Leiser under the title *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion (Prolegomena)* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1993); Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, “Bektaşiliğin Menşeleri,” *Türk Yurdu* 16-2 / 169-8 (May 1925), reprint, Ankara, 2001, 9:68-76; Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, “Abdal Musa,” in *Türk Halk Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul: Burhaneddin Basımevi, 1935), 60-64

Turkish scholarship. This paradigm relies heavily on a dichotomy between urban and rural practices of Islam and puts the Islamization of Turkmen tribes largely on the shoulders of ‘rurally based’ dervish groups. With a nationalist agenda, it aims to create a close link between Anatolian Islam and Central Asia through the figure of Aḥmad Yasawī (Ahmet Yesevi), and while disregarding Anatolia’s ethnic diversity, it constructs a narrative of its religious diversity along Sunni-oriented and nationalist lines.

Köprülü’s narrative is particularly relevant to the general (mis)understanding of the emergence of Alevi groups. According to this narrative, the Turkmen tribes who constituted the first Alevis were ‘inadequately Islamized’ due to their distance from urban centers and lack of knowledge of Arabic and Persian. This led to a syncretic belief system in which they kept their pre-Islamic beliefs under a superficial level of Islamization. The dervish groups credited with Islamizing them, themselves more like shamans in Islamic garb, were the forerunners of the Bektashis, the dervish group closely related to the Alevis in belief and practice, which became the official Bektashi order in the sixteenth century.

We can summarize the recent critique of this paradigm in the following way: 1) The works composed by members of these so-called ‘heterodox’ dervish groups as well as their religious networks show in fact that they were thoroughly Islamized.<sup>4</sup> 2) Claims to a strong Yasavi presence among these dervish groups cannot be corroborated.<sup>5</sup> 3) The historical

---

[reprinted with notes and additions by Orhan F. Köprülü in: Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, “Abdal Musa,” *Türk Kültürü* 124 (1973): 198-207]; Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *Influence du Chamanisme Turco-Mongol sur les ordres mystiques Musulmans* (Istanbul: Zellitch frères, 1929). The same paradigm was further developed in the works of authors such as Irène Mélikoff and Ahmet Yaşar Ocak. For an insightful discussion into Köprülü’s legacy with a focus on Mélikoff and Ocak, see Dressler, *Writing Religion*, 251-268.

<sup>4</sup> See Ahmet T. Karamustafa, “Early Sufism in Eastern Anatolia.” in Leonard Lewisohn (ed), *Classical Persian Sufism: from its Origins to Rumi* (London: Khaniqahi-Nimetullahi Publications, 1993), 175-198; Ahmet T. Karamustafa, “Kaygusuz Abdal: A Medieval Turkish Saint and the Formation of Vernacular Islam in Anatolia,” in Orkhan Mir Kasimov (ed), *Unity in Diversity: Mysticism, Messianism and Construction of Religious Authority in Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 329-342. The focus on the pre-Islamic heritage in modern scholarship is also due to the fact that this scholarship relies heavily on hagiographies, and not nearly as much on works by the ‘saints’ themselves.

<sup>5</sup> See n. 1; also see Ahmet T. Karamustafa, “Yesevîlik, Melâmetîlik, Kalenderîlik, Vefâîlik ve Anadolu Tasavvufunun Kökenleri Sorunu,” in Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed), *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf ve Sufiler* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2005), 61-88.

documents held by Alevi families point rather to an affiliation to Abu'l-Wafā' Tāj al-Ārifīn al-Baghdadī (d. 495/1101 or 501/1107), a renowned eleventh century Sufi of *seyyid* status.<sup>6</sup> Also notable is the fact that Abu'l-Wafā' was partly Kurdish,<sup>7</sup> thus further problematizing the general representation of the formation of Alevi belief and practice as a phenomenon which took place primarily in the Turkmen milieu. 4) The claimed dichotomy between urban and rural religious practices does not hold up to scrutiny.<sup>8</sup>

Despite this multi-faceted criticism, scholars have continued to agree with Köprülü and his legacy on a fundamental matter: the role of dervish piety in the formation of Alevi belief and practices.<sup>9</sup> Studies have identified dervish piety as displayed by the early Bektashis, *Abdāls* of *Rūm*, and other dervish groups as an integral part of what officially became Bektashism in the 16th century.<sup>10</sup> In addition, it has been demonstrated that the lodge of the *Abdāls* of *Rūm* in Karbala, identified as a Bektashi lodge in the mid-eighteenth century, served as the primary

---

<sup>6</sup> See Karakaya-Stump, "The Vefā'iyye, 279-300; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "The Wafā'ī Tarīqa (Wafā'iyya) During and After the Period of the Seljuks of Turkey: A New Approach to the History of Popular Mysticism in Turkey," in *Perspectives and Reflections on Religious and Cultural Life in Medieval Anatolia* (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2012), 149-80. The claims to the existence of a Sufi order in Abu'l-Wafā's name have been problematized in a recent article; see Jonathan Brack, "Was Ede Bali a Wafā'ī Shaykh? Sufis, Sayyids and Genealogical Creativity in the Early Ottoman World," in A.C.S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds), *Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-century Anatolia*, 333-360. For the relative unimportance of Sufi genealogies in the dervish milieu of the period, see Karamustafa, "Anadolu Tasavvufunun Kökenleri Sorunu," 83-85.

<sup>7</sup> For the biography of Abu'l-Wafā' see Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, "Subjects of the Sultan, Disciples of the Shah: Formation and Transformation of the Kizilbash/Alevi Communities in Ottoman Anatolia," Dissertation, Harvard University, 2008, 38-50.

<sup>8</sup> See Rıza Yıldırım, "Sunni Orthodox vs Shi'ite Heterodox?: A Reappraisal of Islamic Piety in Medieval Anatolia," in A. C. S Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds), *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2015), 287-307.

<sup>9</sup> It is important to refrain from categorizing Alevism under the category of Twelver Shi'ism, not only because of its unique mode of emergence, but also due to the various fundamental differences in belief and practice.

<sup>10</sup> See Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period 1200-1550* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994), 61-84; Ahmet T. Karamustafa, "Kalenders, Abdāls, Hayderis: The Formation of the Bektāşīye in the 16th Century," in Halil İnalçık and Cemal Kafadar (eds), *Süleymân the Second and His Time* (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1993), 121-129. For the various connotations of the word '*bektāşī*' in different networks and time periods, see Rıza Yıldırım, "Bektaşī Kime Derler?: 'Bektaşī' Kavramının Kapsamı ve Sınırları Üzerine Tarihsel Bir Analiz Denemesi," *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi* 55 (2010): 23-58.

center of authority for the Alevi milieu, in both religious and legal terms, until it was replaced by the Bektashi lodge in Kırşehir in the nineteenth century.<sup>11</sup> We can now estimate that the particular form of piety displayed today by Alevism<sup>12</sup> and Bektashism began to develop from the twelfth or thirteenth century onwards in parallel with the Islamization of Anatolia and consolidated socially and doctrinally in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.<sup>13</sup>

Ahmet T. Karamustafa defines the *Abdālān-ı Rūm* as a loosely-affiliated group of antinomian Sufis who were part of a new movement of renunciation which emerged in the later middle period (ca. 600—900/1200-1500) in the Islamic lands.<sup>14</sup> This movement of renunciation developed as a reaction to the institutionalization of Sufism from the twelfth century onwards, which went hand in hand with Sufism's increased worldliness, as evidenced by the Sufi orders'

---

<sup>11</sup> See Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, "The Forgotten Dervishes: The Bektashi Convents in Iraq and Their Kızılbaş Clients," *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 16/ 1-2 (2010): 1-24. For an overview of Bektashi history, see Thierry Zarcone, "Bektaşiyye," *Encyclopedia of Islam, THREE*, Kate Fleet, et al. (eds.), Consulted online on 26 February 2017 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912\\_ei3\\_COM\\_24010](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_24010) First published online: 2014; Hamid Algar, "Bektāšiya," *Encyclopedia Iranica*, Vol. IV, Fasc. 2, 118-122.

<sup>12</sup> I use the term Alevism with awareness of the historical plurality overshadowed by its modern use.

<sup>13</sup> See Ahmet T. Karamustafa, "Anadolu'nun İslâmlaşması Bağlamında Aleviliğin Oluşumu," in Yalçın Çamak and İmran Gürtaş (eds), *Kızılbaşlık, Alevilik, Bektaşilik* (Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2015), 43-54. Also important is Karamustafa's critique of the privileged role given to New Asceticism in the Islamization of Anatolia by Ocak and others. While underlining its importance, Karamustafa asserts that dervish piety was only secondary to the institutionalization of Sufism and the increasing prevalence of the cult of saints. See Karamustafa, "Anadolu Tasavvufunun Kökenleri Sorunu," 81.

<sup>14</sup> For a detailed study of this renunciant movement, see Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*. For a more concise account, see Ahmet T. Karamustafa, "Antinomian Sufis," in Lloyd Ridgeon (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Sufism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 101-124. Christiane Tortel's argument for the gypsy origins of these dervish movements does not hold up to scrutiny for the case of Anatolia, as already underlined by Fuad Köprülü in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. See Christiane Tortel, *L'Ascète et le bouffon: Qalandars, vrais ou faux renonçants en islam ou l'Orient indianisé* (Arles: Actes Sud, 2009); Mehmet Fuad Köprülü, "Abdal," in *Türk Halk Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi: Ortaçağ ve Yeniçağ Türklerinin Halk Kültürü Üzerine Coğrafya, Etnoğrafya, Etnoloji, Tarih ve Edebiyat Lûgati* (Istanbul: Burhaneddin Basımevi, 1935), 23-56. The word *abdāl*, whose meaning was originally limited to a group of saints in the Sufi spiritual hierarchy, came to denote a type of dervish from at least the fourteenth century onwards. For a concise discussion of the dissemination of *abdāl* groups in various areas of the Islamic realm, particularly Central Asia, see Orhan F. Köprülü, "Abdal: Edebiyat," *TDVİA*, vol. 1 (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988), 61.

web of relations with the ruling political and cultural elite. The antinomianism of this new form of piety took the shape of a rejection of society, linked to a practice of absolute poverty. The new form of piety developed in contradistinction to Sufism, although it continued to rely on Sufi doctrine, in particular that of sainthood.<sup>15</sup> It was thus deeply linked to the rise of the cult of saints. The antinomian dervish presented himself as the model of sainthood, whose authority came directly from God and thus required no social norms and rules for its acquisition. As such, the dervish's antinomian relationship to society was complemented by some level of acceptance by society, wherein this new form of sainthood was recognized.

The conversion to dervish piety was not limited to a certain class. Although for the cultural elite, antinomian dervish movements became a symbol for 'vulgar' religion, the truth was that many people of respectable social status, such as rulers and Sufis, also joined the ranks of the antinomian dervishes. From the sixteenth century onwards, the establishment of regional empires such as those of the Ottomans, Safavids, and Mughals led to the transformation of these dervish groups. In their need for tighter organization, they either joined the ranks of previously existing Sufi orders or transformed into orders themselves. The Bektashis were one such group, which developed into the official Bektashi order in the sixteenth century. Other such groups were the *Ḳalenderīs*, *Ḥaydarīs* and the *Cāmīs*, whose origins were outside of Anatolia and who spoke vernacular Persian. The appearance of the Bektashis as the umbrella group for other dervish groups was most likely a result of the official acceptance of the Bektashis due to their relationship with the Janissaries. As I will demonstrate in the fourth chapter of my study, Janissary allegiance to the Bektashis can in fact be traced to the early 15th century. The emergence of the *Bektāṣiyye* as an order became an opportunity for antinomian dervish groups to acquire a sufficient level of respectability to avoid persecution by the state.

Together with the Bektashis, the *Abdāls* of *Rūm* were initially distinguishable from other dervish groups of Anatolia in that their literature was composed in the Turkish vernacular. This group became more identifiable through their dress and practices in the second half of the fifteenth and first half of the sixteenth century, and was gradually subsumed into the official

---

<sup>15</sup> For the relationship between sainthood and new renunciation, see Ahmet T. Karamustafa, "The Antinomian Dervish as Model Saint," in Hassan Elboudrari (ed), *Modes de Transmission de la Culture Religieuse en Islam* (Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 1993), 241-260.



Bektashi order in the seventeenth century.<sup>16</sup> The *Abdāls* of *Rūm* became one of the constituents of Bektashism, if not the major constituent. As evidence suggests, prior to the sixteenth century, the *Abdāls* were a larger and more prominent group than the Bektashis.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand, despite the portrayal of the heresiographical literature of the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>18</sup> and despite rivalry between *abdāls* and *bektāšīs* in some hagiographies,<sup>19</sup> the difference between these groups was not always clear-cut. In fact, all of the dervishes whose works are examined in this study were affiliated to both groups.

The *Abdālān-ı Rūm* were one of the four major dervish groups of Anatolia according to the Ottoman historian ‘Āşık Pāşāzāde (d. after 1484).<sup>20</sup> They were described by Ottoman Sufi Vāhidī in his *Menākıb-ı H̄oca-i Cihān ve Netīce-i Cān* composed in 929/1522 as a group of itinerant dervishes attached to the shrine of Seyyid Ġāzī. They were affiliated with two fifteenth-century antinomian saints, Otman Baba and Sultān Şücā‘ (Şücā‘eddīn Velī). Vāhidī undertakes a vivid description of *abdāls*: They were completely naked except for a felt garment (*tennūre*) held together with a belt; their heads and faces were shaven.<sup>21</sup> Their feet were bare. Their paraphernalia included leather pouches, a very large yellow spoon, and a dervish bowl. They consumed hashish regularly and had a clear liking for food. They were indifferent towards religious observances. According to Vāhidī, *bektāšīs* also shaved their heads and faces. They

---

<sup>16</sup> See Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 70-78; 83-84; Ahmet T. Karamustafa, “The Formation of the Bektāšīye.”

<sup>17</sup> For a discussion of this matter see Karamustafa, “Aleviliğin Oluşumu,” 49-50.

<sup>18</sup> See the portrayal of *bektāšīs* and *abdāls* of *Rūm* as two distinct groups in: Vāhidī, *Menākıb-ı H̄oca-i Cihān ve Netīce-i Cān* in Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *Vāhidī’s Menākıb-ı H̄oca-i Cihān ve Netīce-i Cān: Critical Edition and Analysis* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 1993), 126-132 (*abdāls* of *Rūm*) and 159-166 (*bektāšīs*). See pp. 7-8 and 10 respectively for summaries in English.

<sup>19</sup> See various episodes in the hagiography of Otman Baba: *Otman Baba Vilāyetnāmesi: Vilāyetname-i Şāhī Göçek Abdal*, ed. Şevki Koca (Istanbul: Bektaşî Kültür Derneği, 2002). For rivalries between various Sufis and dervishes in this period, see Resul Ay, “Sufi Shaykhs and Society in Thirteenth and Fifteenth Century Anatolia: Spiritual Influence and Rivalry,” *Journal of Islamic Studies* 24:1 (2013): 1-24. Although it does not rely on individual research, the article is valuable for its overview of the subject.

<sup>20</sup> ‘Āşıkpaşazāde, *Tevārīh-i Āl-i ‘Osmān*, ed. Ali Bey (Istanbul: Maṭba‘a-i Āmire, 1332/1913-14); reprinted as *‘Ashiqpashazādeh ta’rikhī: A History of the Ottoman Empire to A.H. 893 (A.D. 1478)* (Farnborough: Gregg, 1970), 205.

<sup>21</sup> For this practice of the “four blows” (*çehār darb*), which consists of shaving the head, the eyebrows, the moustache and beard, see Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 19; for the origin of the practice see *ibid.*, 39-44.

wore twelve-gored conical caps of white felt as well as felt cloaks. Like the *abdāls*, they also carried drums and tambourines, which they played together with their chanting. Since its edition, Vāḥidī's work has become the most cited source on the *abdāls* of *Rūm*.

Since the 1990s, perhaps in parallel with what is called the Alevi revival, a great many aspects of Alevi-Bektashi history have been investigated by scholars. These include: the economic and social mechanisms of Bektashi lodges and their relationships with the central government;<sup>22</sup> the function of Bektashi hagiographies in creating networks and patron relations, as well as the role of these in the construction of lodges;<sup>23</sup> the historical background of the emergence of Alevism as brought to light by the study of documents in the hands of families of *ocaḳzāde* / *seyyid* status;<sup>24</sup> the meaning of the Sunni-Alevi bipartition in the context of medieval Anatolia and how this relates to the love of the Prophet's family;<sup>25</sup> the spread of Bektashism in

---

<sup>22</sup> See Suraiya Faroḳhi, *Der Bektaschi-Orden in Anatolien (vom späten fünfzehnten Jahrhundert bis 1826)* (Vienna: Verlag des Institutes für Orientalistik der Universität Wien, 1981); for the Turkish translation of the same work with a revised introduction, see Suraiya Faroḳhi, *Anadolu'da Bektaşılık* (Istanbul, Simurg, 2003). Also see Suraiya Faroḳhi, "Conflict, Accomodation and Long-Term Survival: The Bektashi Order and the Ottoman State," in Alexandre Popovic and Gilles Veinstein (eds), *Bektachiyya: Études sur l'ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant de Hadji Bektach* (Istanbul: Éditions Isis, 1995), 171-184.

<sup>23</sup> See Zeynep Yürekli, *Architecture and Hagiography in the Ottoman Empire: The Politics of Bektashi Shrines in the Classical Age* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2012).

<sup>24</sup> See previously cited works by Karakaya-Stump, as well as Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, "Kızılbaş, Bektaşî, Safevî İlişkilerine Dair 17. Yüzyıldan Yeni Bir Belge (Yazı Çevirimli Metin-Günümüz Türkçesi'ne Çeviri-Tıpkıbasım)," *Journal of Turkish Studies/Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* Volume 30/II (2006): 117-130; Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, "Documents and Buyruk Manuscripts in the Private Archives of Alevi Dede Families: An Overview," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 37/3 (2010), 273-286. A collection of Karakaya-Stump's articles has recently appeared in Turkish. See Ayfer Karakaya Stump, *Vefailik, Bektaşılık, Kızılbaşlık: Alevi Kaynaklarını, Tarihini ve Tarih yazımını Yeniden Düşünmek* (Istanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2015).

<sup>25</sup> See Rıza Yıldırım, "Abdallar, Akıncılar, Bektaşılık ve Ehli-Beyt Sevgisi: Yemini'nin Muhiti ve Meşrebi Üzerine Notlar." *Belleten* 75/272 (2011): 51-85; Rıza Yıldırım, "Beylikler Dünyasında Kerbela Kültürü ve Ehli-Beyt Sevgisi: 1362 Yılında Kastamonu'da Yazılan Bir Maktelin Düşündürdükleri," in Halil Çetin (ed), *Kuzey Anadolu'da Beylikler Dönemi Sempozyumu Bildiriler, Çobanoğulları, Candaroğulları, Pervaneoğulları, 3-8 Ekim 2011 Kastamonu-Sinop-Çankırı* (Çankırı: Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2012), 344-72; Rıza Yıldırım, "Anadolu'da İslamiyet: Gaziler Çağında (XII.-XIV. Asırlar) Türkmen İslam Yorumunun Sünni-Alevi Niteliği Zerine Bazı Değerlendirmeler," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 43 (2014): 93-124. Also see Karamustafa, "Aleviliğin Oluşumu."

the Balkans<sup>26</sup> and the relationship of Bektashism to 20<sup>th</sup> century Balkan nationalist movements;<sup>27</sup> Bektashi history in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and its role in the Turkish revolution as well as the Turkish modernization process.<sup>28</sup>

One aspect of Alevi-Bektashi history which continues to remain in the shadows is that of the historical evolution of Bektashi and Alevi doctrine. On Bektashi doctrine, our main source continues to be J. K. Birge's *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*, written in the early twentieth century.<sup>29</sup> While of unquestionable value, this work offers a general overview of Bektashi doctrines without treating them in their historical transformation. Moreover, its focus lies on practice more than on theory. On many occasions, doctrinal aspects are deduced from the data on practices.<sup>30</sup> As such, the work does not rely on an in-depth doctrinal study of the primary sources: the works written by the dervishes themselves.

---

<sup>26</sup> For important historical personalities in this regard, see Thierry Zarcone, "Nouvelles perspectives dans les recherches sur les Kızılbaş-Alévis et les Bektachis de la Dobroudja, de Deli Orman et de la Thrace orientale," in Jacques Thobie (ed.), *Anatolia Moderna Yeni Anadolu IV: Derviches des Balkans, disparitions et renaissances* (Paris: Jean Maisonneuve, 1992), 1-11.

<sup>27</sup> See Nathalie Clayer, "Bektachisme et nationalisme albanais," in Alexandre Popovic and Gilles Veinstein (eds), *Bektachiyya: Études sur l'ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant de Hadji Bektach* (Istanbul: Éditions Isis, 1995), 277-308, as well as other articles between pp. 269-409 of the same volume; Nathalie Clayer, *Aux Origines du nationalisme albanais: La Naissance d'une nation majoritairement musulmane en Europe* (Paris: Éditions Karthala, 2007), 474-493. Regarding Bektashism in Albania in the 20th century, also see Nathalie Clayer, "Autorité locale et autorité supra-locale chez les Bektashis d'Albanie dans l'entre-deux-guerres," in Nathalie Clayer, Alexandre Papas, Benoît Fliche (eds), *L'Autorité religieuse et ses limites en terres d'Islam* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2013), 159-193.

<sup>28</sup> See Thierry Zarcone, *Mystiques, philosophes et francs-maçons en Islam: Rıza Tevfik, penseur ottoman (1868-1949), du soufisme à la confrérie* (Paris: Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes d'Istanbul, 1993), 87-175, 301-459. For the amicable relations and overlaps between Bektashis and freemasons in the 19th century in the Ottoman realm, see Thierry Zarcone, *Le Croissant et le compas: Islam et franc-maçonnerie: De la Fascination à la détestation* (Paris: Éditions Dervy, 2015), 151-164.

<sup>29</sup> See John Kingsley Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes* (London: Luzac, 1937).

<sup>30</sup> A similar argument can be made for Ahmet Yaşar Ocak's analysis of Bektashi doctrine and practice, discussed below.

Irène Mélikoff's works have had a profound impact on the theoretical perception of Bektashism and Alevism in Turkish historiography.<sup>31</sup> Her perspectives have even impacted the Alevi understanding of their own belief system. Mélikoff's studies rely on ethnographical field research and completely bypass works by Bektashi and Alevi authors written through centuries. As such, they represent a largely ahistorical view of Alevi and Bektashi doctrine. In her characterization of Alevi and Bektashi belief as a syncretism of pre-Islamic beliefs under a superficial level of Islamization, Mélikoff follows the tradition of Fuad Köprülü and expands it to include pre-Islamic religions other than the cult of ancestors (identified erroneously with Shamanism). However, lacking Köprülü's zeal for documentation, Mélikoff relies largely on free association to exemplify similarities between Alevi-Bektashi belief and other religions.

Ahmet Yaşar Ocak's works exemplify a combination of Köprülü and Mélikoff's methodologies. His efforts at evaluating the evolution Alevi-Bektashi thought in historical terms as well as his detailed descriptions of his sources establish his works as sound sources of bibliography and documentation. Compared to Mélikoff, Ocak shifts his focus relatively towards the Islamic roots of Alevi and Bektashi thought and practice. On the other hand, his adoption of the Köprülü paradigm and Mélikoff's conception of syncretism problematize the soundness of his theoretical perspective. His use of the term *kalender* as an umbrella category for several renunciatory groups (including the *kalender*) significantly alters the self-designations of these groups.<sup>32</sup> In the newer editions of his works, which often display a word by word rewrite, Ocak softens his one-sided language towards antinomian dervish movements.

Due to the lack of focus on works by early Bektashis and *abdāls*, descriptions of the evolution of Bektashi doctrine have kept a basic assumption: That the adoption of Shi'i beliefs by the Bektashis dates to the 16<sup>th</sup> century, as a result of interpenetration with the Kızılbaş.<sup>33</sup> The so-

---

<sup>31</sup> See Irène Mélikoff, *Hadji Bektach: Un Mythe et ses avatars* (Leiden: Brill, 1998); Irène Mélikoff, *Sur les traces du soufisme turc: Recherches sur l'Islam populaire en Anatolie* (Istanbul: Éditions Isis, 1992); Irène Mélikoff, *Au Banquet des quarante: Exploration au cœur du Bektachisme-Alevisme* (Istanbul: Éditions Isis, 2001).

<sup>32</sup> As examples will show, the *abdāl* authors examined in this study all use the word *kalender* to indicate their antinomian temperaments, and not a group affiliation.

<sup>33</sup> Name for Alevis abandoned in the 20th century for its pejorative connotations, which originated from the red cap worn by these groups. For a concise example to the erroneous dating, see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "Aleviliğin Tarihsel Sosyal Tabanı ile Teolojisi Arasındaki İlişki Problemine Dair," in İsmail Kurt and Seyid Ali Tüz (eds.), *Tarihî ve Kültürel Boyutlarıyla Türkiyede Aleviler Bektaşiler Nusayriler* (Istanbul: Ensar Neşriyat, 1999), 385-398. Also see

called “Shi‘itization” of the Bektashis thus brought in both “extremist” and Twelver Shi‘ite beliefs. The research at hand will demonstrate the error in this timeline, by showing that elements of both “extremist” and Twelver Shi‘ite belief existed among *abdāls* and Bektashis as early as the 14<sup>th</sup> century.

The present study is an attempt to investigate the dervish movement of the *Abdālān-ı Rūm* through sources written directly by these dervishes, focusing exclusively on the theoretical aspects of their thought, which has never been extensively treated. For this my sources are the literary works of the *abdāls*, which include *meşnevīs*, treatises, poetry collections, epic works, prose works of fiction. The historiographical studies on Anatolian dervish movements have focused on official documents of the Ottoman era, hagiographies, and sources such as biographical dictionaries, which often say little on such dervish movements. Despite some level of problematization, all of these sources have been treated first and foremost as ‘documents’. This is no doubt due to the lack of studies with a literary approach, in which works such as hagiographies are treated first and foremost as works of literature. The difficulties entailed by such an approach have led to a divide in studies on dervish works: On the one hand, there were the scholars with sound knowledge of the historical context, who nonetheless refrained from tackling literary works due to the methodological shift that this required. On the other hand, there were the scholars of literature who studied these texts solely under a literary light, failing to contextualize them and place them in a meaningful historical narrative.

The aim of this study is to bridge this gap by combining historical, doctrinal, philological, and literary perspectives. Such a methodological approach brings to the forefront questions such as the choice of genre, the intended audience and the organic relationship between literary devices and doctrinal understandings. Lacking prior extensive studies on works by *abdāls* and *bektāşīs*, I had to start at the very beginning: the first known *abdāl* and *bektāşī* to produce major literary works, Kaygusuz Abdāl.

Kaygusuz Abdāl (fl. second half of the fourteenth - first half of the fifteenth century), a venerated saint of Alevism to this day, was the most prominent and prolific representative of the

---

Mélikoff, *Sur les traces du soufisme turc*, 31-32, 58-59, 155. Ocak revised his dating in the newest edition of his *Kalenderiler*; see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Kalenderiler: XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar* (Istanbul: Timaş, 2016), 275. Here he underlines the importance of the 15th century in the formation of Bektashi doctrine, evidenced by the existence of Şadık Abdāl’s *Dīvān*, which I will analyze in the fourth chapter.

*Abdālān-ı Rûm*. His works were instrumental in the formation of the genre which later became known as “Alevi-Bektashi literature.” Indeed, the famous Turkish scholar Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı rightly calls him “the founder of Alevi-Bektashi literature.”<sup>34</sup> The sacred place accorded to aygusuz Abdāl in Alevi-Bektashi lore, the quantity of writing he produced, and the influence he had on his successors all indicate that we are dealing with a major historical figure.

Several points of reference help us contextualize aygusuz Abdāl’s importance for Bektashi history. Not only was he the first *abdāl* (a kind of antinomian Sufi) to write extensively, he was also the first known dervish to call himself Bektashi in his works,<sup>35</sup> as evidenced by the following couplet in his *Meşnevî-i Baba aygusuz*:

*Rûm ilinde Bekdāşîdür ol ‘āşık  
Abdāl olmuş cümle ‘ālemden fārık*<sup>36</sup>

That lover is a *Bektāşî* in the land of *Rûm*  
He has become an *abdāl*, detached from the whole world

aygusuz’s relation to Hacı Bektāş (d. ca. 669/1270-71)<sup>37</sup> can be traced through his master Abdāl Mūsā, who was a follower (*muhibb*) of Hacı Bektāş’s spiritual daughter, Hātūn Ana (or adıncık

---

<sup>34</sup> Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, *Kaygusuz Abdal, Hatayi, Kul Himmet* (1962; Istanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2013), 10; Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, “Halk Edebiyatımızda Zümre Edebiyatları,” *Türk Dili (Türk Halk Edebiyatı Özel Sayısı)* 19, no. 207 (1968), 370. The same point is also stressed by Karamustafa, “Kaygusuz Abdal,” 331.

<sup>35</sup> Hacı Bektāş’s disciple Sa‘īd Emre (Mollā Sa‘deddīn) (fl. second half of the thirteenth-first half of the fourteenth centuries), who is the probable translator of the work *Maḳālāt* attributed to Hacı Bektāş, has several poems in praise of Hacı Bektāş. However, he does not use the term *bektāşî* in these. For his poetry, see Sa‘īd Emre (Mollā Sa‘deddīn), *Said Emre’nin Şiirleri*, in Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı (ed), *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf* (Istanbul: İnkılap, 1961), 280-294.

<sup>36</sup> See aygusuz Abdāl, *Meşnevî-i Baba aygusuz*, in Zeynep Oktay, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University, 2013), 172. The following information is also mentioned in Gölpınarlı, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, 12.

<sup>37</sup> For the life of Hacı Bektāş, the Eponym of the *Bektāşîyye* and the most venerated saint of Alevism and Bektashism, see Karamustafa, “Early Sufism,” 186-190; Karakaya-Stump “Subjects of the Sultan,” 90-103; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, “Hacı Bektāş-ı Velî,” *TDVİA*, vol. 14, 1996, 455-458. Contrary to the studies by certain scholars, historical data indicates that Hacı Bektāş was not a direct disciple of either Aḫmed Yesevî (Aḫmad Yasawî) (d. first quarter of the 13th century), Baba İlyās (d. 638/1240), or Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar (fl. 12th century). Hacı Bektāş was not a Yesevî or Ḥaydarî dervish. He did, however, come to Anatolia from Khurāsān or Turkestan with strong Yesevî connections and led an independent path in this land. Hacı Bektāş settled down in the small village of arahöyük and adopted a woman named Hātūn Ana or adıncık Ana as his spiritual daughter. Several waqf records reported by

Ana).<sup>38</sup> Abdāl Mūsā is also known for his participation in the conquest of Brusa which according to legend ties him to the Bektashisation of the Janissaries.<sup>39</sup> According to Bektashi tradition, aygusuz Abdāl initiated the use of the twelve-gored Qalandarī cap (*tāc*).<sup>40</sup> aygusuz and his master are name holders of two of the twelve sheepskin ceremonial seats (*pūšt*) in the Bektashi *meydān* (ceremonial room), linking them to the duties of *naķīb* (registrar, helper of the *mūrşid*) and *ayaķçı* (keeper of the shoes, in charge of domestic duties such as cleaning) in the Bektashi ceremony (*cem*).<sup>41</sup> The lodge of aygusuz in Egypt, which continued to exist until 1965, was one of the four Bektashi lodges holding the rank of *khalīfa*.<sup>42</sup>

aygusuz Abdāl’s open declaration of his preference for Turkish as well as his antinomian view of mainstream Sufism<sup>43</sup> put him squarely within the antinomian Sufi traditions of Anatolia. Apart from the *Maķālāt* attributed to Hacı Bektāş,<sup>44</sup> aygusuz Abdāl’s works are our

---

scholars demonstrate that Hacı Bektāş was dead before 691(1292-92). Hacı Bektāş’s date of death appears as 669(1270-71) in a collection of manuscripts bound in Sivas in 691 (1291) as well as in a late copy of Hacı Bektāş’s hagiography. For a comparative discussion of his various hagiographies, see Yürekli, 58-60.

<sup>38</sup> ‘Aşık Paşazāde, *Tevārīh-i Āl-i ‘Osmān*, 205. For a summary of information and episodes regarding adınçık Ana in the hagiography of Hacı Bektaş, see Irène Mélikoff, “Recherche sur une Bacıyan-ı Rum: Kadınçık Ana,” in *Au Banquet des quarante*, 32.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 204–206.

<sup>40</sup> For the alenderī cap see Erdoğan Ağırdemir, “Bektaşilikte Taç Şekilleri ve Anlamları,” *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velī Araştırma Dergisi* 60 (2011), 371.

<sup>41</sup> For an explanation of these duties, see Esat Korkmaz, *Alevilik ve Bektaşilik Terimleri Sözlüğü* (Istanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar, 2005), 117 and 509. For a list of all the duties and their relationship to the saints in the ‘Bektashi pantheon’; see Yürekli, 38.

<sup>42</sup> For the history of this lodge see F. De Jong, “The Takīya of ‘Abd Allāh al-Maghāwirī (ayghusuz Sulţān) in Cairo,” *Turcica* 13 (1981), 252. For this lodge in connection to aygusuz Abdāl, see Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, “Mısır’da Bektaşılık,” *Türkiyat Mecmuası* C. VI (1939): 13-40.

<sup>43</sup> For an in-depth discussion of both matters see Karamustafa, “aygusuz Abdal: A Medieval Turkish Saint,” 329-342.

<sup>44</sup> The only early manuscript of the Turkish version of Hacı Bektāş’s *Maķālāt* is dated 827/1423. Despite its early date, this manuscript remains largely unrecognized and unstudied (Hacı Bektāş, *Maķālāt*, MS Manisa Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi 3536/2, fols. 58a-87a). The other works attributed to Hacı Bektāş, *Besmele Tefsiri*, *Fātiha Tefsiri*, *Maķālāt-ı Ğaybiyye ve Kelimāt-ı ‘Ayniyye*, *Kitābu’l-‘Fevā’id* and *Hadīs-i Erba’ın*, are inconsistent in content and generally do not survive in early manuscripts, and are thus of uncertain attribution. Many of them have been attributed to Hacı Bektāş merely due to their presence in manuscript compilations which contain Hacı Bektāş’s

earliest definitive testimony to the doctrines of the Bektashis, as well as to those of the *Abdālān-ı Rūm*. They thus shed light on a variety of matters regarding the formation of Bektashism, such as the evolution of the doctrine of ‘Alī, of the doctrine of the Four Gates (*dört kapı*), and other elements; the nature and time-span of Ḥurūfī influence<sup>45</sup>; and the teachings which mark the continuity and difference with the institutionalized Bektashism and *abdāl* thought of later centuries.

In fact, Ḳayğusuz Abdāl’s corpus includes several key elements of what later becomes the religious doctrine of the Bektashis and Alevis: Poetry in praise of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib<sup>46</sup> as well as passages expounding the theoretical foundation for the veneration of ‘Alī;<sup>47</sup> references to the doctrine of Muḥammad-‘Alī<sup>48</sup> as well as passages expounding the doctrine;<sup>49</sup> references to the Twelve Imams;<sup>50</sup> veneration of the *ahl al-bayt* (the prophet’s family).<sup>51</sup> Together, these doctrinal

---

*Maḳālāt*. The above-mentioned Manisa manuscript, a compilation of two works, not only contains the earliest manuscript of the *Maḳālāt*, but also the *Besmele tefsiri* entitled *Kitāb-ı Tefsīr-i Besmele ma‘a Maḳālāt-ı Ḥacı Bektāş*, suggesting that this is an anonymous work bound together with the *Maḳālāt*. See Hünkār Ḥacı Bektāş-ı Velī, *Besmele Tefsiri (Şerh-i Besmele)*, ed. Hamiye Duran (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2009).

<sup>45</sup> For the original doctrine of the Ḥurūfī sect, see Orkhan Mir-Kasimov, *Words of Power, Ḥurūfī Teachings between Shi‘ism and Sufism in Medieval Islam: The Original Doctrine of Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2015). We currently lack studies of the historical evolution of Ḥurūfī doctrine. For an overview of academic work on the *Ḥurūfiyya*, see *ibid.*, 23-31. For a concise introduction to the topic, see Shahzad Bashir, *Fazlallah Astarabadi and the Hurufis* (Oxford: Oneworld, 2005).

<sup>46</sup> See Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Milli Kütüphane Mil Yz A 7621 (dated 920/1514), fol. 129a, 131b, 135b, 136a, 157b, 207a, 222a; also see Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044 (dated 907/ 1501-2), fol. 309b, 320b; Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 29b [Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2010), 226-227].

<sup>47</sup> See Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Kitāb-ı maḡlaḡa*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044 (dated 907/ 1501-2), fol. 266a-267a, 268a-b, 278b-280a. All citations which precede the critical edition will follow this manuscript.

<sup>48</sup> See Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Milli Kütüphane Mil Yz A 7621, fol. 182a, 187a, 223a; the phrase ‘Aḡmed-i Ḥaydar’ on 166b, 177b, 180b, 223b; the phrase ‘Aḡmed ü Ḥaydar’ on 166b, 209b. Also see Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 20b, 21a, 24b, 26b, 39b, 56a, 57b [Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 190-193, 206-207, 214-215, 266-267, 332-333, 338-339].

<sup>49</sup> See Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Kitāb-ı maḡlaḡa*, fol. 266a, 273b.

<sup>50</sup> See Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Milli Kütüphane Mil Yz A 7621, fol. 136a, 137b.

<sup>51</sup> See *ibid.*, fol.129a, 139b.



references are the earliest in Alevi-Bektashi history, and establish Kaygusuz Abdāl as a foundational figure for Bektashism and Alevism.

Kaygusuz Abdāl wrote over 530 individual poems,<sup>52</sup> three long *mathnawīs*,<sup>53</sup> two short *mathnawīs*,<sup>54</sup> one book of verse (*Gülistān*),<sup>55</sup> three works of prose (*Delīl-i Budalā*,<sup>56</sup> *Kitāb-ı*

---

<sup>52</sup> A previously unknown manuscript dated 920/1514 is located in Ankara, Milli Kütüphane, Mil Yz A 7621. It contains 476 individual poems by Kaygusuz Abdāl. 136 of the poems are also found in Abdurrahman Güzel's *Kaygusuz Abdal Divānı*; see *Kaygusuz Abdal Divānı*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel (Ankara: MEB, 2010). The second most important collection of Kaygusuz's individual poems is in the following manuscript which contains over 130 such poems: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Ms.or.Oct. 4044, dated 907 (1501/1502), fol. 288b-341b as well as other folios scattered in the manuscript. For a description of the manuscript see Barbara Flemming, *Türkische Handschriften, Teil I* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1968-1981): 330-331 (No: 424). Güzel's edition relies on this manuscript as well as other sources such as Kaygusuz's hagiography and edited modern poetry collections. Although this edition includes 370 poems, many of these are actually taken from the *Gülistān* of which they are an integral part, and thus should not be considered part of the *Divān*. 51 of the poems in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek manuscript are not found in the Ankara manuscript. Thus the total number of extant poems can be calculated as approximately 530. A critical edition which takes all manuscripts into account can increase this number. I will cite from the Ankara manuscript, except for poems which are found only in the Berlin manuscript, in which case I will indicate the manuscript.

<sup>53</sup> *Meşnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz*, *İkinci meşnevī*, *Üçüncü meşnevī*. Only the first of these has been edited; see n. 54. Although the Staatsbibliothek copy of the last two *meşnevīs* is older than their Ankara copy, due to the problematic nature of the former's orthography which will be explained in Part Two, I have chosen to cite from the Ankara copy. See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *İkinci meşnevī*. Ankara Milli Kütüphane Mil Yz A 7621, (dated 920/1514), fol. 1a-11a; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Üçüncü meşnevī*, Ankara Milli Kütüphane Mil Yz A 7621 (dated 920/1514), fol. 11b-21a.

<sup>54</sup> *Gevher-nāme* and *Minber-nāme*. There are five editions of the *Gevher-nāme*, two of which rely on the oldest manuscript. See Mehmet Akalın, "Kaygusuz Abdal'ın *Gevher-nāmesi*," *Atatürk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Araştırma Dergisi* 10 (1979), 189-197; Müjgan Cunbur, "Gülşehri ile Kaygusuz Abdal'ın Şiirlerini Kapsayan XV. Yüzyıldan Kalan Bir Mecmua," in *X. Türk Dil Kurultayında Okunan Bilimsel Bildiriler 1963* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1964), 23-30. Abdurrahman Güzel's edition contains the longest text; see *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alâeddîn Gaybî) Menâkıbnâmesi*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1999), 119-123. For the edition of the *Minber-nāme* see *ibid.*, 136-140.

<sup>55</sup> The two oldest manuscripts of this unedited work are incomplete; see Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, Ankara, Milli Kütüphane Mil Yz A 7621, dated 920 (1514), fol. 235a-286a; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, dated 907 (1501/1502), fol. 140a-210b. I will use the former in my study.

<sup>56</sup> In the editions of this work, the name appears as the *Budalā-nāme* (*Budalanāme*). This name, however, does not appear in the manuscripts.

*Mağlaṭa*, and *Vücūd-nāme*), two works in verse and prose (*Dil-güşā* and *Serāy-nāme*).<sup>57</sup> The *Gūlistān*, the long *mathnawīs*, the *Dil-güşā*, and the *Serāy-nāme* impart Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s Sufi teachings in a largely didactic tone and give the impression of having been written for the general public. The *Delīl-i Budalā*, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* and the *Vücūd-nāme* on the other hand, were composed for the members of the lodge or dervish group. While the *Delīl-i Budalā* elaborates doctrinal elements for novices, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* is an entirely esoteric text dealing with the deepest and subtlest doctrinal matters. The *Vücūd-nāme* diverges from the other texts in that it deals with a specific and unique subject matter, namely the human body and its relationship with the various constituents of the macrocosmos as well as with the letters in the Arabic alphabet. Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s individual poems can be categorized according to subject matter, which in part determines the prosody patterns and poetic forms. While the majority of the poems are composed in formal meter (*‘arūz*) and focus on the doctrine of the Oneness of Being (*vaḥdet-i vücūd*) – though of course Kayḡusuz’s own interpretation of it, in the poems composed in quatrains and the syllabic meter, social themes come to the forefront. In these poems, social life becomes a vibrant source of symbolism.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Editions of a majority of Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s works have been published; however many of these are not critical. See the following editions: Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Budalanāme*, in Abdurrahman Güzel (ed), *Kayḡusuz Abdal’ın Mensur Eserleri* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1983), 49-74; also Tahir Galip Seratlı (ed), *Vahdet-i Vücut ve Tevhid Risaleleri* (Istanbul: Furkan Kitaplığı, 2006), 11-128; Bilâl Yücel, “Kayḡusuz Abdal’ın Budalanāme’si,” *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Makaleleri 2* (2002): 50-80; Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, in Abdurrahman Güzel (ed), *Kayḡusuz Abdal’ın Mensur Eserleri* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1983), 82-130; also Bilâl Yücel, “Kayḡusuz Abdal’ın Kitābu Mağlata’sı,” *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Makaleleri 2* (2002): 83-117; Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Vücūd-nāme*, in Abdurrahman Güzel (ed), *Kayḡusuz Abdal’ın Mensur Eserleri* (Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1983), 135-152. Critical editions of three of Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s works are available: Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2009), which relies primarily on a nineteenth-century copy which leaves out the Persian sections and only gives their Modern Turkish translations, which are highly inaccurate; Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*; Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kayḡusuz*, in Oktay, 79-173. In addition, a few of Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s most famous poems have appeared in a number of anthologies. The work published under the name *Risāle-i Kayḡusuz Abdāl* by Abdurrahman Güzel is a misattribution; see Güzel, *Kayḡusuz Abdal’ın Mensur Eserleri*, 153-169.

<sup>58</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl also used his pen name in the form “Ḳayḡusuz”, which sometimes leads to the confusion of his poems in the *cönk* and *mecmū’a* with those of a second Ḳayḡusuz named Alāeddīn el-Vizevī, who lived in the 16<sup>th</sup> century and belonged to the Malāmī movement.

Although aygusuz Abdāl has been the subject of numerous studies, very few of them have a theoretical approach.<sup>59</sup> Opinions regarding his religious persona rely largely on his poems in syllabic meter (particularly his *ahiyyāt* [paradoxical sayings]) and revolve around whether or not he should be considered a “Bektashi”.<sup>60</sup> They paint him as either a complete rejectionist of society or an orthodox mystic, without contextualizing the spectrum of social tendencies which depend first and foremost on the segment of society with which the dervish interacts.

Information on aygusuz Abdāl’s life relies entirely on the references in his poems as well as the hagiographies of him and his master Abdāl Mūsā.<sup>61</sup> Some scholars consider the name “aybī” which figures in his hagiography to be his real name.<sup>62</sup> Other scholars, however, assert that this name rather resembles a pen name.<sup>63</sup> His hagiography indicates that he was the son of

---

<sup>59</sup> The few exceptions are Catherine Pinguet, “Remarques sur la poésie de Kaygusuz Abdal,” *Turcica* 34 (2002): 13-38; Karamustafa, “Kaygusuz Abdal: A Medieval Turkish Saint.” The first of these focuses on aygusuz Abdāl’s *ahiyyāt*, while the second investigates aygusuz Abdāl’s Sufi thought, political attitude, and the role of both in his literary production in the Turkish vernacular.

<sup>60</sup> The most comprehensive study on the topic is Güz̄el’s *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alāaddīn Gaybī)*. This work, however consists largely of a list of Sufi terms and concepts and can be misleading in its portrayal of aygusuz as an orthodox Sunni. See Abdurrahman Güz̄el. *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alāaddīn Gaybī)* (Ankara: Aka, 2004). For previous references to aygusuz Abdāl’s Sufi persona see Kopr̄l̄u, “Mısır’da Bektaılık,” 18; Kopr̄l̄u, “Abdal Musa” ; Muhtar Yahya Dalı, *Kaygusuz Abdal* (Istanbul: Maarif Kitaphanesi, 1939); Melikoff, *Hadji Bektach*, 224-226; Golpınarlı, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, 7-17; Annemarie Schimmel, *Mystical Dimensions of Islam* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975), 335-337; Annemarie Schimmel, “Drei Turkische Mystiker: Yunus Emre, Kaygusuz Abdal, Pir Sultan Abdal,” in Norbert Reitz (ed.), *60 Jahre Deutsch-Turkische Gesellschaft* (Norderstedt: Books on Demand, 2014), 171-185; Ahmet Yaar Ocak, “Kitabiyat,” *Osmanlı Aratırmaları: The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 2 (1981): 243-252; Ahmet Yaar Ocak, *Kalenderiler (XIV.-XII. Yyzyllar)* (Ankara: Turk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1992), 88 ff.; Catherine Pinguet, *La Folle sagesse* (Paris: Patrimoines, 2005), 84-99; Nihat Azamat, “Kaygusuz Abdal,” *TDVİA*, vol. 25, 74-76.

<sup>61</sup> The information on aygusuz Abdāl’s life treated here overlaps to some extent with a previous treatment I undertook as part of my master’s thesis; see Zeynep Oktay, “Kaygusuz Abdal’ın Mesnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz’u: Tenkitli Metin ve İnceleme,” Master’s Thesis, Boazii niversitesi, 2010, 5-13.

<sup>62</sup> See Güz̄el, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, 85-87. Güz̄el’s assertion that aygusuz’s real name was ‘Alā’eddīn does not rely on sound proof.

<sup>63</sup> See for instance Dalı, 36-37.

the Bey (Governor) of ‘Alā‘iye,<sup>64</sup> which may be the reason for his occasional use of the pen name Serāyī. He served in the dervish lodge of his master Abdāl Mūsā (fl.8<sup>th</sup>/14<sup>th</sup> century) which, according to historical documents, was initially located near Finike (Southern Anatolia) and later moved to the village of Tekke in Elmalı.<sup>65</sup> After obtaining his *icāzetnāme*, Ẓayğusuz travelled to Egypt where he founded a dervish lodge in his own name. This dervish lodge as well as that of Abdāl Mūsā later became very important Bektashi centers. The hagiography of Abdāl Mūsā also presents Ẓayğusuz Abdāl as the saint’s disciple and contains several episodes portraying the intimate relationship between the two, wherein Ẓayğusuz has reproachful thoughts which are known to Abdāl Mūsā and subsequently has to ask for forgiveness in multiple ways.<sup>66</sup>

Ẓayğusuz Abdāl makes frequent reference to the practices of *samā‘* (audition) and begging, as well as the consumption of hashish.<sup>67</sup> His poems indicate that he shaved his head and

---

<sup>64</sup> The only full edition of Ẓayğusuz’s hagiography is in Abdurrahman Güzel, *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alâaddin Gaybî) Menâkıbnâmesi*, which relies on an undated manuscript in the author’s personal library as well as a second manuscript dated 1229 (1813). Among the several manuscripts used by various authors to summarize the hagiography, the oldest is the manuscript used by Rıza Nour in Nour, 77-98. This manuscript which included a waqf record dated 857 (1453) belonging to the head of Ẓayğusuz’s lodge in Cairo (named the lodge of Ẓaşr-ı ‘ayn) named Ẓāsım Baba, is now lost.

<sup>65</sup> See Köprülü, “Abdal Musa,” 206 [1973]; Orhan Köprülü, “Abdal Musa,” *TDVİA*, vol. 1, 1988, 64. An official document concerning Teke-ili during the reign of Mehmed II affirms the presence of an Abdāl Mūsā lodge near Finike, founded in the middle of the 14th century. This must be the lodge which became the lodge of Kāfî Baba at a later date. The lodge in Elmalı, known in our day as the Abdāl Mūsā lodge, was founded during or after the 16th century. In time, the traditions relating to Abdāl Mūsā were transferred from one lodge to the other. For research on the economic activities of the Abdāl Mūsā lodge from the 16th to the 19th centuries, see Faroqhi, *Der Bektaschi-Orden*, 48-75. For an ethnographical study on the current social networks of the lodge and its village, see Jérôme Cler, “Neden bu ikilik? ‘Pourquoi cette dualité?’ Ethnographie de la division dans un village Bektashi du Taurus,” in Nathalie Clayer, Alexandre Papas, Benoît Fliche (eds), *L’Autorité religieuse et ses limites en terres d’Islam* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2013), 209-230.

<sup>66</sup> See *Abdal Musa Velâyetnâmesi*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1999). According to Güzel, the work was composed in 1040 (1630) by a certain Velî Baba. The work’s content also indicates that it must have been written in the 16th century or later.

<sup>67</sup> In some regions of Anatolia, the word “kayğusuz” has become synonymous with hashish; see Mélikoff, *Hadji Bektach*, 91.

face, wore a felt cloak (*kepenek*) and a cap (*börk*), carried a horn (*nefir*).<sup>68</sup> His enjoyment of good food is frequently and colorfully expressed in his poetry. One of his poems indicates that he took part in holy war in his youth.<sup>69</sup> The references in his poems to place names in the Balkans as well as the existence of a neighborhood and a fountain named Ẓayğusuz in Bitola (Manastır) indicate that Ẓayğusuz either travelled to the Balkans or lived here for some time.<sup>70</sup> His hagiography narrates his pilgrimage to Mecca and the cities he visited on his return, some of which include the sacred places of the Alevi-Bektashi and Shi'ite traditions, such as Kufa, Najaf, and Karbala. Other cities include Damascus, Hama, Aleppo, Kilis, Antep, Baghdad, Samarra, Nusaybin. It also gives a detailed account of his travel to Egypt and meeting with the Egyptian sultan. Ẓayğusuz makes several references to the mosque of Egypt in his poetry.<sup>71</sup>

Ẓayğusuz Abdāl has one poem in praise of Murād II<sup>72</sup> and refers to him multiple times in his poetry.<sup>73</sup> Aḥmed Sırrı Baba (d.1965), the last shaykh of the Bektashi lodge in Cairo, gives specific dates for Ẓayğusuz's travels and death (the date of 848/1444 for the latter), but does not make reference to any written sources.<sup>74</sup> Two traditions exist on Ẓayğusuz's place of death, in

---

<sup>68</sup> For the clothing of Ẓayğusuz Abdāl and his master Abdāl Mūsā's dervishes, see Güzel, *Kaygusuz Abdāl Divanı*, 358-359 as well as Gölpınarlı, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, 34-35. This famous poem is not found in the oldest manuscripts of Ẓayğusuz Abdāl's *Dīvān*. Like Ẓayğusuz Abdāl, the dervish protagonist of his *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* also wears a felt cloak and cap, and he carries a staff as well; see Ẓayğusuz Abdāl, *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 267b.

<sup>69</sup> See Ẓayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 315b, 316a.

<sup>70</sup> See Ẓayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 315a for Edirne; *ibid.*, 315b for Burgas and Yambol (Yanbolu); Ẓayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.oct. 4044, fol. 334a for Plovdiv (Filibe); *ibid.*, fol. 334b for Sofia; *ibid.*, fol. 335a for Bitola (Manastır). On dervish presence in Bitola, see Nathalie Clayer and Alexandre Popovic, "Sur les traces des derviches de Macédoine Yougoslave," in Jacques Thobie (ed.), *Anatolia Moderna Yeni Anadolu IV: Derviches des Balkans, disparitions et renaissances* (Paris: Jean Maisonneuve, 1992), 47.

<sup>71</sup> See Ẓayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 157b, 165a, 173a, 183b.

<sup>72</sup> See *ibid.*, fol. 317a-b.

<sup>73</sup> See *ibid.*, fol. 315b where Ẓayğusuz also makes reference to Mollā Fenārī (d. 834/1431); Ẓayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.oct. 4044, fol. 296b-297a.

<sup>74</sup> See Aḥmed Sırrı Baba, *al-Risālah al-Aḥmadiyyah fī tāriḫ al-tariqat al-'Aliyyah al-Baktāshiyah* (Egypt: Maṭbū'āt al-Sharq al-Sharīk, 1353/1934), 6; quoted in Azamat, 74-5. The phrase "bu derviş daḫı Muḥammed Muṣtafānuñ sekkiz yüz yılında geldi (this dervish came in the year of 800 of Muḥammad Muṣtafā)" in the *Dil-güşā* (see p. 88) is taken by Riza Nour as the year of Ẓayğusuz's travel to Egypt; see Nour, 88.

parallel with the two distinct branches of his hagiography. According to one of these traditions, ̘aygusuz Abdāl died in Egypt and was buried in a cave in the mountain of Moqattam. This tradition is the source of the name ‘Abdullāhu’l-Mağavrī given to him by the people of Egypt.<sup>75</sup> According to the second tradition, he was buried in the Abdāl Mūsā dervish lodge in the village of Tekke.<sup>76</sup> However, the fact that Evliyā Çelebī does not mention this tomb in his description of the dervish lodge makes doubtful the reference in the *kitābe* of the tomb, which belongs to a later date.<sup>77</sup> On the other hand, the oldest no longer extant manuscript of the hagiography followed this tradition.

As explained above, the Köprülü paradigm bases itself on an urban/rural dichotomy. According to this paradigm, the Alevis only had contact with a ‘popular’ form of Islam propagated by dervishes who themselves lacked the urban education required for true Islamic knowledge. The life example of ̘aygusuz Abdāl shows the difficulty of trying to portray these dervish groups as representatives of rural life. Not only did ̘aygusuz Abdāl travel extensively (like his precursor Yūnus Emre and others) and frequently refer to several cities in his works, he was also of urban origin. His hagiography includes the tale of how he renounced his ‘royal’ heritage for the path of God as brought to life in the figure of his master Abdāl Mūsā (fl. 14th century). As mentioned earlier, the pen name of Serāyī (palace-dweller) which appears in some of ̘aygusuz Abdāl’s poems also points to such an origin. The fact that ̘aygusuz Abdāl received some form of ‘urban’ education is corroborated by his poems in Persian, couplets in Arabic,

---

<sup>75</sup> See Nour, 93; Gölpınarlı, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, 7. The information in Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir’s Osmanlı Müellifleri also follows this tradition. Mehmed Tâhir says that ̘aygusuz was from ̘araman, that he was Abdāl Mūsā’s disciple, that his grave is in a cave in Egypt and he is referred to by the people of the region as ‘Abdullāh al-Mağharawī.’ He names the *Dīvan* and the *Delīl-i Budalā* (which he refers to as the *Budalā-nāme*). See Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir, *Osmanlı Müellifleri* Vol. I (Istanbul: Maṭba‘a-i Āmire, 1333), 144-145.

<sup>76</sup> See Güzel, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, 95-96.

<sup>77</sup> For Evliyā Çelebi’s description, see Evliyā Çelebi, *Evliyā Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, ed. Yücel Dağlı, Seyit Ali Kahraman, Robert Dankoff (İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2005) Vol. II. 14; Vol. IX. 140-141. For information on the *kitābe*, see Şehabettin Tekindağ, “Teke-eli ve Teke-Oğulları,” *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 7-8 (1977): 55-95; quoted in Güzel, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, 96.

citations of Quranic verses, references to Persian poets such as Farīd al-Dīn ‘Attār and Sa‘dī, and lastly, secular love poetry in the style of court poetry.<sup>78</sup>

Among the dervishes in Ḳayḡusuz’s *abdāl* milieu, Abdāl Mūsā is the most familiar figure.<sup>79</sup> He may have migrated from Bukhara before the conquest of Bursa, along with other *abdāls*.<sup>80</sup> His hagiography refers to him as the disciple of Ḥacım Sultān,<sup>81</sup> who according to the Bektashi tradition was Ḥacı Bektāş’s successor and travelled with him from Khorasan to Anatolia.<sup>82</sup> Historians such as Taşköprizāde, ‘Ālī and Ḥoca Sa‘deddīn state that Abdāl Mūsā participated in the conquest of Bursa and had close relations with the antinomian dervish Geyikli Baba.<sup>83</sup> As mentioned before, ‘Āşıkpaşazāde also relates a tradition regarding Abdāl Mūsā’s role in the Bektashisation of the Janissary corps. We know from Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s poems that Abdāl Mūsā carried a club and addressed his dervishes as “*abdāls*.” His followers wore animal hides, carried dervish bowls, and practiced blood-shedding during Muharram.<sup>84</sup>

The name of Şeyḡ Muştafā Abdāl Mūsā appears on an inscription dated 811(1408), probably belonging to a rundown lodge, which figures on the right wall of a fountain at Denizli.

---

<sup>78</sup> See in particular Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 134a, 152b-156b, 215a-218b, 224b-234b. Some of these are on the theme of spring and could be classified as *bahāriyyāt*.

<sup>79</sup> On Abdāl Mūsā, see Ahmed Refik, “Fatih Zamanında Teke-ili,” *Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası* 2/79 (1340): 65-76; İlhan Akçay, “Abdal Mūsâ Tekkesi,” in *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi: Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler I* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1972), 360-373; Murat Korkmaz (ed.), *Abdal Musa ve Erkânı* (Istanbul: Horasan Yayınları, 2006); Orhan F. Köprülü, “Abdal Mūsâ”; Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, “Abdal Musa”; M. Baha Tanman, “Abdal Mūsâ Tekkesi,” *TDVİA*, vol. 1, 1988, 65-66; Ramazan Uçar, *Alevîlik-Bektaşîlik: Abdal Mūsâ Tekkesi Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Araştırma* (Ankara: Berkan Yayınevi, 2012). Poems attributed to Abdāl Mūsā appear in a number of *mecmû’as*. However, most of these belong to the 19th century, thus making the attribution doubtful. No studies have been conducted on the subject.

<sup>80</sup> Other known contemporaries of Abdāl Mūsā and Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl include Abdāl Meḡmed and Abdāl Murād; see Süleyman Uludağ, “Abdal Mehmed,” *TDVİA*, vol. 1, 1988, 63; Orhan F. Köprülü, “Abdal Murad,” *TDVİA*, vol. 1, 1988, 63-64. Both achieved significant fame during their lifetimes.

<sup>81</sup> See *Abdal Musa Velâyetnâmesi*, 152.

<sup>82</sup> See *Velâyetnâme-i Ḥacım Sultān*, published as *Das Vilâjet-nâme des Hadschim Sultan: Eine türkische Heiligenlegende*, trans. and ed. Rudolf Tschudi, Türkische Bibliothek, 17 (Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1914), 1-1. On Ḥacım Sultān, see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, “Ḥacım Sultan,” *TDVİA* vol. 14, 1996, 505-506.

<sup>83</sup> For Geyikli Baba, see Karamustafa, “Early Sufism,” 184-186; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, “Geyikli Baba,” *TDVİA*, vol. 14, 1996, 45-7.

<sup>84</sup> See n. 65.

If we accept that Abdāl Mūsā was alive on this date, then it becomes impossible for him to have attended the conquest of Bursa (726/1326).<sup>85</sup> In some Bektashi sources and in the inscription at the Kāfī Baba Tekkesi near Finike, Abdāl Mūsā is designated as “pīr-i sānī” (the second great master).

An episode which includes Ẓaygūsuz Abdāl is narrated in the hagiography of his famous contemporary Sulṭān Şücā’ (fl. second half of the 14<sup>th</sup>-first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century),<sup>86</sup> where along with Seyyid Nesīmī (d. 820/1418 [?])<sup>87</sup> and Kemāl Ümmī (d. 1475)<sup>88</sup> he travels to

---

<sup>85</sup> See Orhan F. Köprülü, “Abdal Musa,” 64.

<sup>86</sup> For the life of Sulṭān Şücā’, see Haşim Şahin, “Şücâüddin Velî,” *TDVİA* vol. 39, 2010, 247-8; Ocak, *Kalenderîler*, 97-99 [Citations will be made from the 1992 edition unless otherwise specified]. Sulṭān Şücā’ came to Anatolia probably before the Battle of Ankara. He lived in Seyitgazi and travelled in the region of Bursa, Kütahya, Manisa, and Ankara with his disciples. He had a close friendship with Hacı Bayram (d. 833/1430) as well as good relations with members of the Ottoman dynastic family, some statesmen in addition to important holy warriors active in Rumelia.

<sup>87</sup> Neither Kemāl Ümmī nor Nesīmī were in Ẓaygūsuz’s *abdāl* circle, though they evidently were part of the larger dervish milieu. Nesīmī is an early Ottoman poet and mystic, famous for his Hürüfî worldview. Nesīmī had *Dīvāns* in both Persian and Turkish, which he knew equally well, as well as possibly a *Dīvān* in Arabic which is no longer extant. For his Turkish *Dīvān*, see Nesīmī, *Dīvān*, in Hüseyin Ayan (ed), *Nesîmî: Hayatı, Edebî Kişiliği, Eserleri ve Türkçe Divanının Tenkitli Metni I-II* (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2014), 153-862 [First edition Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2002]. For his Persian *Dīvān*, see Sayyid ‘Imād al-Dīn Nasīmī, *Dīvān*, ed. Hamid Mohammadzadeh (Baku: Nashriyāt-i Dawlatī-i Āzarbāijān, 1972). For translations from both, see Kathleen R.F. Burrill, *The Quatrains of Nesîmî – Fourteenth-Century Turkic Hurufî (with Annotated Translations of the Turkic and Persian Quatrains from Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa MS)* (Paris: Mouton, 1972). For general information on Nesīmī, see Frantz Babinger, “Nesîmî”, *Encyclopaedia of Islam (Second Edition)* Vol. VIII (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 8; A. Azmi Bilgin, “Nesîmî”, *TDVİA* Vol. 33, 3-5. Nesīmī also has an unedited prose work named the *Muḳaddimetü’l-ḥakā’ik*, which is based on Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī’s (d. 796/1394) *Jāvidān-nāma*. Nesīmī’s poetry focuses on Hürüfî teachings, the doctrine of the oneness of being, and the praise of the Twelve Imams. The latter aspect, in addition to his martyrdom, has led to the Alevi adoption of Nesīmī, who consider him as one of their seven great poets. Nesīmī also had an important historical role in the development of classical literature in Turkish, with his extensive use of complex images (*maḍmūn*). His poetry is vastly different from that of Ẓaygūsuz Abdāl. Wherein the former is a direct continuation of classical Persian poetry in style, the latter bridges the gap between folk and classical traditions, as we will see.

<sup>88</sup> Kemāl Ümmī is a Turkish mystic poet and Hālvetî shaykh, who is the only Anatolian Safavid poet with an extant *dīvān* prior to the politicization and Shī’itization of the order. Among the several editions of Kemāl Ümmī’s *Dīvān* undertaken as master’s theses and dissertations, only one is published; see Kemāl Ümmī, *Dīvān*, in Hayati Yavuzer



Seyitgâzi to see Sultân Şücâ'. Kaygusuz Abdâl brings Seyyid Nesîmî and Kemâl Ümmî to the presence of Sultân Şücâ' when they tell him that they are looking for someone wiser and more knowledgeable than them. While Seyyid Nesîmî and Kemâl Ümmî show disrespect towards Sultân Şücâ', Kaygusuz tries to prevent their actions. He is thus presented in a neutral tone.<sup>89</sup> Whereas Kemâl Ümmî and Seyyid Nesîmî's feet are hurt from walking bare feet on thorns, the same act does not hurt Sultân Şücâ' and Kaygusuz Abdâl. Their disrespectful behavior leads Şücâ'eddîn's prophecy that Nesîmî will be flayed and Kemâl Ümmî will be hanged.<sup>90</sup> On the

---

(ed), *Kemâl Ümmî Dîvânı (İnceleme-Metin)* (Bolu: Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Bolu Halk Kültürünü Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi, 2008), 417-759. For the life of Kemâl Ümmî, see İsmail Ünver, "Kemâl Ümmî," *TDVİA*, vol. 25. 2002; William Hickman, "Who was Ümmî Kemal?" *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi* 4-5 (1976-1977): 57-82; William Hickman, "Ümmî Kemâl in Anatolian Tradition" *Turcica* 24 (1982): 155-167. Also see the following forthcoming articles: William Hickman, "Two 15th Century Ottoman Sufi Mysteries; An Historiographical Essay. Part II: The Case of Ümmî Kemal" *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, forthcoming; William Hickman, "On Editing Ottoman Turkish Tekke Poetry," *The Journal of the American Oriental Society*, forthcoming. Kemâl Ümmî has unedited *meşnevîs* named the *Kırk Armağân* and the *Hikâyet-i Hazîre-i Kuds* as well as an untitled unedited *meşnevî*, in addition to three treatises named the *Risâle-i Vefât*, the *Risâle-i İmân*, the *Ahlâk Risâlesi*. Of the treatises, only the first has been edited, in the following article: Bilâl Aktan, "Kemal Ümmî'nin Vefât Risâlesi ve Dil Özellikleri," *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 19 (2006): 95-107. According to his hagiography, the followers of Kemâl Ümmî were called "Kemällü." He did not consider himself a master and did not leave any successors. His hagiography presents him as the inventor of the *zîkr* from the throat, also called *koynun zîkri* or *bıçkı zîkri*. See Dervîş Ahmed, *Menâkıb-ı Kemâl Ümmî*, Millet Kütüphanesi Ali Emiri Efendi Kol. 1323/1, 1a-31a ff. Kemâl Ümmî's *Dîvân* differs from those of Kaygusuz Abdâl and Nesîmî in its "orthodox" stance. Kemâl Ümmî puts strict emphasis on God's transcendence, while at the same time focusing on the Sufî's love towards God. He criticizes the practice of *samâ'* (audition) and prefers sobriety over intoxication. This aspect of his temperament is underlined by his use of the metaphor of wine, traditionally coupled with divine love, as a sign of ignorance and intoxication with the world of multiplicity.

<sup>89</sup> Close relations between Kaygusuz Abdâl and Sultân Şücâ' are corroborated by a census register dated to the time of Mehmed II, where together with other dervishes they are said to have built a lodge in a town named Ak Kaya in the vicinity of Mount Nif. See Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda bir İskân ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler I: İstîlâ Devirlerinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zâviyeler," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 2 (1942): 324.

<sup>90</sup> *Şücâ'eddîn Velî Velâyetnâmesi*, in Yağmur Say (ed), *Şücâ'eddîn Velî (Sultan Varlığı) ve Velâyetnâmesi* (Eskişehir: Eskişehir Valiliği, 2010), 121-127 [Undated manuscript, facsimile included]; Ayşe Yıldız, "Şücaaddin Baba Velâyetnâmesi," *Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi* 37 (2006): 64-67 [manuscript dated 1938]. This account is taken up by some of the biographical sources where it is stated that Kemâl Ümmî was executed.

other hand, Sultān Şücā' states that Kaygusuz will travel for a long time after departing from Abdāl Mūsā's lodge due to a clash, after which he will settle in the town of Karacağ in the land of Rūm.<sup>91</sup>

Hagiographies are an important source of information on the *abdāls* of Kaygusuz's time as well as those who follow. We still lack comprehensive comparative studies of these hagiographies, which are known under the title '*bektāşī menāķīb-nāmeleri*' (Bektashi hagiographies), although the relationship of some of the saints in question with Bektashism is not clear.<sup>92</sup> Due to the scope of the required study, I will not attempt at an evaluation of these hagiographies here. Some of them have been the subject of individual studies. Compared to other works by *abdāls* and *bektāşīs*, hagiographies have definitely received the most attention,<sup>93</sup> with some studies presenting new hermeneutical approaches. However the assessment of such hagiographies on the validity of their status as 'documents' continues to be the main trend, which

---

<sup>91</sup> No such location is mentioned in the other sources on Kaygusuz Abdāl.

<sup>92</sup> In addition to those of Kaygusuz Abdāl and Abdāl Mūsā, such hagiographies include those of Baba İlyās (d. 637/1240), Hacı Bektaş, his disciple Hacım Sultān, Seyyid 'Alī Sultān (d. after 815 /1412), Sultān Şücā', Koyun Baba (d. 873/1468), Otman Baba (d. 883/1478), Pīrī Baba (fl. 15th century), Demir Baba (d. after 1012/1603). For a list of facsimiles and editions of the hagiographies, see Yürekli, 6. The following additions can be made to her list: Elvan Çelebi, *Menāķību'l-Kudsiyye Fī Menāsibi'l-Ünsiyye: Baba İlyas-ı Horasānī ve Sülālesinin Menkabevī Tarihi*, ed. İsmail F. Erünsal and Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995); *Hacım Sultan Menāķibnāmesi*, in Salih Gürerer (ed), *Hacım Sultan ve Menāķibnāmesi* (Uşak: Uşak Akademi Kitap Dağıtım Pazarlama Yayınevi, 2014), 414-644; *Velāyet-nāme-i Seyyid 'Alī Sultān*, in Rıza Yıldırım (ed), *Seyyid Ali Sultan (Kızıldeli) ve Velāyetnāmesi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007), 161-184; Şücā'eddīn Velī *Velāyetnāmesi*, ed. Yağmur Say; Yıldız, "Şücaeddin Baba Velāyetnāmesi"; *Otman Baba Velāyetnāmesi*, ed. Filiz Kılıç, Mustafa Arslan, Tuncay Bülbül. Ankara: Grafiker Ofset, 2007. *Menāķīb-ı Koyun Baba*, ed. M. Şakir Çıplak, in *Osmancık'ta Erenler Durağı: Koyun Baba* (Istanbul: Horasan, 2001), 20-165; *Koyun Baba Velāyetnāmesi*, ed. Muzaffer Doğanbaş (Istanbul: Dörtkapı, 2015); H. Yılmaz, "Bilinmeyen Bir Koyunbaba Menāķibnāmesi Üzerine," *Hacı Bektaş Velī Araştırma Dergisi* 11 (1999): 21-52; Muzaffer Doğanbaş, "Pīrī Baba Velāyetnāmesi," *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velī Araştırma Dergisi* 41 (2007): 161-182; *Demir Baba Velāyetnāmesi: İnceleme -Tenkitli Metin*, Edited by Filiz Kılıç and Tuncay Bülbül (Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2011); *Demir Baba Vilāyetnāmesi*, ed. Bedri Noyan (Ankara: Can Yayınları, 1996). I will refer to some of these as they become relevant.

<sup>93</sup> This is evident in the content of the article named "Abdalan-ı Rum (Abdals of Rum), literature" in the new edition of the Encyclopedia of Islam, whose list of *abdāl* literature consists almost extensively of hagiographies; see Michael R. Heß, "Abdalan-ı Rum, literature," *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*, Kate Fleet, et al. (eds.), Consulted online on 26 February 2017 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912\\_ei3\\_COM\\_25751](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_25751) First published online: 2015.

leaves in the dark important questions regarding their nature as literary works, such as the literary devices used and their relationship to the portrayal of sainthood, the context of their production, their intended audience, etc.

Another important, albeit often forgotten corpus of information on *abdāls* and *bektāşīs* is that of the poetry collections named the *cönk* or the *mecmū'a*. The sheer number of such collections is reason enough to give the researcher cold feet. More important, however, is our current lack of precise methodology in approaching the complex array of problems such collections pose to us.<sup>94</sup> The textual production by many *abdāls* and *bektāşīs* have only survived in poetry collections. While the uncovering of these poets is a doctoral project of its own, its importance for the research field cannot be denied. Unfortunately, such an undertaking is beyond the scope of this study, which will have to contend with individual works and *dīvāns*.

## Scope and Outline

The first part of this study is largely devoted to the investigation of the works of aygusuz Abdāl, with the exception of Chapter Three, which deals also with Yūnus Emre, and Chapter Four, which treats the religious doctrines of *abdāls* who follow aygusuz. In Chapter One, I create a specific methodology for the evaluation of aygusuz Abdāl's works, with a focus on the doctrine of the Four Gates (*dört kapı*). I show that aygusuz Abdāl's teachings change in content and vocabulary depending on the spiritual level of his audience, the hierarchy of which is established according to the doctrine of the Four Gates. The frequent shifts in the audience creates a 'multi-perspectival'<sup>95</sup> work, which speaks to all spiritual levels simultaneously. I relate this quality of aygusuz's works to his social persona and demonstrate how he adopts different positions vis-à-vis society, as a way of negating the existence of a singular social identity.

In Chapter Two, I undertake a thorough evaluation of aygusuz Abdāl's religious doctrine, relying on all of his works, including a previously unknown early manuscript containing his most complete poetry collection. I analyze aygusuz's works via two major pathways: 1) The

---

<sup>94</sup> For the methodological difficulties of working with these poetry collections, see M. Sabri Koz, "Cönk ve Mecmûa Yapraklarında Aşık Aramak," in Hatice Aynur, et al., *Mecmûa: Osmanlı Edebiyatının Kırkambarı* (Istanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları, 2012), 159-200.

<sup>95</sup> I thank Ahmet T. Karamustafa for proposing me this term.

relation between God's immanence and transcendence and how these two aspects manifest themselves with respect to the level of teaching (the spiritual Gate). 2) The relationship between the esoteric (*bāṭın*) and the exoteric (*zāhir*) and the changes in this relation with respect to the Gates.

In Chapter Three, I study the relationship between the choice of writing in Turkish and the social context, in particular the way in which the dervish milieu situates itself with regards to the official representatives of religion. I use here as a starting point the formation of the Turkish *ṣaḥiyye*, created by Yūnus Emre (d. 1320) and continued by Ḳayğusuz Abdāl. I read the Turkish *ṣaḥiyye* as a means of transition between the genre of *shaḥ* in Classical Sufism and the genres of oral literature, such as the *tekerleme* (humorous enigmas) and the *maṣal* (popular tale). I maintain that this genre reformulated Sufi knowledge in a popular language and experience in which those without an Islamic education could participate. At the same time, this genre excluded the representatives of exoteric Islam due to its experiential content. As a result, it created a limit between its public and the official representatives of Islam, which prevented the accusations of the latter from having their desired effect in the public, allowing for the acceptance of the authors' claim to sainthood.

Chapter Four is a doctrinal analysis of works by four *abdāls* ranging from the early 15<sup>th</sup> to the early 17<sup>th</sup> century: Ṣādīḳ Abdāl's (fl. late 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> centuries) *Dīvān*, Yemīnī's (d. after 925/1519) *Fazāilet-nāme*, Ṣemsī's (d. after 919/1513) *Deh Murğ*, and Vīrānī's (fl. the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century) *Risāle* and *Dīvān*. This chapter shows the colorful heterogeneity of the doctrinal positions of *abdāls*, whose system of loose affiliation allowed for a diversity of doctrines and practices. Of course, another reason for the given variety is the influence of genre and audience, thus reminding us the importance of taking a literary evaluation into account when determining doctrinal content.

Part Two is devoted to the critical edition, English translation, and commentary of Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's most intriguing work: the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaḥa*. The *Kitāb-ı Mağlaḥa* is Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's only work in which he theoretically elaborates elements of Shi'ite origin, such as the duality of Muḥammad and 'Alī, expressed as prophecy / sainthood (*nübüvvet* / *velāyet*), intellect / faculty of love ('*akl* / '*işık*), exoteric / esoteric. 'Alī is the Imam par excellence and the dervish sees 'Alī blink behind the eyes of biblical personalities. As such, 'Alī makes a sign to the dervish which indicates that he is in fact the Perfect Man, the archetype of all perfect men, as well as the

dervish's interior guide. A deeper level of the work also reveals 'Alī as the self-manifestation of God.

Most of these doctrinal elements will be elaborated in the first chapters of the thesis. On the other hand, the commentary is dedicated to two elements essential for our understanding of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*: the idea of Satan and the notion of dreams. Remaining in dialogue with the Sufi tradition while subverting it at the same time, aygusuz constantly plays with the notions of truthful and false dreams.

For my research in Part One, I will make use of a combination of edited and unedited texts, relying almost exclusively on primary sources. Due to the fact that much of the material is being the object of in-depth analysis for the very first time, I will complement my close reading of the texts with frequent quotations, thus trying to achieve a balance between a vision of the whole and detailed precision.

While hoping to be an important starting point, the given study does not claim to be an extensive account of the doctrines of the *Abdālān-ı Rūm*. Such an extensive account can only be achieved once all the extant works by *abdāls* have been edited and investigated in-depth. Nonetheless I do hope to present here a methodology for such an investigation, which aims to unite 'what' *abdāls* say in their works with the 'how' and the 'why'. These three questions are deeply intertwined and can only be answered by a unification of historical, doctrinal, and literary approaches. Bektashi history owes much to the *abdāls* and it is time we hear them through their own voices.

# Chapter 1

## Layers of Mystical Meaning and Social Context in the Works of Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl

*Bu dūnyā halkı aña delü dirler  
Kimi inkār ider kim velī dirler*

*Kimi eydür ki bu abdāl olupdur  
Bilür tañrı ki bu ne hāl olupdur<sup>96</sup>*

The people of this world call him crazy  
Some reject him; some say he is a saint

Some say: “This is an abdāl;  
Only God knows what state he is in!”

The colorful and wildly differing social personas that Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl presents to us in this excerpt are faithfully preserved in his works. The multiplicity of perspectives and teachings evidenced by these works can be a great challenge to the researcher trying to pin down “which Ḳayḡusuz” is the right one. In this chapter, I present a specific methodology which facilitates the interpretation of Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s texts as well as the social and political insights at which I have arrived as a result. I argue that Ḳayḡusuz’s use of terminology and its related doctrinal position differ according to the specific audience to which it is addressed. Identifying the audience to which each text or passage is addressed allows us to systematize the largely plural and unorganized corpus of Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s teachings.

### The Doctrine of the Four Gates

The *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṭa* put aside, the rest of Ḳayḡusuz’s works, the *Serāy-nāme*, *Gülistān*, *Dil-güşā*, *Delīl-i Budalā*, *Meşnevī-i Baba Ḳayḡusuz*, *İkinci Meşnevī* and *Üçüncü Meşnevī* all consist of loosely-related Sufi teachings lacking any apparent organization, yet unified around the doctrine of the Oneness of Being. As I demonstrate, some of the teachings appear to contradict one another, which complicates understanding Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s mystical doctrine. There is also constant changing of the subject and tense, as well as confusion regarding narrator and time of reference. Narrative perspectives vary throughout each text,

---

<sup>96</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *İkinci Meşnevī*, fol. 3b.

with Kaygusuz sometimes addressing God as a servant or addressing the reader as a master, or with him directly speaking through the mouth of the *velī* who has become one with God, to name but a few.<sup>97</sup> This coexistence of different perspectives is the result of the various layers of meaning in Kaygusuz's works and can be related to a hierarchy inherent within Kaygusuz's teaching. This discursive hierarchy tends to accompany the doctrine of the Four Gates (*dört kapı*).

The doctrine of the Four Gates and Forty Stations (*dört kapı kırk makām*) is a major aspect of Bektashism and Alevism. The Four Gates provides an overall structure for the different stages of the spiritual path known as the Forty Stations. The Gates are ordered accordingly to levels of spiritual awareness and perfection.<sup>98</sup> What may be our earliest testimony to the above doctrine figures in a poem in Yūnus Emre's (d. ca. 1320) *Dīvān*, in the standard edition published by Abdūlbaki Gölpinarlı, which is not in fact considered an Alevi or Bektashi text.<sup>99</sup> The *Maḳālāt*, the most voluminous and historically important text

---

<sup>97</sup> This structural feature suggests some relationship with oral composition or performance, which will be dealt with in the third chapter.

<sup>98</sup> The history of the doctrine of Four Gates and Forty Stations remains almost entirely unexplored. There is one very short scholarly article with serious historical errors, one master's thesis and one popular book on the subject. See Hüseyin Özcan, "Bektaşilikte Dört Kapı Kırk Makam," *Journal of Turkish Studies / Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları: Kaf Dağının Ötesine Varmak, Festschrift in Honor of Günay Kut III* 28, no. 1 (2004), 241-245; Sermin Çalışkan, "Alevilik'te Dört Kapı Kırk Makam," Master's Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2010; Esat Korkmaz, *Dört Kapı Kırk Makam* (Istanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar, 2008). In Alevi practice, the four gates can signify the following four sets of relations to which the follower (*tālib*) belongs: 1) guide (*rehber*) 2) older one (*pīr*) 3) master (*mürşid*) 4) companion (*muşāhib*). For the way in which these four relationships correlate with certain attributes, as well as Muḥammad, 'Alī, and God, see Erdal Gezik, "How Angel Gabriel Became Our Brother of the Hereafter (On the Question of Ismaili Influence on Alevism)," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 43/1 (2016): 62-63. The doctrine of the Four Gates was also part of the doctrines of the Persian Khāksāriyya, founded in Iran in the eighth/fourteenth century. This sect had many practices similar to those of the Bektashis, thus highlighting Ḥaydarī influence on Bektashism; see Thierry Zarcone, "Bektaşiyye." The Ahl-e Haqq also incorporated the Four Gates into their religious beliefs; see V. Minorsky, *The Sect of the Ahl-i Haqq*, *Iranica* 1964: 308-309.

<sup>99</sup> See Yūnus Emre, *Risālat al-Nuḥiyya ve Dīvān*, ed. Abdūlbaki Gölpinarlı (Istanbul: Eskişehir Turizm ve Tanıtma Derneği Yayınları, 1965), 131-132 and fol. 182a-183a. This edition relies on a manuscript which Gölpinarlı dates to the fourteenth century (see *ibid.*, pp. XLIX-L as well as the facsimile of the manuscript). An examination of the manuscript, however, makes this dating doubtful, a fact also pointed out by other scholars. Another earliest manuscript of Yūnus Emre's *Dīvān* is a previously unknown fifteenth-century manuscript in which the given poem does not appear (See MS. Hacı Selim Ağa Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi, Kemankeş Koleksiyonu No. 316/1, fol. 2b-4b, 20b-33b). Nor does the poem appear in the manuscript of the *Dīvān*

attributed to Hacı Bektâş, expounds the doctrine of the Four Gates and Forty Stations in detail, station by station.<sup>100</sup> The doctrine is also central to the main religious texts of the Alevi, called *Buyruk* (Book of Orders).<sup>101</sup> In some *Buyruks*, it constitutes the very structure of the text.<sup>102</sup>

In the above-mentioned Sufi, Alevi and Bektashi texts, as well as late nineteenth-century works which mention the doctrine of the Four Gates and Forty Stations,<sup>103</sup> the gates are set in the following order: *şerî'at* (ritual observance), *tarîkat* (path), *ma'rifet* (experiential knowledge), *hakîkat* (truth). Yet, in Kaygusuz Abdâl's works, the gate of *hakîkat* is placed before that of *ma'rifet*. This detail, along with the fact that Kaygusuz Abdâl's works do not

---

famously known as the Ritter manuscript, probably belonging to the 15th century (See MS. Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.oct. 2575).

<sup>100</sup> For references to what is claimed to be the Arabic version of *Maqâlât* see M. Es'ad Coşan, *Hacı Bektâş-ı Velî ve Bektâşîlik* (Istanbul: Server İletişim, 2013), 16-18. For editions of *Maqâlât* in Turkish see Hacı Bektaş-ı Velî, *Makâlât*, ed. Esad Coşan (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1996); Hünkâr Hacı Bektâş-ı Velî, *Makâlât*, ed. Ali Yılmaz, Mehmet Akkuş and Ali Öztürk (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2007); Hacı Bektaş Velî, "Makâlât," ed. Ömer Özkan and Malik Bankır in Gıyasettin Aytaş (ed.), *Hacı Bektaş Velî Külliyyatı* (Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Merkezi, 2010), 473-767. None of these editions rely on the aforementioned earliest Manisa manuscript (see n. 42). For an edition of the Turkish translation in verse by Hatiboğlu Muhammed (d. after 838/1435) see Hatiboğlu Muhammed, *Bahru'l-hakâ'ik*, in Abdurrahman Güzel, *Hacı Bektaş Velî ve Makâlât* (Ankara: Akçağ, 2002), 287-341. The edition in this monograph is taken from the associate professorship thesis of Esat Coşan.

<sup>101</sup> For an overview of *Buyruk* manuscripts see Ayfer Karakaya-Stump, "Documents and Buyruk Manuscripts in the Private Archives of Alevi Dede Families: An Overview," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 37, no. 3 (2010), 273-286. According to this study, the compilation date of some *Buyruk* manuscripts can be traced to the reign of Shah Tahmâsp (r. 930-984 / 1524-1576) (see 280-282). For a summary of the doctrine of the Four Gates and Forty Stations in the *Buyruk* see Doğan Kaplan, *Yazılı Kaynaklarına Göre Alevîlik* (Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2009), 217-239.

<sup>102</sup> See for instance Bisâtî, *Şeyh Sâfi Buyruğu: Menâkıbu'l-Esrâr Behcetü'l-Ahrâr*, ed. Ahmet Taşğın (Ankara: Rheda-Wiedenbrück Çevresi Alevi Kültür Derneği Yayınları, 2003). In this text, each gate consists of seven and not ten stations. I will discuss this text in the next chapter.

<sup>103</sup> See the prose introduction to some late nineteenth- early twentieth-century editions of *Dīvân-ı Hikmet*, wrongly attributed to Aḥmad Yasawî (Ahmet Yesevi). This introduction is published under the name *Fakr-nâme*; see Kemal Erarslan, *Yesevî'nin Fakr-nâmesi* (Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1977). See also Ahmed Rif'at Efendi, *Mir'âtu'l-Makâsid fî Def'i'l-Mefâsid* (Istanbul, İbrahim Efendi Matbaası, 1293/1876), 282-283; Ali Ulvi Baba, *Bektâşîlik Makâlâtı* (İzmir: Marifet Matbaası, 1341/1922-3), 12. Both texts are referenced in Bedri Noyan Dede Baba, *Bütün Yönleriyle Bektâşîlik ve Alevîlik*, vol. 8, part 1 (*Erkân*) (Ankara: Ardıç Yayınları, 2010), 153-154.



include any references to Forty Stations, suggests that Kaygusuz Abdāl's formulation of the doctrine may have belonged to a different lineage of teachings. This idea is also corroborated by the fact that Seher Abdāl, who lived at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> and the beginning of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, follows Kaygusuz's order of the gates in his reference to the doctrine in his *Sa'adet-nâme*.<sup>104</sup> The two lineages coexist in the work of Vīrānī, a 17<sup>th</sup> century *abdāl* author and poet with Hurūfī affiliation. Vīrānī makes references to both Kaygusuz Abdāl and Hacı Bektaş's *Maḳālāt*.<sup>105</sup> In separate places in his work, both ways of ordering the gates can be seen.<sup>106</sup>

In the *Meşnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, the author defines the four gates in the following way:

*Şerī'atda küllī işi pür-kemāl  
Ṭarīkatda ol kişidür ehl-i ḥāl*

*Ḥaḳīkatda küllī Ḥaḳkdur pes hemān  
Ma'rifeti kendüye yeter nişān*<sup>107</sup>

In religious law his conduct is perfect  
On the path he is a man of the [spiritual] state.

In Truth he becomes God in entirety  
His gnostic knowledge is the only sign he needs.

In these couplets *şerī'at* is defined as a religious act, *ṭarīkat* as an experience of varying states, *ḥaḳīkat* as the experience of oneness, thus corresponding to the station of *fenā* (annihilation), and *ma'rifet* as the knowledge born out of this oneness, that is to say the station of *bekā* (perpetuation). In this sense, *ma'rifet* is the destination to which the path leads:

*Her kimde kim ola bu üç ḥāşşiyyet  
Şerī'at u ṭarīkat u ḥaḳīkat*

*Ma'rifet anda biter kân ol durur  
Ma'rifet cevheri ma'den ol durur*<sup>108</sup>

Whoever has these three special qualities:  
Religious law, the spiritual path and the truth

<sup>104</sup> See Mustafa Özağaç, "Seher Abdal'ın Saadet-nâme İsimli Mesnevîsi (Metin-Muhteva-Tahlil)," Master's Thesis, Izmir, 9 Eylül Üniversitesi, 2009, 142-143.

<sup>105</sup> See Vīrānī Abdāl, *Risāle-i Vīrānī Abdāl*, in Fatih Usluer (ed), *Hurufi Metinleri I* (Ankara: Birleşik Yayınları, 2014), 216 for the former; see *ibid.*, 150 and 169 for the latter.

<sup>106</sup> For the order in Kaygusuz, see *ibid.*, 153-155; for the one in Hacı Bektaş and other works, see *ibid.*, 176, 211.

<sup>107</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 158.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 112.

In him emerges gnostic knowledge; he is the mine  
The jewel of gnostic knowledge; he is the quarry

Part of the *Gülistān* is devoted to explaining the four gates. Instead of conveying the teachings for the various gates with no apparent order, as is usually the case in *Ḳaygusuz*'s works with the exception of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaḡa*, in one section of the *Gülistān*, *Ḳaygusuz* imparts his teachings in their hierarchical order:

*Şerī'at şartını hem keşf eyledi  
Ṭarīkat yolına girdi boyladı*

*Ḥaḳīkat ne demek olur bildi çün  
Ma'rifeti gün be gün oldu füzün*

*Şerī'at ḥāli budur kim bir kişi  
Şart u kânūnile kıla her işi<sup>109</sup>*

*Öz cānına her neyi kılsa kabūl  
Cümle yirde hem anı isteye ol*

*Günde beş vaḳt namāza ḥāzır ola  
Ḥaḳḳ ne kim vırse ana şākir ola  
[...]  
Ṭarīkat oldur ki dünyādan geçe  
Ḥaḳḳ yolında şıdḳıla gözün açā*

*Şerīki olmaya tañrı milkine  
Sīnesinde ḳalmaya kibr ü kīne  
[...]  
Sağ mürebbīye yitüre özini  
Sağ mürebbī açā anuñ gözini*

*Ḥaḳīkat Ḥaḳḳ bu kez ana keşf olur  
Ḥaḳḳı 'ayān gönli içinde bulur  
[...]  
Bu ḥāşılta kendü şehrinde biter  
Ol ki yolda sağ mürebbīye yiter*

*Zāhir ü bāṭın ana rüşen olur  
Cismi ḳalmaz kendü küllī cān olur<sup>110</sup>*

He exhibited the duties of the religious law  
He entered the path and followed it

Thus he learned what the truth meant  
His gnostic knowledge increased day by day

<sup>109</sup> In the manuscripts, the *wāw* is given in the form of an *iḏāfah*. This is an orthographical characteristic common in the 15th and early 16th century manuscripts of similar content.

<sup>110</sup> *Ḳaygusuz Abdāl*, *Gülistān*, 264b-265a. For the whole section see up to 267a.

The state of the religious law is that a person shall  
Perform all of his acts according to his duties and obligations

Whatever he accepts for his own soul,  
He shall wish for the same in all places

He shall be present at his prayer five times a day  
He shall feel gratitude for all that God bestows upon him

The path is that he renounces the world  
He shall open his eyes with veracity in the path of God

He shall hold no partners in the land of God  
He shall not cling to vanity and malice in his bosom

He shall bring himself to the right teacher  
The right teacher shall open his eyes

The truth shall then reveal itself to him  
He shall find God manifest in his own heart

As a result he shall emerge in his own city  
He who reaches the right teacher on this path

The exoteric and the esoteric become manifest in him  
He destroys his body; he becomes the soul in entirety

According to these couplets, the gate of *ṣerīʿat* consists in the observance of ritual obligations, acceptance, and the quest for God in the world; *ṭarīkat* embodies the renunciation of the world and triumph over the base self; *ḥaḳīkat* is the experience of oneness, defined as both unity with God and self-discovery. The couplets focus on the importance of finding the right spiritual teacher in the path, who will direct the disciple from *ṭarīkat* to *ḥaḳīkat*. Of interest is the fact that the gate of *maʿrifet* is not explained. As we will see, *maʿrifet* encompasses all the other gates and involves the capacity of speaking about them. It is thus present in the text as the gate from which *Ḳayḡusuz* speaks.

*Ḳayḡusuz*'s intended spiritual hierarchy is not nearly as well organized in the rest of his corpus. Couplets referring to the different gates frequently alternate, resulting in what we can refer to as a "multi-perspectival narrative." In fact, as the various discussions in this chapter will show, this "multi-perspectival narrative" is the author/poet's primary discursive aim. The Doctrine of the Four Gates, as the only theorization of spiritual hierarchy in *Ḳayḡusuz*'s corpus, offers us a venue into understanding how and why *Ḳayḡusuz* achieves his aim of speaking to multiple people consecutively and simultaneously. We do not have a way of knowing whether he was consciously applying the doctrine to each line of his work. What

we do know, however, is that the spiritual hierarchy embodied in the Four Gates can be discerned in Kaygusuz's work in a number of ways, thus allowing us to confer some structure onto his work and make sense out of the multiplicity of perspectives.

One way in which the Doctrine of the Four Gates uncovers the multi-perspectival quality of Kaygusuz's corpus is through a meaningful systematization of semantic changes in terminology. When examining Kaygusuz's terminology with this four-fold structure in mind, we see that the same term carries a different meaning depending on the gate with which that particular couplet is associated. This can be perhaps be best demonstrated by focusing on Kaygusuz's use of three particular terms: *farq* (differentiation), *hāl* (state), and *'aql* (intellect).

### ***Farq***

The most common use of *farq* is found in couplets which stress the importance of knowing the difference between a Perfect Man, denoted by the word *insān*, and an ordinary man, designated as *hayvān*:

*Gözüñ açıla göresin sultānı  
İnsāndan farq eylesin hayvānı*<sup>111</sup>

May your eyes open so that you see the sultan  
May you distinguish between animal and man

*İnsān dimegüñ maqşūdi 'ilm-i ma'rifetdür  
Budur ahi farq olduğı insānile hayvān*<sup>112</sup>

The object of the word 'man' is the science of experiential knowledge  
O brother, this is what makes the difference between a man and an animal

According to Kaygusuz, the difference is recognized through the language that each type of man employs:

*Sözine bakıp bilürler ādemi  
Söz durur farq iden puhteden hāmı*<sup>113</sup>

One knows a man by his word;  
It is the word that differentiates the cooked from the raw.

---

<sup>111</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 110.

<sup>112</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 321a.

<sup>113</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 114.

The spiritual teacher (*mürşid*) is the person who possesses the faculty of differentiation, and who can impart this faculty on his student:

*Öz hālūñi ol kişiye sor kim ol  
Farq ola anuñ katında sağ u sol*<sup>114</sup>

Ask your own state from that person  
In whose presence the correct and the crooked can be distinguished

Expressed as “*hakkı bātıldan farq itmek*” (differentiating between truth and falsity), this notion is repeated numerous times in Kaygusuz’s works, often with reference to the ontological differences between animals as well as perceptual ones illustrated by the varying tastes of edible food.<sup>115</sup>

A second use of *farq* involves relating the term with the concept of *istiğrāk* (complete absorption). In this station the dervish cuts off all relations with the world and becomes immersed in God or Oneness with his whole existence. The following couplets exemplify this use:

*Bu ne deryā ki ‘ālem ğarq olupdur  
Bu ne ğarq ki ‘ālemden farq olupdur*<sup>116</sup>

What a sea; the universe is submerged in it  
What a submersion; separated from the whole universe

*Küllī hālde bile ulaşıq mısın?  
Yoksa sensin cümleden fāriq mısın?*<sup>117</sup>

Are you forever continuous and connected in every state?  
Or are you yourself, separate from all?

*Kaṭresin ‘ummān içinde ğarq ide  
Özini cümle ‘ālemden farq ide*<sup>118</sup>

May he become but a drop in the ocean  
And separate himself from the entire universe.

---

<sup>114</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 268a.

<sup>115</sup> An example for this: “Bal u yağ olsa şoğandan ne hāşıl / Halva gibi nesne mi var iy ‘ākil / Eti semiz olucağaz keşkegüñ / Ne dadı vardur yemege düglegüñ” (If there is honey and butter; what is an onion worth? / O person of intelligence! Can anything be compared with halvah? / When *keşkek* [a wheat dish] has plenty of meat / What pleasure is there in eating a raw melon?)” (*Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 162.) In this regard also see Orhan Şaik Gökyay, “Kaygusuz Abdal ve Sımâtiyeleri,” *Türk Folkloru* 1/13 (1980): 3-5, 2/14 (1980): 3-6.

<sup>116</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 278b.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., fol. 270a.

<sup>118</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 148.

In a third usage, *farḳ* is employed together with theophany (*tecellī*), which signifies the appearance of the One in the form, or forms, of the many.<sup>119</sup>

*Zihī nūr kim ‘ālemler ğarḳ olupdur  
Özi ferd ü ahaddur farḳ olupdur*<sup>120</sup>

Praise be to the Light which fills the whole universe  
His essence is the One and the Only; he disperses himself into the Many

When we compare these three usages of *farḳ*, we come across a succession – or rather a juxtaposition – of different levels of teaching. In categorizing these teachings in terms of the doctrine of the Four Gates, we can say that the first usage corresponds to the gate of *ṭarīḳat*. This level is characterized by a moral lesson aimed at the taming of one’s base self:

*Her kişi kim ḥaḳḳı bātıldan seçer  
Aña dimişler bu yolda gerçek er*

*Gel berü altuna ḳatmağıl bakır  
Ĝaflet ile cān yüzün eyleme kir*<sup>121</sup>

Whoever is capable of differentiating between the true and the false  
Deserves to be called a real Man.

Come by; do not add copper to gold  
Do not dirty the face of the soul with ignorance

Thus the “capacity to differentiate” is a skill the novice needs to cultivate in order to achieve perfection. The second usage, on the other hand, makes reference to the station of *fenā* (annihilation in God), which is linked to the gate of *ḥaḳīḳat*.

The third usage refers to two complementary concepts. One of these is the unity of *teşbīh* (similarity) and *tenzīh* (incomparability), which can only be understood by the *velī* at the highest stage of perfection. While the first stage on the path clearly distinguishes between the Creator and the created, in the second stage, that of annihilation in God, the focus is entirely on *teşbīh*. Yet, only in the last stage of both *teşbīh* and *tenzīh*, can true experiential

---

<sup>119</sup> This term figures as *farq al-jam‘* in Sufi dictionaries; for more on the concept see ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Qāshāni, *A Glossary of Sufi Technical Terms*, tr. Nabil Safwat (London: The Octagon Press, 1991), 90, 130-131. The term is translated into English as “dispersion”; see for instance William C. Chittick, *The Sufi Path of Knowledge: Ibn al-‘Arabi’s Metaphysics of Imagination* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989), 91.

<sup>120</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevī-i Baba Kayğusuz*, 92.

<sup>121</sup> *Ibid.*, 146.

knowledge of theophany (*tecellī*) be achieved. This last stage corresponds to the Perfect Man's movement from the state of *fenā* to the state of *bekā* (subsistence or perpetuation), where he subsists in God within his servitude, within the world of multiplicity. The level of *ma'rifet* (gnostic knowledge) which he attains is thus a mirror image of God's theophany.

## ***Ḥāl***

The above examples demonstrate how a single term can harbor three different layers of meaning according to the gate with which it is associated. On the other hand, the word *ḥāl* (state), one of the most frequently used terms in Ḳayḡusuz's works, contains four levels of meanings in accordance to the four different gates. In the following couplets, the use of *ḥāl* refers to the condition of the universe and the order in which it operates:

*Bilmedüñ ki bu ne hikmetdür ne ḥāl*  
*Ne imiş ortada dönen mäh u sāl*<sup>122</sup>

You did not know what wisdom this is, what state;  
What are these months and years changing constantly?

*'Aceb pergāl 'aceb tertīb 'aceb iş*  
*'Aceb ḥāldür 'acāyib dürlü gerdiş*<sup>123</sup>

A strange way of the world, a strange order, strange affair  
A strange state, strange turns of fortune

Ḳayḡusuz frequently stresses that this *ḥāl* can only be known by God. While *ḥāl* appears in the singular in the above examples, it is used in the plural in Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl's *Serāy-nāme* and *Gülistān*, where it expresses the world of multiplicity (*keşret*):

*Ol kadīm sulṭān ki vardur bī-zevāl*  
*Ḳanda olurdu yoḡiken küllī ḥāl*<sup>124</sup>

That ancient sultan who stands everlasting,  
Where was he when all states were nonexistent?

Ḳayḡusuz stresses that the various states of the world of multiplicity which bind us to their partial realities are in fact a singular state, the knowledge of which defines the Perfect Man:

---

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., 129.

<sup>123</sup> Ibid., 93.

<sup>124</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 271a.

[*Bu serāyuñ tabakalarınıñ*] cümlesine *Allāh 'uñ halkı tolmış. Her birisi bir hāle meşgūl olmuş, bu serāyda geçer. Ādemden artuğ kimse bu hāli fikr eylemez ki bu serāy ne yirdür. [...]* Bu serāyda cümle eşyā her birisi bu hāl içinde giriftār olmuş qalmış, velī insān-ı kāmīl añladı ki hāl nedür.<sup>125</sup>

All the stories of this palace are filled with the creations of God. Each creation is occupied with some state and keeps on living in this palace. None except for man thinks about this state, or asks what place this palace is. In this palace, each thing is a prisoner stuck in this state. Yet the Perfect Man is the one who understands what it is.

A second definition of *hāl* is the disciple's individual condition.<sup>126</sup> Knowing one's own state gives one the ability to distinguish between truth and falsity as mentioned above:

*Kendü hālüñden gāfil olma gāfil  
Tā ki saña rüşen ola haqq bātıl*<sup>127</sup>

Do not be ignorant of your own state  
In order that the true and false be visible to you

In this second use, *hāl* is also defined as a temporary and God-given state, as opposed to the permanent and earned *makām* (station); this use is parallel to that found in Sufi texts in general.

*Baña bir hāl 'aceb geldi cihānda  
Bu kimdür söylenür her bir lisānda*<sup>128</sup>

A strange state has come upon me in this world  
Who is this, spoken in every language?

The third definition of *hāl* is that of a singular state, making reference to a pre-eternal present in which all beings are One and speak the language of unity. This time frame is central to all of *Ḳayğusuz*'s works and is often referred to by the phrase "ezel demi" (the pre-eternal moment), which *Ḳayğusuz* uses to allude to the *bezm-i elest* (pre-eternal pact). The following four couplets from four different works exemplify this definition of *hāl*:

*Gehī 'iyān gehī pinhān geçerdüm  
Benüm hālüm bu idi her zamānda*<sup>129</sup>

<sup>125</sup> *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 14a-b [*Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, Saraynāme*, 164-167].

<sup>126</sup> In several places in *Ḳayğusuz*'s work, *hāl* signifies both the personal state of the aspirant and the time concept known as the 'present'.

<sup>127</sup> *Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 146.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 89.

<sup>129</sup> *Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, fol. 276b.



I have lived sometimes visibly, sometimes hidden  
This has been my state at all times

*Bu hālî her ki bildi hāmûş oldı  
Şanasın arşlan öñinde mûş oldı*<sup>130</sup>

Whoever knows this state becomes silent  
You would think he were a mouse facing a lion

*Çamu varlık kadîm ü pür-kemâldür  
Hayâl yokdur arada cümle hâldür*<sup>131</sup>

All beings are ancient and perfect  
There is no illusion in between, all is a state.

*Güneş toğdı dahı meş'al gerekmez  
Hâl olıcak arada kâl gerekmez*<sup>132</sup>

The sun is up; no need for the torch  
When the state has come, no need for talk

This *hāl* is inexpressible, absolute and unchangeable. Like the state of the world, it cannot be told; it can only be experienced. In its opposition to *hayâl* (illusion), it is the opposite of *keşret*, of manyness (multiplicity). In that sense, we can say that it is the experience of oneness in the station of annihilation in God.

The final definition of *hāl* is that of the esoteric. It is that which constitutes the opposite of the visible, the hidden component of the spoken word:

*Her şıfat içinde yüz biñ dürlü hâl  
Her hâl içinde 'ağallar pây[i]mâl*

*Sözi söyleyen özidür diñlegil  
Sözi ne kendüzi nedür añağıl*

*Ol durur söz kim bilesin hâl nedür  
Bir elifden bunca kâl u kâl nedür*<sup>133</sup>

Within each attribute are a hundred thousand different states  
Within each state intellects are destroyed

Listen, that which speaks the word is His essence  
Understand, what is His Word, what is His self?

---

<sup>130</sup> Kaygusuz Abdâl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 94.

<sup>131</sup> Kaygusuz Abdâl, *Dil-güşâ*, 72.

<sup>132</sup> Kaygusuz Abdâl, *Gülistân*, fol. 275a.

<sup>133</sup> Kaygusuz Abdâl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 114-115.

The word is that which allows you to know what the state is  
What is all this tittle-tattle derived from one *alif*?

In fact, expressions such as that above declaring that knowing the *ḥāl* is equal to being silent co-exist with those affirming that the *ḥāl* can only be known through the word, through language. Kaygusuz gives us a clue as to how one may express the inexpressible state:

*Şaru geymiş yine cümle şecerler  
Remzile ḥālını söyler tıyana*<sup>134</sup>

All the trees are wearing yellow again  
To those who can hear, they speak their state with a sign

*Haķirem faķirem pīrem ü pīrem  
Saña remz ile bu ḥālümü direm*<sup>135</sup>

I am poor and destitute, I am a spiritual guide  
I tell you this state of mine with a sign

The key word here is *remz* (sign). In order to be capable of expressing the hidden, language itself must have an esoteric dimension beneath its face. In the *Serāy-nāme* and the *Gūlistān*, Kaygusuz calls this language “ḥāl dili” (the language of the state).<sup>136</sup>

Thus, each definition of *ḥāl* represents a different gate in the spiritual hierarchy. The first gate is the concept of *ḥāl* which symbolizes the world of multiplicity with which created beings are occupied. This belongs to the spiritual level of *şerī‘at*, meaning that its audience and point of reference are those people who have not entered the path and thus not adherents to a Sufi order, but rather lay people summoned to the path. The second gate, *ṭarīķat*, involves informing the disciple of the necessity of knowing one’s own spiritual states and how these states vary according to the divine will. We saw earlier that this notion of spiritual state (*ḥāl*) is the essential aspect of this gate.

The couplets stating that all of existence is a single state correspond to the gate of *haķīķat*, where multiplicity entirely disappears within unity. Last of all, the couplets which define *ḥāl* as an esoteric language spoken through signs belong to the level of *ma‘rifet*. At this level, the *velī* is back among the people, untraceable (*bī-niṣān*) except for his words, which

---

<sup>134</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 201b.

<sup>135</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 88.

<sup>136</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, ff. 5b, 15a, 30b [Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 131, 168, 231]; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gūlistān*, fol. 270b. For the use of the phrase “the language of the state” in Ibn ‘Arabī, see Chittick, *Sufi Path of Knowledge*, 387, n. 14.

guide his followers towards perfection through the signs they embody. In this sense, the passage from *ḥakīkat* to *maʿrifet* is also the passage from silence to speech.

## ʿAql

When using the word *ʿaql*, Ḳayḡusuz sometimes specifies his concept of reference with a noun phrase. Yet most of the time, he only uses the word *ʿaql*, thus leaving it to the reader to distinguish between the different concepts embedded in the word. In order to differentiate between these multiple meanings, we first need to see how the word is defined in specific contexts.

In his *Delīl-i Budalā*, Ḳayḡusuz gives two definitions of the intellect. The intellect which is focused on and attached to this world is named *ʿaql-ı maʿāş* (the intellect for subsistence). Ḳayḡusuz says that this intellect is blind and its ride is lame. He distinguishes this intellect from the *ʿaql-ı maʿād* (the intellect for the ultimate goal), necessary for understanding the science of the esoteric.<sup>137</sup> Elsewhere in the same work, in a way which reminds us of the concept of *ʿaql al-awwal* (the first intellect) in philosophy and Sufism,<sup>138</sup> Ḳayḡusuz identifies the intellect with Gabriel.<sup>139</sup>

References to the *ʿaql-ı maʿāş* are also present in Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl's individual poems.<sup>140</sup> In addition, in the *Gūlistān* as well as Ḳayḡusuz's individual poems, we come across the term *ʿaql-ı küll* (the universal intellect):

*ʿAql-ı küll bende bulundu ʿişķile  
Cümle varlık gönlüm içinde bile<sup>141</sup>*

The universal intellect was found in me with love  
All beings are with me in my heart

*ʿAql-ı küllem ʿişķa yoldaş oldum  
Nefs ile yine nice savaşdum<sup>142</sup>*

<sup>137</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā* or *Budalā-nāme*, in Abdurrahman Güzel (ed), *Kaygusuz Abdal'in Mensur Eserleri*, 49-51. Citations will be made from this edition unless otherwise specified.

<sup>138</sup> See for instance ʿAzīz al-Dīn Nasafī, *Kitāb al-Insān al-Kāmil*, Edited by Marijan Molé (Tahran-Paris: Institut Franco-Iranien, 1962), 189 and 225.

<sup>139</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 71.

<sup>140</sup> See Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 127b and 177b.

<sup>141</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Gūlistān*, fol. 273b. Also see fol. 252b.

<sup>142</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 118a. Also see fol. 133a, 222b, and 235a.

I am the universal intellect; I have become the companion of love  
Once again I have fought hard against the base self

In the rest of Kaygusuz Abdāl's corpus, the word *'aql* used by itself denotes one of these meanings, with respect to the intended level of teaching. In the following couplets, the word is used to refer to the *'aql-ı ma 'āş*, which lacks the ability to know God:

*'Akıllar azdı cānlar yolda kaldı  
Da 'vā kılanlaruñ fikri üzildi<sup>143</sup>*

The intellects went astray; the souls remained on the path  
The thoughts of the pretenders fell apart

*Kamu 'ālem ta'accübdür bu hālde  
'Ākıller māt olupdur bu hayâlde<sup>144</sup>*

In this state the entire universe is astonished  
In this illusion the intellectuals are defeated

*'Aqla dime bu sözi cān söylesün  
Sulṭānuñ sözini sulṭān söylesün<sup>145</sup>*

Do not speak this word to the intellect; let the soul say it  
Let the sultan speak the sultan's words

In the following couplets, Kaygusuz is making reference to the *'aql-ı ma 'ād*, the intellect which gives one the ability to enter and follow the path:

*'Ākil iseñ terk idegör dünyāyı  
Gel berü çekme beyhüde sevdāyı<sup>146</sup>*

If you have intellect abandon this world  
Come this way; do not bear this useless passion

*Nefsine uymaya perhiz eyleye  
İşini 'aql ile temiz eyleye<sup>147</sup>*

He shall not follow his base self; he shall abstain  
He shall cleanse his act with his intellect

*Yā hūd 'aqluñ tamām yirince degül  
Ġāfil anuñiçün olduñ iy füzül<sup>148</sup>*

<sup>143</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 83.

<sup>144</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 278a.

<sup>145</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 125a.

<sup>146</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 152.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid. 161.

<sup>148</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 239a.

Or else your intellect is not fully in its place  
That is why you have become ignorant, you haughty man!

*'Aqluñi dir kendüzüñe bir yören  
Ne kişidür gözüñ içinde gören<sup>149</sup>*

Gather your intellect; come back to yourself  
Who is this person who sees within your eyes?

Last of all, Qaygusuz uses the word *'aql* to refer to the universal intellect. In the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, he identifies this intellect with Prophet Muḥammad. He states that Muḥammad is the sultan of the market of the intellect (*'aql bāzārı*) and 'Alī is the sultan of the market of love (*'iṣṣk bāzārı*).<sup>150</sup> In a similar fashion, in Qaygusuz's poetry, when *'aql* denotes the *'aql-ı küll* manifested in the Perfect Man, it is always in conjunction with *'iṣṣk*:

*'Aqlum irdügi budur kim söylerem  
'Iṣṣk deñizinde yüzerem boylaram*

*'Aqlumi 'iṣṣkıla hem-dem eyledüm  
Nefsümi sekitdüm epsem eyledüm<sup>151</sup>*

I say what my intellect has been able to grasp  
I swim in the sea of love; I dive to its depths

I made my intellect the intimate companion of love  
I reprimanded my base self and quieted it down

*Dire 'aqlın fikrini cem 'eyleye  
'Iṣṣk yolında şıdkını şerḥ eyleye<sup>152</sup>*

He shall gather his intellect; get his mind together  
He shall expound his veracity in the path of love

---

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., fol. 270a.

<sup>150</sup> Qaygusuz Abdāl, *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, fol. 266a-b.

<sup>151</sup> Qaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 273a. The companionship between the intellect and the faculty of love was also visible in the couplets with reference to the *'aql-ı küll*; see p. 40.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., fol. 254b. Also see Qaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 264b and 282b; Qaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044 (dated 907/ 1501-2), fol. 315b. In the following couplet, the intellect and the capacity for love are not in cooperation, but in dispute: “*'Iṣṣkı göreli 'aql ile gönül savaşıırken / Arada beni gör ki nice şürde kıldı* [Since I have seen love, the intellect and the heart are in battle / See me in between; see how love has maddened me] (Qaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 246b). In such couplets, the intellect being referred to is no longer the universal intellect, but rather the *'aql-ı ma'aş*. For a second example to this use, see *ibid.*, 148b.

Interestingly, each of the above examples includes the act of speaking. We can thus identify them as referring to the gate of *maʿrifet*, which we saw to involve the passage from silence to speech. The gate of *ḥakīkat* consists in a total loss of all reasoning with the advent of divine love, in parallel with the destruction of the body (*cism*) and the appearance of the soul (*cān*) which we saw earlier. As a result, the word *ʿaql* does not have a level of meaning belonging to this gate. On the other hand, the gate of *maʿrifet* strikes a balance between unity and multiplicity (or the soul and the body) via a cooperation between the intellect and the faculty of love. This makes it possible for the Perfect Man to remain in the world of multiplicity without being attached to it. He can thus maintain his duty as a spiritual teacher, which he performs largely through his speech.

The other levels of meaning for the word *ʿaql* also correspond to their appropriate gates: The references to the *ʿaql-ı maʿāş* belong to the gate of *şerīʿat*, in which the spiritual teacher works to persuade the lay person to let go of his attachment to the world and to enter the path. The references to the *ʿaql-ı maʿād* belong to the gate of *ṭarīkat*, in which the disciple uses his faculty of intellect to remain on the path, lead a righteous life, and grasp subtle truths.

In the gate of *maʿrifet*, which is the destination of the path, Ḳaygusuz Abdāl names the intellect as the *ʿaql-ı kāmīl* (perfect intellect). It thus becomes an integral part of the definition of the Perfect Man:

*Zīrā insān kadīm ü lā-yezāldür  
Ol insān ki anuñ ʿaqlı kāmıldür*<sup>153</sup>

Because Man is ancient and eternal  
That Man whose intellect is perfect

As we can see from this couplet, Ḳaygusuz refers to the Perfect Man with the same attributes that he uses for God. The perfect intellect is one which is capable of grasping the truth behind such expressions, wherein it is identified with the secret of Muḥammad:

*Sen bu sözi ol kişiye şor kim ol  
Muştafā sırrına ʿaqlı buldı yol*<sup>154</sup>

Ask these words from that person  
Whose intellect found the way to the secret of Muştafā

<sup>153</sup> Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 276b. Also see Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 115a and 255a.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, 264b.

## Changing Audiences: From Fear to Certainty

It is common in Sufi literature that the meaning of terms change according to the different levels of teaching at which they are directed. Accordingly, various textual or narrative strategies arise from this attempt to adapt to the spiritual levels of different intended audiences.<sup>155</sup> One such strategy may have the narrator directly address a particular audience, helping navigate how spiritual symbolism is interpreted. Another may be structuring a narrative along the lines of a linear progression according to a given hierarchy, exemplified by ‘Aṭṭār’s *Manṭiq al-Ṭayr*. The difficulty in Ḳayğusuz Abdāl’s works lies in that all levels of his teaching occur *simultaneously*.

In the prose sections of the *Serāy-nāme* and the *Dil-güşā*, when Ḳayğusuz openly states the intended audience, he likewise provides the spiritual teaching appropriate to the group.

*Pes iy tālib-i Haḳḳ! Eger bu kavli ʔutarsañ ki her nesne kişiy e kendüden kendüyedür, bir bābdur. Eger dir iseñ ki ḥayr u şerr tñnrıdandır, bu da bir bābdur. Eger küllī Haḳḳdur ʔutarsañ sen ortadan git. Eger senden saña ise ‘ibādetüñ temiz eyle.*<sup>156</sup>

O the aspirant of God! If you follow this word of mine that all things come to a person from his own self, this is a gate. If you state that the good and the bad come from God, that is also another gate. If you accept that all is God, disappear from in between. If it all comes to you from yourself, cleanse your worship.

In looking closely at these phrases, we once again come across three gates. The first is *ṭarīḳat*, the second *şerī‘at*, and the third *haḳīḳat*. The spiritual teacher (*mürşid*) is the one who knows the level of the aspirant and shapes his teachings accordingly: “*Pes eyle olsa ʔulısañ ʔulluḳ ḥālince debren. Sulṭānsañ mülküñdür emīn ol. Eger nidügin bilmeseñ mürşide şor* [So in that case, if you are a servant, act according to the state of servanthood. If you are the Sultan, then this is your land; have certainty. If you do not know what you are, ask the spiritual teacher].”<sup>157</sup>

Without understanding these hierarchical layerings, many teachings of Ḳayğusuz can seem to be in direct opposition to one another. The two examples below, one from the *Serāy-*

---

<sup>155</sup> In fact, such narrative strategies were also employed by the Prophet, who frequently adapted his speech to the people with whom he spoke; see Éric Geoffroy, *Introduction to Sufism: The Inner Path of Islam*, trans. Roger Gaetani (Bloomington, Indiana: World Wisdom, 2010), 50.

<sup>156</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 120.

<sup>157</sup> *Serāy-nāme*, 52a [Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 316]. For a similar passage see Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 62.

*nāme* and the other from the *Dil-güşā*, exemplify entirely different notions of prophecy, angelology and sainthood. In the first example, the teaching changes according to two levels. In the initial part, the Oneness of Being is stressed and the aspirant is advised to be “certain.” The second part states that the aspirant who has not reached this stage must “act with respect and modesty” and advises fear:

*İnsān oldur ki öz ‘aqlına yörene. Göre ki bu mülk ü serāy bār-gāh kendüzünüñ midür yoḥsa şāhibi mi vardur. Eger şöyle ki özinüñ ise emīn ola. Şāhibi var ise edeb bekleye. [...] Pes Ādem ḥalīfe olduḡunuñ nişānı budur ki Ḥaqq’dan kırka, peygamberden utana, evliyālara ikrār eyleye, ḡayr-ı ḥaqq işlerden perhīz eyleye, bākışın ‘ibret ile baqa.<sup>158</sup>*

Being a Man requires relying on one’s own intellect. He [the Man] shall see whether this land, palace, and court is his own or whether it has an owner. If it is his, he shall be certain. If it has an owner, he shall act with respect and modesty. [...] The sign that Man is God’s representative on earth is that he shall be afraid of God, ashamed before the prophet, and in acknowledgement of the saints. He shall refrain from untruthful acts and possess a gaze that allows for moral improvement.

On the other hand, the second example taken from the *Dil-güşā* is an entirely esoteric teaching and shows the aspirant how the experience of oneness radically changes the meaning of creation. It expresses what Karamustafa accurately identifies as “a complete interiorization of God, Satan, other cosmic actors such as prophets, angels, and saints, cosmic entities as well as sacred history.”<sup>159</sup> When the aspirant comes to know that the being of God is his own, he will have become “certain”:

*Daḡı kalmaya ḡümānuñ özüne  
Sücūd eyleyesin sen kendüzüne  
O menzile irişicek seferün  
Nūr idi daḡı nūr ola nazaruñ  
O demde göresin bu cümle pergāl  
Dem ü sâ‘at gice gündüz meh ü sāl  
Bu ḡayāller ki görinür ‘ālemde  
O şıfatlar ki söylenür kelāmda  
Yol u menzil yakın ıraḡ dimeklik  
Ḥall ü müşkil ya ḡaqq bātıl dimeklik  
Velī Nebī tarīḡ peygamber ü Cibrīl  
Yalan gerçek demek noḡşān u kāmīl  
Cihān içinde gördüḡüñ ḡayāller  
Ḥayāl içindeki mu‘ammā ḡāller  
Hemān bir noḡtadır bir ḡarf-i elif  
Ḥaḡīkat şöyle ki cān bigi laḡīf  
Daḡı bundan laḡīfdür ki direm ben  
İrebilmen nice nişān virem ben<sup>160</sup>*

<sup>158</sup> *Serāy-nāme*, 9b-10a [Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 147-148].

<sup>159</sup> Karamustafa, “Kaygusuz Abdal,” 335.

<sup>160</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 124-127.



You shall not have any doubt as to your essence  
 You shall prostrate to your own self  
 When your journey reaches that stopping place  
 Your vision has been light; light it shall be  
 At that moment you will see this entire universe  
 Moment and hour, day and night, the month and year  
 Those attributes which are spoken in words  
 What is meant by the words: path, stopping place, close and far  
 What is meant by the solution and problem; the true and the false  
 Saint, prophet, path, messenger and Gabriel  
 What mean lie and truth, lacking and complete  
 The imaginary things you see inside the universe  
 The enigmatic states inside those imaginary things  
 They are all a single dot, the letter *alif*  
 The truth is subtle as the soul  
 What can I say that is subtler than this?  
 Knowing you won't reach this, how much more shall I signal?

When considered side by side, the given counsels prescribing the fear of a transcendent God seem radically subverted by the statements taking God's immanence in the absolute. However, if we understand that the first one addresses the lay adherent in the first gate of *şerī'at* and the second one addresses the disciple learning about the next stage in the teaching, it becomes clear that they actually complement one another.

Couplets and sections which counsel fear or certainty alternate in the *Mesnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz* and Kaygusuz Abdāl's other works. Upon a closer look at these sections, we see that fear denotes the state of the common people who have not set foot onto the path:

*Hemān bir mülk, bir sultān, bir meclis, bir sākī. 'Acā'ib dañlamak şey' taşavvurıdır. Zîrā ki 'acā'ib nesne yok; meclis dost tecellisidir. Havf u recā insān zarūretidir. Zîrā ki, maḥlūk şifātında giriftār olupdur, kurtulabilmez ki Hālîk şifātına irişe.*<sup>161</sup>

The land is one; the sultan is one; the gathering is one; the cupbearer is one. Surprise at the sight of strangeness is a conception belonging to created things. For there are no strange things; the gathering is the theophany of the friend. Fear and desire are necessities of the human. For he is stuck in the attributes of the created; he cannot break free to attain the Attributes of the Creator.

In Kaygusuz's works, fear is a tool which allows the person at the stage of *şerī'at* to tame his base self (*nefs*) through worship. Kaygusuz openly states the objective of the fear of God: “*Hakkuñ rahmetine kuluñ tã'ati sebedür ve dahı cümle tã'atüñ aşlı Allāh'dan korqmaqdur* [The reason for God's compassion is the servant's worship and at the origin of all worship lies the fear of God].”<sup>162</sup> Being “certain” on the other hand, is only possible at the point of arrival

<sup>161</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşâ*, 149.

<sup>162</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Serây-nâme*, 22b [Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynâme*, 199].

where no doubts remain, where the vision is transformed into one of light, one of absolute truth. In one of his poems, aygusuz says: “*Hakkuñ emini bu yolda özini bilendir* [God’s trusty in this path is the one who knows himself].”<sup>163</sup> According to aygusuz, being trustworthy of God is equal to having absolute certainty. This, in turn, is defined as the obliteration of all questioning, and more interestingly, all speech. Certainty is thus achieved in the gate of *hakikat*, which we saw to be equal to silence:

*Emin oldı ‘alem çün u çiradan*  
*Hâl iriřdi bu kâl gitdi aradan*<sup>164</sup>

The universe became certain; free of the how and why  
The state arrived; these words disappeared from in between

Thus, in determining the experience of emotion that is advised to the reader, we have the opportunity to understand *which reader* is addressed. aygusuz sees this multiplicity in the experiences of the readers as an expression of the plurality inherent in the self-manifestation of God. This results in a plurality in the manifestation of the Perfect Man himself, whose gate of *ma‘rifet* in which he abides encompasses all of the realities of the universe:

*Geh korkaram bende gibi geh oluram yek-tâ gibi*  
*Geh tãlibem eřyã gibi geh küllî ol zãt oluram*<sup>165</sup>

At times I am scared like a servant; at times I resemble the unique  
At times I am an aspirant like created things; at times I become that essence in entirety

The importance of the notion of fear for aygusuz Abdãl can be discerned from his choice of the pen name *aygusuz* (fearless / carefree). According to his hagiography, this name was given to him by his master Abdãl Mũsã, who said to him: “aygudan rehã bulduñ; řimden řoñra aygusuz olduñ [You have found an escape from fear; from now on you are [to be called] Fearless].”<sup>166</sup> In one of his poems, aygusuz explains the meaning of his pen-name:

<sup>163</sup> aygusuz Abdãl, *Divãn*, 139a.

<sup>164</sup> aygusuz Abdãl, *Gũlistãn*, fol. 280b.

<sup>165</sup> aygusuz Abdãl, *Divãn*, fol. 163b.

<sup>166</sup> *aygusuz Abdal (Alãaddin Gaybî) Menãkibnãmesi*, 100. aygusuz also uses the notion of fear to blame hypocrite dervishes or Sufis, as evidenced by this couplet where he speaks through the mouth of the former: “aygusuz Abdãl âdemdür ben melũlam aygudan / Fuzũlam řöyle tekebbür kibri bařdan řalmadum [aygusuz Abdãl is a Man; I myself am somber with fear / I am presumptuous and haughty; I have not let go of my pride]”

Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl olaldan burhānum  
Ḳayḡum yok ḡandān ben oldum epsem ol<sup>167</sup>

Since Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl became my evidence  
I have no fear; I have become cheerful; be quiet!

The *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṡa* tells the story of a dervish who, in a dream, finds himself in an empty desert, which is a metaphor for the world of multiplicity. The dervish is filled with fear at the idea of not knowing where he is, which path to take, and whom to ask for guidance. Yet, in his waking state, symbolizing unity, he frequently says that he is “*emīn*” (certain). At the end of his journey, he converses with God, who replies to him in the following manner:

‘Aleykūm esselām dervīṡ-i miskīn  
Ḳamu kavli bütün cümle iṡi çin

Müberrāsın kamu zann u gümāndan  
Ḥakīkate yakīn sulṡāna emīn<sup>168</sup>

And unto you peace; wretched dervish!  
Whose speech is sound, whose acts are pure

You are free of all surmise and doubt  
Certain of truth, trustworthy of God

## Layers in the Doctrine of ‘Alī

Following this detailed analysis, we may now discuss the political implications of this juxtaposition of teachings. An examination of these political implications likewise requires a closer look at the doctrine of ‘Alī, which brings us across two complementary points of view. According to the first of these, ‘Alī is portrayed as a disciple who has accepted Muḡammad as his *mürṡid* and who walks in the path of moral perfection. We find this in the *Delīl-i Budalā*:

*Zīrā Ḥazret-i ‘Alī her gāh Peyḡamber Aleyhisselām’ı ḡalvet buldukça eydür kim: “Yā Resūlullāh ne ‘amel idem ki ömrümi zāyi ‘itmemiṡ olam? Ḥazret-i Resūl sallallāhu ‘aleyhi ve sellem eydür ki: “Ḥakḡ’ı bulmak isterseñ kendüñi bil, ‘arıfler ṡoḡbetine gir. ṡādık olup sözi*

---

(Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 172b). In his *Delīl-i Budalā*, Ḳayḡusuz states that the *ḡutb* (pole, the *velī* of highest rank) acts without care (‘*adem-i taḡayyüd*). Upon the command of God, he decides on the fear or happiness to be conferred on God’s servants; see Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 57-58.

<sup>167</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 207a. The whole poem ends with the rhyme “epsem ol [be quiet],” thus stressing the importance of keeping one’s achieved unity as a secret.

<sup>168</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṡa*, fol. 218b.

*taşdîk eyle. Bir dilden iki söz söyleme. Kimseye mekr ü hîle eyleme. Kendüñe ne şanursañ halka dahı anı san. [...] Hemân kendüñi bildüñ ve Hakk'ı bulduñ, bu kerre seyriñ 'arşa ferşe irer. Ömrüñi zâyî 'itmemiş olduñ!" dir.<sup>169</sup>*

Whenever 'Alî found the Prophet (peace be upon him) alone, he would ask him: "O Messenger of God! How shall I act so that I do not waste my life? The Messenger –peace be upon him- would say: "If you want to find God, know yourself. Join the company of gnostics. Be loyal and affirm their word. Do not speak two different words from one tongue. Do not deceive or cheat anyone. Whatever you wish for yourself, also wish for others. [...] If you know yourself and find God, this time your journey will reach the throne of God and all corners of the earth. Then you haven't wasted your life."

On the other hand, we find a dual notion of guidance in aygusuz Abdâl's *Kitâb-ı Mağlaa*. In this work, while the spiritual guide is Muammad at the gate of *şerî'at*, the guide is 'Alî at the gate of *arîat*, when the time comes for the uncovering of the esoteric:

*Bu kerre 'aql bâzârına girdi, 'aql ile badı. Gördi ki sultân Muammed Mutafâdur. 'Iş bâzârına badı; 'ış bâzârında 'Alîyi sultân gördi. Yöridi ilerü ki sultâna hâlini 'arz kıla. Şâh-ı Merdân 'Alî dervîşi gördi. [...] Şâh-ı Merdân 'Alîniñ elin öpdî. Eydür ki: "Yâ 'Alî ben saña mürid oluram, erkân töre bilmezem öğrenmek için" dir.<sup>170</sup>*

This time he entered the bazaar of the intellect. He observed with the intellect and saw that the sultan was Muammad Mutafâ. He looked inside the bazaar of love and saw 'Alî as the sultan. He walked forward to present his state. [...] [He] kissed the hand of 'Alî the King of Men. He said: "O 'Alî! I want to be your aspirant. I don't have any knowledge of principles and customs. I want to learn them from you."

Considering the necessity of full cooperation between the intellect and love in the highest spiritual level, we can say that in this context, the hierarchy in the previous passage no longer holds. The two different spiritual positions allocated to 'Alî in such examples can be said to mirror 'Alî's dual nature according to Shi'ism, wherein the historical 'Alî is the disciple of Muammad, who is initiated by him into his own secret nature as the cosmic 'Alî.

In the *Kitâb-ı Mağlaa*, we find several clues to aygusuz's doctrine of 'Alî. The esoteric teaching quoted above regarding the true meaning behind prophets and saints – or rather behind the whole universe – appears in the *Kitâb-ı Mağlaa* as part of the doctrine of 'Alî. In this work, 'Alî is portrayed as the holder of esoteric knowledge who signals to the dervish the hidden meanings behind Qur'anic episodes. He is the esoteric truth behind every face, including those of prophets:

*Bir gün dervîş düşünde gördi ki Süleymân peygamber zamânında. Süleymân peygamberüñ divânı urmuş. Şâh-ı Merdân 'Alîyi gördi ki Süleymân peygamberüñ kirpügi altından baar. Dervîş der-hâl bildi; tazarru' eyledi. [...] Şâh-ı Merdân 'Alî dervîşe dişin kısdı. "Söyleme"*

<sup>169</sup> aygusuz Abdâl, *Delîl-i Budalâ*, 70. Mistakes in spelling and meaning are corrected by me.

<sup>170</sup> *Kitâb-ı Mağlaa*, 266a-b.

*didî. “Süleymân peygamber ile bile geldüm” dir. “Süleymân peygamber beni özini şanur. Dek tur; hâtırı kalmasun” didî dir. [...] Şâh-ı Merdân-ı ‘Alî eydür: “Dervîş bak.” Dervîş bakdı, gördi ki yüz biñ yigirmi dört biñ peygamber cümle-i evliyâ vü enbiyâ ‘Aleyhim es-selâm turmuşlar her birisi taḥsîn iderler ‘Alîye.<sup>171</sup>*

After many cycles of time, one day the dervish dreamt that he was in the times of Prophet Solomon. Prophet Solomon was holding council. The dervish saw that underneath the eyelashes of Solomon, it was ‘Alî who was looking out. He immediately knew what this meant and begged for mercy. [...] ‘Alî, the King of Men, made a sign for the dervish to remain silent and said: “Don’t say anything. I’ve come (to earth) with Prophet Solomon. He thinks that I am his own self. Remain silent so that he doesn’t feel hurt.” [...] ‘Alî, the King of Men, told the dervish to look up. The dervish looked up and saw that a hundred and twenty-four thousand prophets as well as all saints were present. They were all full of awe for ‘Alî.

In this excerpt, we find a teaching which is different from and complements the one in which ‘Alî is Muḥammad’s aspirant. Not only is ‘Alî the dervish’s *mürşid*, but also the spiritual guide of all beings on earth, much like the *velî* named as *Ḳuṭbu ’l-aḳṭāb* (The Pole of Poles) in Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s *Vücūd-nāme*.<sup>172</sup> Interestingly, although ‘Alî’s cosmic and historical natures are inextricably linked in Shi’ism, they are not expressed together in Ḳayḡusuz’s works. That is, while some of his works stress his historical nature, i.e. his quality as Muḥammad’s disciple, others stress his cosmic nature as the guide of all beings and the manifestation of God.

Although an in-depth analysis of the doctrinal subtleties in this matter are the subject of the second chapter, we now have the tools to interpret why Ḳayḡusuz may have separated his teachings in such a manner. We can safely say that the first teaching was probably directed at the lay adherents or the novice, and that it was only after a certain level of initiation that the esoteric doctrine of ‘Alî entered the disciple’s formation. This idea could also be supported by the fact that this doctrine is openly elaborated only in the *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṭa* and some of Ḳayḡusuz’s poems, in addition to a few minor references in the *Serāy-nāme*.<sup>173</sup> The *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṭa* is characterized by the fact that it does not embody the hierarchy of teachings demonstrated earlier, but rather contains only esoteric teachings, belonging to the gates of

---

<sup>171</sup> Ibid., 267a.

<sup>172</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Delîl-i Budalâ*, 150.

<sup>173</sup> See Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Kitāb-ı maḡlaṭa*, fol. 266a-267a, 268a-b, 278b-280a; also see Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvân*, fol. 129a, 131b, 135b, 136a, 157b, 182a, 187a, 207a, 222a, 223a; the phrase ‘Aḡmed-i Ḥaydar’ on 166b, 177b, 180b, 223b; the phrase ‘Aḡmed ü Ḥaydar’ on 166b, 209b; Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvân*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 309b, 320b. For the references in the *Serāy-nāme*, see Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 20b, 21a, 24b, 26b, 29b, 39b, 56a, 57b [Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Saraynâme*, 190-193, 206-207, 214-215, 226-227, 266-267, 332-333, 338-339].

*hakikat* and *ma'rifet*. It is a symbolic account of a dervish's spiritual voyage, in which he alternates between states of dreaming and wakefulness. The prose text is sprinkled with verse consisting of ecstatic sayings expressing the Oneness of Being.

When we consider some of the social and political ramifications related to these multi-layered teachings, the following questions come to mind: Why is this esoteric teaching regarding 'Alī absent from Kāyḡusuz's other works? Why does it not occur as one of the layers of teaching in his works where all layers are juxtaposed? Finally, could we explain this absence of the notion of 'Alī's divinity as the result of *taqiyya* (dissimulation)<sup>174</sup>? Clues to such a possibility are found in a passage in Kāyḡusuz's *Üçüncü Meşnevî*, where he states that his work is intended for oral reading and underlines the importance of selecting one's audience carefully:

*Bunı yazanı okuyan ile  
Dost yarlığasın diñleyen ile*

*Ehli olıcağ sen okı turma  
Nā-ehl olıcağ şağın okuma*<sup>175</sup>

May the Friend pardon  
The writer and the reader of this [text]

Do not hesitate to read it [out loud] in the company of [the right] people  
Avoid reading it among those who are not qualified

Similarly, in one of his poems, Kāyḡusuz speaks about the repercussions of revealing the secret:

*Söylesem oda yaqarlar şabr idersem ölürem  
Ol sebedendür sözümi söyle muğlak söylerem  
[...]  
Görmişem ol ki 'ālemde cümle cisme cāndur ol  
Üşte yakındur velī kim kaşdı irak söylerem*<sup>176</sup>

If I speak, they will burn me in fire. If I stay patient, I will die.  
For that reason I speak my words obscurely.

I have seen Him who is the soul of all bodies in the universe  
Here he is, nearby. Yet I deliberately speak as if he is far.

---

<sup>174</sup> See Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, "Dissimulation," in Jane Dammen McAuliffe (ed), *Encyclopaedia of the Qur'an* (Georgetown University, Washington DC: Brill Online, 2015).

<[http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-the-quran/dissimulation-EQSIM\\_00122](http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-the-quran/dissimulation-EQSIM_00122)>

<sup>175</sup> Kāyḡusuz Abdāl, *Üçüncü Meşnevî*, fol. 21a.

<sup>176</sup> Kāyḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek MS. Or. Oct. 4044, fol. 305a.

## The Social Context

In order to better understand aygusuz Abdāl’s textual strategies and doctrinal positions, we should first examine how he situates himself within society vis-à-vis religious clerics and Sufis. In a recent study linking aygusuz’s works to the phenomenon of the emergence of Turkish as a vernacular literary medium, Ahmet T. Karamustafa shows how aygusuz openly situates himself against institutionalized Sufism as practiced in “urban” centers and expressed in the languages of Classical Arabic and Persian. Karamustafa points out that aygusuz Abdāl’s criticism was directed not towards the ‘*ulamā*’, with whom he had little contact, but towards the Sufis themselves, who according to aygusuz were nothing but impostors deceiving the general public with their “learned” languages and sciences.<sup>177</sup> In fact, aygusuz never uses the word Sufi to refer to himself, although he expounds an essentially Sufi doctrine. He is very careful to use the word “dervish” instead. aygusuz’s works are filled with vivid and often humorous references to the hypocrisy and ostentatious piety of the *şofu*, whom he takes to be the very personification of Satan:

*Eydürler kim baña şindi seni şeytân azdurur  
Ben şu zerrāk şüfilderden özge şeytân bilmezem*<sup>178</sup>

They tell me that devils lead me astray  
I know no other devil than these hypocritical Sufis

Karamustafa also underlines a number of important points regarding aygusuz’s notion of *şerī‘at*. He states that “aygusuz Abdāl interiorized the *sharī‘a* by reducing it to his own moral imperatives,” adapting its ethical dimensions while completely rejecting its legal aspects.<sup>179</sup> While I agree with this assertion on the basis of the relative unimportance of ritual obligations, I believe it is not possible to say that these were completely absent from aygusuz’s representations of *şerī‘at*.<sup>180</sup> The definition of this gate in the *Gūlistān* quoted in

---

<sup>177</sup> Karamustafa, “aygusuz Abdal,” 336-338.

<sup>178</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 309b. In order to fit the meter, the word *zerk* in the manuscript has been read as *zerrāk*; this also matches the reading of the word in: Gölpinarlı, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, 46.

<sup>179</sup> Karamustafa, “aygusuz Abdal,” 335. The same can be said for the general Bektashi view of formal worship; see Algar, “Bektāşīya.”

<sup>180</sup> See Ocak, *Kalenderiler*, 181 for a list of references to ritual observance in aygusuz Abdāl’s works.

the beginning of this chapter focused on ritual obligations, including the daily prayer.<sup>181</sup> In this respect, of relevance is another passage from the *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, expounding the doctrine of the Four Gates:

*Pîr saña erkân-ı şalât bildüre  
İmân islâm farz u sünnet bildüre*

*Çün ki bildüñ şerî'at nedür tamâm  
Tarîkat yolunda koyasın kadem*<sup>182</sup>

The spiritual director shall instruct you on the pillars of prayer  
He shall instruct you on faith, submission, religious duties and traditions

And when you fully know what religious law is  
Then you shall set foot into the path

On the issue of ritual obligations, it is also interesting that among Kaygusuz Abdâl's poetry which appear in his hagiography, we find more than one poem aimed at proving Kaygusuz Abdâl's adherence to ritual obligations in response to accusations by religious clerics or the ruling elite. In the following poem, the *Salât-nâme*, Kaygusuz meticulously presents the number of *rakats* for prayers in one day and one year:

*İy emîr efendi baña  
Dağı namâz şorar mısun  
Tür haber vireyüm saña  
Dağı namâz şorar mısun  
[...]  
Zâtumdan hayrân oluram  
Farz u sünneti kıduram  
Bir yıllık namâz bilürem  
Dağı namâz şorar mısun*<sup>183</sup>

O Emir Efendi!  
Will you keep asking me if I pray?  
Then let me tell you  
Will you keep asking me if I pray?

I become stupefied by my own self  
I pray the *fard* and the *sunna*  
I know the prayer for a whole year  
Will you keep asking me if I pray?

---

<sup>181</sup> See pp. 31-32.

<sup>182</sup> Kaygusuz Abdâl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 111. These couplets also illustrate another matter I discussed earlier, namely that the passages belonging to the gate of *şerî'at* are addressed to the lay adherent. In addition, they exemplify the role of the *pîr* in the Islamization of the general public, particularly in rural areas.

<sup>183</sup> *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alâaddin Gaybî) Menâkıbnâmesi*, 141-142.



Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl's hagiography includes a second poem entitled the *Minber-nāme*,<sup>184</sup> which he is said to have composed after having been accused of being “bī-tā‘at” (lacking in acts of worship) by the preacher at the Friday prayer. In this poem Ḳayḡusuz engages in an ardent critique of society, which condemns him only because he is lacking in money or status. He accuses the preacher of hypocrisy and demonstrates his knowledge of Sufism as well as of the doctrine of the Oneness of Being.

In a passage in the *İkinci Meşnevī*, part of which was quoted in the introduction of this article, Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl demonstrates that he is deeply aware of the way he is perceived by society. He portrays these perceptions as radically contradictory:

*Kimi eydür niçün kırkar saçalın  
Kimi eydür ol bilür kendi ‘amālın*

*Kimi eydür ki bu merd-i ḡodadur  
Kimi dir bunuñla baḡmaḡ ḡaḡadur  
[...]  
Kimi eydür ki bu dehrī ve bengī  
Yiticek esrārı yiye nehengi*

*Kimi dir cümle sırrı bilür ol ḡaḡḡ  
Yoluñ gözet bulara dutmaḡıl daḡ*<sup>185</sup>

Some say, “Why does he shave his beard?”  
Some say, “It’s his own business.”

Some say, “This is a man of God.”  
Some say, “It is a mistake to take guidance from such a person.”

Some say, “He is a materialist and a cannabis-addict.”  
If he has enough weed, he will eat up the world!”

Some say, “That true man knows all secrets.”  
Follow your own path; do not reproach them.

In the last verse, Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl addresses both himself and other *abdāls* with the advice to remain unaffected by either criticism or praise. In this sense, being “fearless” or “care-free” not only points to a higher spiritual stage in one’s relationship to God, but also implies a level of disengagement from society. In the following passage, Ḳayḡusuz describes the practical side of this disengagement:

---

<sup>184</sup> Ibid., 136-140. A much shorter version of the poem also figures in the most complete and second oldest manuscript of Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s poems. See: Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 123b-124a.

<sup>185</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *İkinci Meşnevī*, 3b.

*Ferāgat 'ālemine kadem başdı. [...] Dā'im tek ü tenhā olup bu hālka bir sa'at karışmaz oldı. Anlara zāhidler gibi bir libās-ı mahşūş degüldür. [...] Kendüsi şöyle tek ü tenhā, miskîn ve mazlûm hālķ içinde gezer. Bir gün aç ve bir gün tok. Açlıķdan ziyān ve tokluķdan ana fā'ide olmaz.*<sup>186</sup>

He set foot into the world of withdrawal [...] He spends time all by himself and does not for a single moment mingle with other people. They do not have special dress like the ascetics. [...] He wanders among people all by himself, wretched and injured. One day he is hungry; the other day he is full. Hunger does not harm him and satiety does not benefit him.

The refusal to be marked by special dress, on the other hand, indicates a second tendency which does not seem compatible with the first. As Karamustafa points out, Kaygusuz Abdāl and other *abdāls* “sided with the Turkish speaking rural masses and chose to ‘blend in’ with regular people by avoiding special dress, urban speak and *shari‘a*-based recipes for social conduct.”<sup>187</sup> Indeed, in the two poems mentioned above, the *Salāt-nāme* and the *Minber-nāme*, we observe active engagement with society, where Kaygusuz passionately criticizes society’s norms while still making a certain effort to fit them. Yet, how is it possible to “not mingle” and “blend in” at the same time?

Kaygusuz Abdāl’s dual relationship with society reminds us of the duality we discussed above regarding Kaygusuz Abdāl’s views on afterlife, prophetology and angelology. Did Kaygusuz Abdāl aim at the “active rejection and destruction of established social custom,”<sup>188</sup> which, as Karamustafa points out, was characteristic of the new renunciation movements which emerged in the thirteenth century, the Qalandariyya and Haydariyya being the best-known representatives? Or did he – at least to a certain degree – attempt to find a following among the wider population despite approbation by certain members of the religious and ruling elite? Could the unquestionable orthodoxy of some of his sayings be explained by this second tendency, which nonetheless did not suppress the more pressing need for renunciation?

While Kaygusuz Abdāl’s self-portrayals stress his practice of the “four blows” (*çehār darb*), his mendicancy, itinerancy and antagonism towards all official representatives of the religion, all of which are basic tenets of renunciant dervish movements, equally important are his self-criticisms and his active preoccupation with his own *nefs*, which are the driving force

---

<sup>186</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 57-58.

<sup>187</sup> Karamustafa, “Kaygusuz Abdal,” 337. Kaygusuz also refers to those who criticize him as “şehir ehli” (the people of the city), as will be demonstrated in the third chapter.

<sup>188</sup> Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 3.

behind his effort to “blend in.” These Malāmatī tendencies come out particularly in his poetry, where he mocks his appetite, his way of life, and even his verse:<sup>189</sup>

*Yamrı yumrı söylerem her sözi düglek gibi  
Ben āvāre gezerem şahrāda legleg gibi  
[...]  
Miskān Serāyī ƙalduñ; nefsiñe zebūn olduñ  
Seniñ hırşuñ hevesüñ dutdı seni faƙ gibi<sup>190</sup>*

I speak awry and deformed; each word of mine is like an unripe melon  
I wander like a vagrant; I am like a stork in the desert.

Poor Serāyī, you got carried away. You became captive to your base self.  
Your ambition and desire caught hold of you like a trap.

As discussed in the introduction, Serāyī (palace-dweller) is another penname less frequently used by Ƙayğusuz Abdāl, possibly alluding to the information in his hagiography that he was the son of the governor of Alā‘iye.<sup>191</sup> It may also be an earlier penname he used before selecting –or being given– that of *ƙayğusuz*. In his works Ƙayğusuz frequently refers to this world as a palace, to symbolize how the world of multiplicity binds us to itself via its illusory beauty and grandeur. The name of one of his works, the *Serāy-nāme*, comes from this symbolism. We can thus assume that Ƙayğusuz’s use of the pen-name Serāyī in the couplet above also has a purpose. It is used to signify the author’s attachment to the world of multiplicity, which is in parallel with the content of the couplet.

---

<sup>189</sup> For the *Malāmatīyya*, see Sara Sviri, “Hakīm Tirmidhī and the Malāmatī Movement in Early Sufism,” in Leonard Lewisohn (ed), *Classical Persian Sufism: from its Origins to Rumi* (London: Khaniqahi-Nimetullahi Publications, 1993), 583-613. In an interesting parallel, similar to *abdāl* piety, the *malāmatīyya* also represented a reaction against movements known for their extreme display of ritual observance and asceticism.

<sup>190</sup> Ƙayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 159a-159b. For a passage in which Ƙayğusuz mocks and belittles his use of language, see Ƙayğusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 61. In the passage, Ƙayğusuz states that he is neither a scholar nor a friend of God capable of performing miracles. He has only spoken of stopping-places (*menziller*) he has personally experienced. Although we initially have the impression that Ƙayğusuz is undermining his own spiritual authority, we come to understand that he is doing just the opposite when he continues to say that his words can only be understood by the gnostic. For similar passages, see *ibid.*, 72; Ƙayğusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 152-153.

<sup>191</sup> See *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alāaddin Gaybī) Menākıbnāmesi*, 90 ff.

## Conclusion

The above mode of interpretation allows us to take into account the different audiences ̖aygusuz Abdāl addresses in his works as well as the shifting social positions with which he identifies. This in turn makes it possible to accurately read ̖aygusuz’s doctrinal shifts. ̖aygusuz’s teachings may be categorized according to four hierarchical levels, directed at three types of audience: the lay adherent, the novice, and the adept. This categorization reminds us that it is not in the interest of the antinomian spiritual teacher to renounce the lay adherent; rather, the *pīr* needs to attract the ‘*avāmm*, the lay people representative of the society at large, and maybe even persuade them to enter the path.<sup>192</sup> It is this very dynamic which requires ̖aygusuz Abdāl to shift his social position according to the segment of society with which he interacts.

As dry and didactic as they are, orthodox moral teachings still occupy the largest part in ̖aygusuz’s corpus. It is only when we ask the “why” and “for whom” that we begin to understand why ̖aygusuz’s deep sense of humor and unique doctrinal interpretations, both of which are readily visible in his individual poems and *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, do not take up the largest space in his body of writing. In this respect, the hierarchy of the Four Gates embodied in ̖aygusuz’s language offers us a way to categorize his teachings and determine the targeted audience of each. The resulting discrepancy between some of the teachings, such as those regarding afterlife and the divinity of ‘Alī, thus should be placed into its social context. In this sense, we can interpret the co-existence of different layers in ̖aygusuz Abdāl’s teachings, in addition to his differing social tendencies, as an interplay between what is acceptable and what is not, between what is “orthodoxy” and “heterodoxy,” where ̖aygusuz plays with and redefines the boundaries of each.

---

<sup>192</sup> In an article which traces *abdāl* communities in fifteenth and early sixteenth century Ottoman censuses for the Çorum area, Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr documents the economic relations of these communities with the surrounding villages as well as their related high social standing. See: Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, “Abdal, L’étrange destin d’un mot: Le problème *abdāl* vu à travers les registres ottomans,” *Turcica* 36 (2004): 37-90.

## Chapter 2

### Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's Religious Doctrine

As demonstrated by Michel Chodkiewicz in his article entitled, “La Réception de la doctrine d’Ibn ‘Arabī dans le monde Ottoman,” Ibn ‘Arabī’s teachings have been more welcome in Anatolia than anywhere else in the Islamic world. In a process which began with Ṣadr al-dīn Ḳūnawī (d.1274), all Anatolian Sufī sects came to produce work tinged with Akbarian thought, at many times even without such an awareness by the author. With Dāvūd Ḳayṣerī (d.1350), disciple of ‘Abd al-razzāq Kāshānī (d.1329), Ibn ‘Arabī’s doctrine entered madrasa education. The first *ṣeyhū’l-islām* of the empire, Ṣemseddīn Muḥammed Fenārī (d.1431) came from an Akbarian family. In the 16th century, Kemālpaşazāde’s famous *fatwā* indicating the error in disapproving Ibn ‘Arabī is emblematic of the state-sanctioned dissemination of Akbarian teachings.<sup>193</sup>

While Chodkiewicz’s survey focuses on treatises written mostly in Arabic, he himself admits to his lack of attention to the realm of poetry. He claims that poetry was the bridge between the educated elite and the uneducated public who did not have access to Ibn ‘Arabī’s works or commentaries. He says that this poetry lacked the technical precision of treatises and was marked with doctrinal fluidity, which he saw as a danger. Despite his unquestionable expertise on Akbarian thought, we have to admit that Chodkiewicz’s characterization of much of the Akbarian influence on Ottoman poetry as “excessive and aberrant interpretations”<sup>194</sup> is due to a lack of understanding for the different paradigm in which this poetry functioned. As the last chapter has shown regarding Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, doctrinal fluidity was at many instances an aim to be achieved, allowing the poet to reach a wider public. There was no social demand which would have created the motivation of remaining faithful to an original, particularly in the case of poets who considered themselves as producers of original work. In addition, in the same social realm,

---

<sup>193</sup> Michel Chodkiewicz, “La Réception de la doctrine d’Ibn ‘Arabī dans le monde Ottoman,” in Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed.), *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society* (Ankara: Atatürk Supreme Council for Culture Language and History, 2005), 97-120. For the influence of Akbarian thought on 19th and 20th century Turkish authors, see Hilmi Ziya Ülken, “L’École Wudjūdite et son influence dans la pensée turque,” *WZKM* 62(1969): 193-208.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, 120.

folk stories and hagiographies were also marked by doctrinal fluidity up until the 15th century, manifesting what could be considered as contradictory elements of Sunnite and Shi'ite origin.<sup>195</sup>

The term of *wahdat al-wudjūd* (the oneness of being), first employed by Sa'īd al-dīn Farghānī (d. 1300-1301) to stand for Akbarian thought, can be considered particularly successful in denoting the essential doctrinal element in pre-Ottoman and Ottoman Sufi poetry in Anatolia, despite the great plurality that this poetry entails. In the case of Bektashi and Alevi poetry, it is harmonized with the concepts of Imam and *walāya* (sainthood).<sup>196</sup> Unfortunately we have barely taken the baby steps to understanding the doctrinal content of Bektashi and Alevi poetry. Nor are there any studies on the religious content of *abdāl* poetry. A handful of studies on big names such as Niyāzī Mīsrī put aside, we can say that the religious content and evolution of pre-Ottoman and Ottoman Sufi poetry is completely in the dark.

As such, the prospects of the current chapter are doomed to be modest. A general picture of the religious doctrines circulating in the 14th and 15th century Anatolian Sufi circles would have been invaluable for placing Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's religious doctrine in an immediate context. This chapter also tells us why Anatolian Sufi poetry has remained in the shadows for so long: The very fluidity dismissed by Chodkiewicz stands as the single great obstacle facing the researcher. Each piece of doctrinal element can soon be contradicted by another, even in the scope of a small poem. That is why answers lie only in the evaluation of Ḳayğusuz's corpus as a whole, which demands a detailed examination through close-reading. The frequent quotations from this corpus will constitute the first translations from the given texts to a Western language.

In this chapter, I will systematize Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's plurality of teachings according to the doctrine of the Four Gates which serves as the foundation for their spiritual hierarchy. I will

---

<sup>195</sup> See Claude Cahen, "Le Problème du shī'isme dans l'Asie mineure turque préottomane," in *Le Shī'isme imāmīte: Colloque de Strasbourg (6-9 mai 1968)* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1970), 115-129; Rıza Yıldırım, "Sunni Orthodox vs Shi'ite Heterodox?," 287-307. In his article on the Shi'itization of the Futuwwa, Yıldırım claims that the blurring of lines between Sunni and Shi'ite faiths was a result of the blow dealt to Sunni Islam as a result of the Mongol invasion and the tolerant religious policy of the Mongols; see Rıza Yıldırım, "Shī'itization of the Futuwwa Tradition in the Fifteenth Century," *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 40/1: 69-70.

<sup>196</sup> For a discussion on Bektashi authors with Akbarian influence, see Salih Çift, "Bektâşî Geleneğinde Vahdet-i Vücūd ve İbnü'l-'Arabî," *Tasavvuf: İlmî ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi* 23 (2009): 257-279. The Sunni self-positioning and the related criticism in the article can be misleading. While the article is useful in acquiring preliminary knowledge on late Bektashi authors, it does not discuss their teachings in depth.

analyze the main elements of aygusuz Abdāl’s doctrine and the dynamics at play in his doctrinal shifts mentioned in the first chapter. I will demonstrate his three-layered notion of theophany and how it relates to his notions of the esoteric and the exoteric which are central to all aspects of his doctrine. I will demonstrate how aygusuz’s descriptions of God’s immanence and transcendence shift according to the hierarchy of the Four Gates. This demonstration will also shed light on the ways in which aygusuz moves between essentialist and existentialist positions.

As the locus of aygusuz’s existentialist position, I will investigate his notion of *dem* (time, moment), focusing on how he redefines the time of the pre-eternal pact (*bezm-i elest*) to mean both unification with God at the gate of *akikat* and also the equivalent of paradise in afterlife, defined as an apocatastasis in which all beings partake. I will relate this concept of *dem* to the concept of *lā-mekān*, which is interwoven with the notion of love. I will show how both concepts display an understanding of theophany which creates the framework for the genre of poetry known as the *devriyye* (poetry of the cycle), although aygusuz did not produce poetry in this genre.

I will relate aygusuz’s unique conception of time and theophany to what is perhaps the most prominent stylistic element of his poetry, as well as a major aspect of his doctrine: The coincidence of opposites, which is redefined and reappropriated for every gate in the spiritual hierarchy. I will then illustrate how each of the above mentioned doctrinal elements come together in the notion of the Perfect Man. I will relate this notion to aygusuz’s descriptions of Muammad and ‘Alī, while also investigating aygusuz’s references to the Twelve Imams.

## Theophany

aygusuz Abdāl’s concept of theophany (*tecellī*) is founded on a three-tiered model expressed by the words *ūret* (form), *ifat* (attribute) and *zāt* (essence). This is demonstrated in expressions such as “*ūretten ifāta geldüm ifātumda zātı buldum* [From the form, I have attained the attributes. In my attributes, I have found the essence].”<sup>197</sup> A second group of words which aygusuz uses to denote the same model is *cism / ten / vücūd* (body), *cān* (soul), *cānān* (beloved).

---

<sup>197</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 166b. Also see *ibid.*, fol. 114b; aygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 151 and 154.

*Cism ü şüretde bu cāni bildüm mi bilmezem  
Cānum içinde cānāni bildüm mi bilmezem*<sup>198</sup>

I do not know if I recognized this soul in body and soul  
I do not know if I recognized the beloved in my soul

The words denoting the same level of theophany in the two groups are also used interchangeably:

*Şüret ü cān cānānile muttaşıl  
Silsiledür ayru degül iy 'āķil*<sup>199</sup>

The body and the soul are joined to the beloved  
O man of intelligence! They are like a chain, not apart

In addition, the word *cān* is sometimes used to mean God's essence.<sup>200</sup> A frequent metaphor  
Ḳayğusuz uses for his notion of theophany is the waves of a sea:

*Ol deñizüñ mevcidür cümle şıfāt  
Evvel ü āķir bu cümle kā'ināt*<sup>201</sup>

All these attributes are the waves of that sea  
The first and the last, the entire universe

In Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's *Serāy-nāme* and *Dil-güşā*, the attainment of perfection is defined as  
reaching God's Essence from his Attributes:

*Ādem oldur ki bile bu ħikmeti  
Şıfātu içinde bula bu zātı*<sup>202</sup>

*Zāt u şıfāt birlige bitdi hemān  
Cism içinde āşkāre görindi cān*<sup>203</sup>

*Sen olasın kamu şey'üñ murādı  
Kamu şıfatlarıñ içinde zātı*<sup>204</sup>

A Man is one who knows this wisdom

<sup>198</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 171b. Also see Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 142a.

<sup>199</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 235a.

<sup>200</sup> See Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 158b.

<sup>201</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 271b.

<sup>202</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 65a [Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 368-9].

<sup>203</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 42b [278-279].

<sup>204</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 76.



One who finds this Essence in His Attributes

The Essence and the Attributes have attained complete unity  
Inside the body the soul became openly visible

May you be the object of desire of all things  
The Essence inside all Attributes

Ḳayğusuz frequently describes God's theophany with phrases such as “*ādem ʔonun gey[miş]* (wearing the garment of man),”<sup>205</sup> “*insān şūretin gey[miş]* (wearing the form of man as garment),”<sup>206</sup> “*ādem ʔonında pinhān* (hidden inside the garment of man),”<sup>207</sup> “*insān libāsında* (in the garment of man).”<sup>208</sup> He says that God is a secret in man's soul. According to Ḳayğusuz, the layers of theophany denote layers of manifestation, leading from the invisible to the visible. A man's soul is hidden inside his body and God's essence is hidden inside his soul.<sup>209</sup>

*Vaʔanum milk-i ezelden gelmişem şimdi ol ilden*  
*Cān vücūdda nihāndur ben cān içinde nihān oldum*<sup>210</sup>

I have come here from that land, my homeland the country of preeternity  
The soul is hidden in the body; I have become hidden in the soul

---

<sup>205</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān* fol. 163b.

<sup>206</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 150a, 163b.

<sup>207</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 292b.

<sup>208</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 117a, 171b. For expressions similar to these, also see *ibid.*, fol. 139b, 161a, 163a, 168a, 195b; *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 6a [*Saraynāme*, 132-133]. The same types of expressions are also found in the doctrines of the *ahl-i haqq*, who refer to the successive incarnations of the divinity as garments. Yet the notion of incarnation (*hulūl*) evidenced by the *ahl-i haqq* is far removed from the theophany to which Ḳayğusuz Abdāl refers. Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's metaphor of God wearing the garment of man should also not be mixed with the concept of *iltibās* (the clothing of the human with the divine). We can say that the difference is one of directionality. While the former refers to God's self-manifestation in man, the latter refers to man's achievement of perfection, whereby he comes to manifest divine qualities. For the concept of *iltibās*, see W. Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy in Sufism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985), 20-27.

<sup>209</sup> This relationship reminds us of Ibn 'Arabī's explanation of the relation between God and created beings via the pair of body (*şūrat*) and spirit (*rūḥ*): “You are His form, and He is your spirit. You relate to Him, as your bodily form relates to you, and He relates to you as the spirit that governs the form of your body.” See Ibn 'Arabī, *Ibn al-'Arabī's Fuşūş al-Ḥikam*, tr. Binyamin Abrahamov (London and New York: Routledge, 2015), 37.

<sup>210</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 212b.

Ḳayğusuz conceptualizes God's essence as the most esoteric layer, which he defines as a secret inside a secret.<sup>211</sup> He underlines the link between theophany from the hidden to the visible and theophany from the universal to the particular:

*Gehī қаtre gehī 'ummān gehī peydā gehī pinhān  
Gehī қulam gehī sulṭān ne қulam ben ne sulṭānam*<sup>212</sup>

At times the drop, at times the ocean; at times manifest, at times hidden  
At times the servant, at times the sultan; I am neither the servant nor the sultan

In verses which stress the concept of divine love, God's secret abode is referred to as the heart.<sup>213</sup> Thus both the soul and the heart are places of manifestation of God's essence. They are thus expressions of God's immanence.

### **Immanence and Transcendence**

In Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's corpus, God's immanence and transcendence are separately highlighted depending on the level of teaching appropriate to the audience's spiritual level. For those in the level of *şerī'at*, God's transcendence is absolute. The distinction between the creator and the created is clearly defined:

*Bir bāb dahı budur ki, pādişāh münezzehdür. Serāydan, bār-gāhdan bu tertibi [Ḥaqq] tebareke ve ta'ālā kulları için düzmişdür ki hem burayı mekān idineler, hem 'ibādet ideler, hem bu ni'metlerüñ şükürin bileler, hem bu serāyda sulṭānı bileler, hem peygamberlere ikrār eyleyeler, hem evliyā ḥāline inşāf ideler, hem gayr-ı Ḥaqq işlerden perhiz ideler.*<sup>214</sup>

Another gate is that God is free of comparison. God –blessed and exalted be he- has made and given order to this palace and court for his servants, so that they may settle here, worship Him, have gratitude for these favors, know the sultan in this palace, affirm the prophets, do justice to the states of the saints, refrain from untruthful acts.

Ḳayğusuz defines paradise as a subtler palace to which created beings go after death:

---

<sup>211</sup> Ibid., fol. 181b. Also see Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 81 and 88.

<sup>212</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 131b.

<sup>213</sup> See for instance Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek, fol. 140b; Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, Mil yz A 7621/2, fol. 241a, 257a-b; 262a, 265a, 268a, 269b, 273a-b, 274a-b, 276a, 279a, 280b, 281b, 283a.

<sup>214</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 61a [Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 352-353].

*İmdi Muḥammed Muṣtafā ‘Aleyhisselām eydür ki: “Pādişāhuñ daḥi bir serāyı vardur; ol bundan laṭıfdür.” dir. “Bunda gelen halk anda daḥi varmaḥ gerek.” dir. “Bunda ne itdiyse ‘ivażın ol serāyda bulmaḥ gerek.” dir.*<sup>215</sup>

Now Muḥammad Muṣtafā says that the sultan has another palace which is subtler than this one. Created being which come to this palace must go onto that one. Whatever they have done here, they must find its equivalent in that palace.

On the other hand, in the transition from the gate of *şerī‘at* to the gate of *ṭarīḳat*, Ḳayḡusuz modifies his metaphor of the palace. In contrast to the passages above, Ḳayḡusuz now states that the world of created beings is the abode of God. God is each person’s companion (*ham-dam*).<sup>216</sup> His absolute transcendence is transformed into his accessibility in the here and now:

*Bu serāydur sulṭānun seyrāngāhi  
Bu serāy içinde iste sen şāhi*

*Zīrā cümle dürlü hikmet bundadur  
Bu serāyı düzen üstād bundadur*<sup>217</sup>

This palace is the sultan’s place of public promenade  
This palace is where you shall look for the king

Because here are found all points of wisdom  
Here is the master who built this palace

In fact, Ḳayḡusuz frequently stresses that this world is the only place where unity with God is possible, thus completely negating the existence of afterlife:

*Anlayıbaḥ küllī varlık bundadur  
Hüsñ ü ‘ışḳ ‘aşıḳ u ma ‘şük bundadur*<sup>218</sup>

Understand this, all of existence is in the here and now  
Beauty and love, the lover and the beloved are in the here and now

*Bu serāyda vardı hemān yol varan*

---

<sup>215</sup> Ibid., fol. 19b [186-187]. For a discussion of the judgement day, see ibid, fol. 28a [220-221]. For a reference to paradise as the eternal abode reserved for mankind only, see ibid., fol. 58b [342-343]. For a similar definition of paradise and judgement day, see Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 50, 52.

<sup>216</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 172.

<sup>217</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 5a [Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 128-129].

<sup>218</sup> Ibid., fol. 26a [164-167]. Also see ibid., fol. 4b [126-127], 25a [208-209].

*Bu gün bunda gördi sultānı gören*<sup>219</sup>

Whoever follows the path follows it in this palace  
Whoever saw the sultan saw Him here today

In a long passage in his *Dil-güşā* which closely resembles the themes of his *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, Ḳaygusuz tells the disciple that the universe is nothing but the vision of his own selfhood, through which he can have access to saints, prophets and God Himself:

*Bashahr-i kh̄sh̄tan dar marū baṣaḥrā ki ṣūd namīkunī. Chirā ki az bīrūn-i vujūd-i shumā chīzī nīst. Har ḡī ki hast dar īn jā ast. Chirā ki nishān-i awliyā anbiyā hamīnast. Pas ī ṭālib u ‘āshiq, īn zamīn u āsumān īn naqsh u pargāl ki mībīnī, hama khayālast. Pas mushqil-i tū bā ḥāl-i tūst. Chirā ki ṣūrat-i insān nishān-i yazdānast.*<sup>220</sup>

Do not leave the city of your selfhood for the desert; it will do you no good. Because there is nothing outside of your own existence. All that exists is in there. The signs of the saints and prophets are in there. So aspirant and lover of God, this ground and this sky, these images and worldly things are all illusion. The cause of your difficulty is your own state. Because the form of man is a sign for God.

The self and only the self is the point of access to God, whose absolute immanence radically redefines the understanding of the universe. For his advancement to the next gate of *ḥakīkat*, the disciple learns to grasp the signs revealed to him by his selfhood, the locus of which is his heart.<sup>221</sup> These signs announce to him the truths behind the act of creation and the notion of union. All truths come together in a conceptual understanding of the Preeternal Pact (*bezm-i elest*), whereby the disciple is introduced to the memory of an already-existing union.

*Bu ‘āleme gelmedin bir ulı sultānidüm  
Ten ṣūret baḡlamadın cān içinde cānidüm*

Before coming to this world, I was an almighty sultan  
Before the body had any form, I was a soul inside a soul<sup>222</sup>

---

<sup>219</sup> Ibid, fol. 38b [262-263]. Ḳaygusuz also negates the existence of the invisible world (*ḡayb ‘ālemi*), saying that he only narrates what his eyes are certain of having seen; see Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 128-131.

<sup>220</sup> Ibid., 179. For the first part of the passage see p. 176.

<sup>221</sup> On how the heart reveals the Preeternal Pact (*bezm-i elest*), in which no forms existed, see Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 251a.

<sup>222</sup> Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 172a.

This, on the other hand, is a type of knowledge not yet corroborated by experience. Experience is obtained only in the next gate, that of *ḥaḳīḳat*, in which the dervish becomes one with God. In this unification, the multiple layers of theophany, the forms and the attributes are no longer perceived by the dervish. He has direct access to God's essence, from whose mouth he speaks:

*Bu görinen 'anāşır şūretümdür  
Ḳamu 'ālem benüm tolu zātumdur*<sup>223</sup>

These visible elements are my forms  
The whole universe is full of my essence

*'Ārif Ḥaḳḳa vuşlat olur şifāti ḳalmaz zāt olur  
Bu vechile 'ārif nice ma'den ü kāna düşmesün*<sup>224</sup>

The gnostic unites with God; he loses the attributes and becomes the essence  
So how can he not fall into the mine?

*Hama 'ālam hamān nūr ast ḥaḳīḳat  
Şifāt magū hama zāt gū hama zāt*<sup>225</sup>

In truth, the whole universe is light  
Do not speak of attributes; say that everything is the essence

Ḳayḡusuz refers to this unification with the phrase “*Allāh ile bilişmek*” (knowing one another with God).<sup>226</sup> Although Ḳayḡusuz borrows his concept of the oneness of being from the Wujūdī school, he radically breaks with this school in his notions of absolute immanence and interiority. He replaces the knowledge of the Lord (*Rabb*) via the Names and Attributes with a direct knowledge of –meaning unity with- *Allāh*. In contrast to the Wujūdī conception of an unknowable and uncreated essence, Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl conceptualizes the *zāt* as the original self-manifestation. In the *Delīl-i Budalā*, in accordance with the hadith qudsi of the Hidden Treasure, the act of creation is expressed in the following way: “*Ol ḳadīm ü lā-yezāl diledi kim, gizlū*

<sup>223</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 89.

<sup>224</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 148a.

<sup>225</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 175. For other references to unification with God's essence (*zāt*), also see Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 56b, 60b, 62b [Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 334-335, 350-351, 358-359]; Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 76-77, 92-93, 98-99.

<sup>226</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 21a, 23a, 24b, 25b [Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 192-193, 200-201, 206-207, 210-211].

*gencin āşikāre éde, kendüsini temāşā éde. Tecellî éyledi zātına. Zāti bilünsün déyü esmā ve şıfāti kendüsi kendüsine nāz éyledi.* [That ancient and eternal being wished to reveal His secret treasure and contemplate Himself. He manifested Himself to his essence. For His essence to be known, He bestowed upon himself the Names and Attributes.]<sup>227</sup> By negating the inaccessibility of the essence, Kaygusuz also breaks with Shi'ite doctrine, where access to God means access to God's exoteric dimension manifested in the Imams.<sup>228</sup>

The accessibility of the *zāt* in the here and now brings Kaygusuz's notion of God to a position of absolute interiority. According to Kaygusuz, "*Hak̄k tebāreke ve ta'ālā küllī kā'ināti zātı birle kaplayupdur* [God –blessed and exalted be he- covers up the whole universe with his Essence]."<sup>229</sup> The *zāt* is absolutely manifest like the sun, yet the intellects of created beings are unable to grasp it.<sup>230</sup> Not only is the *zāt* the esoteric dimension of man's soul; it is also hidden in all beings, and wears them like a garment:

*Cümle 'ālemüñ hemān oldur cānı  
Cümle vücūdlar içinde pinhānı<sup>231</sup>  
[...]  
Cümle vücūdları geymiş ser-be-ser  
Cümle vücūdlar şadefdür o gevher<sup>232</sup>*

He is the soul of the entire universe  
Hidden inside all bodies

He wears as garment all bodies across the world  
All bodies are shells; He is the pearl

<sup>227</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, "Budalanāme," ed. Yücel, 58. The minor differences in the Güzel edition do not change the meaning; See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Delil-i Budalā*, 59.

<sup>228</sup> See Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, *Le Guide divin dans le shi'isme originel* (Paris: Verdier, 1992), 117-118; Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, "Remarques sur la divinité de l'Imam," in *La Religion discrète: Croyances et pratiques spirituelles dans l'Islam shi'ite* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 2006), 92-96; Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, "Seul l'Homme de Dieu est humain: Théologie et anthropologie mystique à travers l'exégèse imamite ancienne," in *La Religion discrète*, 223-225.

<sup>229</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 138-139.

<sup>230</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 30a [Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 228-229].

<sup>231</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 37a [Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 256-257].

<sup>232</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 38a [260-261].

When we evaluate the three gates of *ṣerīʿat*, *ṭarīkat* and *ḥakīkat* side by side, we see that the notion of God shifts from one of absolute transcendence to one of absolute immanence. Yet in the fourth gate, that of *maʿrifet*, a balance is struck between these two poles, which allows them to co-exist. In the following couplets, Kaygusuz speaks through the mouth of God in a position of unity, while expressing God's absolute transcendence:

*Cānum ḥakīkat velī ki cāndan münezzehem*  
*Nām u nişānam nām u nişāndan münezzehem*<sup>233</sup>

*Benüm vaşfum beyān olmaz baña nām u nişān olmaz*  
*Baña kimsene cān olmaz velī ben cümleye cānam*<sup>234</sup>

*Ne odum ben ne yil oldum ne cān u ʿaql u dil oldum*  
*Ne ābam ben ne kil oldum ben ol sırram ki pinhānam*<sup>235</sup>

My soul is the truth, but I am free of the soul  
 I am names and signs; I am free of name and sign

My qualities cannot be expressed; no name or sign can point to me  
 No one can be a soul to me, but I am the soul of all

I am neither fire nor air; I have not become soul, intellect or heart  
 I am neither water nor earth; I am that hidden secret

As the destination of the path, the gate of *maʿrifet* is the gate in which Kaygusuz abides permanently. It is the gate which serves as the foundation for all the other gates, making it possible for Kaygusuz to switch his discourse between them in order to match his audience. As we saw in the last chapter, his definition of *maʿrifet* includes the very act of speaking, which Kaygusuz perceives as a continual movement through multiple perspectives. His understanding of immanence and transcendence also fit this notion of the gate. Kaygusuz represents the gate of *maʿrifet* as a perpetual maneuver between positions of immanence and transcendence:

*Gehī kaṭre gehī ʿummān gehī peydā gehī pinhān*  
*Gehī kulam gehī sulṭān ne kulam ben ne sulṭānam*<sup>236</sup>

At times the drop, at times the sea; at times visible, at times hidden

<sup>233</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 307a.

<sup>234</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 131b.

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 131b.

<sup>236</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 131b.

At times the servant, at times the sultan; I am neither the servant nor the sultan

At each instance, the balance can tip to one side. In verses belonging to the gate of *ma'rifet* which express the dervish's unity with God, the balance tips towards immanence. Yet reference is also made to the notion of theophany as expressed in the concepts of Form and Attribute. In contrast to the gate of *hakikat*, the multiple layers of theophany are thus fully established:

*Ādem bu tonıla insān olupdur*  
*Ḳamu şıfatlar içinde zātam ben*<sup>237</sup>

*Ḳaygusuz Abdāl benem uşbu tenümün adıdur*  
*Ben neyem bu ten içinde gel aḥı baḳ söylerem*<sup>238</sup>

Man became man with this garment  
I am the Essence inside all Attributes

I am Ḳaygusuz Abdāl; this is the name of my body  
What am I in this body? O brother! Come and I will tell you.

On the other hand, when Ḳaygusuz wishes to stress the distinction between creator and created, while still remaining in the position of *ma'rifet*, he does not fail to add a clue to God's immanence. The concept of transcendence in question is thus no longer absolute:

*Hem añaram ol ezel giçen demi*  
*Hem bilürem bu şüret-i ādemi*

*Hem ḥalīfeyem bu cümle maḥlūka*  
*Hem dā'imā şükr iderem ol Ḥaḳka*

*Hem şeyāfīn benümiçün oldı māt*  
*Hem bu serāyda ḳulam ben hem āzād*<sup>239</sup>

I remember the instant that took place in preeternity  
I also know this form of man

I am the vicegerent to all created beings  
I also praise God at all times

Devils were defeated for me

---

<sup>237</sup> Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 301 a-b.

<sup>238</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 305b.

<sup>239</sup> Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 54b [Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 326-327].



I am both a servant in this palace and also truly free

## Essence and Existence

While Ẓayğusuz Abdāl moves between transcendentalist and immanentist positions according to the spiritual hierarchy of his teachings, he strikes a balance between essentialist and existentialist approaches. Although Ẓayğusuz frequently portrays a strict distinction between essence and form, his notion of an all-encompassing *zāt* with which the universe is suffused is much closer to an existentialist perspective.<sup>240</sup> In his article entitled “‘Azīz Nasafī and The Essence-Existence Debate,” Hermann Landolt defines the existentialist position in Nasafī’s work as follows: “Nasafī’s ‘People of Light’ do not make this difference between God and the World, Reality and Appearance, Existence and Non-Existence at all. For them, the individual existents (*afrād-i mawjūdāt*) as a whole are, simply by virtue of being existent, the Reality of Existence itself.”<sup>241</sup> According to Nasafī’s definition of the people of oneness (*ahl-i wahdat*), essence cannot be prior to existence. Existence is the “most comprehensive entity” and has no contrary.<sup>242</sup>

Ẓayğusuz can easily fit among the ranks of Nasafī’s people of oneness. His existentialism comes out most vividly in his discourse belonging to the gate of *ḥaqīqat*, particularly in his description of the Preeternal Pact (*bezm-i elest*), which constitutes the topic of the next section. Yet without delving into this topic of sheer importance, we can investigate the existentialist aspect of his notion of *zāt*. For this we will need to examine how he defines existence at various instances, in parallel with the gate to which the teaching belongs.

Ẓayğusuz uses the words *varlık*, *vücūd* and *hestī* to refer to existence. When speaking to the disciple who has just entered the path, he uses the word *varlık* to refer to the disciple’s selfhood of which he must let go:

*Cān menzili isteriseñ gel iy t̄alib ƙo varlıđı*

---

<sup>240</sup> For a discussion of existentialism vis-à-vis the doctrine of the oneness of being, see Toshihiko Izutsu, “An Analysis of Wahdat al-Wujūd,” in *The Concept and Reality of Existence* (Tokyo: The Keio Institute of Cultural and Linguistic Studies, 1971), 35-55.

<sup>241</sup> Hermann Landolt, “‘Azīz-i Nasafī and The Essence-Existence Debate,” in *Recherches en Spiritualité Iranienne: Recueil d’articles* (Tehran: Institut Français de Recherche en Iran Presses Universitaires d’Iran, 2005), 121.

<sup>242</sup> *Ibid.*, 123.

*Hāk it yüzüñ ayağına luḡfile bilişe yada*<sup>243</sup>

O aspirant! If you desire the stopping-place of the soul, come and get rid of [your] selfhood  
With kindness, bury your face in the earth beneath the feet of friends and strangers alike

Yet as the disciple moves along the path, the connotation of the word *var*[*lık*] changes and the  
disciple's desire for his own selfhood is replaced by the desire for existence itself:

*Deryāda gevher isterem var bilürem var isterem  
Zirā kim oldur cümleñ dillü dilindeki şadā*<sup>244</sup>

I desire the pearl in the sea; I know and desire the existent.  
He is the voice of all those who are eloquent.

For Ḳayḡusuz, true existence is that which has no essence:

*Bu ne milkdür ki hergiz vīrān olmaz  
Bu ne vücūd buna kimse cān olmaz*<sup>245</sup>

What land is this that is never found in ruins  
What existence<sup>246</sup> is this that none can be it soul

In these last two couplets, Ḳayḡusuz seems to confer a higher degree of existence on the *zāt*, thus  
making it into a type of super-essence.<sup>247</sup> This is most apparent in the couplets belonging to the  
gate of *ma'rifet*, which we saw how to distinguish in the previous section. In these couplets, the  
existence of the universal *zāt* diffuses into the particulars and brings them from non-existence  
into existence:

*Ḳamu kaçre bu deryādan olupdur  
Bu deryā cümle kaçreye tolupdur*<sup>248</sup>

*Cism-i vīrān içinde ben genc-i ebed degül miyem  
Añlayıbağ şifātile beküllī zāt degül miyem*<sup>249</sup>

All drops acquire being from this sea

---

<sup>243</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 320a.

<sup>244</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 320a.

<sup>245</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 281b.

<sup>246</sup> The term can also be translated as “body.”

<sup>247</sup> For the use of the term, see Landolt, “The Essence-Existence Debate,” 121.

<sup>248</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 283a.

<sup>249</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 163b.

This sea fills up all drops

Aren't I the everlasting treasure in these ruins of the body?  
Understand this; aren't I the Attributes and the Essence in entirety?

On the other hand, the concept of unification accommodates an entirely different logic, where God's *zāt* is no longer differentiated from his creation. We can find this new logic in couplets belonging to the gate of *ḥaḳīḳat*. As we saw earlier, in this gate the distinction between essence, attribute and form is abolished, thus eradicating multiple categories of existence:

*İnkārı terk itdüm diyen zünnārı terk itdüm diyen  
Cümlesine Ḥaḳḳ disene bu teşbīh ü te'vīl nedür*<sup>250</sup>

You say you let go of denial; You say you abandoned the belt of infidelity.  
Why don't you call all of it the Truth? What is this comparison and interpretation?

This unity of existence is in fact the absolute truth. In his unification with God, which *Ḳayḡusuz* defines as the personal apocalypse, the Perfect Man manifests this absolute truth, defined as the utmost secret:

*'Ayān oldı bu sırr perde açıldı  
Güneş görindi bulutdan saçıldı*<sup>251</sup>

*Bī-nihāyet deryāyam ben yire göge tolmuşam  
Evlüyā ṭonın ṭonandum sırrı 'ayān eylerem*<sup>252</sup>

This secret became manifest; the veil opened  
In between the clouds the sun appeared and began to radiate

I am an endless sea; I have filled up the earth and the sky  
I wore the garment of the friends of God; I divulge the secret

Yet crucial to *Ḳayḡusuz*'s understanding of existence is the fact that, when the truth is finally made manifest, all of existence –meaning the whole universe– becomes a secret. He thus defines the manifestation of truth as the reign of the esoteric.

*Ṭālib maṭlūba irişdi bir oldı*

---

<sup>250</sup> Ibid., fol. 183a.

<sup>251</sup> *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, Gülistān*, fol. 280a.

<sup>252</sup> *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, Dīvān*, fol. 139b.

*Ṭālib maṭlūb ikisi bir sırr oldı*<sup>253</sup>

The desirer attained the desired, became one  
The desirer and the desired became one secret

*Bir sırr oldı ṭālib ü maṭlūb hemān  
Her ŧeye yitdi ḫayāt-ı cāvidān*<sup>254</sup>

A secret the desirer and the desired have become  
Eternal life has reached all things

Although the gate of *ḫaḳīḳat* is not the destination of Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s spiritual hierarchy, we can easily argue that it is the most prominent of the gates. Ḳayḡusuz devotes the bulk of his work into describing this gate, i.e. describing unity with God. Karamustafa’s interpretation of Ḳayḡusuz’s teachings also agrees with this prominence. In his article entitled “Kaygusuz Abdal: A Medieval Turkish Saint and the Formation of Vernacular Islam in Anatolia,” Ahmet Karamustafa stresses Ḳayḡusuz’s belief in God’s immanence in his creation. Karamustafa focuses on the example of the *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṭa* to underline the fact that for Ḳayḡusuz, “the history of creation, prophetic intervention and apocalypse are really the story of personal spiritual development for each human individual.”<sup>255</sup>

Karamustafa interprets Ḳayḡusuz’s constant references to the notion that God’s signs are to be found in “this” world as a theorization which “collapses the spiritual into the physical.”<sup>256</sup> Indeed, as we go up the spiritual hierarchy of Ḳayḡusuz’s teachings, it becomes fully clear that this world is the “only” place of manifestation of God. Ḳayḡusuz states that the source of his spiritual discourse is not some invisible realm, but this physical world perceived by the senses:

*Ġayb ‘āleminde söyleyenler, bizüm ‘aḳlumuz buna irüşmez. Zīrā kim biz āşikāre bāzār iderüz;  
gözümüz gördüğü nesneydür. Göñlümüzüñ emīnligi ki söylendi, bu şıfatlar ki beyān oldı, bunlar  
küllī vāḳi ‘dür. Benī ādem içindeki ḫāldür.*<sup>257</sup>

To those who speak of the invisible word: Our intellects do not grasp this. We do our purchase and sale out in the open, with things our eyes can see. The certainty of our hearts which has been

---

<sup>253</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 283b.

<sup>254</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 135. Also see *ibid.*, 92.

<sup>255</sup> Karamustafa, “A Medieval Turkish Saint,” 334.

<sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*, 335.

<sup>257</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 128-131.

spoken, these Attributes which have been professed, they are all actual occurrences. They are the states of mankind.

In this understanding of the universe, the essentialist position no longer holds. For this reason, when translating the word *zāt* in the gate of *ḥakīkat*, it is more correct to use the terms “selfhood” or “existence.” For Kaygusuz, God’s Existence is absolutely immanent and accessible within this world. This leads to the understanding that all of reality is suffused with God’s Existence, and suffused with the Perfect Man who is the embodiment of God’s Existence. This all-encompassing esoteric can have far-reaching doctrinal consequences and can help us in the interpretation of the doctrine of ‘Alī, which I will deal with in a subsequent section.

### The Preeternal Pact and Eternal Paradise

The preeternal pact between God and his servants expressed by the Quranic verse “Am I not your Lord? They said, Yes” (7:172) is perhaps the most common doctrinal element in all of Kaygusuz Abdāl’s works, which he refers to with phrases such as “*Elestü bi rabbiküm demi*” (the time of ‘Am I not your Lord?’)<sup>258</sup>, “*ezel bezmi*” (the banquet of preeternity)<sup>259</sup> and “*dem-i ene ’l-Ḥakḳ*” (the time of ‘I am God’).<sup>260</sup> Like other doctrinal elements, this teaching is also laden with layers of meaning. Kaygusuz often indicates the similarity between his unity with God in preeternity and his unification in the gate of *ḥakīkat*, which takes place as the outcome of his love of God and the manifestation of God in his heart:

*Cihānda henüz yogidi Mansür  
Tebühüm idi dem-i Ene'l-Ḥakḳ*<sup>261</sup>

*Genc-i ezeliñ haznesi gönümde bulındı  
Genc saklamağa hazne-i vırāneyem yine*

*Ezel cāniken vaṭanum meyḥāne genciydi*

---

<sup>258</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 63.

<sup>259</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, 69b [Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 386-387].

<sup>260</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 154. Kaygusuz frequently refers to al-Ḥallāj in his poetry, as does Yūnus Emre. For the legendary role of al-Ḥallāj as martyr and quintessential Perfect Man in Turkish Sufi poetry, see Louis Massignon, “La légende de Hallacé Mansur en pays turcs,” *Revue des études islamiques* (1941-46): 67-115.

<sup>261</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 117b.

*Bugün daḥı kim uş rind-i meyhāneyem yine*<sup>262</sup>

When Mansūr did not yet exist in the world  
The moment of “I am God” was my litany

The storehouse for the preeternal treasure was found in my heart  
Again I am a ruined storehouse to hide the secret treasure

In preeternity when I was the soul, my homeland was the treasure of the tavern  
Again today I am a drunkard in the tavern

For aygusuz, the love of God is what allows the aspirant to let go of his longing for the world of multiplicity, which he refers to as “*kevn ü mekân*” (created being and space).<sup>263</sup> In its place, the desire for non-space (*lā-mekân*) is born.<sup>264</sup> This signifies the aspirant’s return to his original selfhood:

*‘Işkile gönül bileymiş milk-i ebedde*  
*Bu ‘ışk gönülün aşlıdur aşlına özendi*<sup>265</sup>

The heart and love [of God] were together in the eternal land  
This love is the origin of the heart, that which it aspires to

The aspirant’s intoxication with love in the present time is due to his having drunk from the goblet of the Preeternal Pact (*cām-ı elest*).<sup>266</sup> aygusuz speaks to the disciple in the gate of *tarīat* to remind him of this intoxication and his already existing unity with God:

*anı sen bu ten yogiken cānidüñ*  
*ul degüldüñ ibtidā sultānidüñ*  
[...]  
*Cānidi ol dem yogidi bu tenüñ*  
*Lā-mekân milkindeyidi seyrānuñ*<sup>267</sup>

What happened to that time when you did not have this body, when you were only the soul?  
In the beginning, when you were not a servant, when you were the sultan?

---

<sup>262</sup> Ibid., fol. 203a.

<sup>263</sup> See aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, 262b, 279b.

<sup>264</sup> See aygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, 236b.

<sup>265</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 241a.

<sup>266</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 134b.

<sup>267</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 268b.

At that time your body did not exist; it was part of the soul  
Your travels took place in the land of non-space

The time of the Preeternal Pact (*elest demi*) was when the letters *kāf* and *nūn* were spoken, thus leading to the creation of space and time.<sup>268</sup> It was also when all beings were given their proper shares.<sup>269</sup> The profession of faith in Muḥammad ‘Alī (*Muḥammed ‘Alī ikrāri*) was preordained in preeternity.<sup>270</sup> At this preeternal time, the disciple was able to see God without a veil.<sup>271</sup>

Once the disciple acquires the capacity to experience these truths, his veil is lifted and he has a direct experience of God. As we saw before, this direct experience which takes place in the gate of *ḥaḳīkat* consists in the manifestation of the esoteric. Ḳaygusuz also refers to it as the manifestation of the *lā-mekān* (non-space).<sup>272</sup> Moreover, Ḳaygusuz frequently portrays the same experience as a complete undoing of the world of multiplicity:

*Zāhir ü bāın beküllī nūr hemān*  
*Nūr görünür daıı görünmez cihān*<sup>273</sup>

The exoteric and the esoteric are altogether light  
The light is manifest; the universe is no longer visible

This moment of unity is the same as the *dem* in which Muhammad had his ascension.<sup>274</sup> The Perfect Man is one who has attained this *dem* and *lā-mekān*, a spiritual level for which the model is the prophet’s ascension. The Perfect Man thus acquires the capacity to see the whole universe as it is. No truth is left hidden from him:

*Güneş doğdı nāgāh zerrem içinde*  
*İrişdüm ol deme bu dem içinde*

*Fenāsuz bāḳī menzile irişdüm*  
*Tā ebed lā-mekān tahtına giçdüm*  
[...]  
*O deme iricek gördüm bu dehri*

<sup>268</sup> Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 212a.

<sup>269</sup> Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 235a.

<sup>270</sup> Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 312a.

<sup>271</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 269a.

<sup>272</sup> See *Gülistān*, fol. 267a.

<sup>273</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 243b.

<sup>274</sup> Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 39a [Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 264-265].

*Tamāmet kā`ināt u berr ü baħri*<sup>275</sup>

Suddenly the sun rose in my speck of light  
In this moment I attained that moment

I attained the everlasting stopping-place which never comes to an end  
I took the throne of non-space till eternity

When I reached that moment I saw this world  
I saw the whole universe, the land and the sea

All the beliefs and practices which had validity in the time frame of created beings lose their significance when one attains the time frame of God:

*Evvel ü āħir her ne ki var pergāl içinde  
Bir noktadır ancaħ  
Pes ħavf u recā zühd ü tā`at kitāb u peygām  
Defter ü berāt ne*<sup>276</sup>

From the first to the last, all that exists in the universe  
Is nothing but a dot.  
So what are fear and hope, asceticism and worship, the book and the message,  
The notebook and the warrant?

Interestingly, aygusuz defines this time frame as an apocalypse in which all beings partake. In fact, he makes no distinction between the personal apocalypse and the universal apocalypse, of which he speaks in the past tense, as an event which has already taken place. In this apocalypse, all beings are intoxicated with the love of God, exactly as they were during the Preeternal Pact. Even the celestial bodies are moving around like mad men due to their intoxication. Duality has disappeared completely, and as a result, hell has given way to heaven. God has accepted the prayers and worship of all beings. All non-believers and idol-worshippers have professed their faith in God. All sins have been pardoned. All beings are in the company of God, who has recognized each one of them and has given him his wish. As a result, all spiritual levels have been abolished. The speck of light is no longer less perfect than the sun. At a time when the difference between the dead and the alive has dissolved, all beings have found the treasure of happiness (*sa`adet genci*). The Attributes of God have become manifest in all beings.

---

<sup>275</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 104-105.

<sup>276</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 123a. For a similar passage in which aygusuz negates the existence of daily prayer, see aygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 262b.



All devils have forgotten their mischief, repented, and joined the company of God. The face of God (*vech-i Haḳḳ*) has become visible in all directions.<sup>277</sup> All beings profess oneness and are immersed in existence:

*Cümle halk virdi tanuḳluk birlige*  
*Cümle ‘ālem ğarḳ olupdur varlığıa*

*Cümle varlık birlige oldı delil*  
*Her gönülde bitdi birlikden ḥāşıl*<sup>278</sup>

All created beings have witnessed oneness  
The whole universe is immersed in existence

All beings have become trustworthy of oneness  
The outcomes of oneness have manifested themselves in all hearts

Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl defines the apocalypse as a return to preeternity, an apocatastasis in which man’s primordial condition is restored.<sup>279</sup> The picture he draws of this time frame is in the image of his notion of perfection, which he deems to be singular and unvarying. All moments of perfection are nothing but the act of returning to the singular moment of perfection. The present

---

<sup>277</sup> See Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Gülisṫān*, fol. 243b, 247a-251b, 266b-271a, 280a-280b. Also see Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dil-ğüşā*, 175.

<sup>278</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 43a [Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 280-281]. Also see *ibid.*, fol. 43b [282-283].

<sup>279</sup> This aspect of Ḳayḡusuz’s teaching seems to be in close parallel with Ibn ‘Arabī’s understanding of Judgement Day, where God’s compassion will reach all beings who will find themselves as they were during the Primordial Pact; see Michel Chodkiewicz, *Le Sceau des saints: Prophétie et sainteté dans la doctrine d’Ibn Arabī* (Paris: Gallimard, 1986), 195. One important difference is that while hell is abolished in Ḳayḡusuz’s version, Ibn ‘Arabī does not negate the existence of hell but transforms it to a place where felicity can be obtained. Elsewhere Ibn ‘Arabī stresses that heaven and hell are found in our perceptions of the world in the here and now. Paradise is thus a vision to which we have access and hell is a blindness to the signs of God; see *ibid.*, 203, 212-213. In regard to the notion of apocatastasis in Ḳayḡusuz’s works, it is also important to note that a similar notion existed in early Shi’ism, where the advent of the Mahdī at the end of time was believed to restore the world to its original state before the creation of ignorance (*jahl*); see Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, “Fin du temps et retour à l’origine,” in *La Religion discrète*, 305-306. Ḳayḡusuz’s denial of heaven and hell may have been a trait common in the antinomian dervish traditions of Anatolia, as shown by the similar beliefs held by Barak Baba and his dervishes; see Karamustafa, “Early Sufism,” 195.

is only a continuation of the preeternal present. This knowledge is vital for the Perfect Man, who has cultivated his capacity to live in the present.<sup>280</sup> When one dissolves the past and the future in his own experience, then the eternal present becomes manifest to him. For aygusuz, eternity and preeternity are one and the same concept. The time of created beings is in this sense a perfect circle. As aygusuz states in the verses above, when seen from far enough, as God would see it, this circle appears as nothing but a dot.

In his *Serāy-nāme*, aygusuz states that experiencing the preeternal present is a matter of vision. Created beings are prevented from having this experience due to the colorful illusions of multiplicity presented to them by their intellects: “*Malūkat kendi ‘aqlınca baışı grūşidür ki naş u hayal grür. Zīrā ki fi ‘l-cümle āyāt-ı nūr-ı muladur* [Created beings look and see according to their own intellects. That is why they see ornaments and illusions. Yet in fact everything is a sign to the absolute light].”<sup>281</sup> In this sense, the Preeternal Pact and the eternal paradise it signifies are in fact absolutely immanent in the here and now. The transcendent aspect of this preeternal moment is not inherent to it, but comes rather as a result of the lack of capacity in created beings to see beyond the exoteric. aygusuz defines the cultivation of this capacity as an awakening. He often denotes the apocalyptic moment of eternity with the word “*irte*” (the next morning), which he describes as an eternal day in which the sun no longer rises and sets, in which nighttime never comes.<sup>282</sup> He warns the disciple as follows:

*Gel iy tālib irte oldu bir uyan  
Sa ‘ādet milkinde irdi cümle cān*<sup>283</sup>

---

<sup>280</sup> See the teaching expressed by the following couplet: “*Geçen geçdi gelecek nesne gā`ib / Bu demdür dem daı devrān bu devrān* [What has passed has passed; the future is unknown / This is the moment; this is the period of time] (aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 316a). Also see aygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-gūşā*, 112-113; aygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 26b, 45b [aygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 214-215, 290-291]. Living in the present moment also consists of knowing the truths behind the passage of time. In his *Dil-gūşā*, aygusuz says: “*Kāmillik nişāmı budur ki zamān u mekān avālin bilür* [The sign of perfection is that one knows the states of time and space].” (aygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-gūşā*, 110-111).

<sup>281</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 40b [aygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 270-271].

<sup>282</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Gūlistān*, fol. 279b. For an ecstatic saying of Abū Yazīd Bistāmī on the eternal day in which live those who have become free of attributes, see A.R. Badawi, *Shāṭaḥāt al-şūfiyya*, I, Abū Yazīd al-Bistāmī (Cairo: Dar al-Nahdah al-Misriyah, 1949), 70; quoted in: Chodkiewicz, *Le Sceau des saints*, 52.

<sup>283</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 47a [aygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 296-297].

O aspirant, come and wake up! The morning has arrived.  
All souls have attained the land of bliss.

In the gate of *ma 'rifet*, similar to the coexistence of transcendentalist and immanentist discourses, references to the time conception belonging to created beings coexist with references to the preeternal present. In fact, it is this very coexistence which is stressed. In the following poem, couplets describing both time frames are juxtaposed as *Ḳayğusuz* narrates the journey of the Muhammadan essence into the world of multiplicity:<sup>284</sup>

*Bu 'āleme gelmedin bir ulı sulṫānidüm  
Ten şūret bağlamadın cān içinde cānidüm*

*Ten-i cān oldı şūret Ādem oldı bu kez ad  
Bu ad u sān yoğiken deryā vü 'ummānidüm*

*Cān oldı baña hicāb cān yüzinde ten niḳāb  
Bu hicābum yoğiken şūret-i Raḫmānidüm*

*İçüm taşum nūridi nūrile ma 'mūr idi  
Durduğum yir Ṭūridi Mūsāya 'Imrānidüm  
[...]  
Gah Dānyāl u Buḳrātam sırr içinde hikmetem  
Geh Cālinūs olmuşam geh oldı Loḳmānidüm*

*Gāhī Eyyūb olmuşam derde şabūr kılmışam  
Gāh oldı Muştafāda delil ü burhānidüm  
[...]  
Mecnūn oldum bir zamān Leylīyi gördüm 'ayān  
Gāh oldı bu meydānda Rüstem-i dāstānidüm*

*Şad hezārān tonum var Ḳayğusuz Abdāl gibi  
Bağdādda Mañşūrile menşūr olan benidüm*

Before coming to this world, I was an almighty sultan  
Before the body had any form, I was a soul inside a soul

The form became the soul's body; the name became Adam  
Before this name and appearance existed; I was the sea and the ocean

The soul became a barrier to me, the body a veil on the soul's face  
Before I had this obstacle, I was the form of the All-Compassionate

I was light inside out; I was illuminated by the divine light  
I stood on Mount Sinai; I was Amram to Moses

<sup>284</sup> For poems in Persian with similar content, see *Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, Dīvān*, fol. 221a-223a.

At times I am Daniel and Hippocrates; I am wisdom in secret  
At times I am Galen; at times I became Luḡmān

At times I became Job, I showed patience towards my suffering  
At times I was the trustworthy and evidence of God in Muhammad

For a while I became Majnūn; I saw Laylā with clarity  
At times I was at this public square, the Rustam of the legend

I have a hundred thousand garments like this Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl  
I was the one who became notorious with Ḥallāj in Baghdad<sup>285</sup>

The poem above can be considered as resembling the genre of *devriyye* (poetry of the cycle), which was among the most popular of the poetic genres in the Alevi-Bektashi corpus,<sup>286</sup> wherein the descriptions of the cycle of creation, the belief in God's appearance in many manifestations almost always took this form. The *devriyye* is based on the concept of *dawr* (cycle), in which God's theophany is described as two reciprocal arcs. The descending arc (*ḡavs-i nüzül*) consist of the movement of the divine light through minerals, plants, and animals, finally reaching man. The ascending arc (*ḡavs-i urūc*) involves the divine light's ascent back to God in the Perfect Man. Abdūlbaki Gölpınarlı's poetry anthology *Alevî-Bektâşî Nefesleri* contains several poems similar to the poem above by Ḳayḡusuz, in which the poet speaks through the mouth of the divine light to express its various manifestations.<sup>287</sup> According to Gölpınarlı, such poems should not be called *devriyyes*, because they do not describe theophany as a movement through the two reciprocal arcs. Instead, they serve to express the multiplicity of God's manifestations as well as the different spiritual levels the dervish attains. They indicate that the divine light as it manifests itself in Muhammad contains all the Attributes of God, while other prophets and historical figures include only some of these.

---

<sup>285</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 172a.

<sup>286</sup> The genre was also very popular in Melāmī circles. For an overview of the genre, see Feridun Emecen, "Devriyye," *TDVİA* Vol 9, 251-253; Abdullah Uçman, "The Theory of the Dawr and the Dawrīyas," in Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed), *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society* (Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 2005), 445-475. See the latter for a list of all published *devriyyes* in Turkish. The first known examples to the genre in Turkish are found in the *Dīvān* of Yūnus Emre.

<sup>287</sup> See Abdūlbaki Gölpınarlı, "Devriyeler," in Abdūlbaki Gölpınarlı (ed), *Alevî-Bektâşî Nefesleri* (Istanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1992), 70-82.

In many instances, the distinction between the *devriyye* and poetry expressing the multiple manifestations of the divine light can be blurred. One example for this is a section in prose, taken from aygusuz Abdāl's *Delīl-i Budalā*, in which aygusuz explains the journeys of the soul:

*Hālikuñ emri beni kūze-ger balçığı gibi devrānuñ çarhı üzerine koyup dolāb gibi döndürdi. [...] Gāh insān, gāh hayvān eyledi. Gāh nebāt, gāh ma 'den eyledi. Gāh yaprak, gāh toprak eyledi. Gāh pīr, gāh cīvān eyledi. Gāh şāh, gāh gedā eyledi. Gāh biliş, gāh yad eyledi.*<sup>288</sup>

The Creator's command put me on time's revolution wheel and rotated me, like the mud of a potter. At times I became a human, at times an animal. At times I became a plant, at times a mineral. At times I became a leaf, at times the soil. At times old, at times young. At times a sultan, at times a beggar. At times a friend, at times a stranger.

The important detail here is that, instead of understanding the different levels of manifestation of God as consecutive time frames, aygusuz perceives them in juxtaposition to one another. He thus completely negates a chronological understanding of time, which he finds to be in contradiction with an understanding of infinite possibilities. This conception is in alignment with his notion of *dem* as an ongoing preeternal present, from the perspective of which all units of time can only be simultaneous.

aygusuz Abdāl's short *meşnevī* named the *Gevher-nāme* is about the creation of the essence of Muhammad and its journey into the world of multiplicity.<sup>289</sup> According to this poem, God created the universe to manifest His power. The first being he created was the Muhammadan essence, which aygusuz likens to a pearl cast ashore by the waves of the sea. The reciprocal love between God and this essence became the foundation for love in this universe.

The doctrinal content of the *Gevher-nāme* is also diffused into aygusuz's other works. aygusuz frequently refers to the Light of Muhammad (*nūr-ı Muḥammedī*), which he defines as the essence of the Perfect Man.<sup>290</sup> He unifies the doctrine of the oneness of being with the

---

<sup>288</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 59. See up to p. 61. In this passage, aygusuz goes onto say that he fell into the mother's womb thousands of times and visited twenty-five thousand abodes.

<sup>289</sup> See Güzel, *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alāaddin Gaybī) Menākibnāmesi*, 118-123. For a discussion of the historical evolution of this concept in Sunni circles, see Chodkiewicz, *Le Sceau des saints*, 79- 87. For the earliest elaborations of the doctrine in Shi'ite thought, see Amir-Moezzi, *Le Guide Divin*, 96-112.

<sup>290</sup> See aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 135b, 195b; aygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 23b [aygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 202-203]. For a concise account of the role of this concept in Sufi literature, see Geoffroy, 44-47.

concept of the Light of Muhammad, thus stating that the whole universe is nothing but the manifestation of this light:

*Ten ü cān cānān ki dirler bu kelām  
Üçi bir vücūddur adı bir adam*

*Ol ādem kim adı Aḥmeddür anuñ  
Aşlı oldur her vücūduñ her cānuñ*

*Yaradılmış her ne kim vardur şafā  
Cümle nūr-ı Muştafādur Muştafā*<sup>291</sup>

These words by which they say body, soul and beloved  
All three of them are one existence, one man

That man's name is Aḥmad  
He is the basis of all bodies and all souls

All created beings in purity  
Are the light of Muştafā

In describing his notion of theophany, Ḳayḡusuz uses the words “*seyr*” (movement, travel)<sup>292</sup> and “*seyrān*” (travel, ride).<sup>293</sup> While travelling through the world of multiplicity, the Light of Muhammad preserves his unity with God in preternity and remains unchanged.<sup>294</sup> The Muhammadan essence makes its journey by wearing human beings as garment, yet it should not be confused with them, as they are only the form that it takes.<sup>295</sup> This notion is particularly stressed in verses which mention the names of prophets, kings and famous figures to state that they are also the garments of the essence of Muhammad. Ḳayḡusuz defines the reality of his own

---

<sup>291</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Gūlistān*, fol. 263b. In the *Kitāb-ı Maḡlāṭā*, while portraying the judgement day, the dervish identifies the divine light with God's essence and presents it as distinct from Muhammad (see 273a). He refers to this light as the ‘sultan’, which he identifies with ‘Alī elsewhere in the text. The dervish also depicts God as a lamp (*çıraḡ*) that burns in the middle of all created things (see 268a), which are soaked in this light to the brim (see 268a). All that exists is this light. Elsewhere in the *Kitāb-ı Maḡlāṭā*, the dervish refers to the soul (*cān*) of Muhammad as the first created being from which all other beings were created (see 274a). See the commentary for an elaborate discussion of these sections.

<sup>292</sup> See for instance Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 132b, 139a, 139b, 161b, 162a.

<sup>293</sup> See for instance Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Gūlistān*, fol. 248b, 251a, 268b, 269a.

<sup>294</sup> See Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 118a.

<sup>295</sup> See *Ibid.*, fol. 167a.

worldly existence in the same manner. His notion of theophany thus brings his own present existence together with the preeternal present:

*Bilgil beni kıandayıdum seyrān-ı cevlandıayıdum  
Bu dem Kayğusuz Abdālam kenār-ı meydān gelmişem*<sup>296</sup>

Know me; know where I was. I was travelling and circling around.  
At this instance I am Kayğusuz Abdāl; I came to the edge of the public square.

*Şümārum hisāba gelmez beni degme ‘ākil bilmez  
Bugün Kayğusuz Abdālam bu ad u bu sāna geldüm*<sup>297</sup>

My number is uncountable; not all intellects can perceive me  
Today I am Kayğusuz Abdāl; I came to this name and appearance

### The Coincidence of Opposites

In this section I will focus on a major stylistic element in Kayğusuz’s work and analyze its doctrinal foundation. I name this element the Coincidence of Opposites, after Henry Corbin’s translation of the same term as *coincidentia oppositorum*, which he defines as a “simultaneity of complementaries determining the double dimension of beings.”<sup>298</sup> The term appears as *jam ‘ bayn al-aqdād* in Ibn ‘Arabī’s terminology. According to Ibn ‘Arabī’s mystical doctrine, the name of *Allāh* is a unifier of opposites, by the fact of bringing together God’s names denoting *tanzīh* (incomparability) and *tashbīh* (similarity).<sup>299</sup> Ibn ‘Arabī bases his conceptualization on the verse: “He is the First and the Last, the Manifest and the Nonmanifest, and He is knowing of all things.” (57:3). God created the imaginal world (*‘ālam al-mithāl*) to manifest his strength to

---

<sup>296</sup> Ibid., 137b. For the rest of this poem, which narrates the journey of the Light of Muḥammad with the repetition of the rhyme “gelmişem” (I have come to), see Ibid., fol. 137a-b. For other poems with similar content, see Ibid., fol. 162b, 195b.

<sup>297</sup> Ibid., fol. 167a.

<sup>298</sup> See Henry Corbin, *L’Imagination créatrice dans le soufisme d’Ibn Arabi* (Paris: Editions Médecis-Entrelacs, 2006), 225. The translation is mine.

<sup>299</sup> The same concept is formulized through God’s attributes of grace (*jamāl*) and wrath (*jalāl*) in the teachings of Rūzbihān Baqlī and ‘Ayn al-Qudat Hamadhānī. For the conceptualization of the *coincidentia oppositorum* in the two authors as well as in al-Hallāj, see Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy*, 65, 84-89, 140.

combine elements which are inherently contradictory, to manifest his name *al-Qawī* (the Strong), because the imaginal world is where opposite entities come together. The senses and the intellect do not have the capacity to assemble opposites. This capacity belongs to the imagination (*khayāl*) and can only be found in the gnostic.<sup>300</sup>

Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl's works do not contain the doctrines of presences (*haḡarāt*) and the imaginal world (*‘ālam al-mithāl*). Yet the Coincidence of Opposites is constantly described as one of the major qualities of the Perfect Man. Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl's definition of the concept varies depending on the intended level of teaching. At the first instance, Ḳayḡusuz presents the Coincidence of Opposites as a quality of the world of multiplicity:

*Diri olmaḡ biledür ölmekile*  
*Bile geldi ağlamaḡ gülmekile*

*Biledür dünyāda saḡlık şayruluk*  
*Ağlamak gülmek bilişmek ayruluk*

*Her dimeḡün yine işitmegi var*  
*Gelmekile bile gitmegi var*

*Vuşlat olan yirde hicrān biledür*  
*Küfre baḡ yanında imān biledür*<sup>301</sup>

Being alive coexists with dying  
Laughing has come together with crying

In this world, health and illness exist together  
Crying, laughing, familiarity, and distance exist together

Each speaking has its hearing  
Each coming has its going

Where there is union, there is separation  
Look at unbelief, next to it you will see faith

We can consider this as a teaching directed at the novice. According to this definition, while the world is a place where opposites coexist, these opposites nonetheless retain their individual properties. This quality of the world is due to the fact that it is the manifestation of God's

---

<sup>300</sup> See Chittick, *The Sufi Path of Knowledge*, 59, 115-116, 375.

<sup>301</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 252b.



Attributes, which can be radically contradictory. In fact, Kaygusuz characterizes God's Attributes with this very quality:

*Ne evveldür 'aceb ol āhir olmaz  
Ne āhirdür ki hergiz zāhir olmaz<sup>302</sup>*

What a First that never becomes Last  
What a Last that never becomes Manifest

*Zihī bāṭın ki hergiz zāhir olmaz  
Zihī zāhir ki ebeden sırr olmaz<sup>303</sup>*

Praise be to the Hidden that will never become Manifest  
Praise be to the Manifest that will not be a secret till eternity

On the other hand, the preeternal present and the gate of *ḥakīkat* which constitutes its experience are identified as a radical subversion of this order of the world, whereby all opposites are abolished. We saw earlier that this gate was characterized by the dissolution of the Attributes, thus giving way to a direct experience of the Essence, or rather, existence itself. In his *Gülistān*, Kaygusuz states that in the still ongoing time-space of preeternity, this universe does not exist; neither do the opposite entities of which it is composed:

*Yokdur ol mekānda hergiz bu 'ālem  
Sāl u hefte māh u hūrşīd şubḥ u şām*

*Rāḥat u zahmet ırak yakın dimek  
Beyt ü Ka'be ḥāl u küfr ü dīn dimek<sup>304</sup>*

In that place this universe has no existence  
There is no year and week, no moon and sun, no morning and night

No comfort and trouble, no far and near  
No home and Ka'ba, no state, no unbelief and no religion

In his descriptions of the gate of *ḥakīkat*, Kaygusuz frequently repeats the oneness of blasphemy and faith. As we saw earlier, Kaygusuz characterizes the gate of *ḥakīkat* as the experience of the

---

<sup>302</sup> Ibid. fol. 278b.

<sup>303</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 93.

<sup>304</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 262b.

preeternal paradise to which beings return at the end of time. This preeternal paradise is the place where opposites are dissolved by way of their unification:

*Biliş oldu İbrāhīm Nemrūd ile  
Birlige birikdi ziyān sūd ile*<sup>305</sup>

Abraham and Nimrod became friends  
Loss and gain became one

*Gel ki varlık küllī nūr oldu tamām  
Ma'nāda bir nūra döndi şubḥ u şām*<sup>306</sup>

Come and see how all of existence has become Light  
In meaning the day and the night have turned into a Light

Hell unites with paradise, but does this by dissolving completely in paradise.<sup>307</sup> The distinction between different religions disappears to give way to the direct knowledge of God.<sup>308</sup>

In the gate of *ma'rifet*, the world of multiplicity is reinstated. Kaygusuz states that *vaḥdet* (oneness) and *keşret* (manyness) are one and the same entity.<sup>309</sup> The Perfect Man is one who can unify the two in his own person. He is the microcosm of the world, thus an embodiment of the Coincidence of Opposites with which the world is characterized:

*Gümān benem yakīn benem kıble şalāt u dīn benem  
Fużül benem miskīn benem cümlesiyle pür olmuşam*<sup>310</sup>

I am doubt; I am certainty; I am the qibla, the daily prayer, the religion  
I am the proud and the poor; I am filled with all of these

*Geh korqaram bende gibi geh oluram yektā gibi  
Geh ṭālibem eşyā gibi geh küllī ol zāt oluram*<sup>311</sup>

At times I am scared like a servant; at times I am like the unique  
At times I am an aspirant like created things; at times I become that Essence in entirety

---

<sup>305</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Serây-nâme*, 47a. [Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Sarâyname*, 296-297].

<sup>306</sup> *Ibid.*, 51a [312-313].

<sup>307</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 247a, 266b.

<sup>308</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 191a.

<sup>309</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 166.

<sup>310</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 162b.

<sup>311</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 163b.

As the Coincidence of Opposites, the Perfect Man not only reflects the macrocosm, but also God Himself, in both Essence and Form:

*Hem cānam āşkāre hem vücūdam  
Hem kamu vücūdda cāna mevcūdam*

*Hem kamu halkuñ hālinden āzādam  
Hem bilişem cümleye ben hem yadam*

*Hem benim vaşfumı söyler cümle dil  
Hem bu serāyda delüyem hem 'ākil*<sup>312</sup>

I am the soul; in visibility I am also the body  
I am existent to the soul in all bodies

I am free of the states of all created beings  
I am a friend to all as well as a stranger

All languages speak my qualities  
In this palace I am both the crazy and the sane

Yet one important detail distinguishes the Coincidence of Opposites in the gate of *ma'rifet* from the respective concept in the gate of *tarīkat*, where the concept was part of the definition of the world of multiplicity. Instead of the sharp distinction between opposites which we find in the teachings directed at the novice, in the gate of *ma'rifet*, opposites have become complementary:

*Nūra baķ kim zulmet içinde 'ayān  
Zulmeti gör kim nūra olmuş mekān*<sup>313</sup>

Look at the light; see how it is visible in darkness  
See the darkness; see how it became the locus of light

In this sense, the separateness of opposites in the gate of *tarīkat* and their unity in the gate of *hakīkat* are both preserved in the gate of *ma'rifet*.

---

<sup>312</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, 57a [Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Sarāyname*, 336-337].

<sup>313</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 266a.

## The Perfect Man

The Perfect Man is in many ways the center of aygusuz’s teaching uniting various elements of doctrine, although aygusuz does not consecrate much of his time to defining the Perfect Man. As we saw earlier, The Perfect Man is the esoteric (*bāṭın*) or the soul (*cān*) of the universe.<sup>314</sup> His esoteric dimension, his *cān* is God’s essence (*zāt*). He is the manifestation of God’s Attributes.<sup>315</sup> His heart is the abode of God and his body is a microcosmos which mirrors the universe. In his *Delil-i Budalā*, aygusuz compares man’s body to a city. The upper half of this city consists of the seven heavens and the throne. The lower half consists of the seven layers below ground, the ox, the sea, and the fish.<sup>316</sup>

aygusuz Abdāl says that the saints (*evliyā*) are the reason for the creation of the universe, thus giving them the same ontological status as Prophet Muhammad.<sup>317</sup> In fact, nowhere in his work does aygusuz make any ontological distinction between prophecy and sainthood, both united under the single category of the Perfect Man or saint, who is the embodiment of the essence of Muhammad. When the Perfect Man abandons his bodily existence, he becomes one with God, and thus all beings prostrate to him.<sup>318</sup> He is the object of desire of all

---

<sup>314</sup> In addition to the earlier examples, also see aygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 255b; aygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 36a [aygusuz Abdāl, *Sarāyname*, 252-253]. The Perfect Man sees his Lord with the eye of the soul; see *ibid.*, fol. 21a [192-193].

<sup>315</sup> See aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 293b; aygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 140b; aygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 255b, 257a, 273b. For a concise treatment of the notion of the Perfect Man (manifested in the Imam and the Friends of God) as the Face of God in Shi‘ism, see Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, “Introduction,” in Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi (ed.), *L’Ésotérisme shi‘ite: Ses racines et ses prolongements* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2016), 3-4. Similar to aygusuz’s Perfect Man, the Imam also has both an exoteric and an esoteric dimension, his manifestation in the physical imams and his hidden aspect in the metaphysical Imam.

<sup>316</sup> See aygusuz Abdāl, *Delil-i Budalā*, 63-64. Also see the related section in the *Vücüd-nāme* in Güzel, *Kaygusuz Abdal’ın Mensur Eserleri*, 142. For this ancient belief about the form of the universe, see İskender Pala, *Ansiklopedik Divan Şiiri Sözlüğü* (Istanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2004), 294.

<sup>317</sup> aygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 140a; aygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 258b.

<sup>318</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 254b.

created beings, the source of prosperity (*devlet*) and wisdom (*hikmet*) for all.<sup>319</sup> He is the source of faith and the qibla for the men of religion.<sup>320</sup> He speaks the word of God, who is in fact the true speaker behind his words.<sup>321</sup>

The disciple must recognize these qualities in his spiritual teacher (*mürşid*). If he cannot do this, it means that he is face to face with an impostor. After choosing the right spiritual teacher, the disciple must abandon himself to him completely. His spiritual teacher must become the qibla towards which he prostrates.<sup>322</sup> The disciple must become one with his spiritual teacher, allowing the spiritual teacher to manifest himself in the disciple's own person.<sup>323</sup> The relationship between disciple and his spiritual teacher reflects the true relationship of all created beings with the Perfect Man. He is the guide (*kulağuz*) to all beings.<sup>324</sup> The Perfect Man brings together the states of all created beings in him.<sup>325</sup>

Ḳayğusuz frequently refers to the Perfect Man's invisibility, the fact that he remains untraceable (*bî-nişān*) in this world. His appearance as a dervish is a cover-up masking his true identity:

*Dervîş görür âşikâre halk anı  
Bilimezler kim odur halkuñ cānı*

*Zîrâ kim cāmı bu halk görmîş degül  
Nişānından dil nişān virmîş degül<sup>326</sup>*

Created beings see him on the outside as a dervish  
They cannot know that he is the soul of all beings

Because created things have not seen the soul  
The tongue has not spoken a sign to designate it

---

<sup>319</sup> Ibid., fol. 255a, 273b.

<sup>320</sup> Ibid., fol. 255b, 257a.

<sup>321</sup> See for instance ibid., fol. 258a; Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 158.

<sup>322</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 260a.

<sup>323</sup> Ibid., fol. 261a.

<sup>324</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 23b [Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Sarāyname*, 202-203].

<sup>325</sup> Ibid., fol. 45b [290-291].

<sup>326</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 140b. Also see Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 255b.

The people reproach the dervish for being a reprehensible innovator (*bid'at*), a cannabis-addict and a drunkard because they lack the ability to see the dervish for what he really is.<sup>327</sup> All of the criticisms directed at the dervish are a result of the dervish's esoteric and invisible quality, due to which he can only be grasped by those capable of seeing with the eye of the soul.<sup>328</sup> Kaygusuz defines unrecognizability as a primary asset of the saint at the top of the spiritual hierarchy, the pole (*kutb*).<sup>329</sup>

In his poetry, Kaygusuz often designates himself as a man of blame (*melāmet*), a debauchee (*rind*), and a dissolute drunkard (*ḥarābātī*), interpreting his low social status as the sign of a high spiritual status.<sup>330</sup> His main tool in acquiring blame is his divine love, thanks to which he lets go of his honor (*nāmūs*) and sense of shame (*'ār*).<sup>331</sup> He enjoys the criticisms of the accusers (*müdde'ī*), whose attacks only serve to strengthen his spirituality.<sup>332</sup> In addition to his lack of status, the dervish also has no possessions of value which can tie him to the world of multiplicity.<sup>333</sup> He designates his language as *dervīṣāne kelām* (dervish-like words), which indicates the act of belittling oneself with one's own words and speaking words of unbelief and ignorance to mask his true nature.<sup>334</sup>

The following three couplets from the *Gūlistān* incorporate all of the above-mentioned aspects of the Perfect Man:

*Anuñile işlenür Hakkuñ işi  
Evvel āḥir ol kişidür ol kişi*

<sup>327</sup> See *ibid.*, fol. 255b; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 58.

<sup>328</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gūlistān*, fol. 261b.

<sup>329</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 58.

<sup>330</sup> He thus closely follows the literary tropes in Persian Sufi poetry and ties himself to the Path of Blame, which we will deal with in the next chapter.

<sup>331</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 125a, 163a, 177a, 190b, 196b, 197a, 206b.

<sup>332</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 178b, 196b, 225a, 229a, 231a, 234b, 257a, 265a, 267b, 271b, 273a, 273b, 276b.

<sup>333</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 316a. Also see the humorous poems in which Kaygusuz speaks in the first person to tell the story of how he was led astray by elder women who offered him food and possessions in order to make him their concubines; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 315a-316a, Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 334a-335a. In the next chapter, I will discuss the allegorical meaning of these poems, which say the opposite of what they mean to surprise the reader.

<sup>334</sup> See the whole poem beginning with “‘āşık oldum bīhūde bir yabana” (I fell in love with a useless prairie) in Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 310a.

*Ol kişinüñ nişanı bu āşkäre  
Fakîr ü haķîr görinür gözlerē*

*Ol kişidür cümle ‘ālemden murād  
Anda mevcūd küllî şîfāt küllî zāt<sup>335</sup>*

God’s acts are performed by his hands  
That person is the First and the Last

On the outside, the sign of that person  
Is that he looks poor and lowly to the eyes

That person is the intention behind the creation of the universe  
The Essence and the Attributes are fully present in him

## **Muḥammad-‘Alī and the Twelve Imams**

While the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* is the only work in Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s corpus in which the doctrine of Muḥammad-‘Alī is developed, couplets interspersed in his *Dīvān* and *Serāy-nāme* give us hints as to what this doctrine might have been in the oral teaching. Most of these couplets are in praise of Muḥammad and ‘Alī, referred to frequently as “Aḡmed-i Ḥaydar”<sup>336</sup> and “Aḡmed ü Ḥaydar.”<sup>337</sup> The couplets praise ‘Alī’s acts (*iş*),<sup>338</sup> manliness (*mürüvvet*),<sup>339</sup> character (*hūy*).<sup>340</sup> They describe him with the following epithets: the key to all sciences (*cümle ‘ilme miftāh*),<sup>341</sup> with true speech (*ķavli çin*),<sup>342</sup> faithful to his word (*ķavline şādık*),<sup>343</sup> always diligent (*dā ‘im uyanık*),<sup>344</sup> a good horseman (*şeh-süvār*).<sup>345</sup> In the same couplets, Muḥammad is praised for his

---

<sup>335</sup> See Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 261b.

<sup>336</sup> See Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 166b, 177b, 180b, 223b.

<sup>337</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 166b, 209b.

<sup>338</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 182a.

<sup>339</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 24b [Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 206-207].

<sup>340</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 104-105.

<sup>341</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 131b.

<sup>342</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 20b [Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 190-191].

<sup>343</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 39b [266-267].

<sup>344</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 21a [192-193].

<sup>345</sup> *Ibid.*, 29b [226-227].

moral nature (*hulk*)<sup>346</sup> and described as the possessor of science (*ṣāhib-i ‘ilm*)<sup>347</sup> and the cupbearer to the lovers who know God (*Hakki bilen ‘aşıklara sākī*).<sup>348</sup> Of interest is the fact that the reference to horsemanship put aside, there are no references to chivalry and holy war in Ḳaygusuz Abdāl’s depictions of ‘Alī, although these were prominent aspects of such descriptions in the *abdāl* works of the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>349</sup>

In his entire corpus, Ḳaygusuz Abdāl makes two references to the Twelve Imams,<sup>350</sup> two references to the *ahl al-bayt* (the prophet’s family),<sup>351</sup> and one reference to the concept of *teberrā* (dissociation from the *ahl al-bayt*’s adversaries).<sup>352</sup> Other than the poetry by Nesīmī,<sup>353</sup> who was neither a Bektashi nor an *abdāl* but later became elevated to the status of a saint in Bektashism and Alevism, these are our earliest attestations in the Turkish realm to the given doctrines of Shi’ite origin. The fact that Ḳaygusuz only made minor allusions to these doctrines could be explained by two possibilities. The first is that the doctrines were not fully developed in the *abdāl* circles at the time. The second possibility is that they were reserved particularly for oral tradition, due to a certain political sensitivity.

Once again, Ḳaygusuz portrays his relationship to Muḥammad-‘Alī and the Twelve Imams in various ways according to the hierarchy of spiritual levels. For the lay adherent, he is a *muḥibb* (lover)<sup>354</sup> and a *gūlām* (humble servant)<sup>355</sup> of Muḥammad-‘Alī, as well as an adversary to their enemies. For the disciple, he is in service of (*hizmet*) ‘Alī,<sup>356</sup> who is always beside him in his path (*hem-rāh*).<sup>357</sup> He is in aspiration towards (*müştāk*) Muḥammad and has gained felicity

<sup>346</sup> Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 182a, 187a; Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 20b, 24b [Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 190-191, 206-207]; Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 104-105.

<sup>347</sup> Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 39b [Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 266-267].

<sup>348</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 63b [362-363].

<sup>349</sup> See chapter IV for further details.

<sup>350</sup> See Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 136a, 137b.

<sup>351</sup> See Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 129a, 139b.

<sup>352</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 166b.

<sup>353</sup> For the earliest example of the Alevi-Bektashi liturgical poems named *düvāzdeh imām* (Twelve Imams) see Nesīmī, *Dīvān*, 542.

<sup>354</sup> Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 166b.

<sup>355</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 129a, 131b.

<sup>356</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 182a.

<sup>357</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 131b.



because Muḥammad-‘Alī’s gaze has fallen upon him.<sup>358</sup> For those familiar with the experience of oneness, Ḳayḡusuz says that one’s own self is the place where he should look for ‘Alī and the Twelve Imams.<sup>359</sup> This is because the Perfect Man is ontologically equivalent to Muḥammad and ‘Alī,<sup>360</sup> who can only be experienced in the preeternal present of oneness.<sup>361</sup> Ḳayḡusuz’s teachings range from telling the lay adherent to follow Muḥammad-‘Alī to instructing the advanced disciple to become one with them.

Unlike the rest of his corpus, Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṭa* betrays a complex web of teachings related to Muḥammad and ‘Alī. As discussed in the first chapter, Ḳayḡusuz describes Muḥammad as the sultan in the market of the intellect, while describing ‘Alī as the sultan in the market of love. We know from the discussion in the first chapter that Ḳayḡusuz sees the capacity of love as the esoteric dimension of the intellect. The dervish who is the protagonist of the *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṭa* enters the service of ‘Alī and becomes his disciple. ‘Alī explains to him how to acquire a vision of God by looking at His creation and how to interpret Quranic episodes such as that of Joseph. ‘Alī is the Imam par excellence and the dervish sees ‘Alī blink behind the eyes of prophets. ‘Alī then tells the dervish that he is the true identity of all prophets. When the dervish begins to grasp his own divinity, ‘Alī hides himself in the dervish’s heart. Such a teaching is in parallel with the notion of the Secret (*sirr*) in Shi’ism, wherein “the historical imams are the holders and transmitters of a Secret the content of which is precisely the metaphysical Imam.”<sup>362</sup> As such, for the dervish, accessing this secret content is equal to self-identification with it, that is with the metaphysical Imam. Prior to this identification, as the dervish’s interior guide, ‘Alī also instructs the dervish to beware of Satan.

In Ḳayḡusuz’s depictions of judgement day in the *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṭa*, Muḥammad acts as intercessor and as the guide leading all created beings to the presence of God. On the day of judgement when all sins have been pardoned, all beings speak in understandable languages the Shi’i profession of faith: “*Lā ilāha illallāh Muḥammadun rasūlullāh ‘Aliyyun waliyyullāh* (There is no God but God. Muḥammad is the messenger of God. ‘Alī is the friend of God).” After

---

<sup>358</sup> Ibid., fol. 223a.

<sup>359</sup> Ibid., fol. 136a.

<sup>360</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 309b.

<sup>361</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 26b, 39b [Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 214-215, 266-267].

<sup>362</sup> Amir-Moezzi, “Introduction,” 5.

attaining this time frame depicted as the apocalypse, the dervish realizes that all that used to exist was nothing but Muḥammad himself.

At the end of the work, the dervish reaches the sultan's banquet, a feast in which all beings are in the presence of God. He sees 'Alī as the sultan and converses with him, only to realize that 'Alī was his own self. We can interpret this part of the work as indicating the divination of 'Alī. In a similar fashion, in the *Vücūd-nāme*, Ḳayḡusuz says: “*Muḥammed Muṣṭafā [...] iṣāret buyurdu ki ḥāne ṣāhibiniñ ismi üç ḥurūf iledür. Biri 'ayn ve biri yedür.* [Muḥammad Muṣṭafā signalled that the owner of the house has a name with three letters. One of these is 'ayn and the other is yah].<sup>363</sup>

While 'Alī is God himself, Muḥammad is the first created being, who contains all of existence within him. From the perspective of oneness, or to rephrase, from the perspective of the time and space of oneness to which the dervish frequently returns, Muḥammad is the only created being, the Perfect Man in and for whom the universe was made manifest. Both the creator and the created are depicted as infinite divine light.

## Conclusion

In his frequent addresses to his audience of various spiritual levels, Ḳayḡusuz never allows us to lose sight of the fact that the aim of his writings is the disciple's education. Yet on many occasions, the word “doctrine” sounds off mark in explaining his writings, which narrate his intimate personal experience of sainthood in as visionary a manner as someone like Rūzbihān Baqlī. Although he sometimes refers to the pole (*ḳutb*), we generally have the impression that Ḳayḡusuz does not believe in the existence of a hierarchy among those who have reached perfection. Saints and prophets alike are simply manifestations of the Muhammadan essence, which is at every instance the only true actor. For Ḳayḡusuz, the realization of this truth is the same as resuscitating its memory, the memory of the time of oneness where existence was not masked by an exoteric dimension.

Indeed, Ḳayḡusuz makes no attempt at historicizing his work. He does not refer to the Muslim saints before him; he only rarely cites the Qur'an and the hadith; he shows no regard for

---

<sup>363</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Vücūd-nāme*, 144-145. In the same work, Ḳayḡusuz also says that the truth is Muḥammad Muṣṭafā and 'Alī; see *ibid.*, 143.

the historical order of prophets, who are not ontologically distinguished from fictional characters like Majnūn and Rustam. For him, time and space are just concepts belonging to created beings, of which he has been set free. He obtains his knowledge directly from the source, which he equates with his own selfhood.

For ̒aygusuz Abdāl, sainthood is not the proximity to God as understood by the Akbarian school. Proximity implies levels of sainthood, distance, and the changing of both. Nor is sainthood defined by the manifestation of the Imam in the heart of his devotee, which would imply an ontological hierarchy between the two holders of *walāya*. Although ̒aygusuz is constantly preoccupied with the apocalypse as it manifests itself in the exoteric world and the saint's heart, he only refers to the Mahdi when he wants to say that the Mahdi is none but the dervish's own self.<sup>364</sup> Once again, the self is the saint's only savior and only spiritual teacher.

On the other hand, we have to admit that on one level, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* breaks with this general perspective, because in this work, 'Alī appears as both the dervish's interior guide and the *zāt* (selfhood) of God. We could thus speak of an extremist (*ghulāt*) influence on ̒aygusuz's doctrine, although this does not spread to all of his works.

That said, even the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* fully corroborates ̒aygusuz Abdāl's complete disregard for any intermediaries between him and God. In this light, his multi-perspectival writing which switches freely between various doctrinal positions can also be read as a commentary on the nature of revelation, which he deems to be beyond any sort of order conferred upon it by time and space. When considered side by side with his frequent proclamations that his word is the word of God, we could say that ̒aygusuz sought to imitate the very structure of the Qur'an, with its multiple voices and juxtaposed meanings.<sup>365</sup> This will become clearer in the next chapter, where I will investigate ̒aygusuz's paradoxical sayings together with the undeniable influence of those by Yūnus Emre.

̒aygusuz's language is a remarkable example of the futility of maintaining a division between high and low Islam defined through certain exterior signs. As the next chapter will show, ̒aygusuz was one of those mystics who went to the greatest possible lengths to dissociate themselves from any affiliation to high culture.

---

<sup>364</sup> See for instance ̒aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 135b.

<sup>365</sup> For a comparison between the multiplicity of speakers and audiences in the Qur'an and the *Maṣnavī*, see Ahmet Karamustafa, "Speaker, Voice and Audition in the Koran and the Mathnawī," *Sufi* 79(2010): 36-45.

### Chapter 3

#### Boundary-making and Genre-making:

#### The Role of Dervish Piety in the Creation of a Vernacular Islamic Tradition in Anatolia

New perspectives in the study of classical texts criticize an essentialist approach to textual production and edition, stressing the importance of the material matrix and social context of a text in establishing its meaning. Accordingly, “the truth of art –and philology– lies not within the artifact itself but in its relationship to its context of production.”<sup>366</sup> This context also includes the dynamic relationships with readers belonging to interpretive communities which can be both simultaneous and successive.

In this sense, perhaps the greatest mistake of narratives regarding the emergence of Anatolian Turkish as a literary medium was that of reading early Anatolian Turkish texts as they would be read in a modern Turkish interpretive community. Thus was born a nationalist framework which posited the emergence of Anatolian Turkish as a struggle to win precedence over Persian and Arabic.<sup>367</sup> As I have discussed in the introduction, the emergence of a vernacular Islamic tradition was also interpreted among similar lines, always linked to a ‘pre-existing’ national identity. One area of research which brought these two narratives together was the emergence of Alevism.

In this chapter, I will conduct a comparative study of the poetry of Yūnus Emre (d. 1320-1)<sup>368</sup> and Kaygusuz Abdāl (fl. second half of the 14<sup>th</sup>- first half of the 15<sup>th</sup> century).

---

<sup>366</sup> Nadia R. Altschul and Bradley J. Nelson, “Transatlantic Discordances: The Problem of Philology,” *Hispanic Issues* 2 (2007): 61. For an overview of recent approaches and criticisms see Roger Chartier and Maurice Elton, “Crossing Borders in Early Modern Europe: Sociology of Texts and Literature,” *Book History* 8 (2005): 37-50.

<sup>367</sup> For an overview of literary production in this era, the development of Old Anatolian Turkish as a written language, as well as a detailed critique of the current state of scholarship, see A.C.S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız, “Introduction: Literature, Language and History in Late Medieval Anatolia,” in A.C.S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds), *Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-century Anatolia* (Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2016), 19-35. In the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, Ottoman and Early Republican thinker Rıza Tevfik was already aware of the invalidity of nationalist paradigms in understanding Kaygusuz’s predilection for Turkish; see Rıza Tevfik Bölükbaşı, “Ehemmiyetsiz Bir Hatâyı Tashih Vesilesiyle,” in *Tekke ve Halk Edebiyatı Makaleleri*, ed. Abdullah Uçman (Istanbul: Dergah Yayınları, 2015), 120 [First edition: 1982]: For Rıza Tevfik, see Zarcone, *Mystiques, philosophes et francs-maçons*, 329-448.

<sup>368</sup> Information on Yūnus’ life is scarce and relies heavily on the references in his poems as well as legendary tales. For a record indicating his date of death, see Adnan Erzi, “Türkiye Kütüphanelerinden Notlar ve

Together with figures like Sultān Valad (d. 712/1312), ‘Āşık Paşa (d.733/1332) and Gülşehrī (d. after 717/1317), Yūnus Emre belongs to the very first generation of authors who are known to have written in Western Turkish, which as a written language can only be traced back to the late thirteenth/early fourteenth century. Yūnus Emre is the veritable forefather of mystical and lyric poetry in Anatolian Turkish. Despite its unique character, Kāyğusuz’s poetry was highly influenced by that of Yūnus Emre, in both content and language.<sup>369</sup> In one of his poems, Kāyğusuz openly expresses this influence and his effort to find his own voice: “*Ben kendü sözüm söyleyem şî ‘r-i Yūnusı terk idem* [I shall speak my own words; I shall stop imitating the poetry of Yūnus].”<sup>370</sup>

I will analyze the poetry of the two mystics, in particular their *şatḥiyye*,<sup>371</sup> from several complementary angles: Firstly, I will investigate how this poetry is used in creating a boundary between the religious elite and the dervish milieu, the latter extending to the common people. Secondly, I will investigate how this boundary-making and related group formation plays into the creation of a literary genre. For this I will focus on the creation of the genre of the Turkish *şatḥiyye*,<sup>372</sup> as different from the classical *shatḥ*, by Yūnus Emre and his successor Kāyğusuz Abdāl. I will show how the genre bridges the gap between classical Sufi concepts and genres of folk (at the time oral) literature. I will demonstrate that boundary

---

Vesikalar I,” *TTK Belleten*, XIV/53 (1950): 85-89. According to the general opinion, Yūnus was born in an area nearby the Sakarya river and lived in the Tapduk Emre convent located at Emrem Sultan near Nallıhan. He donated his land in Sarıköy to the convent. References in his poems indicate that Yūnus was a disciple of Tapduk Emre, who was in turn the disciple of Şarı Şaltuk. There are graves attributed to Yūnus in various places in Anatolia as well as in Azerbaijan. Scholars agree on the authenticity of the grave in Sarıköy, near Sivrihisar.

<sup>369</sup> An examination of the two poems which figure in the appendix reveals that Kāyğusuz’s poem may be a *naẓīre* (imitation poem) to the one by Yūnus. Compare the sixth couplet in Yūnus’s poem with the sixth quatrain in Gölpinarlı’s recension of Kāyğusuz’s poem, both of which include the phrase ‘*leylek koduk toğurmuş*’ [the stork gave birth to a donkey foal]; see Gölpinarlı, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, 68. With reference to the Sufi teachings of the two poets, compare the discussion of different types of intelligence (‘*akl*’) in the beginning of Kāyğusuz’s *Delil-i budalā* with Yūnus’s discussion of the same topic in the *Risāletü ‘n-nuşḥiyye*; see Yūnus Emre, *Yunus Emre Divānı: Risāletü ‘n-Nuşḥiyye, Tenkitli Metin*, ed. Mustafa Tatcı (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1991), 48-49; Kāyğusuz Abdāl, *Delil-i Budalā*, 49-50.

<sup>370</sup> See Kāyğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 219a.

<sup>371</sup> The oldest copy of Yūnus’s poem dates from the year 940 (1540); see Yūnus Emre, *Yunus Emre Divānı: Tenkitli Metin*, ed. Mustafa Tatcı (Istanbul: H Yayınları, 2008), 4. Kāyğusuz’s poems, on the other hand, are found in the two oldest copies of his *Dīvān*, dated 907(1501-2) and 920 (1514).

<sup>372</sup> I use the word “Turkish” here not as an ethnic term, but as reference to the language in which these *şatḥiyye* were unanimously written.

making and cultural and religious transfer are complementary aspects of the same dynamic, which are highlighted depending on the context.

My larger aim is to offer a context-based, multi-dimensional approach which will shed light on the role of dervish piety in the formation of Alevi-Bektashi belief and practice, as well as on the dynamics of the emergence of a vernacular religious tradition, as it plays out in the Anatolian Turkish literary realm.

### **Self-differentiation from Representatives of Religious Authority**

As I have discussed in the introduction, Fuad Köprülü's narrative of the formation of Alevism became the dominant scholarly tradition regarding the topic throughout much of the twentieth century, in many ways impeding innovative research. This narrative relied on a strict dichotomy between high and low Islam. It maintained that the Alevis developed syncretic beliefs due to their lack of access to urban centers and the Islamic teachings of the religious elite. They learned Islam from rural-based dervish communities, who themselves were inadequately Islamized.

As *Çaygusuz Abdāl*'s corpus suggests, the assumption that he and his fellow dervishes were not fully Islamized is entirely off the mark. We can say the same for his precursor *Yünus Emre*. These dervishes not only situated themselves and their teachings within Islam; they were also thoroughly aware of the dynamic relationship of their literary production with their classical Sufi heritage of Persian and Arabic origins.

One of the less apparent holes in Köprülü's conceptual framework was his idea of a lack of relationship between 'urban' representatives of Islam and 'rural' tribes, which caused the development of distinct modes of piety. Anthropological research suggests that in the creation of religious boundaries, the main role is played by interaction, not by its absence. The following definition of ethnic boundary-making by Fredrik Barth can also be applied to religious boundaries. According to Barth, 'ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of social interaction and acceptance, but are quite to the contrary often the very foundations on which embracing social systems are built.'<sup>373</sup> Barth also says that what defines the group is the boundary, and not the 'cultural stuff' it encloses, thus allowing the boundary to be maintained while the 'cultural stuff' (in this case units of belief and practice) may change.

---

<sup>373</sup> Fredrik Barth, "Introduction," in Fredrik Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969), 10.

This highlights the fact that boundaries are performative in nature, and depend on how they are carried out by their actors, both during and after their initial formation.

The role of boundary-making in the formation of religious identity can be exemplified in a multitude of ways throughout the history of Islam. The multiple aspects of confession-building in the Ottoman Empire can also be evaluated in this regard.<sup>374</sup> Yet due to the supremacy of the Köprülü paradigm throughout the twentieth century, instances of collective boundary formation in the Anatolian religious landscape were most often subsumed under the category of ‘messianic propaganda.’<sup>375</sup> This perspective served to overshadow, and not highlight, the points of contact between different religious groups. In this section, I will attempt to investigate how boundaries are formed and acted out in the poetries of Yūnus Emre and aygusuz Abdāl. I will explore how these relate to their textual production in the Turkish vernacular.

Perhaps the best known Anatolian Turkish mystic of all time, Yūnus Emre’s various politically charged portrayals in present-day Turkey can be misleading.<sup>376</sup> Contrary to the mutually antagonistic attempts to portray him as either ‘orthodox’ or ‘unorthodox’, this period in Anatolian religious history was not marked by a fully established orthodoxy.<sup>377</sup> Yet this

---

<sup>374</sup> See Derin Terziođlu, “How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization: A Historiographical Discussion,” *Turcica* 44 (2012-2013): 301-338; Tijana Krstić, *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change and Communal Politics in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011).

<sup>375</sup> See Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *La Révolte de Baba Resul ou la Formation de l'Hétérodoxie Musulmane* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989); Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler: 15-17. Yüzyıllar* (Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998).

<sup>376</sup> For a discussion of this matter see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, “Yunus Emre: 13-14. Yüzyıllar Arasında ‘Bir Garip Derviş-i Kalender-reviş’ Yahut Önce Kendi Zaman ve Zemininin İnsanı,” in Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed), *Yunus Emre* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012), 183-198. Among the various editions of Yūnus’s *Dīvān*, I will rely on the one by Abdūlbaki Gölpınarlı, mentioned in the first chapter; see Yūnus Emre, *Risālat al-Nushiyya ve Dīvān*, ed. Gölpınarlı.

<sup>377</sup> See Cemal Kafadar, *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995), 71-76. Kafadar’s use of the term “metadoxy” to express this period’s case of being beyond doxies has been widely accepted among academics critical of the Köprülü paradigm. Furthermore, in this period, as Devin DeWeese underlines for the same period in Inner Asia, we need to distinguish Sufi communities, “marked [...] by organizational patterns based on local and regional traditions and shrines, on hereditary lineages of shaykhs, or on the individual charisma of particular teachers [...], from the actual Sufi *ṭarīqahs* organized around specific *silsilahs* and conscious of themselves as distinct spiritual communities based upon a particular “way” of doctrine.” (DeWeese, *Islamization in the Golden Horde*, 139).

did not prevent a certain level of hostility towards dervish circles by the representatives of institutionalized Islam. Allegations of infidelity directed at Yūnus's community in his era were quite severe.<sup>378</sup> Yūnus's poetry shows plenty of instances where this hostility is reciprocated, albeit always in a mystical context. He frequently distances himself from representatives of religious authority, and criticizes a purely legalistic view of religion:

*Ḥaḳīkat bir deñizdür şerī'at anuñ gemisi<sup>379</sup>  
Çoqlar gemiden çıkup deñize talmadılar*

*Bular geldi tapuya şerī'at tutdı turur  
İçerü girübeni ne varın bilmediler*

*Dört kitābı şerḥiden 'āşīdür ḥaḳīkatde  
Zīre tefsīr okuyup ma'nāsin bilmediler<sup>380</sup>*

The truth is a sea, religious law is its boat  
Many have failed to leave the boat to dive into the sea

They came in [God's] presence but religious law kept them bound  
Upon walking in they failed to recognize where they were

Those who comment on the four books are in truth sinners  
For they read commentaries without knowing their meaning

In other poems, Yūnus Emre openly targets official representatives of religion: the *muftī*, *mudarris*, *faḳīh*, and last of all, the *şūfī*.<sup>381</sup>

*Bu dervīşlik berātın okumadı müftīler  
Anlar ne bilsün anı bu bir gizlü varaḳdur<sup>382</sup>*

*Medreseler müderrisi okumadılar bu dersi*

---

We thus need to understand the mystics of this period, including Yūnus Emre and Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, not as representatives of the various *ṭarīqahs* which appropriate them later on, but as individual thinkers and actors. This line of thinking is also important for our understanding of the figure of Ḥacı Bektaş.

<sup>378</sup> See Osman Turan, "Selçuklular Türkiyesi Din Tarihine Ait Bir Kaynak," in *60. Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Fuad Köprülü Armağanı* (Ankara: Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi, 1953), 544-546; quoted in: İlhan Başgöz, "The Human Dimension of Yunus Emre's Transformation," in Talat Halman (ed), *Yunus Emre and His Mystical Poetry* (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, 1981), 39.

<sup>379</sup> The metric error in the verse was fixed by Gölpınarlı by reading the word *şerī'at* as *şer'at*.

<sup>380</sup> Yūnus Emre, *Risālat al-Nushiyya ve Dīvān*, 55 and 78a-b.

<sup>381</sup> For an analysis of the relationship between the institutionalization of Sufism and the appearance of antinomian dervish movements, see Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 25-38.

<sup>382</sup> Yūnus Emre, *Risālat al-Nushiyya ve Dīvān*, 57 and 81a-b.



*Şöyle kaldılar 'āciz bilmediler ne bāb durur*<sup>383</sup>

*Sen fakīhsin ben fakīr saña hiç tañumuz yok  
İlmüñ var 'amelüñ yok günāhlara batarsın*<sup>384</sup>

*Yüri hey şūfti zerrāk ne sālūslik şatarsın  
Haḳkdan artuḳ kim ola ḳula dilek viresi*<sup>385</sup>

The müfti have not read this dervish warrant;  
How can they know such a secret leaf?

You are a jurist and I am poor man; you do not surprise us  
You have the science but you lack the deed; you are deep in sin

Madrassa professors have not read this lesson  
They were left helpless; they failed to recognize what chapter this was

Walk away, you deceitful Sufi! Why do you sell hypocrisy?  
Who other than God can grant the servant's wishes?

While the importance of adhering to religious law is not absent from Yūnus's poetry, more pronounced is the value of spiritual love as the true act of worship:

*Oruç namāz ḡusl u ḥacc ḥicābdur 'āşıḳlara  
'Aşıḳ andan münezzeh ḥālīş heves içinde*<sup>386</sup>

Fasting, daily prayer, ablution and pilgrimage are obstacles to a lover  
In his genuine desire, the man of love is free of these

Lastly, Yūnus tells us that his esoteric view of religion makes him the target of blame by the religious elite:

*İy beni 'ayıblayan gel beni 'ışḳdan ḳurtar  
Eliñden gelmez ise söyleme fāsīd ḥaber*<sup>387</sup>

O blamer, come and save me from love  
If that you cannot do, do not speak corrupt words

In this respect, also telling is Yūnus's expression of his spiritual lineage as '*Yūnus'a Ṭapduḡ u Şaltuḡ u Baraḳ'dandur naşīb* [Yūnus's spiritual lot comes from Ṭapduḡ, Şaltuḡ, and

---

<sup>383</sup> Ibid., 108 and 150a-b.

<sup>384</sup> Ibid., 60 and 85a.

<sup>385</sup> Ibid., 145 and 201a.

<sup>386</sup> Ibid., 120 and 166a.

<sup>387</sup> Ibid., p. 46 and fol. 66a.

Barak].<sup>388</sup> While the name of Şarı Şaltuğ (d. shortly after 700/1300) is particularly important for his role in the Islamization of the Balkans as told in the *Şaltuğ-nāme*,<sup>389</sup> Barak Baba, his disciple, is a key early figure in the development of antinomian dervish piety in Anatolia.<sup>390</sup> Yūnus’s self-description as a “strange man who wanders from city to city”<sup>391</sup> reveals his heritage as a wandering dervish<sup>392</sup> and further illustrates that such multi-faceted social identities cannot be simplified to an urban/rural dichotomy. Nor can they be boiled down to a rift between ‘learned Islam’ and popular belief. Yūnus Emre is fully at ease with the themes and terminology of Classical Sufism. As it has been shown, his mystical thought bears many affinities to those of Aḥmad Ghazālī and Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī,<sup>393</sup> while he mentions the latter reverently in his works. Close parallels between some of his poems and those of Sa‘dī Shīrāzī and Jalāl al-Dīn Rūmī indicate that Yūnus knew enough Persian to do translation.<sup>394</sup>

On the other hand, a defining aspect of Yūnus Emre’s poetry is precisely the orientation away from Arabic and Persian, and the tendency to refer to Sufī terms with their Turkish counterparts. The following couplet on the state of oneness during the preeternal pact (*bezm-i elest*), demonstrates that Yūnus paid attention to the nuances of each word indicating oneness:

*Ezelī biliş idük birlige bitmiş idük*  
*Mevcūdāt düşdi irak vüçüd cān yatağudur*<sup>395</sup>

In preeternity we knew one another, we had attained oneness  
 All existent things have fallen apart; the body is a shelter for the soul

<sup>388</sup> Ibid., p. 100 and 140a.

<sup>389</sup> See Ahmet T. Karamustafa, “Islamisation Through the Lens of the *Saltuk-name*,” in A. C. S Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds), *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia* (Surrey: Ashgate, 2015), 349-364.

<sup>390</sup> See Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 62-63; Karamustafa, “Early Sufism,” 193-196.

<sup>391</sup> Yūnus Emre, *Risālat al-Nushiyya ve Dīvān*, 190.

<sup>392</sup> Although Yūnus Emre spent most of his life in the area between today’s Ankara and Eskişehir, we also know from his poems that he travelled extensively. The places mentioned in his poems include Kayseri, Sivas, Maraş, ‘upper lands’ (Azerbaijan), Damascus, Shiraz, Baghdad, Tabriz, and Nakhchivan.

<sup>393</sup> For an in-depth discussion of Yūnus Emre’s historical relationship with the path of love (*mazhab-i ‘ishq*) in Sufism, see Ahmet T. Karamustafa, “İslam Tasavvuf Düşüncesinde Yunus Emre’nin Yeri,” in Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed), *Yunus Emre* (Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012), 287-304.

<sup>394</sup> See Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf*, 100-101.

<sup>395</sup> Yūnus Emre, *Risālat al-Nushiyya ve Dīvān*, 54 and 77a.

Apart from *biliş* [knowing one another, friend] and *birlige bitmiş* [having attained oneness], Yūnus also uses the word *bilelik* [togetherness] in his repertoire of terms for unity with God. Furthermore, Yūnus complements this vernacular religious vocabulary with a high use of proverbs,<sup>396</sup> along with references to the Turkish epic tradition and genres of oral poetry.<sup>397</sup> Although he wrote several poems as well as a *mathnawī* (*Risāletü'n-Nuşhiyye*) in formal meter (*'arūz*), Yūnus also has an abundance of poems in the traditional syllabic meter. He may have sung these to the accompaniment of the *ķopuz* (a type of lute), to which he frequently refers in his poetry.<sup>398</sup> His poems in formal meter typically have one or more lines which fit the syllabic meter much more closely. His selection of meter enables the caesural pauses which, together with internal rhyming, bring his poetry phonetically closer to the quatrain form prevalent in oral folk poetry.<sup>399</sup>

Yūnus's predilection for plain Turkish and folk content was taken up by his successor Ķayğusuz Abdāl, who pushed this vernacularization one step further, and devoted entire poems to folk themes. The discussion on meter regarding Yūnus's poetry also applies to Ķayğusuz Abdāl.<sup>400</sup> The structural features of Ķayğusuz's poetry suggest some relationship with oral composition or performance. For instance, the use of the *'arūz* meter in his *Meşnevī-i Baba Ķayğusuz* indicates that the syllabic value given to words depends on their pronunciation in spoken Turkish and not on their orthography. This in turn implies that the text was either dictated to a third party in its initial composition or destined for oral performance. Also interesting is the fact that, despite being few in number, Ķayğusuz has some verses on profane love which show an affinity with the *'āşık* literature put down in writing from the 17th century onwards. Unlike his other poetry on profane love, these verses do not follow the abstract metaphorical outlook of *dīvān* poetry, but rather describe a concrete, tangible beloved.<sup>401</sup>

<sup>396</sup> For a list, see Başgöz, "The Human Dimension," 38.

<sup>397</sup> See *ibid.*, 25, 33-34, and 38.

<sup>398</sup> See p.122 for an example to this. The *ķopuz* was used by epic poets in performance at least until the fifteenth century, as evidenced by the numerous references in the *Book of Dede Korkut*.

<sup>399</sup> For a detailed discussion of these formal aspects see Hasibe Mazıođlu, "Yunus Emre'nin Şiirlerinin Şekil Özellikleri," In *Uluslararası Yunus Emre Semineri: Bildiriler*. Istanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1971, 183-187.

<sup>400</sup> This has led some of his poems to be edited in quatrain form, although they appear in couplets in the manuscripts.

<sup>401</sup> See Ķayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 234a.

Ḳayğusuz Abdāl drew the boundary between himself and the religious elite more rigidly than Yūnus Emre, hence making his textual production our richest source on *abdāl* piety. As I have discussed in the introduction, the *Abdālān-ı Rūm* had clear antinomian tendencies since their early days, which reached their peak in the early 16th century around the figure of Otman Baba.<sup>402</sup> In Ḳayğusuz Abdāl’s time, distinctions were based more on personal affiliation and temperament, than on physical aspects such as dress and ritual. In the following couplet, Ḳayğusuz indicates two complementary aspects of his temperament:

*Gehī abdāl oluram mest ü hayrān*  
*Gehī ‘āşık oluram zār-ı giryān*<sup>403</sup>

At times I am an *abdāl*, drunk and bewildered  
 At times I am an ‘*āşık*, sorrowful and weeping

It is the second aspect, that of spiritual love, which ties him to the path of Yūnus. The recently discovered early copy of his poetry collection demonstrates that this path of love was much more pronounced in Ḳayğusuz’s poetry than previously imagined.<sup>404</sup> His book of verse, the *Gūlistān*, is in the form of a *mathnawī* interspersed with *ghazals* to the theme of love, which figure after every ten *mathnawī* lines.<sup>405</sup> At the same time, the first aspect, that of *abdāl* piety, separates Ḳayğusuz from the path of Yūnus.<sup>406</sup> While the path of love distances the dervish from official representatives of religion by creating a boundary between esoteric and exoteric modes of piety, it nonetheless does not break with official religion and religious law, deemed necessary for the common people and those in the early stages of the spiritual path. Expressions to this regard can be found in the works of both Yūnus Emre and Ḳayğusuz Abdāl.<sup>407</sup>

*Abdāl* piety, on the other hand, represents a strong mutual antagonism with official representatives of Islam. In his “Ḳayğusuz Abdal: A Medieval Turkish Saint and the

<sup>402</sup> See Karamustafa, *God’s Unruly Friends*, 70-78.

<sup>403</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *İkinci meşnevī*, fol. 5b.

<sup>404</sup> See Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 114b-235a, 312a-325b.

<sup>405</sup> See Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Gūlistān*, fol. 235a-286a.

<sup>406</sup> Also telling in this respect is Yūnus’s critical opinion of the dervish Geyikli Baba (fl. Fourteenth century), who shared the same social circle with Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, see Yūnus Emre, *Risālat al-Nushiyya ve Dīvān*, 161.

<sup>407</sup> See *ibid.*, 77-78 and fol. 108a-b. İlhan Başgöz speculates that poems with such contents were written at an early period of Yūnus’s life, before he became a mystic. See Başgöz, “The Human Dimension,” 23-40. For the role of ritual obligations in Ḳayğusuz Abdāl’s work, see Chapter 1.

Formation of Vernacular Islam in Anatolia,” Ahmet T. Karamustafa shows how Kaygusuz distances himself from the Sufis, who are in his eyes the representatives of institutionalized religion. Karamustafa demonstrates Kaygusuz’s strong criticism of the Sufis, whom Kaygusuz blames with hypocrisy.<sup>408</sup> In Kaygusuz Abdāl’s works, Yūnus Emre’s blaming of the *mufī* and *mudarris* for their lack of spiritual understanding has shifted to the Sufi and the ascetic (*zāhid*), who not only lack spiritual knowledge, but also pretend to be the sole possessors of it.<sup>409</sup> The accusation of the other now acquires an equally fervent second dimension, where the *abdāl* himself has now become the object of blame. The following couplets from two consecutive poems by Kaygusuz demonstrates this animosity in all its aspects:

(I) *Tanıkluk virdiler bengīliğine*  
*Ehl-i sūnnet ü cemā‘at dimişler*

*Müsülmānluk yolın varmaz yitürmiş*  
*Yola gelince bu heyhāt dimişler*  
[...]  
*Dā‘im mest ü harāb meyhānelerde*  
*Bu müslümān degül feryād dimişler*

*Ne bellü tersādur ne hod müsülmān*  
*Ne bellü Türk imiş ne Tat dimişler*  
[...]  
*Ne sūnneti bilür kaṭ‘ā ne farzı*  
*Ne delīl bilür ne āyet dimişler*

*Dā‘im esrār yir [ü] kırkar saḳalın*  
*Görüñ bu dehrī-i bid‘at dimişler*<sup>410</sup>

They say: ‘The people of the tradition of Muhammad and the consensus of the Ummah  
Have testified to his hashish addiction.’

They say: ‘He does not follow the path of Islam  
Alas! He is lost to the path!’

They say: ‘He spends his whole time in taverns, fully drunk,  
This is not a Muslim, God help!’

<sup>408</sup> See Karamustafa, “Kaygusuz Abdal.” For a similar perspective on Sufis in Persian poetry, see Karamustafa, “Antinomian Sufis,” 113.

<sup>409</sup> Kaygusuz also criticizes the learned (*dānişmend*) and the chief judge (*mollā*). One particularly humorous poem is about the way in which these learned representatives of Islam try to benefit from the deaths in town to fill up their bellies and wallets; see Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 323a. Kaygusuz ends the poem by saying that these people will not be able to benefit from his own death, because he has nothing but a cloak full of lice.

<sup>410</sup> Ibid., fol. 180a-b.

They say: ‘Is he a Christian or a Muslim? A Turk or a Persian?  
It is impossible to distinguish!’

They say: ‘He knows neither the Sunnah nor the Fard;  
He has absolutely no knowledge of any proof or verse.’

They say: ‘He constantly eats hemp; he cuts off his beard.  
See this materialist innovator!’

(II) *Mescide varduğın kimsene görmez  
Velī meyhāneye seyyār dimişler  
[...]  
Zāhidler gürūhı beni göricek  
Görün bu mel‘ūn-ı kâfir dimişler*

*Velī şādık kişi hālūme bakmış  
Habīrdür her hāle settār dimişler*

*‘Aşıklar göricek i‘tikād itmiş  
Erenlerden bu da bir er dimişler*

*Ḳamu halk-ı cihān āhır sözinde  
Budur ol ‘ayyār u mekkār dimişler*

*Ḳamu gönüllerüñ sırrını bilmiş  
Ḳamu dilleri bu añlar dimişler*

*Kayğusuz Abdāl her kim ki gördi  
Muhibb-i Aḥmed-i Ḥaydar dimişler*

*İnkār itdüğini ikrāra gelmiş  
Velī ikrārına inkār dimişler<sup>411</sup>*

They say: ‘Nobody sees him go to the masjid,  
But he is a regular of the tavern.’

When a group of ascetics sees me,  
They say: ‘Look at this damned infidel!’

Yet the honest person looks at me and says:  
‘He has knowledge of every state but he hides it.’

When the lovers of God see me, they believe.  
They say: ‘This is another perfect man among perfect spiritual directors.’

All peoples of the world, in their own tongues say:  
‘This is that [beloved] deceitful rogue.’

They say: ‘He knows the secrets in all hearts;  
He understands all languages.’

---

<sup>411</sup> Ibid., fol.180b-181a.

Whoever sees aygusuz Abdāl says:  
'This is a lover of Muammad and 'Alī.'

'He has come to earth to avow what he had denied,  
Yet they have mistaken his avowal for denial.'

These couplets demonstrate a clash of several points of view, the first one being the perspective of 'zāhidler gürūhī' [the band of ascetics], backed by the Sunni (authorities), which identifies aygusuz as an infidel, due to his lack of regard for the *sharī'ah*, consumption of alcohol and hashish, and antinomian physical appearance. The second perspective is that of the 'āşık (men of spiritual love) who recognize him as a man of God. The last perspective is that of the common people, who elevate him to the rank of a saint.<sup>412</sup> This elevation is all the more important, considering that aygusuz Abdāl's poetry contains the first known elaborations of the doctrine of 'Alī ('Alī b. Abī Tālib) as it later figures in Bektashi and Alevi belief. We should remind ourselves that aygusuz is still considered an important saint in Alevi circles.

aygusuz Abdāl gives us the clues to understanding how his socially-accepted sainthood came to coexist with the strong accusations of infidelity.<sup>413</sup> In the first chapter, I showed how aygusuz Abdāl's doctrinal and social positions shift regularly to accommodate different types of audience, whereby he simultaneously speaks to audiences with varying spiritual levels. I further illustrated that this 'multi-perspectival' quality of his works sometimes result in a juxtaposition of radically different points of view. I argued that this juxtaposition played itself out also as an alternation between the tendencies to reject society or blend into it as a spiritual director. All of these dynamics suggest that aygusuz Abdāl viewed his literary output primarily as a performance, always dependent on its immediate relationship with his audience. I use the term 'performance' as defined by Erving Goffman in his *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*: "all the activity of a given participant on a given

---

<sup>412</sup> aygusuz touches upon the radical differences in the public opinion regarding his sainthood and infidelity; see for instance aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 169b. In an article on Otman Baba's hagiography, Halil İnalçık gives a similar account of the varying reactions towards Otman Baba; see Halil İnalçık, "Dervish and Sultan: An Analysis of the Otman Baba Vilāyetnāmesi," in Grace Martin Smith and Carl W. Ernst (eds.), *Manifestations of Sainthood in Islam* (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1993), 221. This reminds us that disparities in public opinion were a quality all *Abdāls* of *Rūm* shared.

<sup>413</sup> Interestingly, he presents this coexistence as the result to a geographical dichotomy, separating him and his followers from 'the people of the city' (*şehr ehli, şehirlü*). See *ibid.*, fol. 176a, 225a, 252a; aygusuz Abdāl, *Üçüncü Meşnevî*, fol.18b.

occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants.”<sup>414</sup> For ̘aygusuz, social and doctrinal positions as well as self-designations are not part of a solid self-referential ‘identity’. They acquire meaning in context, during interaction, and may thus change with a change of context.

For ̘aygusuz Abdāl, different ways of understanding Islam depended not on territorial distinctions but on performative categories. While he could freely navigate between the categories of *abdāl*, *‘āşık* (lover of God) and *mürşid* (spiritual director), other categories he had to break with radically in order to establish his social identity. His criticism of representatives of institutionalized Islam allowed him to relate to his audience in a certain manner. It enabled him to distance himself from institutional religion, lacking the moral and spiritual aspects which he thought were the true definitions of religion in the eyes of the common people. One way to reinforce the boundary between his public and the religious elite was to speak the language of the common people, understood as both the act of writing in Turkish and an engagement with the verbal arts of the Turkish vernacular. The notion of the use of vernacular language as a marker of a type of piety is also stressed by Ahmet T. Karamustafa in his article on ̘aygusuz Abdāl, where he says: “The fissure between institutionalized Şūfī paths that took shape around the nuclei provided by authoritative, and increasingly also authoritarian, Şūfī masters on the one hand and loose dervish groups that assembled around the example of libertine itinerant Şūfī masters on the other hand can now be seen to include, at least partially, a linguistic rift.”<sup>415</sup>

In his *Delīl-i Budalā*, ̘aygusuz states that a number of dervishes told him: *‘Mī’dānī nemī’dānī bilmeyüz. ̘uş dili mi söylersin? Türkçe söyle kim añlansun.* [We do not understand the Persian phrases ‘you know’ and ‘you don’t know’. Are you speaking the language of birds? Speak Turkish so that you can be understood.]’<sup>416</sup> Similarly in his *Dil-güşā*, ̘aygusuz says that the scribe to whom he dictated his work, who was also a dervish, once asked him: *‘Fārsī mī’dānī. Hiç Türkçe bilmez misin?* [You know Persian. Don’t you know any Turkish?]<sup>417</sup> Further on in the same work, he explains his use of Turkish in the following manner:

---

<sup>414</sup> Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre, 1956), 8.

<sup>415</sup> Karamustafa, “Kaygusuz Abdal,” 337.

<sup>416</sup> ̘aygusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 58. The expression *mī’dānī* is repeated throughout the text of the *Delīl-i Budalā*. Thus in one sense ̘aygusuz is mocking his own text.

<sup>417</sup> ̘aygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 99.



*Biz dillerde Türkî dilin bilürüz. Gün doğıcağ ırte oldı dirüz; dolıncıcağ gıce oldı dirüz. Şuyuñ geldüğinden yaña yukaru, gıtdüğinden yaña aşagadur. Türkî dilince hemân bu kadar bilürüz.*  
418

Turkish is the language that we know. When the sun comes up we say the day has come; when it goes down we say the night has come. ‘Upwards’ is the opposite of the direction of water fall; ‘downwards’ is in the direction of water fall. This is what we know in the Turkish language.

Kaygusuz’s words illustrate his preference for Turkish over Persian as initially due to a criticism by a fellow dervish, further emphasizing his need to dissociate from his ‘learned’ roots. They also stress the collective aspect of his textual production in Turkish, as underscored by his use of the first-person plural.

### **The Making of a Genre: How Folk Tradition and Sufi Tradition Come Together in the Turkish *şatıhiyye***

If textual production in plain Turkish was directly linked to the dervish group’s particular social position, how did this impinge upon form and content? In this section, I will try to investigate the relationship between textual production in the dervish milieu and the social environment surrounding these dervishes via the creation of a particular genre, the Turkish *şatıhiyye*, as a medium of dialogue between folk culture and the ‘learned’ Islam represented by Classical Sufism. For this I will focus on the *şatıhiyye* of Yünus Emre, the first example of the genre, and those of Kaygusuz Abdâl, who is his best-known successor in the genre. I will show that, while transferring Sufi concepts to the realm of folk literature, the *şatıhiyye* also serves to reinforce boundaries between the folk and the representatives of official religion, who cannot participate in the symbolic world of the former.

Although the Turkish *şatıhiyye* has been the topic of some anthologies and articles,<sup>419</sup> we still lack a narrative of how the genre developed in the Anatolian realm. This path of development will be available to us only after we can distinguish it theoretically and structurally from the *shatıh* in the formative period of Sufism, such as those of al-Ḥallāj (d.

---

<sup>418</sup> Ibid., 120-123.

<sup>419</sup> See Cemal Kurnaz and Mustafa Tatcı, *Türk Edebiyatında Şatıhiye* (Istanbul: Akçağ, 2001); Mustafa Tatcı, *Yünus Emre Külliyyâtı 5: Yünus Emre Şerhleri* (Istanbul: H Yayınları, 2008); Pinguet, “Remarques,” 13-38; Pinguet, *La Folle sagesse*, 75-93.

922) and Abū Yazīd al-Bisṭāmī (d. 874 or 877-8).<sup>420</sup> Medieval theoretical writing on the *shaṭḥ* emphasizes its involuntary aspect, whereby it is spoken in a state of ecstasy as a natural outcome of contemplation.<sup>421</sup> Ecstatic sayings are said to be signs of a state of union with God which annihilates the mystics's selfhood. The words spoken in such a state become divinely-inspired, or for some, the very words of God. The sayings thus resemble an early stratum of ḥadīth qudsī<sup>422</sup> as well as a group of sermons attributed to 'Alī b. Abi Ṭālib.<sup>423</sup>

The similarity in content between the latter and the *shaṭḥ* of Yūnus and Ḳaygusuz is particularly striking, as shown by a comparison between three excerpts:

1) I am the Secret of secrets, I am the Guide of the heavens, I am the *First* and the *Last*, I am the *Manifest* and the *Hidden*, I am the *All-Compassionate*, I am the Face of God, I am the Hand of God, I am the Archetype of the Book, I am the Cause of causes.<sup>424</sup>

2) *Yūnus degül bunı diyen kudret dilidür söyleyen  
Kāfir ola inanmayan evvel āḥir hemān benem*<sup>425</sup>

This is not Yūnus speaking; the speaker is the tongue of omnipotence  
Those who don't believe are infidels; I am the *First* and the *Last*

3) *Cümleye mevcūd benem Ka'be benem put benem  
Arada maḳṣūd benem uşda fülān bendedür*

*Evvel ü āḥir benem tedbīr ü taḳdīr benem*

<sup>420</sup> In this respect, in the Anatolian milieu, the following remark by Carl Ernst is far from the truth: "When the theoretical outlook associated with the Andalusian master Ibn 'Arabī came to dominate the intellectual expression of Sufism, *shathiyat* became mere allegories for the subtle doctrines of Ibn 'Arabī's school. After this time, inspired speech became a conventional rhetorical device." See Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy*, 6. As we will see, since its early days, the experiential effect of the *shaṭḥ* was directed towards the listener. The Anatolian *shaṭḥ* tradition not only borrowed from the early examples of the genre, but also created its own literary devices in maintaining the value of paradox and shock.

<sup>421</sup> See Abu Nasr 'Abdallah b. 'Ali al-Sarrāj al-Ṭusī, *The Kitāb al-luma' fi'l-taṣawwuf*, ed. Reynold Alleyne Nicholson (Leiden: Brill, 1914); Rūzbihān al-Baqī, *Sharḥ-i shathiyāt*, ed. Henry Corbin (Tehran and Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1966). For an overview of the *shaṭḥ* tradition see: Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy*.

<sup>422</sup> See William A. Graham, *Divine Word and Prophetic Word in Early Islam* (The Hague: Mouton, 1977), 173. Quoted in: Carl W. Ernst, "Shaṭḥ," *The Encyclopedia of Islam: Second Edition Vol IX* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 361-362. The *shaṭḥ* was also considered to resemble expressions in the Qur'an and hadith known as enigmatic utterances (*mutashābihāt*); see Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy*, 18-19.

<sup>423</sup> See Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, "La Divinité de l'Imam," in *La Religion discrète*, 89-108.

<sup>424</sup> Ibid., 90 (the English translation is mine).

<sup>425</sup> Yūnus Emre, *Risālat al-Nushiyya ve Dīvān*, 94 and 131a.

*Ġanī vü fakīr benem nūr-ı imān bendedür*<sup>426</sup>

I am present for all; I am the Kaaba; I am the idol  
I am the purpose of all; in me is found so-and-so

I am the *First* and the *Last*; I am the plan and the preordination  
I am the *Rich* and the poor; in me is found the light of faith

The above words by K̄aygusuz manifest a central theme in his poetry, that of paradox, which he often portrays as a coexistence of opposites. Paradox is a key element in the classical definitions of the *shaḥ*, where the knowledge and experience of God is said to be achieved only in a state of absolute unknowing.<sup>427</sup> This paradox is in turn defined as a reflection of the dual (or multi-layered) structure of reality itself, the paradoxical relationship between the manifest and the hidden.<sup>428</sup> In fact, modern scholarship has established that most of the *shaḥ* are not spoken in states of ecstasy, but are rather ways of expressing one's spiritual teaching in a counter-intuitive and shocking manner, achieved by bringing together affirmations and negations which should not co-exist according to common sense. This method of speaking allows the disciple to get rid of the cognitive obstacles put forth by the act of reasoning.<sup>429</sup> Once these obstacles are overthrown, the esoteric meaning can manifest itself.

As medieval debates demonstrate, both proponents and opponents of the genre agree on the fact that the *shaḥ* makes the hidden meaning apparent. It thus produces in its listener an initial feeling of ambiguity or confusion (due to the difficulty of simultaneously understanding the juxtaposed layers of meaning), and often shock. In their poems, Yūnus

---

<sup>426</sup> K̄aygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 135a. In both excerpts, the words in italics are the Names of God, thus further stressing the divinity of the speaker.

<sup>427</sup> See Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy*, 32-36.

<sup>428</sup> See Henry Corbin, "Introduction," in *Sharḥ-i shaḥīyāt*, by Rūzbihān al-Baqlī, ed. Henry Corbin (Tehran and Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1966), 7-19; Paul Ballanfat, "Réflexions sur la nature du paradoxe," *Kār Nāmeḥ* 12-3 (1995): 25-40.

<sup>429</sup> See Pierre Lory, "Les Paradoxes mystiques (shatahāt) dans la tradition soufie des premiers siècles," in *École pratique des hautes études, Section des sciences religieuses, Annuaire, Tome 102, 1993-1994* (Paris: École Pratique des Hautes Études, 1993), 225-227; Pierre Lory, "Les Paradoxes mystiques (shatahāt) dans la tradition soufie des premiers siècles," in *École pratique des hautes études, Section des sciences religieuses, Annuaire, Tome 103, 1994-1995* (Paris: École Pratique des Hautes Études, 1994), 231-234. Also see Henry Corbin, "Introduction." Although Ernst generally focuses on the element of inspiration in the *shaḥ*, in his *Words of Ecstasy*, he categorizes the sayings on faith and infidelity as a different category of *shaḥ*, which is not directly due to divine inspiration. He calls this type of *shaḥ* 'less prophetic than paradoxical.' See Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy*, 141.

Emre and Kaygusuz Abdāl frequently qualify their poetry as manifesting the hidden.

Furthermore, they state that God manifests himself through their poetry:

*Diyen ol işiden ol gören ol gösteren ol  
Her sözi söyleyen ol şüret cān menzilidür*

*Şüret söz kanda buldı söz ıssı kaçan oldı  
Şürete kendü geldi dil hikmetüñ yoludur<sup>430</sup>*

*Kaygusuz Abdāl benisem añla rāzum diñle sözüm  
Benüm dilümde söyleyen küllī o şahdur ben hiçem<sup>431</sup>*

*Hem benüm vaşfumı söyler cümle dil  
Hem bu serāyda delüyem hem ‘ākil<sup>432</sup>*

He is the one who speaks, hears, sees and shows  
He is the one who says every word; the face is the halting-place of the soul

How did words become manifest? How did they become possession of the manifested?  
They manifested themselves; language is the path of wisdom [Yūnus Emre]

If I am Kaygusuz Abdāl, understand my secret, listen to my words  
In my tongue, the speaker is none but that sultan; I do not exist

All languages speak my qualities  
In this palace, I am both the sane and the insane [Kaygusuz Abdāl]

Yet the poems referred to so far, which closely follow the classical *shath* tradition, are not the poems by Yūnus and Kaygusuz identified as *şatḥiyye* in modern scholarship; nor are they the poems repeatedly commented and imitated in Ottoman literature. In this respect, Yūnus Emre’s most famous and possibly most controversial poem is his only ‘*şatḥiyye*’, which begins with the verse “*çıkıdum erik dalına anda yidüm üzümü* [I climbed the branches of a plum tree and ate grapes there].”<sup>433</sup> The last couplet of this poem with vibrant and nearly

---

<sup>430</sup> Yūnus Emre, *Risālat al-Nushiyya ve Dīvān*, p. 47 and fol. 67b.

<sup>431</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 219b.

<sup>432</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 57a. [Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Saraynāme*, 336].

<sup>433</sup> See the end of the chapter for a full translation of the poem. For a published English translation, see Yūnus Emre, “Selected Poems Translated by Talāt S. Halman,” in Talat Halman (ed), *Yunus Emre and His Mystical Poetry* (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, 1981), 169-170. The famous *shatḥiyya* of Barak Baba (d. 1307-8), who can be linked to Yūnus Emre via his master Tapduk Emre as previously mentioned, may also be of interest in this context, although the inaccessibility of meaning is much greater in the latter; for the *shatḥiyya*, its Persian commentary and modern Turkish translation see Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf*, 255-75, 457-72.

obscure symbolism manifests a purpose of composition which is profoundly different from that of the classical *shaḥ*:

*Yūnus bir söz söylemiş hiçbir söze beñzemez  
Münāfıklar elinden örter ma'nī yüzini*<sup>434</sup>

Yūnus has spoken words like no other  
They hide the face of meaning from the hands of hypocrites

Similarly, in the last quatrain of his famous poem beginning with the verse “*Ḳaplu kaplu bağalar / Ḳanatlanmış uçmağa* [Tur tur turtles / Have put on wings to fly],”<sup>435</sup> Ḳayğusuz questions the capacity of words to convey the truth and subtly criticizes those capable of hearing only the exoteric:

*Ḳayğusuzuñ sözleri Hindistānuñ kozları  
Bunca yalan sözile gire misin uçmağa*

These words by Ḳayğusuz, the walnuts of India  
With so many lies, you still think you will enter heaven?

When we look closely at this poem edited at the end of the chapter, we see animals performing many human activities, such as asking somebody’s hand in marriage, building a bridge, weighing grain etc. As we saw in the first chapter, the difference between human qualities and those of animals is major theme in Ḳayğusuz’s poetry. Knowing this difference is a skill which needs to be cultivated by the disciple in the path.<sup>436</sup> An ignorant man is one who is unaware of the divine attributes with which he has been invested. The qualities and actions of such a man resemble those of an animal. In this sense, we can interpret Ḳayğusuz’s poem as a reversal of the order of the world. Instead of people acting like animals, we have animals acting like humans.

Another major theme in Ḳayğusuz’s *ṣaḥīyye* is that of food, where Ḳayğusuz speaks of his consumption of hashish and endless appetite. His references to various cooked foods makes his poetry an important source for the history of Anatolian cuisine.<sup>437</sup> In one poem,

---

<sup>434</sup> Yūnus Emre, *Yūnus Emre Dīvānı*, ed. Tatçı, 428-430. While Tatçı’s edition is a critical edition of the poem, the poem also figures in: Yūnus Emre, *Risālat al-Nushiyya ve Dīvān*, 204. The word *münāfık* (hypocrite) is replaced by the word *cāhiller* (ignorants) in some manuscripts.

<sup>435</sup> See the end of the chapter for a full edition of the poem, based on its earliest manuscript, along with its translation.

<sup>436</sup> See Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 110; Ḳayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 321a.

<sup>437</sup> See Gökyay, “Kaygusuz Abdal ve Simâtiyeleri.”

Ḳayḡusuz says that he is at war with his appetite and continues to describe all the different edible foods he wishes to consume, as well as the wealth that he longs for.<sup>438</sup> We thus have the impression that Ḳayḡusuz is mocking his base self (*nefs*) in his unique humorous way. This mockery often turns into blame:

*Sen aṣ u itmegi gözle Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl  
Bu sırra kaçan irişür seniñ gibi sersām*<sup>439</sup>

O Ḳayḡusuz Abdal, you'd better go after cooked food and bread  
How will a foolish idiot like you ever attain this secret?

Ḳayḡusuz has several *ṣaḥḥiyye* in which he speaks in the first person to tell the story of how he was led astray by elder women who offered him food and possessions in order to make him their concubines.<sup>440</sup> In other *ṣaḥḥiyye*, Ḳayḡusuz describes the sexual advances which take place between him and a pasha, who refrains from becoming intimate with Ḳayḡusuz due to his embarrassment of the dervish's social status.<sup>441</sup> On one level, these poems contain a vehement critique of society, which judges people according to their wealth and status, and not on their moral character. On another level, the poems once again represent an allegory of the base self, one's personal Satan, which can appear in any of the forms described by Ḳayḡusuz.

In addition to many such poems with seemingly absurd, subversive and humorous content,<sup>442</sup> in his prose work named the *Kitāb-ı maḡlaṭa*, Ḳayḡusuz constantly plays with, contradicts and transforms the created meaning, thus forcing the reader to break all prejudices and preconceived notions. As my commentary of the work will reveal, this work can be considered as a *ṣaḥḥiyye* in prose. One article which deals with this aspect of Ḳayḡusuz's work is Catherine Pinguet's "Remarques sur la poésie de Kaygusuz Abdal." In this article Pinguet states that in Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl's poetry, "convergence between realities takes place on

---

<sup>438</sup> See Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 339b.

<sup>439</sup> See Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 125b.

<sup>440</sup> Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 315a-316a, Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 334a-335a.

<sup>441</sup> *Ibid.*, fol. 335a-b.

<sup>442</sup> For a similar example in which humor is used to subvert social order and dissimulate the mystical experience, see Alexandre Papas's portrayal of the 17th century Central Asian mystic Mashrab in Alexandre Papas, *Mystiques et Vagabonds en Islam: Portraits de Trois Soufis Qalandar* (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 2010), 127-136.

the plane of the inconceivable and the singular.”<sup>443</sup> She designates this aspect of Kaygusuz Abdāl’s work as an “inversion of the natural order of things”<sup>444</sup> and defines its purpose as the creation of a language which will only be understood by a person of the same spiritual rank.<sup>445</sup> Elsewhere in his poetry, Kaygusuz makes various references to the importance of dissimulation:

*Fāş olmağıl Manşūr gibi cāhil saña ta’n itmesün  
‘Aşık gerek sırrı dā’im bīgāneden pinhān gerek*<sup>446</sup>

*Her sözüñ yirin bilüp ehline söyle söyleseñ  
Ki saqın şöbet içinde ehl-i inkār olmasun*<sup>447</sup>

*Cümle vücūdda cān ben oldum epsem ol  
Cān içinde cānān ben oldum epsem ol*<sup>448</sup>

*Sırruñı saqın ‘ārif iseñ naşiye virme  
Her bī-ħabere maħrem-i esrār dimek olmaz*<sup>449</sup>

*Söylesem oda yaqarlar şabr idersem ölürem  
Ol sebebdendür sözümü şöyle muğlaq söylerem*<sup>450</sup>

Do not divulge like Hallāj; do not let the ignorant condemn you  
The man of love must always keep his secret hidden from the stranger

You should know the place for each word and say it to the right people  
Make sure that among the company there are no men of denial

I have become the soul in all bodies; be quiet!  
I have become the beloved inside the soul; be quiet!

If you are a gnostic, do not present your secret to the foreigner  
One must not call every ignorant a confidant

If I speak, they will burn me in fire. If I keep to myself, I will die.  
That is why I speak with abstruse words

---

<sup>443</sup> Pinguet, “Remarques,” 33.

<sup>444</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>445</sup> Ibid., 21.

<sup>446</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 136b.

<sup>447</sup> Ibid., fol. 146b.

<sup>448</sup> Ibid., fol. 207a.

<sup>449</sup> Ibid., fol. 209a. Also see Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Gülistān*, fol. 237a.

<sup>450</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, fol. 305a. Also see the fifth couplet in the same poem.

Before I come back to the social context of the deliberate act of dissimulation undertaken by both poets, I wish to focus on the literary tools used, most notably the flagrant imagery. As shown by Pertev Naili Boratav in his *Zaman İçinde*, this type of imagery is taken directly from the *tekerleme* (tongue twisters<sup>451</sup>) which figure in the beginning of the *maşal* (fairy tales).<sup>452</sup> Boratav portrays a reciprocal relationship in which Kaygusuz makes use of the *tekerleme* as a literary medium and alternatively, in time his poems become *tekerlemes* with independent lives in the oral tradition.<sup>453</sup> A *naẓīre* (imitation poem) written by Niyāzī Mıṣrī (d. 1694) shows that Yūnus’s imitators were well aware of the affinity between the *tekerleme* and this type of poetry:

*Ṭadsız kabak gibi bir tekerleme söz ile  
Yūnuslayın Niyāzī ‘irfānı ārzūlarsın*<sup>454</sup>

With a tongue twister tasteless like a squash  
Niyazi, you desire the spiritual knowledge of Yūnus

Boratav identifies the purpose of the *tekerleme* as a way of introducing the audience to the world of the fairy tale, where the notion of reality in daily life will no longer hold.<sup>455</sup> When a *tekerleme* is spoken during the tale, it serves again to remind the audience that she is in a supernatural world where things simply do not have to make sense. Many times, the storyteller openly says that her craft is that of speaking lies –the exact expression found in Kaygusuz’s quatrain quoted above.

---

<sup>451</sup> This translation, although the closest, lacks validity. This is because this genre, which could be in verse or prose or both, does not aim at difficulty of pronunciation.

<sup>452</sup> The use of the indirect past tense also brings the poems closer to the fairy tale, which was traditionally told using this tense.

<sup>453</sup> Boratav gives the example of two *tekerlemes* born out of Kaygusuz’s poem quoted above. See Pertev Naili Boratav, *Zaman Zaman İçinde* (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2007), 49-50; 94-95 [First edition: 1958]. Moreover, his work includes a third *tekerleme* which treats the topic of predilection for food in a humorous language particularly similar to Kaygusuz’s *şatıyyes* on this topic; see *ibid.*, 95-97. Catherine Pinguet also makes reference to this reciprocal relationship between the *şatıyye* and the *tekerleme*; See Pinguet, “Remarques,” 15-18; Pinguet, *La Folle sagesse*, 93. However instead of seeing this imagery as a tool in what is openly expressed as an attempt at dissimulation, Pinguet is inclined to interpret it as an outcome of an ecstasy induced by the use of hashish.

<sup>454</sup> Tatçı, *Yūnus Emre Şerhleri*, 63; quoted in Pinguet, “Remarques,” 17; Pinguet, *La Folle sagesse*, 93.

<sup>455</sup> See Boratav, p. 40-59.



The *şatıyye* also has affinities with other genres of folk literature. In a voluminous anthology of folk literature, Doğan Kaya includes one *bilmece* (riddle) and one *mani*<sup>456</sup> (genre of folk poetry in quatrains), both of which seem to be in direct relationship to Kaygusuz's *şatıyye* beginning with the verse “*Kaplu kaplu bağalar / Kanatlanmış uçmağa* [Tur tur turtles / Have put on wings to fly], edited and translated at the end of the chapter.

*Mani*  
*Gittim arpa biçmeğe*  
*Eğildim su içmeğe*  
*Dediler yarin gelmiş*  
*Kanat açtım uçmağa*<sup>457</sup>

I went to harvest barley  
I bent down to drink water  
They said my beloved had arrived  
I opened my wings to fly

*Bilmece*  
*Masal masal matladı*  
*İki sıçan atladı*  
*Kurbağa kanatlandı*  
*Gelin çıktı çardağa*  
*Mart o...du bardağa*  
*Bardak iki parça oldu*  
*Gelinin yüzü kara oldu (Cevap: yazla kış)*<sup>458</sup>

The tale became astonished  
Two rats jumped  
The turtle put on wings to fly  
The bride went out to the bower  
The month of March farted in a glass  
The glass broke in two  
The bride turned red [literal: black] with shame (Answer: summer and winter)

These twentieth century examples from two separate folk genres indicate that Kaygusuz's poem lived on in the folk imagination in various forms, wherein the anonymous creators of these poems and riddles relied on Kaygusuz's *şatıyye* as a literary source from which they could readily improvise.<sup>459</sup>

---

<sup>456</sup> The word is considered to be a vernacularized form of the word *ma'nā* (meaning), which in time came to be associated with this type of folk poetry.

<sup>457</sup> Doğan Kaya, *Anonim Halk Şiiri* (Ankara: Akçağ, 1999), 30.

<sup>458</sup> *Ibid.*, 512.

<sup>459</sup> The genre of the *bektāşī fıkrası* (Bektashi anecdote), written examples of which date from the early 20th century, can also be considered in relation to Kaygusuz Abdāl's legacy. The majority of the anecdotes in the only known anthology derive their humor from the opposition between the representatives of exoteric religion (the *şofu*, *ʿālim*, *zāhid*) and the Bektashi *baba*. As such they squarely fit within the antinomian legacy established

Another aspect of the *şatıyye*'s affinity with the *tekerleme*, *bilmece*, and *mani* is in the source of imagery. Both Yūnus Emre and Kaygusuz Abdāl rely entirely on images from natural and social life for their *şatıyyes* and frequently use local proverbs and idioms. That is to say, they make absolutely no reference to Islamic terminology, although the content remains a hundred percent Islamic. This is evident in Kaygusuz's allegories of the base self in the poems mentioned above, where the base self appears in the forms of tasty food, physical comfort, wealth, and sexual freedom imagined as relationships with elderly women and pashas. The Islamic content can also be seen in the common interpretation of the first line of Yūnus Emre's *şatıyye* quoted above, "I climbed the branches of a plum tree and ate grapes there." The seven known classical commentaries of the poem all interpret this line as the act of a hypocrite Sufi who tries to obtain esoteric science from the tree of exoteric science.<sup>460</sup>

When compared with the majority of their poems<sup>461</sup> as well as their other works, where both authors exemplify an intricate knowledge of Sufi terminology, these poems display a deliberate choice on the part of their composers to reword their Sufi knowledge within the dominant folk tradition of their intended public. One famous example is Kaygusuz's allegory of the base self (*nefs*), which is portrayed as a goose that simply will not get cooked.<sup>462</sup> In Yūnus Emre's *şatıyye*, the line "I climbed the branches of a plum tree and ate grapes there" is followed by: "*Bostān ıssı kağıyup dir ne yirsin kozumı* [The owner of the orchard scolded me: 'Why are you devouring my walnuts!']". To interpret the couplet, the commentaries rely on the Doctrine of the Four Gates (*dört kapı*). They identify the plum as the gate of *şerī'at* (religious law), the grape as the gate of *tarīkat* (the path, meaning esoteric observance) and the walnut as the gate of *hakīkat* (truth, meaning unity with God).<sup>463</sup> It is thus safe to assume that the word *koz* (walnut) already had a frame of reference in the tradition, which the poets could tap into by way of metonymy.

---

by Kaygusuz Abdāl's sense of humor. See Dursun Yıldırım (ed.), *Türk Edebiyatında Bektaşî Fıkraları* (Ankara: Akçağ, 1999).

<sup>460</sup> See Tatçı, *Yūnus Emre Şerhleri*, 114-292.

<sup>461</sup> We must remember that such poems constitute only a small fraction of Kaygusuz Abdāl's poetry, although he has become identified with them in secondary literature. As stated above, Yūnus's original *şatıyye* is the only extant example of its kind in his corpus.

<sup>462</sup> See Gölpınarlı, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, 84-87.

<sup>463</sup> See Tatçı, *Yūnus Emre Şerhleri*, 164-166.

Non-religious genres of folk literature in Anatolian Turkish were only put down in writing from the seventeenth century onwards.<sup>464</sup> Therefore, we do not have the opportunity to explore the full network of intertextuality displayed by these *şâhiyye*. The similarity between a proverb and a phrase which figures in both Yūnus’s poem and that of Kaygūsuz<sup>465</sup> can be read as an indicator of a much wider web of references.<sup>466</sup> The very fact that the transfer from the Sufi conceptual framework to folkloric imagery, with absolutely no explanatory tools embedded within the text, suggest that the allegorical connotations of the imagery were immediately visible to their public. In his article entitled “Orality, Textuality, and Interpretation,” John Miles Foley explains the relationship folkloric texts have with oral tradition in the following manner:

Such richness of meaning derives from the simple fact that any performance or text –whether oral or oral derived- is not ‘the whole story.’ Its elements have life outside the narrow confinement of any given configuration, and that life is a matter not only of compositional utility but also of aesthetic content. The metonymy of phraseology or narrative pattern collectively constitute a kind of anaphora, or epiphora, in which the repeated elements occurs not in contiguous line or stanza but in a ‘contiguous’ performance or text in the poetic tradition, or, ultimately, in the contiguous yet unspoken tradition.<sup>467</sup>

It is by way of the ‘contiguous yet unspoken tradition’ that Yūnus and Kaygūsuz’s *şâhiyye* are able to communicate with their public and escape being interpreted as senseless. However, this unspoken tradition does much more than a transfer of symbols. It transposes the experiential aspect of the folk genre, in this case the *tekerleme*, to the realm of an Islamic mystical experience. As explained above, the *tekerleme* normally works to dissociate the listener of the *maşal* from his common sense of reality. In blurring the lines between truth and lie, between what is possible and what is not in the style of the *tekerleme*, the mystical poem creates a feeling of confusion in its audience, thus engendering an *experience of paradox*.

---

<sup>464</sup> The only exception to this is the *Book of Dede Korkut* put down in writing in the second half of the fifteenth century.

<sup>465</sup> See the phrase ‘Balık kavağa çıkmış’ [The fish climbed the poplar tree] in Yūnus Emre, *Yūnus Emre Dîvânı*, ed. Tatçı, 429 and Gölpinarlı, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, 68. It is almost identical with the proverb “balık kavağa çıkınca [when the fish climbs the poplar tree], indicating ‘never’ in a sarcastic tone.

<sup>466</sup> See Annemarie Schimmel, “Yunus Emre,” in Talat Halman (ed), *Yunus Emre and His Mystical Poetry* (Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, 1981), 73.

<sup>467</sup> John Miles Foley, “Orality, Textuality, and Interpretation,” in A. N. Doane and Carol Braun Pasternack (eds), *Vox Intexta: Orality and Textuality in the Middle Ages* (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 43.

This in turn, links the Turkish *şat̄hiyye* with its classical counterpart, the *shaṭh*, which is as we saw paradoxical in nature and involves the shattering of one's sense of self, which is the only way direct knowledge can appear.

The obvious question is: who is this experience intended for? Affinities in genre allow us to identify the public as those versed in folk tradition, in this case in the *tekerleme* and the *maşal*. This affinity is further stressed by the use of the syllabic meter by both poets, which ties them to the folk tradition as opposed to the classical tradition from which they borrow their religious content. A closer look at their corpuses reveals that both poets alternate between the syllabic and formal meters ('*arūz*') in accordance with their subject matter, terminology and thus intended audience.<sup>468</sup> While poems in formal meter ('*arūz*') typically manifest denser Sufi terminology, in the poems composed in the syllabic meter, social themes come to the forefront. All of this allows us to come to the following conclusion: In the case of the *şat̄hiyye*, the transfer of religious knowledge and experience from the realm of Sufi terminology to that of folk literature has a certain audience in mind.

Perhaps in delimiting the audience, we need to look at who it excludes. In the last line of his poem, Yūnus states that the excluded are none other than the 'hypocrites'. In fact, each couplet of the poem is a different allegory establishing a stark contrast between the hypocrite representative of exoteric religion and the true mystic. In another poem, Yūnus also posits this antagonism as one between religious practices:

*Ben bir kitāb okudum kalem anı yazmadı  
Mürekkab eyler isem yetmiye yidi deñiz*

*Ben oruç namāz için süci içdüm esridüm  
Tesbīh ü seccādeyçün diñledüm çeşte kopuz*

*Yūnus 'uñ bu sözinden sen ma 'nī añlarısañ  
Konya menāresini göresin bir çuvalduz<sup>469</sup>*

I read a book no pen has ever written  
If I were to put it into ink, seven seas would not suffice

For fasting and daily prayer I drank wine and became drunk  
For the rosary and prayer rug I listened to *çeşte* and *kopuz*.

---

<sup>468</sup> A striking example for this common practice in the Anatolian Sufi milieu is the work of Seyyid Seyfullāh Nizāmoğlu (d. 1601). Compare the form and language of his *ilāhīs* with his poem *Seyr-i kemāl*; see Vasfi Mahir Kocatürk (ed), *Tekke Şiri Antolojisi* (Ankara: Edebiyat Yayınevi, 1968), 233-240; Seyyid Seyfullāh, *Seyyid Seyfullah Külliyātu I: Manzum Eserler*, ed. Arzu Meral (Istanbul: Revak Kitabevi, 2014), 257-263.

<sup>469</sup> Yūnus Emre, *Risālat al-Nushiyya ve Dīvān*, 70 and 97b-98a.

If you understand the meaning of these words by Yūnus  
You shall see the minaret of Konya as a packing needle

While the first couplet here questions the nature of the knowledge exhibited by ‘learned’ religious scholars, the second couplet represents this clash as one between mere exoteric observance and intoxicated love and devotion to God, symbolized by Sufi rituals such as *samā*‘ (audition). The third couplet gives us the dynamic behind dissimulation: Yūnus’s words can only be understood by those who know that exoteric observance by itself is as small in the eyes of God as a packing needle.<sup>470</sup>

Similarly, in Kaygusuz Abdāl’s social criticisms, the word *sālūs* (hypocrite) comes to the forefront, paired usually as *zāhid-i sālūs* (the hypocrite ascetic), and less often as *sūfī-i sālūs* (the hypocrite Sufi). Kaygusuz is particularly disturbed by the so-called ‘teaching of Islam’ which has a central role in the hypocrite Sufi’s claim to religious authority:

*Diñle sözüüm añla zārum ben zāhidem nefşüm keffār*  
*Ĥalka naşihat eylerem ben duđaman kaldum nā-çār*<sup>471</sup>

*Zāhidem İslām yolunda ĥalkı da ‘vet eylerem*  
*Veli benüm naşihatüm hiç baña kılmaz eşer*<sup>472</sup>

Hear my words; understand my lament; I am an ascetic; my base self is an excessive infidel.  
I offer counsel to the people but I cannot hold my own advice; I have no remedy.

I am an ascetic; I summon people to the path of Islam  
Yet my own advice has no effect on me

In addition to this strong antagonism, there is a second aspect of Kaygusuz’s social self-positioning underlined by Ahmet T. Karamustafa: The fact that he “chose to blend in with regular people by avoiding special dress, urban speak and *sharī‘a* based recipes for social conduct and ritual.”<sup>473</sup> Thus the language Kaygusuz employed was a part of this effort to blend in, which would only be possible by an adaptation of folk elements and an inclination towards the formal aspects of folk tradition.

We can say that for both authors, those who are not meant to understand the poem’s content are the ‘hypocrite’ representatives of legalistic and exoteric religion. This is because

---

<sup>470</sup> Also revealing in this respect is Niyāzī Mısrī’s interpretation of the ninth couplet of Yūnus’s *şatıyye* as the self-concealment of the true gnostic when faced with the boasts of the hypocrite ascetic, which cause him to feign ignorance in his speech; see Tatcı, *Yūnus Emre Şerhleri*, 173-174.

<sup>471</sup> Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 145a.

<sup>472</sup> Ibid., fol. 145a.

<sup>473</sup> Karamustafa, “Kaygusuz Abdal,” 337.

the poem works by creating a paradox which confuses the base self (*nefs*) and collapses its defense system, while breaking down the person's sense of reality. This allows for the experiential truth to appear. Yet the exoteric observer's bond to the *nefs* is too strong, reinforced by a lifetime of self promotion through religious observation. Moreover, the poems are not meant to be understood by reason (*'aql*), even for their intended audience.<sup>474</sup> While discarding reason is an impossibility for the religious hypocrite, it is made possible for the common people through an experience that evokes familiar language and imagery, and is thus not entirely unrecognizable. Understanding only occurs by way of experience. The catch here is: this type of knowledge can be achieved by an audience which may be completely unfamiliar with Islamic terminology.

In his *Anatomy of Criticism*, Northrop Frye classifies literary genres according to their relationship to allegory: "Within the boundaries of literature we find a kind of sliding scale, ranging from the most explicitly allegorical, consistent with being literature at all, at one extreme, to the most elusive, anti-explicit and anti-allegorical at the other."<sup>475</sup> The example of the *ṣaṭḥiyye* offers a radically different dynamic, where the most allegorical can at the same time be the most anti-explicit. This in turn pushes the experience of the poem towards two opposite poles: The first is that of the common people who, although not necessarily versed in mystical terminology, still find familiar codes of symbolism and experience allowing them to participate in its meaning. The second is that of the official representatives of 'learned' Islam, who, despite their greater familiarity with Sufi concepts, are excluded from an experience of the poem due to their inability to break the face of reality and participate in the allegory as opposed to trying to decipher it mentally. As with the doctors of law faced with the classical *shāḥ*, the content of the poem remains unbelievable and scandalous to them.

Coming back to our earlier discussion of boundary-making, we can claim that the experience of the *ṣaṭḥiyye* is one which *performs* a social boundary. This understanding of boundaries via their performative character also allows us to refrain from seeing them as rigid categories. Boundaries are constantly negotiated in individual and communal contexts, which partake in their maintenance while allowing for perpetual shifts and cross-overs. The example

---

<sup>474</sup> As discussed in the second chapter, for Kaygusuz Abdal, this capacity which is denied to the intellect belongs to the faculty of love; see Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşā*, 110-111; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 53, 55; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Serāy-nāme*, fol. 31b, 39a [*Saray-nāme*, 234-235, 264-265]; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, fol. 280a, 282b; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Mesnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz*, 126-127, 141.

<sup>475</sup> Northrop Frye, *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957), 89.

of the *şatıyye* demonstrates to us that the performative character of poetry was an integral aspect of the performance of personal and communal identity. In fact, going back to our discussion in the first chapter, we can say that for *Ḳayğusuz*, the refusal of a fixed identity was also expressed via the performative opportunities of poetry. A comparison of his poetry with his prose shows us that the “multi-perspectival” quality of his work is much more pronounced in his poetry. While doctrinal and terminological shifts occur perhaps once every page in his prose, they appear as often as every two couplets in his poetry. This allows us to speculate that poetry probably was a greater tool in *Ḳayğusuz*’s eyes in the way it allowed for 1) the possibility of speaking simultaneously to a multiplicity of people of various spiritual levels 2) the performance of social categories and personas which he could negate or reinforce at his will. We should remember in this context that *Ḳayğusuz Abdāl* is rightly credited as the founder of “Alevi Bektashi literature.” The importance he devotes to poetry acquires greater meaning in light of the liturgical, doctrinal, social, and spiritual roles of poetry in the Alevi-Bektashi religious system.

What unites *Ḳayğusuz*’s various purposes in using poetry as his medium of performance is the *experiential* effect on which each of these rely. As such, poetry serves to stimulate a change in the person of the listener, via an intricate balance between what the listener can and cannot understand. We can further link this notion with the social persona of the dervish, which also has a similar experiential effect. In one of his poems, *Ḳayğusuz* defines his physical look as an act of dissimulation aimed at engendering misunderstanding and confusion:

*Ḳayğusuz Abdāl genci bulduñise saklağıl  
Şüretüñ vîrân eyle gören bid‘at şansun*<sup>476</sup>

*Ḳayğusuz Abdāl*, if you have found the treasure, hide it  
Ruin your appearance, so that those who see will mistake it for an innovation

Once again, this confusion is only directed at the authoritarian religious authority. The men of love (*‘āşık*), the saints (*evliyā*) and the righteous of the folk all agree on his sainthood. In fact, this agreement is made possible precisely because a line is drawn between the ‘learned’ and the folk, where the authoritarian claims to *Ḳayğusuz*’s infidelity do not hold in the general public. Despite all efforts to the contrary, the common people knew that, when *Ḳayğusuz* said

---

<sup>476</sup> *Ḳayğusuz Abdāl*, *Dîvān*, fol. 213b. The word *bid‘at* appears as *bida‘at* in the manuscript for metric reasons.

“*Bunca yalan sözile gire misin uçmağa* [With so many lies, you still think you will enter heaven?]”, he meant the official representatives of Islam.

The exclusion of aygusuz Abdāl from all bibliographical dictionaries, despite his enormous corpus of writing, indicates that in the case of aygusuz, the boundary-making worked both ways. This, however, in no way meant his exclusion from poetry *mecmū* ‘as and Sufi education repertoires, as evidenced by a proliferation of both his individual poems and copies of his works. Also telling in this respect is the contrast between Yūnus Emre’s commonly accepted sainthood and the chief *mufitī*’s *fatwā* indicating that his poem must be considered *kūfr* (infidelity), in an era when confessional boundaries were harshly strengthened.<sup>477</sup> This, however, was a fight Islamic authorities could not win, as Yūnus’s mystical understanding of Islam permeated all social strata in the Ottoman realm. On the other hand, aygusuz Abdāl’s strand of *abdāl* piety remained mostly limited to Bektashi and Alevi circles, and became a central element of their religious views and practices.

## Conclusion

The view of dervish groups as bearers of Islam to the Anatolian ‘rural’ environment and Turkmen tribes in particular, set forward by Fuad Köprülü and developed further by his successors, had several shortcomings: it set a strict dichotomy between urban and rural modes of piety, despite evidence to the contrary; it described dervish piety as an inadequate representation of Islam, a syncretism based primarily on pre-Islamic beliefs, although the textual production by the same dervish groups showed no signs of pre-Islamic belief. Dervish poets wrote in plain Turkish not because they lacked the type of education which would allow them to use Persian and Arabic words, but because their relationship with their audience demanded it. This relationship also led them to take part in a repositioning of their religious knowledge and experience within the context of the popular tradition surrounding them. This was made possible by a merging of the genres and concepts of Classical Sufi literature with those of folk tradition. A vernacular language of Islam was thus formed not as a simple act of translation from one language to another, but as a transfer of a form of mystical knowledge and experience into its closest parallels in the folkloric realm.

---

<sup>477</sup> See Mehmet Ertuğrul Düzdağ, *Şeyhülislām Ebussuud Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı* (Istanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1972), 87.



Furthermore, Köprülü's paradigm missed a main dynamic at play: the boundaries he perceived between legalistic and mystic understandings of Islam in Anatolia were neither territorial nor essential. They were continually performed by actors on both sides, open to shifts and changes depending on the immediate context. In this sense, the earliest examples of the Anatolian *şâhiyye* show that the transfer of Sufi knowledge into the realm of folk literature also formed and performed a boundary: it allowed the common people to participate in a type of mystical experience from which Islamic authorities were *de facto* excluded. This dynamic interplay of inclusion and exclusion was at the heart of the emerging Turco-Islamic landscape, as well as the poetic foundation of what later became Alevi-Bektashi literature.

## Appendix I<sup>478</sup>

*Çıkıdum erik dalına anda yidüm üzümü  
Bostān ıssı kaçkıyup dir ne yirsin kozumu*

*Kirpiç koydum kazğana poyrazıla kaynatdum  
Nedür diyü şorana bandum virdüm özünü*

*İplik virdüm çulhaya şarup yumağ itmemiş  
Be-cidd işmarlar gelsün alsun bezini*

*Bir serçenüñ kanadın kırk kañluya yükletdüm  
Çifti dağı çekmedi kaldı şöyle yazılı*

*Bir sinek bir kartalı kaldurup urdı yire  
Yalan degül gerçekdür ben de gördüm tozını*

*Balık kavağa çıkmış zift turşusun yimege  
Leylek koduk toğurmuş baş a şunuñ sözünü*

*Bir küt ile güreşdüm elsüz ayağum aldı  
Güreşüp başamadum göyündürdi özümü*

*Kāf tağından bir taşu şöyle atdılar baña  
Öylelik yola düşdi bozayazdı yüzümü*

*Gözsüze fışıldadum şağır sözüm işitmiş  
Dilsüz çağırup söyler dilümdeki sözümü*

*Bir öküz boğazladum kaçıldum sere kodum  
Öküz ıssı geldi eydür boğazladuñ kazumu*

*Uğrılık yapdum ana bühtān eyledi baña  
Bir çerçi geldi eydür kanı alduñ gözgümü*

*Tosbağaya uğradum gözsüzsepek yoldaşı  
Şordum sefer kancaru Kayseriye 'azîmi*

*Yūnus bir söz söylemiş hiçbir söze beñzemez  
Münāfıklar elinden örter ma 'nī yüzünü*

I climbed the branches of a plum tree and ate grapes there  
The owner of the orchard scolded me: 'Why are you devouring  
my walnuts!'

I put sun-dried mud in the cauldron, boiled it with the north-east  
wind  
When someone asked me what it was, I dipped and gave it to  
him

I gave yarn to the weaver, but he failed to wind it into a ball  
He exhorts in a serious tone: 'Tell him to come get his cloth!'

I loaded the wings of a sparrow on forty ox carts  
The spans could not pull them; so they remained as was their lot

A fly lifted an eagle and threw it on the ground  
This is the truth, not a lie; I myself saw the rising dust

The fish climbed the poplar tree to eat pickles of tar  
The stork gave birth to a donkey foal; hear what he says!

I wrestled with a cripple; with no hands he grabbed my legs  
I fought but could not beat him; he burned me inside

From the mountain of Kaf they threw a rock at me  
It fell on such a spot that it almost destroyed my face<sup>479</sup>

I whispered to the blind; the deaf heard my words  
The mute screams and shouts the words on my tongue

I slaughtered an ox, threw it on the ground  
Its owner came and said: 'You strangled my goose!'

I stole from him; he falsely accused me  
A peddler came and said: 'You took my mirror; where is it?'

I ran into the tortoise; the mole was his companion  
I asked: 'Where to?' He was sprinting towards Kayseri

Yūnus has spoken words like no other  
They hide the face of meaning from the hands of hypocrites

<sup>478</sup> Yūnus Emre, *Yūnus Emre Divānı*, ed.

Tatçı, 428-430 (The diacritics on the poem  
have been added by me).

<sup>479</sup> Although Tatçı prefers the word 'yire,' the  
word 'yola' appears in a larger number of

copies. The translation which would match the meaning given  
to the line in the commentaries would be: 'It fell on half a day's  
road and almost destroyed my face.'

## Appendix II <sup>480</sup>

*Ƙaplu ƙaplu bağalar ƙanatlanmış uçmağa  
Dirilmiş kertenkele bile ƙonup göçmege*

*Bir püre bir muş tuzı götürmiş şehre gider  
Geh segirdür geh yiler ƙamle ider uçmağa*

*Allāhı bile gide üç balıcağ ƙışlamış  
Şusuzluğdan buñalmış ƙañlı ister göçmege*

*İki çay ortasında böcek tohūm ekmiş  
Dirilmiş sivri siñek imeci gelmiş biçmege*

*Ƙurbağa gül yüzinde bir çift lecek bir tutmuş  
Toşbağa kille almış gelmiş çeçin ölçmege*

*Üyez dahı ok yay almış tağda tavşan avlar  
Ayuyı beliñletmiş toñuz turur ƙaçmağa*

*Bir kepelek bir müşuñ depmiş oyluğın şımış  
Sivri siñekden ƙorğmuş kömüş ağzın açmağa*

*Kömüş ƙamama girmiş tana dellāklık eyler  
Deve ƙapuya gelmiş destūr ister göçmege*

*Ƙarınca bir deveyi başmış āmūhte eylemiş  
Bir ƙaç yārenler ister tenhā yirde içmege*

*Amasya ırmağında leklek köpri eylemiş  
Yükli yükli ördekler gelmiş andan geçmege*

Tur tur turtles<sup>481</sup> put on wings to fly  
Lizards gathered together to migrate as nomads

A flea carries a *muş*<sup>482</sup> of salt into town  
At times it walks; at times it runs; it makes an effort to fly

To know and reach God three little fish passed the winter  
Sweltered with dehydration they want oxcarts to migrate

Bugs planted seeds in between two streams<sup>483</sup>  
Mosquitoes gathered together to work in a group and harvest  
the crops<sup>484</sup>

The frog hid its beautiful face with a pair of veils  
The tortoise bought a mosquito net and came to measure his  
heap of grain

The horsefly took a bow and arrow and went to the mountains  
to hunt rabbits<sup>485</sup>  
The pig awakened the bear; it makes a move to escape

A butterfly kicked a mouse and broke its thigh bone<sup>486</sup>  
The water buffalo got scared of the mosquito and could not  
open its mouth

The water buffalo went to the public bath where the calf works  
as a shampooer  
The camel came to the door to ask permission for his journey

The ant defeated the camel and taught him a lesson<sup>487</sup>  
It wants a few friends to go drinking in a secluded place

The stork built a bridge on the river of Amasya  
Ducks came full of loads to pass the bridge

<sup>480</sup> Ƙayğusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, Ankara Milli Kütüphane MS. Mil Yz A 7621/2, fol. 314a-b. For a version of the poem which is almost entirely different, see Gölpinarlı, *Ƙayğusuz Abdal*, 68-70. In the edition, the poem is incorrectly displayed in quatrain form. The poem does not figure in the oldest copy of Ƙayğusuz’s poetry collection, dated slightly earlier (907/1501-2).

<sup>481</sup> While the word “ƙaplubāğa” means turtle, the word “ƙaplu” means “covered” or “with a

shell,” thus creating an additional level of word play not visible in the English translation.

<sup>482</sup> A unit of mass.

<sup>483</sup> The line has a metrical error.

<sup>484</sup> The line has a metrical error.

<sup>485</sup> The caesural pause in this line does not fit the rest of the poem.

<sup>486</sup> In the manuscript, the word *müş* was changed to *kömüş* as a way of correction. However, this correction disrupts the meter.

<sup>487</sup> The line has a metrical error.

*Amasyanuñ çayları şusuzlukdan kurumış  
Sivasuñ mināresi egilmiş su içmege*

*Yarasa bir karyı almış yaruğa çıkmış  
Bir koca ister bulunmaz ol karı çoçmağa*

*Çakal tavuğa gelmiş kızın oğluna diler  
Dilkü tavşana binmiş gider saçu saçmağa*

*Eşek torbasıyile āhürdan çıkmış gider  
Geh segirdür ağırur varıban şu içmege*

*Kaygusuzuñ sözleri Hindistānuñ kozları  
Bunca yalan sözile gire misin uçmağa*

The rivulets of Amasya dried up with lack of water  
The minaret of Sivas bent down to drink water

The bat took an old woman and left its den(?)  
The woman wants a husband to be intimate with but cannot find  
one<sup>488</sup>

The coyote visited the chicken to ask his daughter's hand in  
marriage to his son  
The fox mounted the rabbit; together they go to distribute  
wedding gifts

The donkey left the stable with its sack  
At times it runs; at times it brays; it goes to drink water

These words by Kaygusuz, the walnuts of India  
With so many lies, you still think you will enter heaven?

---

<sup>488</sup> The caesural pause in this line does not fit  
the rest of the poem.

## Chapter 4

### Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's Legacy: The Religious Doctrines of the Abdālān-ı Rūm

Our in-depth study of Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's works has shown us that in the vernacular milieu of the *abdāl* tradition, form and audience are vital in establishing content. Thus, as students of religion we must couple our historical approach with a literary understanding. Genre is not simply an empty shell which an author fills with his thought. By instituting or breaking convention, by establishing a type of audience, genre creates content.

In this chapter, I wish to undertake a close reading of five texts belonging to *abdāls* whose life spans range from the late 14<sup>th</sup> to the early 17<sup>th</sup> centuries. The texts I have chosen are Şādīḳ Abdāl's *Dīvān*, Yemīnī's *Fazīlet-nāme*, Şemsī's *Deh Murğ*, and Vīrānī Abdāl's *Risāle* and *Dīvān*. My choice of these works resulted from the availability of their editions, the size of the works which provided an adequate amount of material for study, the range of their audiences and time periods.<sup>489</sup> A study of these texts side by side, hoping to be the first of its kind for the *abdāl*

---

<sup>489</sup> Thus for instance I did not include Seher Abdāl's (d. after 901/1495-6) two edited works: the *Sa'ādet-nāme* and the *Halvā vü Nān*, due to their small size (501 couplets for the *Sa'ādet-nāme*, which is a translation of the work of the same name by Nāşir-i Khusraw, and 138 couplets for the *Halvā vü Nān*). See Seher Abdāl, *Sa'ādet-nāme*, in Mustafa Özağaç (ed), "Seher Abdal'ın Saadet-nāme İsimli Mesnevîsi (Metin-Muhteva-Tahlil)," Master's Thesis, İzmir, 9 Eylül Üniversitesi, 2009, 88-149; Fatma Sabiha Kutlar, "Seher Abdal'ın Helvâ vü Nân'ı," *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Dergisi* 56 (2010): 261-294. An evaluation of Seher Abdāl's thought would also have required a study of the other unedited works attributed to him, such as the *Şerh-i Tercî'-i Evhadü'd-dîn Kirmânî* and the *Velâyet-nāme-i 'Alî Kerremallāhu Vecchû Penc Püser*, which is beyond the scope of this study. I did not include Ḳayretî's (d. 941/1534) poetry, due to his character as a *dīvān* poet. For his references to his *abdāl* temperament, see Ḳayretî, *Dīvān*, ed. Mehmed Çavuşoğlu and M. Ali Tanyeri (Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1981), 19-21 and 91-99. I was unable to obtain a copy of the following edited *Dīvān* of the 16th century poet Muhyiddīn Abdāl: Bayram Durbilmez, "Muhyiddin Abdal Divanı (inceleme-tenkitli metin)," PhD Dissertation, Elazığ, Fırat University, 1998. Due to the scope of my study, I had to exclude the unedited works attributed to Şemsī, Şīrī, Vīrānī, and Ḳayretî in the catalogues, which need to be investigated for their correct attribution. I also could not include the only known copy of the 16th century poet Kelāmī's *Dīvān*; see Kelāmī, *Dīvān*, Istanbul, Yapı Kredi Sermet Çifter Araştırma Kütüphanesi Yazmaları, 611, 138 fols. I had to disclude all the poets whose poetries have only survived in poetry collections (*cönk* and *mecmû'a*), due to the great methodological difficulties that this medium entails. It remains to say that such collections are arguably the least employed sources of our research field, which

milieu, confronts us first and foremost with the great heterogeneity of this milieu's religious doctrines. The deification of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib in one text can be replaced with the establishment of Muḥammad's higher rank in another. The importance given to miracles in some of the texts can be completely disregarded in others.

Some of these differences result from the selected audience and genre. Şādık Abdāl's *Dīvān* consists mostly of didactic poems teaching the lay adherent and novice the pillars of the Bektashi path. Thus, although it is not intended for those in the highest spiritual rank, it does not speak to the society at large, but rather to those with some relation to the Bektashi milieu. Yemīnī's *Fazīlet-nāme*, on the other hand, is an epic work written for the general public: the holy warriors and those who love the Prophet's family. Şemsī's *Deh Murğ* is a work of classical literature dedicated to a sultan and thus the product of numerous discretions on the part of its author. Vīrānī Abdāl's *Risāle* is a didactic treatise written for the wayfarer. His *Dīvān* is an intimate testimony to Vīrānī's spiritual journey which he shares with those of equally high spiritual rank. Perhaps the difference between Vīrānī's *Dīvān* and *Risāle* demonstrate above any other the importance of genre in establishing points of doctrine.

Face to face with its divergent and rich corpus, this chapter's intentions remain nonetheless humble: It aims to be nothing more than a cross-section of some of the doctrinal and social perspectives circulating in the *abdāl* milieu from the late 14th to the early 17th centuries. In addition to a number of other texts which wait to be studied, the great corpus of individual poems by authors with *abdāl* or Bektashi affiliation in poetry collections remains virtually untouched. For this reason, I do not aim to reach a definitive conclusion on the evolution of *abdāl* thought and practice, although some of my preliminary findings in this regard will be explained at the end of the chapter.

### Şādık Abdāl's *Dīvān*

Şādık Abdāl's *Dīvān* is our main source on his life. According to this work, Şādık Abdāl became acquainted with Bektashi doctrine at the age of thirteen, when he heard the words of a

---

can provide us with a mine of information when approached with the right methodology. For a list of *abdāl* poets, see Doğan Kaya, "Cönklerden Gün Işığına: Abdal Mahlaslı Halk Şairleri," *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Makaleleri* 2 (2003): 121-144; Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 74-75; Ocak, *Kalenderiler*, 226-228.

certain Dervīş Meḥmed belonging to the lodge of Seyyid ‘Alī Sulṭān (d. after 815/1412), famous *ḡāzī* and dervish who played a major role in Ottoman conquests in Rumelia.<sup>490</sup> Şādık Abdāl became Seyyid ‘Alī Sulṭān’s disciple at the age of twenty-two and began writing poetry at the age of twenty-four.<sup>491</sup> Considering that Seyyid ‘Alī Sulṭān died shortly after 815 (1412), Şādık Abdāl must have been born in the years before 1390. In his poetry, Şādık Abdāl refers to Ḥacı Bektāş, Abdāl Mūsā, Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, and Otman Baba (d. 883/ 1478). However, he does not refer to the famous figures of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, such as Balım Sulṭān or Aḳyazılı Sulṭān. This indicates that Şādık Abdāl probably lived up to the 1460s.<sup>492</sup>

While the only known copy of the *Dīvān* is dated 1155 (1742),<sup>493</sup> the lack of references to important Bektashi figures who lived after Şādık Abdāl’s time illustrates that no major revisions were made by the copyist or other earlier copyists.<sup>494</sup> Şādık Abdāl’s *Dīvān* consists of sixty-six poems in the order of a *müretteb* (regularly arranged) *dīvān*, wherein the order of the poems follows the alphabetical order of the last letters of the rhymes. In his work Şādık Abdāl states that

---

<sup>490</sup> For the most extensive treatment of Seyyid ‘Alī Sulṭān’s life, see Rıza Yıldırım, *Seyyid Ali Sultan (Kızıldeli) ve Velâyetnâmesi* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007). Seyyid ‘Alī Sulṭān participated in conquests in Rumelia during the reigns of Orḡan and Murād I. He was awarded a waqf plot of land by the Ottoman sultan (Bāyezīd I according to the hagiography, but Murād I as demonstrated by the archive documents), on which he built his famous lodge near Didymoteicho (Dimetoka). Some of the information in his hagiography is corroborated by the hagiography of Abdāl Mūsā, where Seyyid ‘Alī Sulṭān is portrayed as Abdāl Mūsā’s disciple. This work credits Abdāl Mūsā with sending Seyyid ‘Alī Sulṭān first to the lodge in Ḥacı Bektāş, then to Rumelia for conquest (See *Abdal Musa Velâyetnâmesi*, 147-149). Seyyid ‘Alī Sulṭān is the name holder of the ceremonial seat of the cook (*aşçı*) in the Bektashi ceremonial room. His lodge is one of the four Bektashi lodges holding the rank of *khalīfa*.

<sup>491</sup> See Şādık Abdāl, *Sādık Abdāl Dīvānı*, ed. Dursun Gümüšoḡlu (Istanbul: Horasan Yayınları, 2009), 144-146.

<sup>492</sup> See *ibid.*, 13.

<sup>493</sup> It was copied in Alexandria by a copyist named Rüstem Abdāl. The copyist makes many orthographical mistakes throughout the text, some of which may have passed on from previous copyists. Dursun Gümüšoḡlu provides a facsimile of the manuscript at the end of his edition. According to him, the manuscript is located at the Konya Regional Library, under the class mark 894-35.1. I was told by the librarians that the class mark is incorrect. I have not been able to locate the manuscript. Some of Şādık Abdāl’s poems are also located in a poetry collection dating from the early twentieth century; see *Mecmū‘a-i eş‘ār*, Ankara Milli Kütüphane Yazmalar Koleksiyonu, 06 Mil Yz B 170 (undated).

<sup>494</sup> Rıza Yıldırım also underlines the same point in the following article: Rıza Yıldırım, “Muhabbetten Tarikata: Bektaşî Tarikati’nin Oluşum Sürecinde Kızıldeli’nin Rolü,” *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Dergisi* 53 (2010): 153-190.

he wrote the poems in sixty-six days.<sup>495</sup> The references to Otman Baba, when considered together with the information that Şādık Abdāl began writing poetry at the age of twenty-four, imply that the poems were written not in consecutive sixty-six days, but over the course of Şādık Abdāl's life. Alternatively, Şādık Abdāl could have discarded his earlier poems and only kept the poems written in a certain period towards the end of his life. However, as we will see, the content of some of his poems seem to suggest that they were written early in Şādık Abdāl's spiritual career.

Şādık Abdāl was definitely well educated, probably more so than most of his fellow *abdāls*. His language dense with Arabic and Persian is proof of this fact. He also has some couplets in Persian,<sup>496</sup> suggesting that he may have been proficient in this language. The vocabulary list added to the end of the work by one of the copyists indicates that Şādık Abdāl's readers in the *abdāl* milieu were not generally equipped to understand the elevated language of his poems.

Yet Şādık Abdāl's elevated language does not disrupt his antinomian tendency, due to which he frequently criticizes ascetics and religious scholars. He blames ascetics for hoping to become saints through ascetic discipline and ritual worship.<sup>497</sup> He attacks them for taking bribes<sup>498</sup> and admonishes religious scholars for their attachment to the values of the world of multiplicity.<sup>499</sup> He advises his readers to keep away from those who perform the daily prayers with hypocrisy. He underlines the importance of distinguishing the false Sufis, sheikhs, and dervishes, who make a show of excessive asceticism.<sup>500</sup> He calls such persons "the people of fear and desire (*ehl-i hayf u recā*)"<sup>501</sup> and states that the Perfect Man has abandoned both of these.

Similar to Kaygusuz Abdāl, the people of the world fail to recognize Şādık Abdāl for who he really is. Some of them praise him while some belittle him<sup>502</sup>; both are incapable of seeing beyond the exoteric. Again reminding us of similar passages in Kaygusuz Abdāl, Şādık Abdāl

---

<sup>495</sup> See *Sādık Abdāl Dîvânı*, 222.

<sup>496</sup> See *ibid.*, 191, 196. The Persian topic sentences and the indication of meter which precede each poem probably belong to Rüstem Abdāl or a previous copyist; see Gümüšoğlu, 12.

<sup>497</sup> See *ibid.*, 103, 115.

<sup>498</sup> See *ibid.*, 218.

<sup>499</sup> See *ibid.*, 176.

<sup>500</sup> See *ibid.*, 116.

<sup>501</sup> See *ibid.*, 99.

<sup>502</sup> See *ibid.*, 122 and 167.



says that the dervish does not wear special dress like the ascetics because he has completely subdued his base self and needs no confirmation from the outside world.<sup>503</sup> Moreover, Şādık Abdāl makes frequent reference to the importance of seclusion, which can protect the wayfarer from the people of hypocrisy.<sup>504</sup> Seclusion brings the dervish closer to the divine solitude of God.<sup>505</sup> Such passages can perhaps be read as an indication of Şādık Abdāl’s detachment from his urban origins, which his high level of education seems to indicate.

Ritual obligations are rarely mentioned in Şādık Abdāl’s work. The only such references are to daily prayer, one of which has already been underlined. The second reference occurs in the couplet below:

*Ƙıl namāzın āşikāre sırrile hem Ƙıl niyāz  
Ol namāz dūrüst niyāz dur fehm iderseñ bī-gümān*<sup>506</sup>

Perform your daily prayer openly; complement it with your secret entreaty  
If you understand this without doubt, daily prayer is sound entreaty

The couplet indicates that the exoteric observance of daily prayer is not denied, however the emphasis is put on its inner meaning.<sup>507</sup>

Unlike the works we will discuss below, the Shi’ite practices of *tawallā* (love of the *ahl al-bayt*) and *tabarrā* (dissociation from the *ahl al-bayt*’s adversaries) do not appear as concepts in Şādık Abdāl’s *Dīvān*. The same can be said for Hūrūfī doctrine.<sup>508</sup> These absences indicate that these doctrinal elements had not yet become prevalent in *abdāl* doctrine in the fifteenth century. On the other hand, the Bektashi path seems to have been firmly established at this time. Şādık Abdāl frequently uses the words *tarīķ-i bektāşī* or *rāh-ı bektāşī* to refer to this path. His descriptions indicate that he understood entry to the path as the act of becoming a disciple in a Bektashi lodge. As Rıza Yıldırım also underlines in his “Muhabbetten Tarikata,” Şādık Abdāl’s

<sup>503</sup> See *ibid.*, 200.

<sup>504</sup> See *ibid.*, 171, 173, 174, 175, 218.

<sup>505</sup> See *ibid.*, 201.

<sup>506</sup> *Ibid.*, 189 and 29a. All quotations from the work have been transliterated directly from the facsimile.

<sup>507</sup> For a discussion of Şādık Abdāl’s treatment of ritual prayer, see Mark Soileau, “Conforming Haji Bektash: A Saint and His Followers between Orthopraxy and Heteropraxy,” *Die Welt des Islams* 54/3-4 (2014): 432-433.

<sup>508</sup> One such reference can be found in the text; see *ibid.*, 171.

*Dīvān* is the oldest source in which the word Bektāšī openly denotes an organized path.<sup>509</sup> However, the details of Bektashi practices are not given in the text. All we know from the *Dīvān* is that the people of the Bektāšī path wear the Alif cap (*elīfī tāc*),<sup>510</sup> also referred to as the Bektashi cap (*Bektāšī tāc*).<sup>511</sup>

Şādık Abdāl speaks reverently of Ƙayğusuz Abdāl. He states that understanding Ƙayğusuz Abdāl’s *Dil-güşā* will lead the wayfarer to the secret of God.<sup>512</sup> In his second reference to Ƙayğusuz, Şādık Abdāl mentions Ƙayğusuz’s royal origin as narrated in his hagiography:

*Dağı şādıklarun ol reh-nümāsı Ƙayğusuz Abdāl  
Ki a ‘lā cāh ile tūğun fedā kıldı bilā emlāk*<sup>513</sup>

Kaygusuz Abdal, the faithful’s guide to the path  
He abandoned his high position and signs of rank to live without property

This is followed by a narration of Ƙayğusuz Abdāl’s attainment of *walāya* and references to his miracles, such as his healing of the sultan of Egypt narrated in his hagiography. Yet Ƙayğusuz Abdāl is not identified with the pole (*ķutb*), the highest rank in the spiritual hierarchy. As we will see, this is reserved for Ƙayğusuz Abdāl’s contemporary Seyyid ‘Alī Sulţān.

After the death of Seyyid ‘Alī Sulţān, the rank of pole is transferred to Otman Baba. In one of his poems, Şādık Abdāl identifies Otman Baba as the pole, to whom he also refers as Ğanī Şāh and Hüsām Şāh.<sup>514</sup> This poem can perhaps be considered to have been written towards the end of Şādık Abdāl’s life. In the same poem, Şādık says that dervishes named Hızır Baba and Ƙara Baba are in fact Otman Baba’s exoteric dimension, in whom he has manifested himself.<sup>515</sup>

<sup>509</sup> See Yıldırım, “Muhabbeten Tarikata,” 165. In this respect Şādık Abdāl’s *Dīvān* is followed by Otman Baba’s hagiography.

<sup>510</sup> See *Sādık Abdāl Dīvānı*, 150. In two instances Hacı Bektāş is described as wearing this cap; see *ibid.*, 134, 149. In one instance Seyyid ‘Alī Sulţān is wearing it; see *ibid.*, 135. For the Alif cap, see Ağirdemir, “Bektaşilikte Taç Şekilleri,” 369; Birge, 37, n.3.

<sup>511</sup> See *ibid.*, 75, 125, 182. For another reference to the Bektashi lodge, see *ibid.*, 187.

<sup>512</sup> See *ibid.*, 66, 162.

<sup>513</sup> *Ibid.*, 161 and 23b.

<sup>514</sup> See *ibid.*, 74, 75. According to his hagiography, Hüsām Şāh was Otman Baba’s real name.

<sup>515</sup> Ƙara Baba wore the Bektashi cap and followed the pillars of the path at Seyyid ‘Alī Sulţān’s lodge. He asked for and was given license, as expressed by his receipt of the *şofra* (meal) and the *ķerāğ* (lamp). After obtaining his license, he moved near a town named Taşlık Köyü on the Mediterranean shore. See *ibid.*, 75-76.

There is no indication in Şādīk Abdāl's work that he met either Kaygusuz Abdāl or Otman Baba. Both meetings would have been entirely possible, since we know that Kaygusuz Abdāl travelled in the Balkans and Otman Baba spent a good portion of his life there.

Ḥacı Bektāş, Abdāl Mūsā, and Seyyid 'Alī Sulṭān are intimately linked to one another in Şādīk Abdāl's poetry, where they play a central role. According to Şādīk Abdāl, Ḥacı Bektāş's "secret" (*sirr*) passed onto Abdāl Mūsā, who transferred it to Seyyid 'Alī Sulṭān. They are thus consequent manifestations of the same secret, the source of which is 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib.

Sometimes references to Abdāl Mūsā are skipped in this line of transmission and Seyyid 'Alī Sulṭān is referred to as the secret of Ḥacı Bektāş or 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. The *seyyid* statuses of both Seyyid 'Alī Sulṭān and Ḥacı Bektāş are underlined as they are depicted as relatives.<sup>516</sup> The portrayals of Ḥacı Bektāş, Abdāl Mūsā, and Seyyid 'Alī Sulṭān focus largely on the miracles they perform. The abundant references indicate that Şādīk Abdāl has read the hagiographies of all three figures<sup>517</sup> or is familiar with them through oral lore.

Ḥacı Bektāş is referred to as 'Alī's secret,<sup>518</sup> indicating that he is the manifestation of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. He is the object of desire (*maṭlūb*) and purpose (*maḫşūd*) of all beings in the universe, who take refuge in him.<sup>519</sup> His lodge resembles the Ka'ba and his path resembles the ship of Noah.<sup>520</sup> He is identical to the creator (*ḥāliḳ*), the bountiful maker who revolves the world, in whose love wayfarers let go of themselves. His *Maḳālāt* is proof to union with God, told by way of allusions.<sup>521</sup> Ḥacı Bektāş is referred to as the pole (*ḳutb*) of this world and the hereafter. He has many names spoken in all languages.<sup>522</sup> The attainment of *walāya* by any wayfarer depends on the wayfarer's relationship to him.<sup>523</sup> In fact, the path to salvation of all beings is decided and acted upon by Ḥacı Bektāş. The janissaries are but one example of this. The phrase

---

<sup>516</sup> See *ibid.*, 105-106.

<sup>517</sup> For Ḥacı Bektāş, see *ibid.*, 59, 60, 63, 134; for Abdāl Mūsā, see *ibid.*, 108-109; for Seyyid 'Alī Sulṭān, see *ibid.*, 104, 136, 152-153, 183.

<sup>518</sup> See *ibid.*, 125, 147.

<sup>519</sup> See *ibid.*, 133.

<sup>520</sup> See *ibid.*, 133.

<sup>521</sup> See *ibid.*, 134.

<sup>522</sup> See *ibid.*, 181.

<sup>523</sup> See *ibid.*, 208-209.

“*şecā ‘atle nazar kılmış yeñiçer kullarına ol*”<sup>524</sup> (he gazed at his janissary servants with bravery) indicates that the cult of Hacı Bektāş had already been linked to the Janissary corps in Şādık Abdāl’s time.<sup>525</sup>

As mentioned before, Hacı Bektāş’s spiritual knowledge is carried over to Abdāl Mūsā. Phrases such as “*zāhirde nazar kılmış aña Sulţān Hacı Bektāş*” (in the exoteric world, Hacı Bektāş gazed at him)<sup>526</sup> indicate a sheikh-disciple relationship between them in the physical world, although in the esoteric realm they are essentially identical. Similar to Hacı Bektāş, Abdāl Mūsā is also one of the many names of the same spiritual truth, an eternal being who guides the wayfarer on the path to God.<sup>527</sup> Şādık is one such wayfarer, who becomes the recipient of Abdāl Mūsā’s gaze and spiritual attraction and whose heart is filled with light as a result.<sup>528</sup>

Similar to Hacı Bektāş and Abdāl Mūsā, Seyyid ‘Alī Sulţān is a pseudonym for ‘Alī b. Abī Tālib who is the truth of his being.<sup>529</sup> As such, Seyyid ‘Alī Sulţān is ‘Alī b. Abī Tālib’s secret.<sup>530</sup> He is also Hacı Bektāş’s secret.<sup>531</sup> In one poem, Şādık Abdāl says that Seyyid ‘Alī Sulţān or Kızıldeli are additional names or pen names for Hacı Bektāş.<sup>532</sup> Seyyid ‘Alī Sulţān is praised for his conquest of Rumelia.<sup>533</sup> In these battles, the Dhu’l-fiqār is transformed into Seyyid ‘Alī Sulţān’s wooden sword, also mentioned in his hagiography. Those present at war fail to see the identity of the two swords.<sup>534</sup> Seyyid ‘Alī hurls the same cry that ‘Alī b. Abī Tālib hurled in his holy wars.

Seyyid ‘Alī Sulţān’s gaze supports Şādık Abdāl and frees him of his suffering (*derd*) and perplexity (*hayret*). Seyyid ‘Alī Sulţān is Şādık Abdāl’s true identity hidden inside his body, the true speaker from his tongue and the true writer from his hand. He is the source of all the good

---

<sup>524</sup> Ibid., 60 and 2b.

<sup>525</sup> Şādık Abdāl’s work is our earliest clear evidence for the Janissary allegiance to Hacı Bektāş.

<sup>526</sup> Ibid., 64 and 3b.

<sup>527</sup> See *ibid.*, 64.

<sup>528</sup> See *ibid.*, 110.

<sup>529</sup> See *ibid.*, 70, 148-149.

<sup>530</sup> See *ibid.*, 151.

<sup>531</sup> See *ibid.*, 166.

<sup>532</sup> See *ibid.*, 135.

<sup>533</sup> See *ibid.*, 91, 135, 148.

<sup>534</sup> See *ibid.*, 135, 148, 183.

and bad that come Şādīk's way.<sup>535</sup> Şādīk Abdāl states that he has personally witnessed some of Seyyid 'Alī Sulṭān's miracles,<sup>536</sup> which generally take up a large portion of Şādīk Abdāl's portrayals of the saint.

As the poles of their time, Ḥacı Bektāş, Abdāl Mūsā, and Seyyid 'Alī Sulṭān are consequent manifestations of the secret of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib.<sup>537</sup> While 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib is mentioned as part of the praise for these three figures, few poems are dedicated directly to him. In one such poem, 'Alī is referred to as the essence in potentiality (*zāt-ı bi'l-kuvve*)<sup>538</sup> and the possessor of divinity (*ulūhiyyet ıssı*) who spreads his light over the universe, reveals his secret to the gnostics and manifests himself to them. He has numerous names; he is both the exoteric and the esoteric, and as such Şādīk Abdāl's being and soul. In a second poem, he is described as the sultan of this world and the hereafter, who is eternally present. His relationship to the poles is expressed by the phrase “*cümle aḳṭāb-ı velāyet dā'imā andan bülüg*” (all poles of friendship with God acquire their ranks from him).<sup>539</sup> His creative faculty is identified with that of God:

*Ḥurde beñzer cümle eşyā zır ü bālā şeş cihet  
Ol ulūhī kuvvet ile cümlesin kılmış ārüg*

From top to bottom, on all directions all things resemble dust and crumbs  
He is the one who has diffused all things with his divine power<sup>540</sup>

For all wayfarers on the path, 'Alī is the one who lets them obtain their desire and provides the medicine for their suffering. He is the one who grants successorship to some of the wayfarers; he is the source of the divine light of saints and their desire for their beloved. He is the source of all

---

<sup>535</sup> See *ibid.*, 139-140.

<sup>536</sup> See *ibid.*, 140-141.

<sup>537</sup> For a discussion of this secret, see Yıldırım, “Muhabbeten Tarikata,” 166. On one occasion, the secret is referred to as the secret of the ascension (*sırr-ı mi'rāc*), which probably invokes the narrative of the ascension in which Muḥammad comes across 'Alī, discussed further on in the chapter. The given reference indicates that the narrative was already common in oral lore in the 15<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>538</sup> *Ibid.*, 147, in two separate couplets, as well as *ibid.*, 181.

<sup>539</sup> *Ibid.*, 154.

<sup>540</sup> *Ibid.*, 155.

the compassion which has come Şādiq's way, the king professed in the words of all beings since the beginning of time.<sup>541</sup>

Among the sixty-six poems in the *Dīvān*, two are dedicated to the Twelve Imams.<sup>542</sup> These fit squarely within the genre of *dīvāzdeh imām* in Alevi-Bektashi poetry. As mentioned earlier,<sup>543</sup> the earliest example of this genre was found in Nesīmī's *Dīvān*, which together with other doctrinal elements served towards the later appropriation of Nesīmī by the Alevi-Bektashi tradition. These poems in Şādiq Abdāl's *Dīvān* are also the only poems which mention prophet Muḥammad, in whose praise the poems typically begin. We can thus say that in Şādiq Abdāl's work, Prophet Muḥammad is left entirely in the shadow of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, who constitutes not only the esoteric dimension of all beings but also the creative power of God.

On the other hand, despite his vital role, references to 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib mostly serve to emphasize the spiritual ranks of prominent saints, to whom Şādiq Abdāl devotes the greatest portion of his text. We could thus say that the entire focus of the work is on the notion of the saint. However, we must also admit that Şādiq Abdāl's portrayals of sainthood are hardly conceptual. As the examples above have shown us, these portrayals focus largely on miracles. Yet upon a closer look, we can discern some of Şādiq's conceptual basis. According to Şādiq Abdāl, all saints have one essence (*yek zāt*) which is identified with 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. As such, they are preeternal and indestructible.<sup>544</sup> As mentioned earlier upon several occasions, their gaze (*naẓar*) plays a particular role in guiding the wayfarer and bestowing grace upon him. Indeed, the saint is the spiritual director which leads all beings to God. All beings take refuge in the saint, who is the true presence inside all bodies.

Such depictions draw a picture of the saint as the embodiment of all that is accessible in God. Indeed, references to God's transcendence are virtually absent from Şādiq Abdāl's poetry. On the other hand, there are no instances of *shatḥ* in the work, wherein God speaks in the first person. Not only is Şādiq far from a full identification with God, nowhere is this expressed as a possibility for the wayfarer. The wayfarer's relationship to God is portrayed as a reciprocal one

---

<sup>541</sup> See *ibid.*, 181.

<sup>542</sup> See *ibid.*, 120-122 and 219-222.

<sup>543</sup> See Chapter 2, n. 161.

<sup>544</sup> See *ibid.*, 69, 109.

of knowledge and love.<sup>545</sup> Additionally, Şādık does not identify himself as a saint in any of his poems. One partial exception to this is a poem in which he speaks through the first person and states that all beings identify him with the object of their desire.<sup>546</sup> Moreover, at the end of his *Dīvān*, Şādık says: “*Dilümden söyledi ol şāh tamām dīvān-ı pür-rehber* [That king spoke this *Dīvān* full of guidance from my tongue].” Şādık Abdāl identifies ‘Alī b. Abī Tālib and all the poles as his esoteric dimension, while being careful to differentiate himself from them. Perhaps this can be explained to some extent by the possibility that the majority of the poems were written early in Şādık Abdāl’s spiritual career. This would definitely explain the lack of focus on Şādık Abdāl’s own perfection.

As also underlined by Rıza Yıldırım, the concept of the pole plays a central role in Şādık Abdāl’s poetry, where it is portrayed as the very definition of perfection. Becoming the pole takes place via a transmission of ‘Alī’s secret from a previous pole. Şādık Abdāl does not elaborate on what the word secret (*sirr*) signifies, however we are told that this secret gives its bearer immense power, thus creating the framework for the frequent descriptions of miracles.

In its overall tone, Şādık Abdāl’s *Dīvān* is a didactic work, teaching the disciple on the pillars of the path. In the obtainment of sainthood, Şādık Abdāl underlines the importance of self-effacement in love.<sup>547</sup> Similar to Kaygusuz Abdāl’s *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* which will be discussed in the commentary, Şādık identifies personages such as Nimrod, Pharaoh, and Croesus with vices of the base self.<sup>548</sup> With the help of the saint, the wayfarer lets go of his perplexity (*taḥayyür*<sup>549</sup> or *ḥayret*<sup>550</sup>). Although Şādık does not focus on remuneration or punishment in afterlife, he does not

---

<sup>545</sup> See *ibid.*, 199.

<sup>546</sup> See *ibid.*, 113-114. Considering that this poem is very unlike the rest of Şādık Abdāl’s *Dīvān* in language and content, we have to admit the possibility that it is a later addition.

<sup>547</sup> See *ibid.*, 213.

<sup>548</sup> See *ibid.*, 171.

<sup>549</sup> See *ibid.*, 147.

<sup>550</sup> See *ibid.*, 139. This is an important difference from Kaygusuz Abdāl, who views the creation of perplexity as an important tool in the transformation of the disciple, as is evidenced by the discussions of the third chapter and as I will further demonstrate in the commentary.

negate the existence of afterlife either, as evidenced by his phrases such as *dü kevn*<sup>551</sup> or *kevneyn*<sup>552</sup> (the two created worlds).

Şādık Abdāl frequently tells his readers that in order to obtain perfection, they must enter the path and become a disciple at a Bektashi lodge. It thus seems that the work is written largely for the lay adherent or the novice. The lack of intricate theoretical elaborations also seems to support this view. Moreover, for self-advancement in the path, Şādık Abdāl puts the focus mainly on the grace conferred upon the wayfarer by the saints. Entering the Bektashi path is not only valuable for its spiritual practices such as subduing the base self, but also for allowing the powerful saints' gaze and grace to fall upon the wayfarer. Indeed, the focus on the latter is so profound that the position of the wayfarer himself becomes rather passive. This is of course radically different from Kaygusuz Abdāl's position, who puts his entire emphasis on the wayfarer's own selfhood and faculties.

Although Şādık Abdāl was only a quarter of a century younger than Kaygusuz Abdāl, read his works and spoke reverently of him, and although both referred to Hacı Bektāş and Abdāl Mūsā as their masters, the extant works of the two *abdāls* show some radical differences. These can be summarized as follows: 1) Şādık Abdāl devotes significant attention to the praise of his spiritual directors and their miracles while both are generally insignificant in Kaygusuz Abdāl's works. 2) Şādık Abdāl focuses on the concept of the pole, thus establishing a hierarchy of sainthood, while Kaygusuz negates such a hierarchy, despite his occasional references to the pole. 3) Şādık Abdāl portrays a strictly reciprocal relationship with God –an element which is present in Kaygusuz Abdāl. Yet Kaygusuz also posits an essential union, which is more pronounced than a reciprocal relationship. 4) Kaygusuz deifies 'Alī b. Abī Tālib in only some of his texts while Şādık Abdāl imbues all of his poetry with 'Alī's divinity. 5) Prophet Muḥammad plays no role in Şādık Abdāl's poetry while he is a central figure in that of Kaygusuz, via the concept of the Muḥammadan essence. 6) Şādık Abdāl relies on the compassion and grace of saints for his spiritual advancement in the path while Kaygusuz repeatedly underlines the importance of relying only on oneself. 7) Şādık Abdāl speaks largely to lay adherents and novices while Kaygusuz Abdāl speaks to people of all levels. 8) Despite this fact, Şādık Abdāl's poetry is

---

<sup>551</sup> Ibid., 160

<sup>552</sup> Ibid., 181.



denser in Arabic and Persian words, although aygusuz Abdāl’s poetry is denser in theoretical complexity.

### Yemīnī’s *Fazīlet-nāme*

Our knowledge on the life of Yemīnī is mostly limited to the information he gives in his *Fazīlet-nāme*, which he wrote in the year of 925 (1519). Accordingly, his name was Dervīş Muammed and he was also called by the pseudonym of Hāfızođlı (the son of the keeper of the Qur’an).<sup>553</sup> His father was from Samarkand. In this work, Yemīnī identifies Otman Baba as the pole (*utb*), and Ayazılı Sultān as the pole who succeeded him. We thus know that Yemīnī was a member of Ayazılı Sultān’s *abdāl* circle.<sup>554</sup> Yemīnī makes no reference to Hacı Bektaş in his work.<sup>555</sup> The hagiography of Demir Baba, one of Ayazılı Sultān’s successors, refers to Yemīnī

---

<sup>553</sup> See Dervīş Muhammed Yemīnī, *Fazīlet-nāme*, ed. Yusuf Tepeli (Ankara: Trk Dil Kurumu, 2002), 600.

<sup>554</sup> Ayazılı Sultān was Otman Baba’s foremost disciple and the leader of the *abdāls* after him. In addition to Yemīnī’s *Fazīlet-nāme*, this information is also corroborated by the hagiography of Demir Baba written in 1029 (1619-20). For Ayazılı Sultān’s lodge in Bulgaria which was an important Bektashi center in the 17th century, see Semavi Eyice, “Ayazılı Sultan sitānesi,” *TDVİA*, Vol. 2 (Istanbul: Trkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1989), 302-303; Semavi Eyice, “Varna ile Balık Arasında Ayazılı Sultan Tekkesi,” *TTK Belleten* 31/124 (1967): 551-600; Kamil Drst; “Varna’da Ayazılı Sultan Tekkesi,” *Vakıflar Dergisi* 20 (1988): 443-452. For oral lore regarding Ayazılı Sultān, see Aynur Koak, “Ayazılı Sultan ve Tekkesine Folklorik Bir Yaklaşım,” *Trk Kltr ve Hacı Bektaş Velī Araştırma Dergisi* 26 (2003): 223-234. The importance of the number seven in this lodge’s liturgy, incorrectly attributed to Ismaili influence by Melikoff (see Melikoff, *Hadji Bektach*, 124) seems instead to be connected to Hurufism. There may also be a possible reference to the “*yediler*,” consisting of Muammad, ‘Alī, Fāıma, Hāsan, Hseyin, Salmān, and Archangel Gabriel ; see Frederick De Jong, “The Iconography of Bektashiism: A survey of themes and symbolism in clerical costume, liturgical objects and pictorial art,” *Manuscripts of the Middle East* 4 (1989): 10, 11, 17. Ahmet Yaşar Ocak also repeats Melikoff’s opinion. However his speculations regarding Ismaili influence on Alevism and Bektashism lack concrete evidence; see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, “Islam’s Second Aspect in Turkey’s History: Rethinking the Shī’a Element in Anatolia, or some comments on the Isma’īlī Influences,” in Kaan Durukan, Robert W. Zens and Akile Zorlu-Durukan (eds.), *Hoca, ‘Allame, Puits de Science: Essays in Honor of Kemal H. Karpat* (Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2010), 11-26.

<sup>555</sup> This may be an indicator to the separate identities of the followers of Otman Baba and Hacı Bektaş at the time of Yemīnī, the former being referred to as the *abdals* of Rm and the latter as the Bektashis. This would be in line with the categorization by Vaidī undertaken three years after the *Fazīlet-nāme*, as also underlined by Rıza Yıldırım in Yıldırım, “Yemini’nin Muhiti,” 72.

with the titles “ḥāfız-ı kelām” (the keeper of the word [of God])” and “efendi,” thus stressing his educated status and the fact that he was a keeper of the Qur’an like his father.<sup>556</sup> Yemīnī’s work demonstrates that he was proficient in Arabic, and if he indeed translated some of it from Persian, he was proficient in Persian as well. According to an early 20th century historical source, Yemīnī was martyred in Manastır (Bitola) in present day Macedonia in 940 (1533). His tomb located here was venerated until the 20th century.<sup>557</sup>

Yemīnī states that he translated his work from a prose work in Persian by a certain Şeyḫ Rükneddīn. The work narrates ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib’s excellent qualities in nineteen chapters, while also including individual poetry dispersed within the text, mostly to the praise of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib and the Twelve Imams. Yemīnī identifies the sources of the stories with important historical figures such as ‘Abd Allāh b. al-‘Abbās and Imams such as Zayn al-‘Ābidīn and Mūsā al-Kāzım.

In the *Fazīlet-nāme*, Yemīnī describes his audience as the people of the sunnah (*ehl-i sūnnet*), the lovers of the Prophet’s family (*muḥibb-i ḥānedān*), and the *gāzīs* (warriors) engaging in holy war in the land of *Rūm*.<sup>558</sup> In his article on the *Fazīlet-nāme*, Rıza Yıldırım argues that the text is directed towards the latter and identifies references to the land of *Rūm* with the Balkans.<sup>559</sup> While it is clear from the few references to his life that Yemīnī was connected to the Balkan milieu, this milieu does not necessarily constitute the focus of the text. However it is undeniable that holy war is a major theme. It seems that ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib’s foremost quality is his success as

---

<sup>556</sup> See *Demir Baba Velâyetnâmesi: İnceleme -Tenkitli Metin*, Edited by Filiz Kılıç and Tuncay Bülbül (Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2011), 46. Also see Yıldırım, “Yemini’nin Muhiti,” 65-66. See p. 64 of the *Demir Baba Velâyetnâmesi* for another reference to Yemīnī. See pp. 55-56 for an episode regarding Ḥāfız Dervīş Meḥemmed and p. 61 for a reference to Ḥāfızoğlu Meḥemmed Efendi, both of whom may have been the same person as Yemīnī. If these are indeed Yemīnī, he may have had a lodge in Gerlova (located in present day Bulgaria); see *Demir Baba Velâyetnâmesi*, 46 and 150. For a summary of all the episodes referenced here, see Aydın Kırman, “Yemini’nin Fazīlet-nâme’si –Şekil ve Muhteva Tahlili,” Dissertation, Izmir, Ege University, 2004, 18-20. The episode regarding Ḥāfız Dervīş Meḥemmed is depicted differently in this study, where the roles of the protagonists have shifted.

<sup>557</sup> See Binbaşı Mehmed Tefvik, *Manastır Vilayetinin Tarihçesi* (Bitola: Beynelmîlel Ticaret Matbaası, 1327), 59-60; quoted in Kırman, “Yemini,” 23. For a second text which confirms the same information see Muhtar Yahya Dağlı, *Bektâşî Tomarı Bektâşî Nefesleri* (Istanbul: Sebat Matbaası, 1935), 37-39. For excerpts by Mehmed Tefvik and Dağlı, see Bedri Noyan, *Bütün Yönleriyle Bektâşilik Alevilik* vol. I (Ankara: Ardıç Yayınları, 1998), 278-279.

<sup>558</sup> Yemīnī, 108.

<sup>559</sup> See Yıldırım, “Yemini’nin Muhiti,” 63-65.

an Islamizer. Most of the miracles he performs serve to this purpose. Among the Islamized are not only some of the foremost rulers of the world and Jewish and Christian communities, but also giants, dragons, and demons. In fact, we could even say that the majority of the action takes place around such supernatural figures. The nineteen excellent qualities (*fazīlet*) which form the body of the text can be more accurately identified as nineteen extraordinary adventures and miracles. In this respect, the *Fazīlet-nāme*'s closest relative is the *Şaltuḡ-nāme*, a 15th century account of the legendary life of Şarı Şaltuḡ (d. shortly after 700/1300), mentioned in the previous chapter. The *Şaltuḡ-nāme* is a slightly later example in the line of legendary works such as the *Baṭṭāl-nāme* and the *Danişmend-nāme*, which narrate the lives and holy wars of Islamic heroes. It separates from these works on account of its greater emphasis on fantastic themes and fairy tale content.

‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib’s battles in the *Fazīlet-nāme* mimic the style of these works.<sup>560</sup> Both ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib and his adversaries are described with fantastic physical features, such as extraordinary size and strength.<sup>561</sup> Action sequences include an exceptional outcry (*na‘ra*) by ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib or one of his fellow heroes,<sup>562</sup> which scares his adversaries to the point of fainting. In battle, heroes from opposite camps enter the field one by one and engage in one to one combat. This technique allows the narrator to detail the action sequences. Another thematic element that the *Fazīlet-nāme* shares with these works is its portrayal of Christian monks who are secret Muslims.<sup>563</sup>

Yorgos Dedes’ discussion of *meddāḡ* (storyteller) literature and its relationship to the *Baṭṭāl-nāme* indicates that this type of literature constituted the main repertoire of storytellers up until the 17th century.<sup>564</sup> It is thus incorrect to assume that *ḡāzīs* alone were the main audience of the *Fazīlet-nāme*. In fact, we can safely say that with its style and content, Yemīnī’s work hoped to reach the widest possible audience. This can be a challenge to the researcher aiming to deduce

---

<sup>560</sup> For examples to the characteristics described in this paragraph, see *Baṭṭāl-nāme*, in Yorgos Dedes (ed), *Battalname* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 1996), 344-345, 348-351, 361-363, 368-370.

<sup>561</sup> See Yemīnī, 145.

<sup>562</sup> See *ibid.*, 274, 478.

<sup>563</sup> See *ibid.*, 349-351.

<sup>564</sup> See Yorgos Dedes, *Battalname* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 1996), 43-84.

Yemīnī's religious beliefs from his text, which he may have distorted or at least held back due to the social context in which he lived, at the height of the Ottoman-Safavid conflict and the resulting persecution of 'heterodox' groups.

In the *Fazīlet-nāme*, 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib has more physical strength than all other living creatures combined.<sup>565</sup> We often hear this strength confirmed by Muḥammad himself,<sup>566</sup> who sends 'Alī on missions which result in the conversion to Islam of those communities who see 'Alī's extraordinary capacities. These conversions are prompted by awe and fear.<sup>567</sup> The Prophet's companions also confirm 'Alī's extraordinary heroism. Several times, 'Alī saves the companions from being crushed on the battlefield.<sup>568</sup> When asked by a person to perform miracles, the second caliph 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb sends him to 'Alī, who he says is the only person capable of performing the miracles. 'Umar praises 'Alī and describes him with phrases such as "*vaṣiyy-i Muṣṭafā*" (Muṣṭafā's trustee), "*vilāyet nūri*" (the light of sainthood). According to 'Umār, 'Alī is the only person capable of showing the secret to the oneness of God and the prophecy of Muḥammad.<sup>569</sup>

In fact, Yemīnī's position regarding the three caliphs is particularly interesting. He accepts their official positions as caliphs, while also underlining 'Alī's superiority over them. On more than one occasion, the caliphs cannot perform the miracles asked by those who come to them, which are afterwards performed easily by 'Alī. On the other hand, one episode in the *Fazīlet-nāme* has the Prophet declaring from the pulpit of the mosque to all the companions that 'Alī and the Twelve Imams are his true successors.<sup>570</sup> It thus seems that Yemīnī is deliberately silent about the events that took place after the Prophet's death, possibly by fear of persecution.

---

<sup>565</sup> See *ibid.*, 177.

<sup>566</sup> See *ibid.*, 263.

<sup>567</sup> See *ibid.*, 300-301.

<sup>568</sup> See for instance *ibid.*, 483.

<sup>569</sup> See *ibid.*, 310-311.

<sup>570</sup> See *ibid.*, 513-514. In the same episode, Muḥammad tells his companions that only one of the seventy-three groups of people will be believers in the Imams. He also informs them about the advent of the Mahdi, in whom all true Muslims should believe.

The same episode also includes a major theme that frequently comes up in Alevi texts<sup>571</sup> : the miracle in which ‘Alī and Muḥammad had their heads coming out of the same shirt. The episode can be interpreted as an enactment of the famous hadith which is frequently repeated in the *Fazāilet-nāme*: *laḥmuka laḥmī nafsuka nafsī damuka damī jismuka jismī rūḥuka rūḥī* (your flesh is my flesh; your blood is my blood; your breath is my breath; your body is my body; your soul is my soul). Yemīnī describes the episode in detail. First, the heads of Muḥammad and ‘Alī come out of the same shirt. Then upon the request of those who are still not convinced of their unity, they show their heads as one and bodies as two. Lastly, again upon request, they show both their bodies and heads as one. Yemīnī defines this as the unity of prophecy and sainthood.<sup>572</sup>

The bodily relationship between Muḥammad and ‘Alī also has several other manifestations in the text. When ‘Alī is born, instead of his mother’s milk, he sucks on Muḥammad’s tongue from which he gets all his nutrition.<sup>573</sup> When ‘Alī is ill, Muḥammad drinks the medication in his place, which results in ‘Alī’s recovery.<sup>574</sup> Yemīnī again identifies this episode as the proof of the hadith mentioned above. On the other hand, the superiority of Muḥammad over ‘Alī is never in doubt. This is evident in the acts of respect they show towards each other. While ‘Alī kisses Muḥammad’s hand, Muḥammad kisses ‘Alī’s forehead.<sup>575</sup> On judgement day, ‘Alī is the second after Muḥammad to enter paradise.<sup>576</sup> In one long episode, ‘Alī is asked if he is superior to the prophets Adam,<sup>577</sup> Noah, Şāliḥ, Job, Moses and Jesus. ‘Alī explains one by one why he is superior to each of the prophets.<sup>578</sup> Yet when the question finally reaches Muḥammad, ‘Alī underlines Muḥammad’s superiority and states that all beings including

---

<sup>571</sup> See for instance one of the oldest Buyruk texts, *Risāle-i Şeyḫ Şaḫī*, Konya Mevlana Museum Ferid Uğur Collection No.1172 (dated 1201/1786), fol. 33a. Also see Gezik, 60.

<sup>572</sup> See *ibid.*, 515-516.

<sup>573</sup> *Ibid.*, 125.

<sup>574</sup> *Ibid.*, 458-459.

<sup>575</sup> While the first gesture is an act of respect to an elder, the second is an act of love towards a younger person.

<sup>576</sup> *Ibid.*, 176.

<sup>577</sup> In line with Alevi tradition, the forbidden food which Adam and Eve eat is wheat.

<sup>578</sup> *Ibid.*, 408-417. For another episode which narrates ‘Alī’s superiority over all prophets other than Muḥammad, see *ibid.*, 386-394.

himself were created for the love of Muḥammad. He then engages in a long praise of Muḥammad which he ends with an affirmation of their unity.<sup>579</sup>

Yemīnī's *Fazīlet-nāme* also includes the famous episode in which Muḥammad comes across 'Alī in his ascension.<sup>580</sup> In parallel with the recension of the story in oral lore and Alevi poetry, upon setting foot onto the throne, Muḥammad comes across a lion, in whose mouth he throws his ring. His ring is given back to him by 'Alī upon his return from his ascension. One aspect of Yemīnī's recension which differs from the common story is that during Muḥammad's conversation with God, Muḥammad sees a young boy standing in the corner, which he recognizes to be 'Alī. Upon Muḥammad's return from his ascension, 'Alī repeats to him every piece of conversation which took place between him and God. The whole story is told through the mouth of Muḥammad to the companions, who agree on 'Alī's status as *walī* (friend) and *waṣī* (trustee).<sup>581</sup>

In addition to being the *vaṣiyy-i sırr-ı nebī* (the trustee of the prophet's secret), 'Alī is Muḥammad's *muṣāhib* (companion). Companionship (*muṣāhiblik*) is an 'artificial kinship between two couples'<sup>582</sup> in the Alevi social system, which is a requirement for all adult members of the community. The reference thus indicates that Alevi communities constituted an important part of the *Fazīlet-nāme*'s intended audience. 'Alī is the one who put forth the science of the path (*'ilm-i ṭarīkat*)<sup>583</sup> and he is the guide (*rehber*) of the wayfarer.<sup>584</sup> He has the capacity to directly converse with God, a capacity which is denoted as an inspiration (*ilhām*) bestowed upon his heart.<sup>585</sup> As spoken in the words of Muḥammad, all angels wish to be in the service of 'Alī, who

---

<sup>579</sup> Ibid., 417-418.

<sup>580</sup> For a full version of the Alevi-Bektashi narrative of the ascension, see Esat Korkmaz, *Alevilik ve Bektaşilik Terimleri Sözlüğü*, 408-411 as well as 469-472. For an abridged version, see Birge, 137-8.

<sup>581</sup> Ibid., 359-360. For a second reference to the same story, see *ibid.*, 475.

<sup>582</sup> See Karakaya-Stump, "Subjects of the Sultan," 42 and 214. Bektashis in the Balkans have this institution but those in Anatolia do not.

<sup>583</sup> Ibid., 397.

<sup>584</sup> Ibid., 473.

<sup>585</sup> See *ibid.*, 322. For the use of the word *ilhām* (inspiration), see *ibid.*, 338.

is the agent of earthquakes.<sup>586</sup> ‘Alī is also beyond time and space.<sup>587</sup> He can travel long distances in the blink of an eye. He partakes in events and shows heroism at different times before his physical birth.<sup>588</sup>

In one episode in the *Fazīlet-nāme*, Prophet Muḥammad explains the relationship between his prophecy (*nubuwwa*) and ‘Alī’s sainthood (*walāyā*) in a particularly Shi’i manner. He states that while the era of prophecy comes to an end with him, this marks the beginning of the era of sainthood. In this era, the light of sainthood is carried by ‘Alī and his twelve descendants. A real saint (*velī*) is one who has attained the light of ‘Alī and has become ontologically identical to him.<sup>589</sup> On the other hand, the end of Muḥammad’s speech includes an interesting twist which would not be expected in a Shi’ite text: Upon hearing Muḥammad’s words, all companions prostrate with gratitude for both sainthood and the time of the apocalypse when the people’s religion will be corrected.<sup>590</sup>

The light of Muḥammad-‘Alī is a major theme in the *Fazīlet-nāme*. A story treated by Yemīnī common in oral lore establishes Gabriel as the first created being.<sup>591</sup> In his wanderings, Gabriel comes across the light of Muḥammad-‘Alī, which is half green and half white. The white light of ‘Alī instructs Gabriel to speak to God with the right words of worship. Yemīnī’s notion of the double light of Muḥammad and ‘Alī has its origins in the treatment of the same concept in early Shi’ism.<sup>592</sup> Accordingly, Yemīnī states that the light of Muḥammad-‘Alī was transferred from prophet to prophet until it reached the prophet’s paternal grandfather ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, after which it divided into two. The light of prophecy reached Muḥammad’s father ‘Abd Allāh. The light of sainthood reached Abī Ṭālib.<sup>593</sup> In contrast with the Shi’ite conception, Yemīnī’s portrayal of pre-Muhammadan prophecy and sainthood does not include the existence of imams who constitute the esoteric dimension of the transmission of the light, corresponding to the

---

<sup>586</sup> Ibid., 487.

<sup>587</sup> One episode which narrates this quality of ‘Alī is of particular interest, because it depicts a people created from fire before the time of Adam; see *ibid.*, 333.

<sup>588</sup> See for instance *ibid.*, 354-357.

<sup>589</sup> In one phrase, the pole of the saints is identified as ‘Alī for all times; see *ibid.*, 472.

<sup>590</sup> *Ibid.*, 234-235.

<sup>591</sup> *Ibid.*, 230-233. The first part of this story which is missing in the *Fazīlet-nāme* can be found in Gezik, 56-70.

<sup>592</sup> See Amir-Moezzi, *Le Guide divin*, 75-78; 101-110.

<sup>593</sup> Yemīnī, 112-113 as well as 361-362.

transmission of the exoteric dimension by prophets. Moreover, a non-Shi'ite addition to the concept of the light of Muhammad-‘Alī is the idea that the seven heavens were created from the light of Muḥammad while the seven layers of the earth were created from the light of ‘Alī. This is what gives ‘Alī the role of producing earthquakes mentioned earlier.

Yemīnī separates perfect men (*kāmil insān*) into four classes. The first class is those who engage in supplication, whose wishes are then granted by God. The second class is those who are inspired by God but continue to act of their own will. The third class is those who are also given inspiration but have completely submitted to the will of God. The fourth class is the *sāhib-i kudret* (the possessors of force). These are saints whose acts are the acts of God, whose wills cannot be separated from the will of God.<sup>594</sup> Other than this section, there is only one other depiction of sainthood in the *Fazīlet-nāme*. In this passage, sainthood is defined as knowing God’s acts, essence, and attributes; being beyond heaven and hell in one’s desire for God; experiencing God’s theophany in the whole universe; understanding the true nature of created things and the unique quality of God’s names.<sup>595</sup>

Yemīnī’s depictions of prophecy and sainthood leave no room for the doctrine of the oneness of being which is so prominent in all of Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl’s works. Throughout his text, Yemīnī maintains a strict dichotomy between the Creator and the created:

*Ḳul oldur kim bile sultānı kimdür  
Serāy-ı serdeki mihmānı kimdür*

*Kimüñ emriyle geldi bu mekāna  
Kim itmişdür mekān bu cismi cāna*<sup>596</sup>

The servant is one who knows the sultan  
One who knows the guest in the palace of his head

On whose command he came to this place  
The guest who put this soul in the space of this body

Yemīnī reserves the word *vücūd* (existence) to God, while he uses the word *mevcūd* (existent) for created beings.<sup>597</sup> One formulation by Yemīnī which stresses the immanence of God is in his

---

<sup>594</sup> Ibid., 343-345.

<sup>595</sup> Ibid., 420-421.

<sup>596</sup> Ibid., 304.

<sup>597</sup> Ibid., 244.



depiction of the difference between man and other created beings. According to Yemīnī, while other beings are the place of manifestation (*mazhar*) of God’s attributes (*şifāt*), man is the place of manifestation of God’s essence (*zāt*) via His names (*esmā*).<sup>598</sup> This notion seems to go hand in hand with the description of sainthood as an identification with ‘Alī, whereby the saint comes to possess all possible knowledge about God.

Unlike K̄aygusuz Abdāl, Yemīnī does not deny the existence of heaven and hell anywhere in his text. He asks for Muḥammad’s intercession on judgement day.<sup>599</sup> He identifies Jesus with the Mahdi, who will reinstitute the true Islam which has been corrupted.<sup>600</sup> Due to the current condition of the world, in which proclaiming the love of ‘Alī and his descendants has become a reason for immediate death, Yemīnī deems the return of the Mahdi to be near.<sup>601</sup> Despite the general understanding that *abdāl* circles as well as Alevi disregarded the *sharī‘a*, Yemīnī’s work contains references to the importance of ritual worship. Yemīnī advises his reader to perform his daily prayer, fast, and undertake his pilgrimage if he wants to go to heaven and avoid hell.<sup>602</sup>

As examined in Rıza Yıldırım’s article, we can discern H̄urūfī influences in Yemīnī’s terminology, although this influence is not often stressed.<sup>603</sup> The most common elements of this terminology are the *‘ilm-i esmā*’ (science of names)<sup>604</sup> and the *ehl-i a‘rāf* (the people of the a‘rāf).<sup>605</sup> The latter indicates those who have solved the mysteries of creation with H̄urūfī science and attained the truth.<sup>606</sup> Yemīnī also makes one reference to Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī.<sup>607</sup> The following verses contain the most explicit rendition of Yemīnī’s H̄urūfī thought:

*Cemālūñ muşḥafı āyāt-ı Hakk̄dur*  
*H̄urūfı ‘arīf insāna sebak̄dur*

*Oḳuyan vechūñ āyātın ‘ayānī*

---

<sup>598</sup> Ibid., 193, 346.

<sup>599</sup> Ibid., 305.

<sup>600</sup> Ibid., 460 and 529

<sup>601</sup> Ibid., 529 and 598.

<sup>602</sup> Ibid., 241, 244, 305.

<sup>603</sup> Yıldırım, “Yemini’nin Muhiti,” 55-59.

<sup>604</sup> See Yemīnī, 291, 405,

<sup>605</sup> Ibid., 419, 459,

<sup>606</sup> Yıldırım, “Yemini’nin Muhiti,” 59.

<sup>607</sup> See Yemīnī, 459.

*Aña keşf ola her sirruñ beyāni  
[...]  
Revān geçer sırāt-ı müstakīmi  
Kaçan kim oquya ‘ilm-i kadīmi*

*Kadīmüñ ‘ilmi esmā’dur haķīkat  
Oķur anı olan pīr-i tarīkat<sup>608</sup>*

The book of your beauty contains the verses of God  
Its letters are a lesson to the gnostics

Whoever reads the verses of your face clearly  
The explanation of all secrets will be unveiled to him

Whenever one reads the ancient science  
He will easily follow the right path

In truth, the names are the science to the ancient  
This science is what the path’s spiritual teacher reads

The Shi’ite practices of *tawallā* (love of the *ahl al-bayt*) and *tabarrā* (dissociation from the *ahl al-bayt*’s adversaries) are present in Yemīnī’s *Fazīlet-nāme*,<sup>609</sup> although they are not mentioned as terms and not as often and deeply stressed as for instance the work of Vīrānī. Interestingly, Yemīnī frequently targets the Jews as the Imams’ adversaries.<sup>610</sup> Yemīnī also turns his criticism on three different groups: the dervishes, the representatives of official religion, and last of all, the extremists who view ‘Alī as God.

Yemīnī merges Sufis, dervishes and ascetics (*zāhid*) under one category and attacks them for their hypocrisy and their dependence on others for their sustenance. He claims that Sufis have fallen prey to their base selves and are struck with doubt.<sup>611</sup> In one passage in the *Fazīlet-nāme*, Yemīnī conveys a fascinating portrayal of the *abdāls* of his generation:

*Olar kim dirilür dervīş ü abdāl  
Ki tebdīl eylediler şekl-i aĥvāl  
Yahn ayak yürüyüp açdı başı  
Döşendi toprağı yasdandı taşı  
Tıraş eylediler saç u şakalı  
Ki terk itdük diyüben ķīl u ķāli*

---

<sup>608</sup> Ibid., 490-491.

<sup>609</sup> See ibid., 259

<sup>610</sup> See ibid., 104, 475, 576

<sup>611</sup> See ibid., 224, 225.

*Ki ya 'nī ecelinden öñdin öldi  
 Bu da 'vāyı kılup meydāna geldi  
 Tevekkül bābına açmadı gözin  
 Şanur tevḥīd-i ḥaḳḳdur kendü sözin  
 Varup bir evliyāyı idinür pīr  
 Özin kurtarmaḡiçün kıldı tedbīr  
 Müheyyā kıldı çün fakruñ şifātın  
 Degüldür ḥāceti kim bile zātın  
 Ḳanā 'at ḳapusın terk eylediler  
 Varuban ḥalka yalan söylediler  
 Muḥibb-i ḥānedān da 'vīsın idüp  
 Piyāde Kerbelā vü ḥācca gidüp  
 Biraz dem ḡarba vü şarka gidüben  
 Müsāfirliklerin şöhret idüben  
 Varurlar aḡniyānuñ ḡapusına  
 Ki ya 'nī dūnbeginün ḳapusına  
 Ulu begler işigine varurlar  
 Niyāz idüp ana yüzler sürerler  
 Ki ide sīm ü zer anlara in 'ām  
 Bulalar anuñulan şöhret-i tām  
 Ḳanā 'at ḳapusın her dem yaparlar  
 Riyāzat rāḡını koyup saparlar  
 Şifāti dervīş ü zātı ḡama 'kār  
 Kişi olur mı bundan daḡı bed-kār*

Those who pose as dervishes and *abdāls*  
 By changing their appearances and states  
 They walk bare feet and keep their heads open  
 They lie on the ground and use stones as pillows  
 They shave their heads and beards  
 They say they have let go of all petty talk  
 They come out in public  
 Claiming they have died before death  
 Their eyes are not open to the gate of trust in God  
 They think their words are evidence to the oneness of God  
 They attach themselves to a saint for a spiritual teacher  
 Their real plan is to save their own selves  
 They put into existence the attributes of poverty  
 They are incapable of knowing their own selves  
 They have abandoned the gate of contentment  
 They have lied to the people  
 They pretend to be lovers of the descendants of 'Alī  
 They go to Karbala and to pilgrimage on foot  
 After going east and west for some time  
 After gaining fame for their travels  
 They reach the presence of the wealthy  
 Meaning the door of the scholars and jurists  
 They arrive at the doorsteps of important princes  
 They supplicate and prostrate at their doorsteps  
 So that they can receive donations in silver and gold  
 So that with these they can find true fame

They keep the door of contentment closed at all times  
They let go of the path of ascetic discipline  
They are called dervishes but they are full of greed  
Can a person have worse character than this?

Yemīnī's bleak portrayal of the *abdāls* of his time gives us some important information on the trends in the *abdāl* milieu in the early 16th century. We can summarize these trends as: shaving all facial hair, extreme asceticism as evidenced by sleeping on stones, travelling extensively, going on pilgrimage to Karbala and the Ka'ba, having good relations with wealthy people as well as some scholars and jurists. Elsewhere in the *Fazīlet-nāme*, Yemīnī characterizes this relationship with scholars and jurists as worshipping the Umayyads.<sup>612</sup> Yemīnī's direct criticism of the jurists in the text focuses on the idea that they give *fatwās* ordering anybody's execution, accept bribes, and try to accumulate wealth.<sup>613</sup>

Yemīnī devotes a significant section of his work to his portrayal of extremist Shi'ites. He focuses on two figures who believe in 'Alī's divinity after seeing his miracles: Bayān b. Sam'ān (d. 119/737) and Nuṣayr Ṭūsī.<sup>614</sup> When they refuse to deny 'Alī's divinity, 'Alī kills these two multiple times, bringing them back to life each time due to either his own act of pity or God's command. Yemīnī likens Ibn Sam'ān to the Christians who he says were the only people to accept Ibn Sam'ān and his community. According to Yemīnī, Ibn Sam'ān's community believe that 'Alī was the reincarnation of Jesus Christ and would continue to reincarnate himself until the end of time. Yemīnī also says that Ibn Sam'ān's people call 'Alī "Aya Marḳo." Yemīnī is less harsh on the community of Nuṣayr, which he names as the Nuṣayrīs. He says that these people follow religious law and engage in proper ritual worship. Their only difference from regular Muslims is that they believe in the divinity of 'Alī and sing psalms expressing this belief.

After this detailed discussion, we can summarize the *Fazīlet-nāme*'s major doctrinal differences from Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl's works as follows:

1) Yemīnī speaks to the folk and does not intend to explicate intricacies of doctrine. His portrayal of 'Alī is largely focused on 'Alī's heroism, but nonetheless contains doctrinal elements

---

<sup>612</sup> Ibid., 599.

<sup>613</sup> Ibid., 505.

<sup>614</sup> Ibid., 306, 319-339. The person Yemīnī calls by the name "Nuṣayr-ı Ṭūsī" may be Abū Shu'ayb Muḡammad Ibn Nuṣayr al-Namīrī (fl. mid-third/ninth century), because Yemīnī characterizes the former as the founder of the Nuṣayrī movement.

dispersed within the text. These elements stress the superiority of Muḥammad over ‘Alī as well as the superiority of ‘Alī over all the other prophets. In contrast with Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, prophecy and sainthood are portrayed as distinct categories and the supremacy of the former is never in doubt.

2) In comparison with Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, many of Yemīnī’s views can hardly be called ‘heterodox’: He believes in heaven and hell, the importance of ritual worship, and a strict distinction between the Creator and the created. Yemīnī’s focus on distinguishing his love of ‘Alī from the beliefs of extremist sects indicates that he himself may have wanted to portray some level of orthodoxy, perhaps in order to avoid persecution. One aspect which does break his relatively orthodox position is his Ḥurūfī tendency.

### Şemsī’s *Deh Murğ*

Information on Şemsī can be found in the biographical dictionaries of Laṭīfī, ‘Aşık Çelebi and Kātib Çelebi, as well as in his *Deh Murğ*.<sup>615</sup> While Laṭīfī states that Şemsī was from Seferihisar, ‘Aşık Çelebi and Kātib Çelebi assert that he was an immigrant from Persia (*Acem*). Şemsī was popular as both a poet and a storyteller in the gatherings which took place in wealthy homes.<sup>616</sup> This popularity brought him to the presence of Selīm I, to whom the *Deh Murğ* is dedicated. In addition to several words of praise to the sultan throughout the text, the beginning and the end of the work contain long eulogies to him.

In his *Deh Murğ*, Şemsī dates the composition of his work to 919 (1513). Two of the work’s manuscripts identify the place of composition as ‘Alā’iye.<sup>617</sup> Other than his few poems which appear in the biographical dictionaries, Şemsī is also supposed to have a *Dīvān*, which is not extant today. According to Laṭīfī, Şemsī died before the end of the reign of Selīm I, thus before the date of 926 (1520). On the other hand, in a few manuscripts of the *Deh Murğ*, some of the words of praise for Selīm I are replaced with those for Süleymān I. This has led researchers to

---

<sup>615</sup> See Hasan Aksoy, “Derviş Şemseddin,” *TDVİA*, Vol 9 (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1994), 198-199; İdris Güven Kaya, *Derviş Şemsī and his Mesnevi Deh Murğ* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 1997), 11-12.

<sup>616</sup> ‘Aşık Çelebi, *Meşā’irü’ş-şu’arā*, ed. Meredith Owens (Cambridge: E. J. W. Gibb Memorial, 1971), 250a-250b.

<sup>617</sup> Kaya, *Derviş Şemsī*, 53.

underline the possibility that the work was also presented to Süleymān I after the death of Selīm.<sup>618</sup> This possibility contradicts Laṭīfī's statement regarding the approximate date of Şemsī's death.

Laṭīfī identifies Şemsī as *ışık*<sup>619</sup> (a synonym for *abdāl*)<sup>620</sup> and 'Āşık Çelebi refers to him as *kalender*.<sup>621</sup> While these words denote a temperament in line with that of Şemsī, he himself prefers the terms *dervīş*<sup>622</sup> and *abdāl*<sup>623</sup> when referring to himself. In his work, he calls himself "Dervīş Şemseddīn."<sup>624</sup> At the end of the work, Şemsī addresses the audience directly and states that his purpose in writing the work was to amaze the audience with a gulp from the gourd (*cur'a*) of dervishes (*erenler*).<sup>625</sup> These couplets are a repetition of the same words spoken through the mouth of the vulture, a symbol for the *abdāls* of *Rūm*, earlier in the text.<sup>626</sup>

Şemsī's short *meşnevī* of 1053 couplets is surprisingly rich in content. It is written through the mouths of ten different birds, identified with ten social groups.<sup>627</sup>

- 1) *baykuş* (*būm*) = *şūfī*, *zāhid*
- 2) *kağga* (*zāğ*) = *kışsa-ḥ'ān*, *şā'ir*, *remmāl*
- 3) *tūfī* = *monla*, *dāniş-mend*
- 4) *kerges* = *Rum abdālī*, *kalender*, *Bektāşī*
- 5) *bülbül* = *Naqşibendī*, *güyende*, *şehrī*
- 6) *hüdhüd* = *ḥakīm*
- 7) *kırlağaç* (*piristū*) = *sāhib-nücum* (*müneccim*)
- 8) *ıvūs* = *bāzırgān*, *tācir*, *bazzār*
- 9) *keklik* = *dihkān*, *Oğuz oğlanları*, *Türk oğlanı*, *yurd oğlanı*
- 10) *leglek* = *şeyḥ-i Hindūstānī*, *namāz maḥmūdi*, *gāziler gibi*, *ḥaccāc*, *ehl-i dil*, 'ārīf

- 1) owl = *sufi*, ascetic
- 2) crow = storyteller, poet, fortune teller

---

<sup>618</sup> See *ibid.*, 54-55.

<sup>619</sup> Laṭīfī, *Tezkire-i Laṭīfī* (Istanbul: Kitāb-ḥāne-i İkdām, 1314), 209-210.

<sup>620</sup> See Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 71 and 129.

<sup>621</sup> 'Āşık Çelebi, *Meşā'irü 'ş-şu'arā*, 250a-250b.

<sup>622</sup> Şemsī, *Deh Murg*, in İdris Güven Kaya (ed), *Derviş Şemsī and His Mesnevi Deh Murg* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 1997), 171 and 175.

<sup>623</sup> *Ibid.*, 174 and 175.

<sup>624</sup> *Ibid.*, 174-175.

<sup>625</sup> *Ibid.*, 171.

<sup>626</sup> *Ibid.*, 118.

<sup>627</sup> In the beginning of the work, Şemsī lists these birds and groups, see *ibid.*, 84. The list above includes the titles in this list as well as other versions of them within the text.

- 3) parrot = religious scholar
- 4) vulture = *abdāl* of *Rūm*, qalandar, *Bektāšī*
- 5) nightingale = Naqshbandi, singer, city-dweller
- 6) hoopoe = physician
- 7) swallow = astrologist
- 8) peacock = merchant, pedlar, marketplace dealer
- 9) partridge = villager, peasant, the son of *Oğuz*,<sup>628</sup> Turkmen, tent-dweller
- 10) stork = Indian sheikh, with praiseworthy daily prayer, like a holy warrior, frequent undertaker of pilgrimage, man of love, gnostic

The body of the text begins with the other birds' criticism of the owl. The owl then defends himself and criticizes the other birds. After this point, each bird's monologue is divided into two sections: criticism of the bird coming before it and its own description and praise. We have the impression that Şemsī identifies with more than one of these birds a.k.a. social groups. In this section of the chapter, I will not investigate the depiction of each social group. I will only focus on those social groups which are directly related to Şemsī's own self-positioning and his attempt to situate *abdāl* groups within a larger social context.

Like Kāyğusuz, Şemsī unites Sufis and ascetics under a single category, which he links to the practices of *tevbe* (repentance and turning toward God), *çile* (religious retirement), *zühd* (asceticism), *taḳvā* (pious fear of God), dream interpretation, and knowing the spiritual states of all of one's disciples.<sup>629</sup> It is interesting that, despite the given differences from the category of dervishes which is symbolized by the vulture, the Sufi vehemently criticizes the other birds –the society at large– for not giving alms to dervishes.<sup>630</sup> There thus does not seem to be antagonism between Sufis and dervishes in the text. In fact, the criticism towards the Sufi and ascetic for remaining trapped in the exoteric dimension of religion, showing reverence to exoteric signs of spiritual accomplishment, and thus acting with hypocrisy is undertaken not by the dervish as one would expect, but by the storyteller/poet, symbolized by the crow.<sup>631</sup>

What we know about the life of Şemsī should indicate that he may identify with the category of the storyteller/poet to some extent. Yet there are no references in the text which would suggest this. On the other hand, Şemsī's association of the same category with the qualities

---

<sup>628</sup> A Turkic coalition of tribes which were the ancestors of the Turkmens.

<sup>629</sup> See *ibid.*, 91-93.

<sup>630</sup> *Ibid.*, 90. A similar criticism is also voiced by the Turkmen villager (symbolized by the partridge) regarding the merchants (symbolized by the peacock) who are ashamed to greet dervishes.

<sup>631</sup> See *ibid.*, 96-97.

of the fortune teller, to which he dedicates a significant portion of the section, seems to suggest otherwise.

For our purposes, the vulture's monologue is the most interesting of all.<sup>632</sup> The vulture begins his monologue with a vehement critique of the religious scholar. He blames the religious scholar for adhering only to the exoteric dimension of religion and being an imitator of true knowledge with his 'learned' sciences. The religious scholar is far from understanding the most important truth: the spiritual significance of man as the theophany of God. The vulture's criticisms also extend to the qadis, who accept bribes and make decisions which do not have enough judicial support.

The vulture, who openly identifies himself with the *abdāls* of *Rūm*, describes his physical appearance as naked with only a shawl, animal hide (*pūst*) or felt (*nemed*), as having a shaved head and face, as well as a tattoo of the Dhu'l-fiqār on his chest.<sup>633</sup> These descriptions are in agreement with Vāhidī's account in *Menākīb-i H'oca-i Cihān ve Netīce-i Cān*, as well as with Western travelers' reports.<sup>634</sup> The *abdāl* is a gnostic, a man of love who lives in physical seclusion and mental detachment from the world. He spends his time in the house of qalandars (*qalender-ḥāne*). The *abdāl* is God's secret treasure and the embodiment of the Beautiful Names of God. He is a follower of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, Imām Ḥusayn, and the Maḥdī. He is also a *Bektāṣī*. He adheres to the practices of *tevellā* and *teberrā*. He mourns during 'Āshūrā' in the form of a feast in which he plays the drums and dances to the jingling of the bells he wears.<sup>635</sup>

The criticism of the *abdāl* is the task of the Naqshbandī shaykh who is also a singer, symbolized by the nightingale. He accuses the *abdāl* for being a cannabis-addict and a drunkard, for completely disregarding religious duties and being ignorant of the *sharī'a*, for having abandoned both his intellect ('*aql*) and society. Of particular interest is the characterization of the *abdāl*'s beliefs and practices as reprehensible innovation (*bid'at*), due to the *abdāl*'s belief that heaven and hell are located in this world. As we saw in the second chapter, this doctrinal element was an important characteristic of Ḳaygusuz Abdāl's thought. According to the nightingale's

---

<sup>632</sup> See *ibid.*, 110-118.

<sup>633</sup> For the treatment of the Dhu'l-fiqār in Bektashism and Alevism, see Thierry Zarccone, "The Sword of 'Alī (Zūlfikar) in Alevism and Bektashism," *Journal of the History of Sufism* 6 (2015): 113-126.

<sup>634</sup> See Karamustafa, *God's Unruly Friends*, 71-74.

<sup>635</sup> See Şemsī, 115-118.



description, the *abdāl* is one who relies on ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib’s saying that he will not believe in a God he does not see,<sup>636</sup> in order to claim that he has seen God. The *abdāl*’s wrong interpretation of the hadith leads him to believe that he has seen God with his physical eyes instead of the eyes of the soul to which the proper interpretation of the hadith refers. The nightingale calls the dervish *Ḥaydarī* and *Bektāṣī* and criticizes him for his practice of *teberrā*.<sup>637</sup>

The last social group which is of particular interest to us consists of the Turkmen villagers represented by the partridge. They live on farming which is described as the ancestral craft (*ata şan ‘atı*). Labor and rightful living constitute an important part of their self-pride. Phrases such as “*Türk oğlanı*” (son of the Turk) underline their ethnicity in a way which was uncommon for the other social groups. They also take pride in giving alms and food to dervishes. At one instance, they even call themselves dervishes in this world which has only one true owner. Most importantly, they say that the food they cultivate and prepare belongs to the *shāh*. Although we cannot ascertain who the word *shāh* refers to in the text, imagining the Turkmen context during the reign of Selīm I, a reference to ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib is quite logical.<sup>638</sup> These Turkmens could thus very well be Alevis.<sup>639</sup>

The stork’s criticism of the Turkmen peasants centers on their ignorance and lack of care for religious duties, focusing particularly on daily prayer. The stork says that performing daily prayer is the requirement for being part of Muḥammad’s *ummah*, a point of stress with particular relevance when we consider that Alevi communities may be the group in mind. The stork takes care to distinguish himself from the Turkmen, first by offering to teach them how to perform daily prayer, then by calling himself “*namāz maḥmūdi*” (with praiseworthy daily prayer). This is particularly interesting considering Şemsī’s self-identification with the stork. The following two couplets demonstrate this self-identification:

*Bu haber ‘ariflerüñ güftārıdur  
Sözlerüm arşun-ı Leglek yārıdur*

*Pāy-ı rāzum ‘aybını mestūr idüñ  
Artuğ eksük söyledüm ma‘zūr idüñ*

---

<sup>636</sup> For a contextualization of this hadith within the larger tradition of Imams, see Amir-Moezzi, *Le Guide divin*, 123.

<sup>637</sup> *Ibid.*, 118-121.

<sup>638</sup> Şemsī would definitely not refer to Şāh İsmā‘īl in this way in a work presented to Selīm I.

<sup>639</sup> *Ibid.*, 160-163.

This narrative is the talk of gnostics  
My words are friends to the stork's long path<sup>640</sup>

Please hide my fault in my excuse for secrecy  
I may have said too much or too little; please excuse me

A long prayer for Selīm I is also spoken through the mouth of the stork.<sup>641</sup> As can be seen from the list above, the stork characterizes himself in a number of ways, such as Indian sheikh, (like a) holy warrior, frequent undertaker of pilgrimage, man of love and gnostic (*şeyh-i Hindūstānī, namāz maḥmūdı, gāzīler gibi, ḥaccāc, ehl-i dil, 'ārif*). He particularly stresses his frequent travels, which give meaning to the choice of the stork as a symbol. While the same symbolism is in line with Şemsī's portrayal as an immigrant to Anatolia in the biographical dictionaries, the Persian origin is here switched to an Indian one.

The use of the stork as a symbol for a religious man partaking in several categories at once allows Şemsī to avoid being particularly identified with one of the personalities he depicts. Yet at the end of the prayer for Selīm I, Şemsī goes back to referring to himself and his social group as dervishes. He identifies himself once again as an *abdāl* and apologizes to Selīm I for any fault he may have committed.<sup>642</sup> The dynamic behind Şemsī's self-positionings can be interpreted through the following couplets, which explicate the general aim of Şemsī's narrative strategies, starting with the structure of his work:

*Kuşlar eyle didi vü kıldı vedā  
Birbirine kıldılar hoş elvedā*

*Uçdılar gavgā yirinden gitdiler  
'Ālem-i ervāḥa pervāz itdiler*

*Ḥayr-ı bād oldu kamu ru'yāları  
Benlik imiş ortada gavgāları*

*Benligi tende kodı kim her biri  
Çıkdılar şol bir maḳām tutmaz yiri*

*Didiler seyrānımız hep bir gerek  
Toldı 'ālem her gelene yir gerek*

---

<sup>640</sup> Ibid., 169.

<sup>641</sup> Ibid., 170-171.

<sup>642</sup> Ibid., 174, 175.

The birds spoke thus and said good bye  
They bid each other farewell

They flew away from the land of quarrel  
They flew to the world of souls

All their dreams dissipated to lead the way to prosperity  
Their base selves were the reasons for their quarrels

Each one of them left his base self in his body  
They left this abode where noone stays

They said we should all go to contemplate the one  
The world is full; each newcomer needs new space<sup>643</sup>

With the help of the general structure of his work, Şemsî portrays *abdāls* as one social category among many, each with its own mistakes. This could be a narrative strategy to depict *abdāls* as a group which is politically harmless, to distinguish them from their Turkmen supporters while also underlining the innocence of the latter. The criticism of the *abdāl* through the mouth of the religious scholar, on the other hand, would eliminate the possibility of interpreting Şemsî's *abdāl* portrayal as positively biased.

In the introduction and conclusion to the *Deh Murğ*, in which Şemsî speaks as himself, a small number of references give us clues to Şemsî's religious beliefs. In the beginning of the work, Şemsî refers to 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib as the Imam<sup>644</sup> and shows his reverence for the *ahl al-bayt*.<sup>645</sup> In his section of praise to Selīm I, he compares Selīm's heroism to that of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, once again confirming that 'Alī's heroism in holy war was a significantly common topic in oral lore.<sup>646</sup> In the conclusion to his work, Şemsî depicts the world of oneness (*vāḥidiyyet 'ālemi*) as the abode of God as well as the destination of all beings. While his expressions seem to negate the existence of heaven and hell, he nonetheless continues to hold a strict separation between the creator and the created.<sup>647</sup>

Şemsî's *Deh Murğ* is a colorful work which is a rich source on *abdāl* practices in the early 16th century. It also gives us information on how *abdāls* were viewed by different segments of

---

<sup>643</sup> Ibid., 175.

<sup>644</sup> Ibid., 73.

<sup>645</sup> Ibid., 74.

<sup>646</sup> Ibid., 81.

<sup>647</sup> See *ibid.*, 172-173.

society, ranging from enmity to reverence. It shows that Kaygusuz's disregard for religious obligations, lack of belief in the otherworldly existence of heaven and hell, as well as the immanence of God in his creation were generally held by the *abdāls* of the early 16th century. On the other hand, the work does not tell us much about Şemsī's own religious views as an *abdāl*. This is due to the fact that he situates himself primarily as a poet and a storyteller within his text, although he does not identify with this social group in the content of his work.

### **Vīrānī Abdāl, *Risāle*, *Dīvān***

Vīrānī's dates of birth and death are unknown and the secondary studies aiming to establish when he lived can be contradictory. After his own work, our main source on Vīrānī's life is the hagiography of Demir Baba mentioned earlier with regards to Yemīnī. From Yemīnī's *Fazīlet-nāme*, we know that Aқыazılı Sulṭān became the pole (*ḳutb*) of *abdāls* in 901(1496) and remained in this post when Yemīnī wrote his work in 925(1519). Oral lore tells us that Demir Baba's father was also a disciple to Aқыazılı Sulṭān,<sup>648</sup> thus suggesting that Demir Baba became Aқыazılı Sulṭān's disciple and successor towards the end of the latter's life. Demir Baba's hagiography narrates a confrontation between Demir Baba and Vīrānī which took place when Demir Baba was over a hundred years old and Vīrānī was in his thirties, as a result of which Vīrānī died an immediate death at his young age.<sup>649</sup> Demir Baba's hagiography narrates an episode between himself and Sulṭān Aḫmed, who reigned between 1012 (1603) and 1026(1617).<sup>650</sup> All of this suggests that Vīrānī lived at the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century.

The hagiography of Demir Baba portrays Vīrānī in a highly antagonistic tone, although some of this portrayal is in line with what we know of Vīrānī through his work. Vīrānī is described as a true poet, who spoke Arabic and Persian.<sup>651</sup> His main weakness is said to be his pretention to the status of pole (*ḳutb*), reserved for Demir Baba according to the hagiography.

---

<sup>648</sup> See Baha Tanman, "Demir Baba Tekkesi," *TDVİA* Vol. 9. (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1994), 150-151.

<sup>649</sup> See *Demir Baba Velâyetnâmesi*, 147.

<sup>650</sup> See *Demir Baba Velâyetnâmesi*, 95; quoted in: Fatih Usluer, *Hurufî Metinleri I* (Ankara: Birleşik Yayınları, 2014), 95. For a list of aspects of oral lore regarding Vīrānī see *ibid.*, 95-96.

<sup>651</sup> For the whole episode between Vīrānī and Demir Baba, see *Demir Baba Velâyetnâmesi*, 139-150.

Throughout their confrontation, Vīrānī tries to prove to Demir Baba his rank, first via a miracle, then via a horse race, both of which result in the victory of Demir Baba. Vīrānī is rude to Demir Baba and belittles him for his lack of proper education. Yet Demir Baba also emerges victorious from a test in which he is asked to recite and comment on a surah from the Qur'an. Demir Baba criticizes Vīrānī for obeying his base self, as well as relying too much on his intellect, and tells him repeatedly to “erase the ink off his teeth.”<sup>652</sup> After a shameful humiliation by Demir Baba, Vīrānī and his dervishes take off for the lodge of Otman Baba. Vīrānī dies during his short stay at the lodge of a certain Ḥāfız-zāde in Gerlova, where he is buried.<sup>653</sup>

Vīrānī is the author of a treatise in Turkish known under various names, such as the *Risāle-i Vīrānī Baba*, the *Risāle-i Vīrān Abdāl* and the *Faqr-nāme*.<sup>654</sup> He also has a Turkish *Dīvān*. In his treatise and poetry, Vīrānī makes reference to Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī,<sup>655</sup> Seyyid Baṭṭāl Ġāzī,<sup>656</sup> Ḥacı Bektāş,<sup>657</sup> Seyyid ‘Alī Sultān,<sup>658</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl,<sup>659</sup> Kemāl Ümmī,<sup>660</sup> Yemīnī,<sup>661</sup> Şultān Şücā‘,<sup>662</sup> Abdāl Mūsā,<sup>663</sup> Otman Baba,<sup>664</sup> Aḳyazılı Sultān (whom he calls Ḳızı Veli),<sup>665</sup> Balım Sultān,<sup>666</sup> Ḥamza Baba,<sup>667</sup> Beybaba,<sup>668</sup> and Naşīr al- Dīn al- Ṭūsī.<sup>669</sup> Other than

---

<sup>652</sup> See *ibid.*, 146, 149.

<sup>653</sup> This is the same lodge mentioned earlier, which may have been the lodge of Yemīnī.

<sup>654</sup> The treatise includes some verse dispersed within the text.

<sup>655</sup> The references to Faḍl Allāh are particularly numerous but some examples are: Vīrānī, *Âşık Viranî Divanı*, ed. M. Hâlid Bayrı (Istanbul: Maarif Kitaphanesi, 1959), 59, 61, 70, 101, 112, 162, 177, 223, 259.

<sup>656</sup> *Ibid.*, 39, 115, 116; Vīrānī, *Risāle-i Vīrānī Abdāl*, 150.

<sup>657</sup> *Ibid.*, 150, 169; Vīrānī, *Divan*, 39, 93.

<sup>658</sup> Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 216.

<sup>659</sup> *Ibid.*, 216.

<sup>660</sup> *Ibid.*, 216.

<sup>661</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.

<sup>662</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 39.

<sup>663</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>664</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

<sup>665</sup> *Ibid.*, 39. 80-81 (This poem is a eulogy to Aḳyazılı).

<sup>666</sup> *Ibid.*, 93, 222.

<sup>667</sup> *Ibid.*, 39. On Ḥamza Baba see Semavi Eyice, “Hamza Baba Türbesi,” *TDVİA* Vol 15. (Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1997), 502-503.

<sup>668</sup> *Ibid.*, 39, 194. I have not been able to identify Beybaba.

<sup>669</sup> *Ibid.*, 67.

the founder of the Ḥurūfiyya,<sup>670</sup> an Umayyad warrior, and a highly important Shi'i scholar, all of the other names are important Anatolian dervishes, identified either as *abdāls* or *bektāšīs*.<sup>671</sup> Three works which Vīrānī mentions are Ḥacı Bektaş's *Maḳālāt*,<sup>672</sup> Yemīnī's *Fazīlet-nāme*,<sup>673</sup> and Faḍl Allāh's *Jāwidān-nāma*.<sup>674</sup> Vīrānī refers to himself often as "Urum Abdālī" (*Abdāl* of *Rūm*). He identifies the leader of his group as Aḳyazılı Sulṭān. Yet his references to Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī are far more numerous than the references to any of the other names mentioned above. When we also take into account Vīrānī's proclaimed reverence for Ḥacı Bektāš and Balım Sulṭān, we can say that he was an *abdāl*, a *ḥurūfī*, and a *bektāšī*. The content of his work is indicative of a mixture of these three affiliations. In addition, Vīrānī sometimes calls himself *Nuṣayrī* in his poetry.<sup>675</sup> While some authors interpret this as a Nuṣayrī origin,<sup>676</sup> others interpret it as an attestation to Vīrānī's divination of 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib.<sup>677</sup> Vīrānī also calls himself *Ca'ferī*, to underline his adherence to Twelver Shi'ism.<sup>678</sup> At one point, he refers to himself as *ḳalender*, to stress his antinomian social tendencies.<sup>679</sup>

The fact that Vīrānī translates the Arabic and Persian quotations in his treatise indicates that he wrote for a public which was not versed in these languages. Yet his treatise is a highly detailed theoretical work focusing on various numerical calculations of the Ḥurūfī kind. It thus supports that the idea that Ḥurūfī doctrines became rooted in Bektashi thought during the 16th century.<sup>680</sup> I will not focus on Vīrānī's Ḥurūfī teachings, the study of which should constitute an

---

<sup>670</sup> We have to underline that Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī himself did not use the term Ḥurūfī; see Mir-Kasimov, 2.

<sup>671</sup> Kemāl Ümmī was neither, but he was part of the same dervish circle. See the introduction for a short discussion on him.

<sup>672</sup> Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 169.

<sup>673</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.

<sup>674</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 169.

<sup>675</sup> See *ibid.*, 73, 118, 236.

<sup>676</sup> See Bedri Noyan, *Bütün Yönleriyle Bektâşîlik ve Alevîlik* Vol 4. (Ankara: Ardıç Yayınları, 2001), 536.

<sup>677</sup> See Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, *Alevî-Bektâşî Nefesleri* (Istanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1992), 20.

<sup>678</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 218; Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 226.

<sup>679</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 177, 219-220 (a poem in praise of the *ḳalender*).

<sup>680</sup> See Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, *Hurufî Metinleri Kataloğu* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973), 29; Hamid Algar, "The Ḥurūfī Influence on Bektashism," in Alexandre Popovic and Gilles Veinstein (eds), *Bektachiyya: Études sur l'ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant de Hadji Bektach* (Istanbul: Éditions Isis, 1995), 48-49. For an overview of Bektashi-Ḥurūfī relations, see Birge, 148-159.

extensive individual study. My main interest in this section is to evaluate how the doctrinal elements we saw in Kaygusuz Abdāl's works as well as those of Şādīk Abdāl, Yemīnī, and Şemsī are continued or transformed in the corpus of Vīrānī. Before doing this, I wish to begin with Vīrānī's depictions of the *abdāls* of Rūm as a group, in both their beliefs and practices. These depictions are found in his *Dīvān*.

The *abdāls* of Rūm have accepted Ḥaydar ('Alī b. Abī Ṭālib) as their sultan<sup>681</sup> and Aқыzalı as their present leader.<sup>682</sup> They venerate the *ahl al-'abā'* (people of the mantle) and the descendants of 'Alī.<sup>683</sup> They smoke hashish and consume alcohol.<sup>684</sup> Some prefer to remain sober while some are always intoxicated.<sup>685</sup> They shave their heads and walk bare feet.<sup>686</sup> In contrast to the Sufis, they do not accumulate any wealth.<sup>687</sup> They wear caps (*tāc*), animal hides (*pūst*), cloaks (*hırka*), felt (*nemed*), and belts (*kemer*). They carry axes (*teber*)<sup>688</sup> and blades (*īḡ*).<sup>689</sup> They practice blood-shedding during Muharram.<sup>690</sup> They perform miracles.<sup>691</sup> Vīrānī uses the words *tercemān* and *gūlbeng* to refer to prayer, thus indicating that these Alevi-Bektashi terms were established before the 17th century.<sup>692</sup> He also refers to the '*ayn-ı cem*', the name of the religious ceremony conducted to our day in Bektashism and Alevism.<sup>693</sup>

---

<sup>681</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 49.

<sup>682</sup> *Ibid.*, 80-81.

<sup>683</sup> *Ibid.*, 105, 93, 215.

<sup>684</sup> *Ibid.*, 72.

<sup>685</sup> *Ibid.*, 229.

<sup>686</sup> *Ibid.*, 105, 216, 229.

<sup>687</sup> *Ibid.*, 203.

<sup>688</sup> *Ibid.*, 216. For the *teber* see De Jong, "Iconography," 7-29.

<sup>689</sup> *Ibid.*, 216.

<sup>690</sup> *Ibid.*, 195, 218, 242.

<sup>691</sup> *Ibid.*, 229.

<sup>692</sup> For the word *tercemān* see *ibid.*, 176, 196, 239; for the word *gūlbeng* see *ibid.*, 189, 215, 216, 226.

<sup>693</sup> *Ibid.*, 215, 226.

In his poetry, Vīrānī occasionally criticizes the *şofu* (hypocrite Sufi),<sup>694</sup> the preacher (*vā'iz*),<sup>695</sup> the ascetic (*zāhid*),<sup>696</sup> and the doctor of law (*faḳīh*)<sup>697</sup> for attacking the *abdāls*, for their hypocrisy and egotism, for their excessive pride and antagonism towards 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib. In one poem, Vīrānī lists the attacks against his own self. Accordingly, he is called a *Rāfīzī* in the pejorative sense; he is called an innovator (*bid'at*), canonically impure (*tahāretsüz*), and Judah's donkey (*Yahūdānuñ eşegi*).<sup>698</sup>

On the other hand, Vīrānī's confrontations are not limited to those whom he deems to be representatives of exoteric Islam. On several occasions, the *abdāls* themselves become the object of his attacks. In his poetry, he accuses some *abdāls* for lacking knowledge of the pillars (*erkān*) of their faith.<sup>699</sup> Elsewhere, he says that the *abdāls* of his time have not turned away from the world of multiplicity as they should, but are rather attached to it via their wives, sons and wealth.<sup>700</sup> Their exoteric profession of love for 'Alī and his family is nothing but hypocrisy because their true servitude is to their base selves.<sup>701</sup> One passage in Vīrānī's *Risāle* is particularly harsh in its depiction of hypocrite *abdāls*:

*İmdi iy ṭālib-i faḳr u fenā! Bir kişide 'ilm, 'amel, edeb, ḥayā olmasa ol kişiniñ cānına ve erkānına ve pīrine ve her umūrına şad hezār la'net olsun ki ben abdālam diyü da 'vā idüp da 'vāsında yalan çıḳa.*

Now, o seeker of poverty and annihilation! If a person does not have the science, the acts, the conduct, and the modesty, a hundred thousand laments to that person's soul, the pillars of his religion, his spiritual director, and all his affairs. He lies in his claim to be an *abdāl*.<sup>702</sup>

One cannot but wonder if this passage contains any secret reference to the confrontation with Demir Baba. That said, the passage does embody clues to Vīrānī's temperament, wherein his

---

<sup>694</sup> Ibid., 58, 175.

<sup>695</sup> Ibid., 58, 161, 175.

<sup>696</sup> Ibid., 227, 257.

<sup>697</sup> Ibid., 265.

<sup>698</sup> Ibid., 259. Interestingly, Vīrānī asks for God's compassion and benevolence towards his attackers, much like a similar poem found in Ḳaygusuz Abdāl's *Dīvān*; see Ḳaygusuz Abdāl, *Dīvān*, fol. 213a.

<sup>699</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 70.

<sup>700</sup> Ibid., 240.

<sup>701</sup> Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 225.

<sup>702</sup> Ibid., 213.



antinomian tendencies are less pronounced than his focus on science and education. Yet Vīrānī does put significant emphasis on the importance of abandoning the world. As we saw above, the failure to do so is the major weakness of the *abdāls* of his day. Vīrānī invokes the concept of blame (*melāmet*) to underline the spiritual accomplishment achieved by incurring blame as well as the blameworthy nature of the world of multiplicity which the true lovers of God have abandoned.<sup>703</sup> Similar to Ẓayğusuz Abdāl, according to Vīrānī, those who have abandoned this world and the next have let go of their fear and acquired certainty.<sup>704</sup> Vīrānī also adopts Ẓayğusuz’s distinction between the Perfect Man, denoted by the word *insān*, and the ordinary ignorant man, referred to as *ḥayvān* (animal). For Vīrānī, those men who do not know themselves, God, and ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib are in fact animals in nature.<sup>705</sup>

Vīrānī’s portrayal of religious duties breaks with the general portrayal of the *abdāls* in his period as irreverent of the *sharī‘a*. Vīrānī devotes significant passages in his *Risāle* to Ḥurūfī calculations regarding daily prayer and fasting.<sup>706</sup> However, these calculations do not treat devotional duties as mere allegories, as is claimed by scholars regarding the Bektashi adoption of the Ḥurūfī stance on the *sharī‘a*.<sup>707</sup> Vīrānī also underlines the importance of performing the five religious duties.<sup>708</sup> He says that the people accuse him and his fellow *abdāls* of not performing the five daily prayers because they do so out of sight.<sup>709</sup> Perhaps this is corroborated by the details of Vīrānī’s death as mentioned in the hagiography of Demir Baba, wherein he is said to have died after performing the noon prayer. On the other hand, it would be incorrect for us to assume that Vīrānī’s performance of daily prayer is a Sunni attribute. He describes the content of his meditation during prayer as Muḥammad, ‘Alī, the *ahl al-bayt*, the Twelve Imams, the Fourteen Innocents,<sup>710</sup> and the descendants of ‘Alī.<sup>711</sup> Vīrānī’s portrayal of a hypocrite dervish in

---

<sup>703</sup> See Vīrānī, *Divan*, 30, 59, 174, 205, 212, 214, 231.

<sup>704</sup> *Ibid.*, 99.

<sup>705</sup> Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 143, 184.

<sup>706</sup> For the calculations on daily prayer, see *ibid.*, 173, 200, 203. For the calculations on fasting, see *ibid.*, 200-201, 204

<sup>707</sup> See Algar, “The Ḥurūfī Influence,” 52.

<sup>708</sup> Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 202.

<sup>709</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 229.

<sup>710</sup> See below for an explanation.

<sup>711</sup> See Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 226; Vīrānī, *Divan*, 100.

a passage in his *Risāle* is particularly revealing of the importance he gives to fasting and daily prayer:

*İmdi erenlerüñ sözini şınduran ol kimsedür ki evliyā dergāhına gelür, bendeyem dir, tāt u püst u hırka vü fakr libāsını egnine alur, başına tırāş u erkān kabul eyler. Andan döner, ol tāt ile ve püst ile ve hırka ile ve ol kisvet ü erkānla zinā ve livāta eyler ve namāz kılmaz ve oruç tutmaz ve şarāb içer ve yalan söyler.*

A person who breaks the word of fellow dervishes is one who comes to the saint's lodge; professes his servitude; wears the cap, the animal hide, the cloak, and the dress of poverty; accepts shaving his head and the pillars of the path. And then he goes and with the same cap, hide, and cloak, with those garments and pillars he performs adultery and sodomy, does not perform daily prayer, does not fast, drinks alcohol, and tells lies.<sup>712</sup>

Before treating the particularly Shi'ite aspects of Vīrānī's works, I wish to focus on certain elements which have been major themes in my treatment of Qaygusuz Abdāl, such as the doctrine of the Four Gates, immanence versus transcendence, and the notion of the Perfect Man. I will begin with Vīrānī's stance on afterlife, which is also similar to his stance on daily prayer. In one place in his *Risāle*, Vīrānī states that this world is the true place of unification with God.<sup>713</sup> Elsewhere, however, he particularly stresses the existence of heaven and hell, while stating that the love of 'Alī and his descendants is the prerequisite for entering the former.<sup>714</sup> He also says that a true lover of 'Alī will be uninterested in heaven and hell, but will see unification with 'Alī as his only aim.<sup>715</sup>

Vīrānī's treatment of the doctrine of the Four Gates suggests that he was influenced by two distinct teachings, one coming from Qaygusuz Abdāl's works and the other from Hacı Bektaş's *Maḳālāt*. In the beginning of his *Risāle*, Vīrānī follows Qaygusuz's order of the four gates and does not mention the forty stations ( *kırk maḳām*).<sup>716</sup> However, later in the text, he switches to the order in Hacı Bektaş's *Maḳālāt* and also refers to the concept of the forty stations,

---

<sup>712</sup> Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 175.

<sup>713</sup> *Ibid.*, 218.

<sup>714</sup> *Ibid.*, 230; Vīrānī, *Divan*, 181, 207, 212. In one poem, Vīrānī says that heaven is made up of the elements of water and earth, while hell is made up of the elements of wind and fire; see *ibid.*, 207. In fact, he has a complex doctrine regarding the four elements. For some examples see *ibid.*, 175, 204, 240.

<sup>715</sup> *Ibid.*, 235.

<sup>716</sup> Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 153-155.

although he does not list the stations in detail.<sup>717</sup> Interestingly, he identifies the third gate (*ma'rifet*) with Muḥammad and the fourth gate (*ḥakīkat*) with 'Alī. His depictions of the four gates focus on identifying them with different parts of the human body. The references to the doctrine in Vīrānī's *Dīvān* are also in line with the order of the gates in the *Maḳālāt*<sup>718</sup>; these typically emphasize the divinization of 'Alī.

In one of his poems in his *Dīvān*, Vīrānī does a terminological classification of different types of intellect. Similar to Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl, he defines the *'aql-ı ma'āş* (the intellect for subsistence) as the intellect which binds one to the world of multiplicity. In place of Ḳayḡusuz's terminology of the *'aql-ı ma'ād* (the intellect for the ultimate goal), which is the intellect allowing the disciple to remain on the path and lead a righteous life, Vīrānī prefers the term *'aql-ı cüz'ī* (the partial intellect) to refer to the intellect which leads one to heaven. Lastly, he identifies the intellect which unites one with God as the *'aql-ı küll* (the whole intellect).<sup>719</sup>

God's immanence and transcendence are not subjects treated extensively by Vīrānī. However, we can summarize his stance in the following way: When speaking to or about God, which happens only rarely, Vīrānī stresses God's transcendence.<sup>720</sup> When speaking to or about 'Alī, as he does throughout both of his works, he equates 'Alī with the absolute essence (*zāt-ı muṭlak*).<sup>721</sup> As we will see in detail below, Vīrānī stresses 'Alī's immanence in all beings, as the soul of all bodies.<sup>722</sup> Vīrānī considers God's absolute immanence as manifesting itself through 'Alī, whom he describes as the First and the Last.<sup>723</sup> Vīrānī defines perfection as attaining 'Alī and his family.<sup>724</sup> In fact, neither in his *Risāle* nor in his *Dīvān* does he spend time elaborating on the Perfect Man. His doctrinal descriptions on man focus on creating parallels between the

---

<sup>717</sup> Ibid., 176, 211-212. P. 211 also includes the relationship of the doctrine with the four elements.

<sup>718</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 96, 225. Also see pp. 54 and 64 for references to the doctrine of the Four Gates.

<sup>719</sup> Ibid., 264.

<sup>720</sup> Ibid., 192; Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 215.

<sup>721</sup> Ibid., 183, 237.

<sup>722</sup> Ibid., 183.

<sup>723</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 55, 102, 111, 199-200.

<sup>724</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 213. In the same work, Vīrānī defines his aim as being in likeness to the word of the divine All-Compassionate (*mişāl-i nuḳ-ı rahmān-ı ilāhī*); see *ibid.*, 40. One of his poems is similar to the genre of the *devriyye*, though it does not include the two arcs representative of the genre. It thus resembles such poems by Ḳayḡusuz discussed in the third chapter. See *ibid.*, 203-204.

different kinds of soul (*rūh*), self (*nefs*), body parts, and worlds (*‘ālem*).<sup>725</sup> Vīrānī also draws numerical parallels between elements of the universe and different parts of the human body, in a way which resembles Ḳaygūsuz’s *Vücūd-nāme*.<sup>726</sup> When thought together with the prevalence of Ḥurūfī numerical calculations in the *Risāle*, Vīrānī’s descriptions give us the impression that Demir Baba’s criticism of Vīrānī for relying too much on the intellect to express his spiritual level was at least partially true.

Vīrānī’s dualistic vision of the world is reminiscent of the dualism present in early Shi’ism.<sup>727</sup> Vīrānī states that created beings are separated into two, as holders of faith (*īmān*) and blasphemy (*kūfr*), in accordance with their love of ‘Alī or animosity towards him. This in turn is a reflection of the duality of God’s names of grace (*cemāl*) and wrath (*celāl*).<sup>728</sup> The concepts of *teberrā* and *tevellā* are prevalent throughout Vīrānī’s *Risāle* and *Dīvān*,<sup>729</sup> with a particular emphasis on the former, which is sometimes equated with one’s battle with one’s base self.<sup>730</sup> Vīrānī’s veneration of the Twelve Imams has certain interesting aspects to underline: On several occasions, Vīrānī refers to the Twelve Imams as the twelve lights (*oniki nūr*), thus indicating his conception that the light of Muḥammad-‘Alī is twelve-fold.<sup>731</sup> In one poem, Vīrānī states that the Twelve Imams are none but ‘Alī himself, since ‘Alī is the unity of God’s self-manifestation.<sup>732</sup> Vīrānī describes his religious practice as the pillars of religion of the path established by Ja‘far al-Šādiq (*tarīk-i Imām Ca‘feru’š-Šādiq erkānī*).<sup>733</sup> Lastly, Vīrānī does not identify the Mahdī with Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī as do the followers of the Ḥurūfī tradition, but rather remains faithful to the Twelver Shi’ite identity of Imam Muḥammad Maḥdī.<sup>734</sup>

---

<sup>725</sup> Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 190, 192.

<sup>726</sup> *Ibid.*, 209, 212.

<sup>727</sup> See in particular Amir-Moezzi, “Seul l’homme de Dieu est humain,” in *La Religion discrète*, 209-228.

<sup>728</sup> Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 248-253.

<sup>729</sup> For the term *teberrā*, see *ibid.*, 124, 144, 147, 168, 174, 175, 180, 183, 186, 187, 192, 193, 194, 202; Vīrānī, *Divan*, 44, 153, 224. For the term *tevellā*, see Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 124, 161, 252.

<sup>730</sup> *Ibid.*, 185.

<sup>731</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 32, 38, 251.

<sup>732</sup> *Ibid.*, 188.

<sup>733</sup> Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 194.

<sup>734</sup> *Ibid.*, 171, 180, 183, 191.

In addition to the veneration of the Twelve Imams, which we saw to be present in Kaygusuz Abdāl as well as Šadīk Abdāl, Yemīnī and Şemsī, Vīrānī also puts focus on the *āl-i ‘abā* (People of the Mantle)<sup>735</sup> and the Fourteen Pure Innocents (*çārdeh ma ‘şūm-ı pāk*).<sup>736</sup> While the former is a borrowing from Shi’ite tradition, the latter conception is a transformation of the concept in Shi’ism.<sup>737</sup> The fourteen pure innocents in Bektashi and *abdāl* doctrine are children of Imams who were martyred in their youth, several of which were killed in the Battle of Karbala. Although their names differ in the texts, a common list can be found in Birge’s *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*.<sup>738</sup>

With regards to their teachings on Muḥammad and ‘Alī, Vīrānī’s *Risāle* and *Dīvān* display different temperaments. In the *Risāle*, several passages highlight the unity of Muḥammad and ‘Alī, who are identified respectively as *nebiyyullāh* (God’s messenger) and *veliyyullāh* (God’s friend).<sup>739</sup> The unity of the light of prophecy (*nūr-ı nübüvvet*) and the light of sainthood (*nūr-ı velāyet*) is stressed.<sup>740</sup> Muḥammad and ‘Alī are considered as a single entity, so much so that the first Imam is referred to as Muḥammad-‘Alī.<sup>741</sup>

Vīrānī’s second tendency is to identify ‘Alī with both God’s first theophany and God himself, a tendency which becomes much more pronounced in his *Dīvān*. His *Dīvān* only includes one verse expressing the unity of Muḥammad and ‘Alī.<sup>742</sup> The rest is devoted entirely to ‘Alī, in a way that leaves references to the Twelve Imams also in the shadow of ‘Alī’s divinity. In both the *Risāle* and the *Dīvān*, as the dot beneath the *ba* according to the famous hadith, ‘Alī is

<sup>735</sup> Vīrānī also includes Muḥammad’s wife Khadīja in this category; see *ibid.*, 96-180.

<sup>736</sup> See *ibid.*, 180, 223, 226; Vīrānī, *Divan*, 28, 98, 101, 105, 136, 186, 202. The Twelve Imams, Khadīja, Fāṭima, and the Fourteen Innocents are numerically important in their correlation with the alphabet; see Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 191.

<sup>737</sup> See Amir-Moezzi, *Le Guide divin*, 73-75.

<sup>738</sup> See Birge, 147-148. For the relation of the Fourteen Pure Innocents to Ḥurūfī thought, see *ibid.*, 151-152.

<sup>739</sup> See *ibid.*, 148.

<sup>740</sup> *Ibid.*, 150, 194.

<sup>741</sup> *Ibid.*, 191. This is also how Vīrānī interprets the meaning of the prophetic saying “*lahmika lahmī nafsika nafsī damika damī jismika jismī rūḥika rūḥī* (your flesh is my flesh; your blood is my blood; your breath is my breath; your body is my body; your soul is my soul).” Regarding the unity of Muḥammad-‘Alī, also see *ibid.*, 144, 217, 230. Their unity is identified with the word *bismillāh*; see *ibid.*, 217.

<sup>742</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 95. The few other references to Muḥammad refer to the narrative of his ascension in which he comes across ‘Alī (p. 66), the notion that ‘Alī consists of the best part (*zūbde*) of Muḥammad’s light (p. 118) as well as the esoteric dimension of his science (p.235), and the idea that in the Qur’an, Muḥammad praised ‘Alī (p. 118).

the dot of oneness (*noḳṭā-i vaḥdet*) from which the whole universe emerged.<sup>743</sup> ‘Alī is the soul of all beings, the hidden aspect of all bodies.<sup>744</sup> In one place in his *Risāle*, Vīrānī calls ‘Alī the form of the All-Compassionate (*ṣūret-i Raḥmān*).<sup>745</sup>

On the other hand, the majority of the references to ‘Alī equate him with God.<sup>746</sup> As mentioned before, ‘Alī is referred to as the absolute essence (*zāṭ-ı muṭlāk*).<sup>747</sup> In a formulation influenced by the doctrine of the oneness of being, ‘Alī is both God and His theophany, both the Creator and the created, the hidden and the manifest.<sup>748</sup> He is referred to with the Names of God.<sup>749</sup> Quranic verses describing God are used to express that their true object of reference is ‘Alī.<sup>750</sup> In fact, ‘Alī is the possessor of all four of the holy books and hence the source of the Qur’an.<sup>751</sup> All of the holy books and the pre-Islamic prophets were sent with the purpose of praising ‘Alī,<sup>752</sup> who constituted the object of their knowledge.<sup>753</sup> The preeternal pact between God and his servants expressed by the Quranic verse “Am I not your Lord? They said, Yes” (7:172) is also interpreted by Vīrānī to refer to ‘Alī. ‘Alī is thus the object of faith in all hearts

---

<sup>743</sup> Ibid., 237, 238, 245, 261; Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 183, 223. Elsewhere, this dot is equated with God; see Vīrānī, *Divan*, 102.

<sup>744</sup> Ibid., 68, 94, 236; Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 183. Vīrānī expresses this belief via a symbolism which was used by Yemīnī to denote the unity of Muḥammad and ‘Alī. According to this symbolism, ‘Alī’s head figures on all robes.

<sup>745</sup> Ibid., 183. In the same passage, ‘Alī is also the cupbearer on the day of judgement (*sākī-i rūz-ı kıyāmet*). In another passage, ‘Alī is referred to as the possessor of ta’wīl (*sāhib-i te’vīl-i Qur’ān*); see *ibid.*, 169.

<sup>746</sup> For direct expressions of this, see Vīrānī, *Divan*, 56, 88, 90, 102, 112, 118, 120, 167, 188, 222, 225, 242.

<sup>747</sup> Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 183; Vīrānī, *Divan*, 95, 237. ‘Alī is also referred to as God’s essence and attributes (*zāṭ u ṣifātullāh*); see *ibid.*, 56.

<sup>748</sup> See *ibid.*, 56, 102, 118

<sup>749</sup> Ibid., 101, 118, 167. He is also identified with the word *bismillāh*, which was used to identify Muḥammad-‘Alī in one part of the *Risāle*; see *ibid.*, 245; Vīrānī, *Risāle*, 223. In one passage in the *Risāle*, Vīrānī lists the seven names of ‘Alī in accordance with the seven letters in the phrase *bismillāh*. Some of these names figure in the holy books preceding the Quran. See *ibid.*, 223. In his *Faḏīlet-nāme*, Yemīnī also lists the names of ‘Alī in the previous holy books, although these are different from those expressed by Vīrānī; see Yemīnī, *Faḏīlet-nāme*, 125.

<sup>750</sup> Vīrānī, *Divan*, 59. ‘Alī is also identified with the surah of *Fātiḥa*; see *ibid.*, 165.

<sup>751</sup> Ibid., 225.

<sup>752</sup> Ibid., 205.

<sup>753</sup> Ibid., 245.

and their spiritual director in this world and the next.<sup>754</sup> The aspirant on the path to perfection has let go of his caring for heaven and hell, to hold as his only aim the unification with ‘Alī.<sup>755</sup>

To conclude, the preceding analysis of Vīrānī’s *Risāle* and *Dīvān* shows that the veneration of ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib in Şādīk Abdāl, Yemīnī and Şemsī’s works is now transformed into a deification. This deification goes hand in hand with a complex theoretical framework based on teachings of Ḥurūfī, Shi’ite and Sufī origin. While the *Risāle* is largely a didactic work directed at the disciple, Vīrānī’s *Dīvān* contains almost no poetry targeting the novice or the lay adherent. Unlike the poetry of Kaygusuz Abdāl, the content of Vīrānī’s *Dīvān* does not shift according to the audience. Instead, Vīrānī’s doctrine is evenly dispersed throughout his poetry, some of which may have served liturgical purposes.

## Conclusion

I wish to devote this conclusion to the points of difference and continuity between the texts which will allow for an evaluation of the doctrinal evolution of *abdāl* thought. To begin with, Şādīk Abdāl’s *Dīvān* puts its focus on sainthood and designates ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib as the face of God and the esoteric dimension of all saints, while leaving out specific references to Muḥammad or doctrines related to him. Yemīnī’s *Fazīlet-nāme*, on the other hand, dresses ‘Alī as an epic hero and emphasizes his role as an Islamizer. The work establishes Muḥammad’s superiority over ‘Alī on several occasions, while also focusing on their essential unity. Whereas Yemīnī’s treatment of *nubuwwa* and *walāya* shows Shi’ite influence, elements such as the three caliphs’ admiration of ‘Alī suggest that Yemīnī was looking for some common ground with his Sunni audience as well.

Yemīnī mentions the *abdāl* practices of shaving all facial hair, extreme asceticism, and extensive travel. His references to companionship (*muşāhiblik*) indicate that this important Alevi institution already existed in the early 16th century. While Şādīk Abdāl’s *Dīvān* makes no reference to the concepts of *tevellā* and *teberrā*, these concepts are prevalent in Yemīnī’s text. Considering the absence of the concepts from Kaygusuz Abdāl’s texts as well, we can say that these concepts did not become central in *abdāl* doctrine before the late 15th century. Both Şādīk

---

<sup>754</sup> Ibid., 236.

<sup>755</sup> Ibid., 235.

Abdāl and Yemīnī criticize the hypocrisy of religious scholars, Sufis, and ascetics. This thus seems to be a common trend which originated early on, as the third chapter suggests. Neither Şādīk Abdāl nor Yemīnī posit the possibility of a union with God's essence, which was a prevalent aspect of K̄aygusuz's work. This aspect of K̄aygusuz should probably be considered as part of his unique thought.

Şemsī's *Deh Murğ* portrays *abdāls* as one of many groups. The *abdāl* elements exemplified in his work are thus those traits which fit the public image of the *abdāls*, and not necessarily Şemsī's own views as an *abdāl*. As was the case for Şādīk Abdāl, in Şemsī's work *abdāl* and *bektāşī* constitute the same category. The *abdāls* are followers of 'Alī b. Abī Tālib, Imām Ḥusayn, and the Maḥdī. They practice *tevellā* and *teberrā*. They mourn during 'Āshūrā'. They consume cannabis and alcohol, disregard religious duties, and consider this world to be the only place of salvation. These characteristics are reminiscent of K̄aygusuz Abdāl's self-portrayal. As was the case for K̄aygusuz Abdāl, the *abdāls* of the early 16th century were also under attack for their beliefs and practices considered as innovation.

Vīrānī was also both *abdāl* and *bektāşī*. He differs from his predecessors by his Ḥurūfī affiliation. Vīrānī's work offers us many details on *abdāl* practices. In the late 16th and early 17th centuries, *abdāls* continued to consume cannabis and alcohol, to practice the four blows, and venerate the descendants of 'Alī. They did not accumulate wealth. Their paraphernalia included caps, belts, axes, and blades, which complemented the animal hides and cloaks worn since K̄aygusuz's time. Like his predecessors, Vīrānī is critical of hypocrite Sufis, ascetics, and religious scholars. He also puts emphasis on the importance of abandoning the world. On the other hand, he cannot be said to disregard the *sharī'a* completely, as he makes numerous references to daily prayer and fasting.

Vīrānī is the only one of the four authors to treat the doctrine of the four gates. His treatment shows the influence of both Ḥacı Bektāş and K̄aygusuz Abdāl. While Vīrānī's *Risāle* expresses the unity of prophecy and sainthood via the unity of Muḥammad and 'Alī, the *Dīvān* is devoted largely to the veneration of 'Alī, whose deification has now reached an extent unforeseen in the previous authors.

Our discussion in this chapter demonstrates the heterogeneity of the *abdāl* movement which, due to its structure of loose affiliation, left greater room for the expression of individual temperament and belief. This diversity is also the result of the wide array of literary tools and



genres available to the members of the movement, depending on their education, social circles, selected audience, and temperaments. In addition, our four authors show us that the co-habitation of the *abdāl* and *bektāṣī* movements was not an incident specific to Ẓayğusuz Abdāl, but a phenomenon prevalent throughout *abdāl* history, up until the *abdāl* movement's complete dissolution in Bektashism.<sup>756</sup>

---

<sup>756</sup> As such, the general argument regarding the separate identities of the *abdāls* and *bektāṣīs* up until the 17th century, which was part of the legacy of Fuad Köprülü, needs to be revised. See Köprülü, "Abdal," 36; Orhan F. Köprülü, "Abdal: Edebiyat," 61, among others.

**PART TWO**

*The Book of Prattle (Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa) by aygusuz Abdāl*

## About the present edition

### *Selected manuscripts*

1) Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Ms. or. Oct. 4044 (Manuscript B)

Earliest copy of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, dated 907 (1501/1502), between fol. 263b-288b in a collection of Kaygusuz's works consisting of 345 folios. Written in naskh script by a copyist named Dervīş 'Alī Ḥorāsānī, with 15 lines and 1 column per page. The physical dimensions of the manuscript are 195x125-140x90 mm. Watermarked Genoese, watermarked brown, and yellow paper.<sup>757</sup>

The content of the manuscript is as follows: *Serāy-nāme* between fol. 1b-70a, *Na 't-ı 'Aliyyü'l-Murtażā* between fol. 70b-71a, *Meşnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz* between fol. 71b-105a, *Gevher-nāme* between fol. 105a-107a, *İkinci Meşnevī* between fol. 107a-120a, five *ğazels* between fol. 120a-121b, *Üçüncü Meşnevī* between fol. 122a-134a, *tercī'-i bend* between fol. 134a-137b, *terkīb-i bend* between fol. 137b-139b, *Gülistān* between fol. 140a-210b, two *ğazels* between fol. 211a-211b, *Dil-güşā* between fol. 211b-260b, poetry between fol. 261a-262b, a poem added by a later hand on fol. 263a, approximately 130 poems between fol. 288b-341b, miscellanea by various hands between fol. 342a-344b, one poem by Kaygusuz on fol. 345a.

The spelling of the manuscript indicates that dictation was used in its production. The copyist has poor spelling and lacks knowledge of Persian and Arabic. Arabic and Persian words are usually written according to their Turkish pronunciations. Letters which are not pronounced in Turkish are often not written; short vowels are shown by letters; letters such as [ث], [ض] and [ظ] which do not figure in Turkish words are often replaced with letters such as [س] and [ز] which fit the Turkish pronunciation. In Turkish words, the letter [l] is often used in the middle of the word to denote the sounds [a] and [e]. It also tends to replace the letter [e] at the end of a word. We can thus say that the manuscript does not fit the standards of spelling for Turkish words. Many words appear separated into syllables. The Arabic conjunction wa(u) is written usually with the letter [و]. Only rarely does it appear with [و]. Turkish words which contain the [d]-[t] change are

---

<sup>757</sup> See Flemming, *Türkische Handschriften, Teil I*, 326-331 (No: 424).

written with [d]; Turkish words which can be written with [k], [h], or [ğ] are written with [ğ]. The vowels in some words and suffixes show rounding or unrounding according to vowel harmony.

One peculiar aspect of manuscript B is the frequent use of the phrase “didi dir” in place of simply “didi” (he said) or “dir” (he says). The fact that this phrase appears sporadically in the other manuscripts indicates that it is a grammatical feature which existed in the original manuscript but was gradually changed in the later copies due to its archaic nature. Two hypotheses are possible in explaining this grammatical feature. Firstly, it can be understood as a double narration, in which one narrator quotes what a second narrator has said. The phrase would then be translated as “he says that he said.” Yet this does not in any way match the content. The second hypothesis is that we have here a particular use resembling the phrase “dip didi” in Eastern Turkish, as in “he said that.” The second hypothesis makes more sense in terms of meaning. Due to the lack of other similar examples, this issue will have to wait for a future clarification by grammatologists.

Lastly, a number of times in the manuscript the word “dir” appears without the first word of “didi,” in places where no direct or indirect speech is present. The only possible interpretation I can make for this is that there perhaps used to be an extra layer of narration in the original work which was later dropped. Yet the likelihood of this seems doubtful. I have kept these extra “dir”s in the transliterated text, so that they can be useful for resolving the matter in the future.

## 2) Manisa, Manisa Provincial Public Library, 45 Hk 7793/2 (Manuscript M)

Copy dated 956 (1549), between fol. 164b-221a in a manuscript consisting of 223 folios. Written in naskh script by copyist named ‘Alī b. Ḥacı ‘Osmān (pen name Mu‘ammāyī), with 11 lines and 1 column per page. The place of copy is İskitye.<sup>758</sup> The physical dimensions of the manuscript are 215x155-130x80 mm.<sup>759</sup> The title of the work and the name of the copyist are erroneous in the catalogue. The name of the work appears as “Mağlaṭa-i Kaygusuz” in the manuscript. In a cardboard and cloth binding covered with ebru paper with a black spine. The paper is Eastern paper (*ābādī*).

---

<sup>758</sup> Possibly a small town in the region of Genisea. See Halit Çal, “1192 Numaralı 1696-1716 Tarihli Hurufat Defterine Göre Yunanistan’daki Türk Mimarisi,” *Erdem: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Dergisi* 58 (2010): 176.

<sup>759</sup> “T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Türkiye Yazmaları,” accessed February 27, 2016,

[https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay\\_goster.php?k=22566](https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay_goster.php?k=22566).

Between fol. 1a-164a, an anonymous work on Sufism which is missing in the beginning. Before this, there are four folios containing an excerpt from another anonymous work on Sufism, by another hand. These folios seem to have been bound together with the manuscript at a later date. Between fol. 221b-223b, miscellanea by another hand, in Persian and Turkish.

The copyist of manuscript M almost always uses correct spelling for Arabic, Persian, and Turkish words. Although he generally does not use vowel marks, he puts them when he believes that a word is hard to read. In writing Turkish words, he sometimes denotes vowels with vowel marks instead of letters. This can also be seen in the case of suffixes ending with vowels. Such spelling inconsistencies may have been inherited from an earlier manuscript, which would explain why they are not the common form of spelling throughout the text. Turkish words which contain the [d]-[t] change are written with [d]; Turkish words which can be written with [k], [h], or [ğ] can be seen written with all three letters. Couplets are designated by the word “beyt,” written in red.

### ***Other Manuscripts***

- 1) Ankara, National Library, Collection of Ankara Adnan Ötüken Provincial Public Library, 06 Hk 824/2 (Manuscript AO)<sup>760</sup>

Undated copy, between fol. 75b-104b in a manuscript consisting of 104 folios which also includes Kaygusuz Abdāl’s *Dīvān*. Written in naskh script by an unidentified copyist, with varying lines and 1-2 columns per page. The physical dimensions of the manuscript are 205x150 - 175x110 mm.<sup>761</sup> On fol. 94a, a birth record dated 1262(1846) by a certain Sa‘īd, the handwriting of which does not match the copyist. Eastern paper (*ābādī*). Cover with flap, lined with red cloth; cardboard binding.

---

<sup>760</sup> The transliteration of the manuscript is published in Yücel, “Kaygusuz Abdal’ın Kitâbu Mağlata’sı.”

<sup>761</sup> “T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Türkiye Yazmaları,” accessed February 27, 2016,

[https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay\\_goster.php?k=76960](https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay_goster.php?k=76960).

2) Ankara, National Library, National Library Manuscript Collection, 06 Mil Yz A 1107/5  
(Manuscript A)

Copy dated 1140 (1727-8), the fifth work in a manuscript consisting of 231 folios which includes eight other works on Sufism, one of which is Kaygusuz Abdāl's *Dil-güşā. Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* figures between fol. 91b-108a. Written in nastaliq script, with 23 lines and 1-2 columns per page. The physical dimensions of the manuscript are 205x150 - 175x110 mm.<sup>762</sup> The title of the work appears as "Risāle-i Mağlaṭa" in the manuscript. Erroneous title in the catalogue. An earlier date of copy figures on the last page of the manuscript (the date of 1122). Paper with watermark in the shape of a bottle. Binding covered with black lining.

3) Ankara, National Library, Collection of Eskişehir Provincial Public Library, 26 Hk 273/2  
(Manuscript E)

Copy dated 1201 (1786-7), between fol. 109b-131b in a manuscript consisting of 132 folios. Written in naskh script by a copyist named Seyyid Meḥmed Emīn Ḥalvetī 'Alevī, with 19 lines and 1-2 columns per page. The title which figures in the manuscript is "Delīl-i Budalā ve Defter-i 'Āşīkân ve Sırr-ı Şādiqân ve Ḥayāl-i Nādān," however the content is that of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*. An empty folio in the beginning, *Meşnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz* between fol. 1b-27b, three *gazels* by Ḥaḳīkī between fol. 27b- 28a, an anonymous *meşnevī* by a poet possibly named Kayy between fol. 28b-32a, *Serāy-nāme* between fol. 32a-81b, various poems by Kaygusuz Abdāl between fol. 81b-83b, *Dil-güşā* between fol. 83b-108b, 109a empty, colophon on 132a. On 1a, waqf record belonging to the Seferihisar Library.

4) Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Düğümlü Baba Collection, 00411 (Manuscript DB)

Copy dated 1208 (1793/1794), between fol. 109b-131b in a manuscript consisting of 132 folios. Written in naskh script by an unknown copyist, with 19 lines and 1-2 columns per page. The physical dimensions of the manuscript are 210x145-150x80-85 mm. In a leather binding with a brown spine and carmine covers. Waqf record of Düğümlü Baba on every page, as well as a waqf record of Vecḥīpaşazāde Kemāl dated 1292 (1875/1876). *Meşnevī-i Baba Kaygusuz* between fol. 1b-27b, three *gazels* by Ḥaḳīkī between fol. 27b-28a, anonymous *meşnevī* belonging to a poet

<sup>762</sup> "T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Türkiye Yazmaları," accessed February 27, 2016,

[https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay\\_goster.php?k=138694](https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay_goster.php?k=138694).

possibly named ays between 28b-32a, *Serāy-nāme* between fol. 32a-81b, various poems by aygusuz Abdāl between fol. 81b-83b, *Dil-güşā* between fol. 83b-108b, 109a empty.

5) Istanbul, Millet Library, Collection of Ali Emiri, AEmnz797 (Manuscript AE)

Copy dated 21 Ramadan 1229 (13 Mart 1814), between fol. 143b-168b in a manuscript consisting of 168 folios. Written in naskh script by Seyyid Derviş ‘Alī b. Yūsuf ursun Baba ḫalīfe-i āsitāne-i ḫazret-i Ḥünkār Hacı Bektāş Velī, with 19 lines and 1-2 columns per page. The physical dimensions of the manuscript are 197x150-152x100 mm. In a gilded, tooled leather binding with a flap and a cardboard base. White, sized, water-based European paper with watermark, of medium thickness. Between fol. 1a-b, a poem entitled “Der beyān-ı enfüs-i āfāk-ı kelām-ı na’ımī mi’rāc-ı ḫaḫīkat-i ḫadīm;” between fol. 2a-b, a section explaining the contents of the manuscript, possibly composed by the copyist; between fol. 3b-34b, the hagiography of aygusuz Abdāl which includes the poems *aşıde-i Dolāb*, *Minber-nāme*, and *Şalāt-nāme*; *Dil-güşā* between fol. 35a-64b; *Meşnevī-i Baba aygusuz* between fol. 65a-92a; one *gazel* on 92b; *Üçüncü Meşnevī* between fol. 92b-102b; *İkinci Meşnevī* between fol. 102b-112a; poems by aygusuz Abdāl between fol. 112a-143b.

6) Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı, Collection of Osman Ergin, O.E. 663 (Manuscript OE)

Undated copy, between fol. 70b-105b in a manuscript consisting of 105 folios. Written in naskh script by an unknown copyist, with 14 lines and 1 column per page. The physical dimensions of the manuscript are 215x155-145x100 mm. The title which appears in the manuscript is “Esrārü’l-‘arīfin Mağlaḫa-i aygusuz.” The treatise of Vīrānī between fol. 1b-33b; poetry collection including poets such as aygusuz Abdāl, Nesīmī, Ḥayretī, Enverī, Rūḫī, Hatāyī, Aḫmedī, Fuzūlī, Vīrānī between fol. 34a-70a.

7) Vatican Library Turkish Manuscripts Vat.Turco 185 (Manuscript V)

Undated copy, between fol. 51b-78b in a manuscript consisting of 145 folios. Written in naskh script by an unknown copyist, with 17 lines and 1 column per page. The physical dimensions of the manuscript are 215x145 mm. The work is incomplete at the end. Between fol.1b-45a, the hagiography of aygusuz Abdāl which includes a number of poems by him; poems by aygusuz Abdāl between fol. 46a-47b; *Delīl-i Budalā* between fol. 91b-115a; fol. 115b-117a empty;

between 117a-145a, excerpts from authors such as ‘Ömer Gürānī, Şemseddīn Sivasī, ‘Azīz Maḥmūd Hüdāyī, and ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, as well as anonymous excerpts in verse and prose.

8) Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Collection of Hacı Mahmud Efendi, 03040 (Manuscript HM)<sup>763</sup>

Copy dated 12 jumādā al-ākhirā 1268(1852), between fol. 29b-46b in a manuscript consisting of 46 folios. Written in ta‘liq script by an unknown copyist, with 15 lines and 1 column per page. The physical dimensions of the manuscript are 175x115 - 120x65 mm. *Delīl-i Budalā* between fol. 1b-29b. European binding with a brown leather spine and brown cold-stamped cloth covers. Inner covers are marbled paper prints. European paper.

9) Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library, Collection of Uşşaki Tekkesi, 00261/11 (Manuscript U)

Copy dated 1240 (1824-5), between fol. 134b-153b in a manuscript consisting of 153 folios. Written in riq‘a script by an unknown copyist, with 16-17 lines and 1-2 columns per page. The physical dimensions of the manuscript are 240x160-190x120 mm. A 19th century mecmū‘a which includes 11 works, some of which are: the *Dīvān* of Yūnus Emre, İsmā‘īl Ḥaḳḳı Brūşavī’s commentaries on poems by Yūnus Emre and Hacı Bayram, Mektūbāt-ı ‘Azīz Maḥmūd Hüdā’ī, Der Beyān-ı Ta‘bīr-i Ru‘yā-i Enfūsī. Cardboard binding covered with purple cloth, with a black leather spine. European paper.

10) Istanbul, Hacı Selim Ağa Library, Kemankeş Collection, 248 (Manuscript K)


Undated copy, between fol. 56b-113a in a manuscript consisting of 113 folios. Written in naskh script by an unknown copyist, with 11 lines and 1 column per page. The physical dimensions of the manuscript are 153x98-103x70 mm. The work does not appear in the catalogue. Waqf seal of ‘Abdü’l-ḳādir Emīr Ḥvāce (d. 1151/1738-9) on several folios. The Turkish version of Hacı Bektāş’s *Maḳālāt* between fol. 1b-55a. Cardboard binding with leather spine. Sized paper.

---

<sup>763</sup> Special thanks to Hatice Karagöz at the Süleymaniye Library for her help with the physical description of the next two manuscripts.



*Stemma*



## *Principles of the Edition*

E. Birnbaum's Ottoman Turkish Transliteration scheme (1967) has been used for rendering full diacritics for Turkish in the Arabic script. The edition is based primarily on manuscript B, while the variants in manuscript M are given in the footnotes. These two manuscripts are not only the two oldest manuscripts, but also representatives of the two major branches in the stemma. In M, after the first few folios, the phrase "didi dir" (he said) changes to variants with the same or similar meaning, such as "didi," "eydür," and "diyüp." In addition, repetitions of these words tend to be omitted when these omissions do not result in a loss of meaning. Due to the frequency of these stylistic differences, variants of the verb "to say" in M were not shown in the footnotes. Words or phrases absent in B but present in M are given in brackets. Words or phrases absent in M but present in B are indicated with a footnote. In the following cases, the variant in M was preferred, and the variant in B was shown with a footnote: a) In verse, when the variant in M was a better match to the formal meter (*'arūz*). b) In prose, when the variant in M was longer or better fit the context. Errors in meter are not uncommon in the poetry of Kaygusuz Abdāl. Therefore, those verses with error in the meter were not omitted as erroneous variants.

The *Kitāb-ı Mağlata* is written in a register of Turkish that reflects the spoken vernacular at the time. This is marked by a limited, largely Turkish vocabulary; a high number of verbs, often in succession; and a great frequency of direct speech, used even when expressing inner thoughts. A literal translation of the text would not only be dry, but would also result in a loss of meaning on many occasions. For this reason, a literary translation was preferred, which remained faithful to the meaning and flow of the text. Direct speech was translated sometimes as direct speech and sometimes as indirect. In the edition, the punctuation and division of the sentences is to some extent arbitrary and meant to facilitate the modern reader. Due to the difference between the stylistic conventions of the two languages, the punctuation and division of the sentences in English does not always match those in Turkish.

## Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa<sup>1</sup>

Bismillāhirrahmānirrahīm

Delīl-i ḥayr,<sup>2</sup> kitāb-ı büdelā, defter-i sālīk, sırr-ı ‘ārif, ḥayāl-i nā-dāndur bu kitāb; ḥikāyet-i endüh, lisān-ı ṭayr, nūr-ı nazar-ı ‘āşıḳān. Ber Muḥammed şalavāt.

Düşinde bir dervīş görmüş ki kendözini bir şahrāda ki hiç nihāyeti yokdur.<sup>3</sup> Gözin açmış, baḳmış, görmüş ki bir şahrādur, bu şahrānuñ<sup>4</sup> bir ulu yol ortasına varur. Daḫı hiç kimesne yoḳdur.<sup>5</sup> “Bu ḥāli kimden şorayın?” didi dir. Bu dervīş dört yaña baḳdı, gördi ki hiç kimesne yoḳ, yaluñuz özidür. “Hele<sup>6</sup> (*M 165a*) yabana gitmekden yol yaḫşı.” didi dir. Dervīş [bu ulu] yolu ṭıtdı, gitdi. Bir cümle<sup>7</sup> ki yolca gitdi, gördi ki hiç nihāyeti yoḳdur. Bu kez dervīş eydür: “Çaḡırayın bāri, vaḳt ola ki kimesne var ise işide, baña bir ḥaber vire.” didi dir. Bu dervīş çaḡırdı, [gördi ki hiç kimesne yoḳ, hemān özidür. Bu dervīş] bu kez eydür: “Çün kimse yoḳdur, bāri emīn olayın.” didi dir. Bu dervīş bir ḥamle daḫı emīn oldı dir.<sup>8</sup> Bu dervīş gördi ki ne bu şahrānuñ nihāyeti var, ne bu yoluñ [ḥadd ü] pāyānı var. Bu dervīş özinden cūşa geldi, dir kim:

‘Ālem küllī vüçüddur cān ben oldum

Vüçüda cān cāna cānān ben oldum

(*M 165b*)

Şüretümi gören dir ki ādemdür

Şüretde şıfat-ı rahmān ben oldum

---

<sup>1</sup> Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa min kelām-ı Kayḡusuz Abdāl rahmetullāhi ‘aleyh B : Mağlaṭa-i Baba Kayḡusuz ‘aleyhi’r-rahmetü ve’l-gufrān M

<sup>2</sup> delīl-i ḥayr M : delīl ü ḥaber B

<sup>3</sup> hiç nihāyeti yokdur B : nihāyeti ve ḥaddi yoḳ M

<sup>4</sup> bu şahrānuñ B : -M / The word “özi” in B is an error.

<sup>5</sup> daḫı hiç kimesne yoḳdur B : dervīşden özge hiç kimesne yoḳ M

<sup>6</sup> hele B : ḥāliyā M

<sup>7</sup> cümle B : miḳdār M

<sup>8</sup> bu dervīş bir ḥamle daḫı emīn oldı dir B : -M

didir. Şi‘r bünyād eyledi dir.<sup>9</sup> Gördi ki hiç emīn degüldür. Bir kimesne diler<sup>10</sup> kim öz hālinden haber şora. Velī hiç kimesne göremedi, özini (*B 264a*) tenhā gördi dir. Özine yörendi dir. Didi kim: “Vaqt ola, bu benüm düşümdür ola.” didi dir. Gördi ki düşi degüldür, āşkāredür. Bu kez nā-çār oldı, cümleden ümīdini kesdi, özine<sup>11</sup> fikr eyledi dir. Gördi ki başı bacadan taşra çıkmış, gözi bu şahrāya düşmiş dir. Tiz başını özine<sup>12</sup> çekdi dir. Gördi ki ne şahrā var ne yol, ten-i tenhā hemān<sup>13</sup> özidür. Şi‘r (*M 166a*) didi, eydür ki:<sup>14</sup>

Çamu şeyde benem ‘ayn-ı haqīkat  
Şıfāt-ı zāt-ı mutlak baħr-ı hikmet

Hemān benem daħı çün u çerā yok  
Ne *ene’l-haqq* ne Mansūr u ne Bağdat<sup>15</sup>

didir. Bu hāl içinde söylenürken gördi ki<sup>16</sup> bir pīr gelür.<sup>17</sup> Saçalı aqdur, tesbīhi boynında, seccādesi çigninde dir. Zikri ve tesbīhi řodı dir. Dervīş dir ki: “Şükür<sup>18</sup> hele bu geldi,” dir, “şindi<sup>19</sup> haber şorayın.” dir. “[Bir hoş pīr, ancak ola ki] bu şahrā ne şahrādur [bir haber bilem].” dir. Dervīş yürüdi ileri ki şeyhe selām vire. Şeyh dervīşi ki gördi, didi ki: “*Allāhu ekber.*” Dervīş eydür: “İy şeyh, saña noldı ki böyle dehşete varduñ?”<sup>20</sup> dir. Tiz bir (*M 166b*) ‘aşası varmış, çekdi yürüdi, dervīşüñ üstine sürdi. Dervīş didi ki: “Bu şeytāndur, ola mı?” dir. [Dervīş daħı] tiz kötegin

---

<sup>9</sup> şı‘r bünyād eyledi dir B : -M

<sup>10</sup> diler B : ister M

<sup>11</sup> özine B : özin M

<sup>12</sup> özine B : öz evine M

<sup>13</sup> ten-i tenhā hemān B : hemān ten-i tenhā M

<sup>14</sup> şı‘r didi eydür ki B : yine şı‘r didi M

<sup>15</sup> In M, in the margins figures the following note by the copyist: “Bāğidāddur aşlda, şoñra Bağdād didiler. Baba bu arada hikmet kâfiyesinde buyurdılar tā ile.”

<sup>16</sup> gördi ki M : dir B

<sup>17</sup> gelür B : geliyorur M

<sup>18</sup> şükür B : çok şükr yā Rabbī ki M

<sup>19</sup> dir şindi B : bir M

<sup>20</sup> iy şeyh saña noldı ki böyle dehşete varduñ M : şeyh noldı saña B

çıkkardı, karşıısına yürüdü. Bakdı gördi ki şeyh bu dağı buña gelür, şeyh kaçmağa düşdü.<sup>21</sup> Dervîş [dilîr olup] didi ki: “Seni kaçduğıña mı korum?” didi dir. [Üstine] sürdü, yetdi dir. Şeyh [gördi ki hâl ayruksı] didi ki: “Beni öldürme, ‘aşamı saña vireyin!” didi dir. Dervîş didi ki: “Hay saña<sup>22</sup> haber şorayın.” didi dir. Şeyh didi ki:<sup>23</sup> “Senden korıldum!” didi dir (*B 264b*). “[Kimsin? Hiç] senün gibi kişi gördüğüm yokdur.” didi dir. “Yirüñ göğün müsâfiriyem, ben dağı şeyhem, benüm dağı<sup>24</sup> mürîdlerüm (*M 167a*) çokdur.” didi dir. “Velî hiç senün gibi kişi gördüğüm yokdur.” didi dir. “Ödüm şıtdı,<sup>25</sup> hele haber gerekse şor.”<sup>26</sup> didi dir. Dervîş didi ki: “Şormak ‘ayb olmasun, evvel<sup>27</sup> sen ne kişisin?” didi dir. Şeyh didi ki: “Benüm hikâyetüm çokdur.” didi dir. “Sen haberün [var ise anı] şor.” didi dir. Dervîş didi ki: “Bu şahrâya ki irişdüm, bu ne yirdür?” didi dir. Şeyh didi ki: “Hay<sup>28</sup> bu şahrâyı mı şorarsın?” didi dir. “Bu heyhât yazusıdır, Süleymân peygamber bu şahrâda yitdi.” dir. Dervîş dir ki: “[İy] şeyh, sen şeytânsın, ola mı?” didi dir. Şeyh didi ki: “[Behey] yâr, benüm hâlümü ne şorarsın?” didi dir. “Ben dergâh-ı hazret-i ‘izzetde bir kişi idüm.” didi dir. “Bunca tâ‘at (*M 167b*) [u] ‘ibâdet kılmışdum.” didi dir. “Ben cümle ‘âleme şeytân oldum, âdem baña şeytân oldı, bu lağab baña yapışdı.”<sup>29</sup> didi dir. Dervîş gördi ki bunu şeytândur, “Allâh ‘avn eyleye!” didi dir. Kõdı bunu geçdi dir. Şükr eyledi,<sup>30</sup> “Hele bu belâdan kırtuldum!” didi dir. Yolına gitdi.<sup>31</sup> Bir sâ‘at ki ileri vardı,<sup>32</sup> gördi ki bu şahrânuñ içinde bir ağaç bitmişdür [ğâyetle] ulu. Dervîş didi ki: “Hele şol bir yirdür, [bir mağâm.” Anca] sürdü, geldi, gördi ki bir ulu ağaçdur bitmiş. Dibinde bir çeşme revân olmuş akar. Dervîş didi ki: “Bu ‘aceb yirdür.” Yuğarı

<sup>21</sup> düşdü B : yüz tıtdı M

<sup>22</sup> didi ki hay saña B : eydür behey kişi hele saña bir M

<sup>23</sup> didi ki B : eydür behey kişi M

<sup>24</sup> benüm dağı B : -M

<sup>25</sup> ödüm şıtdı : -M

<sup>26</sup> hele haber gerekse M : anda haberün varsa B

<sup>27</sup> olmasun evvel M : degül B

<sup>28</sup> hay B : -M

<sup>29</sup> yapışdı B : tağıldı M

<sup>30</sup> şükr eyledi M : didi ki B

<sup>31</sup> yolına gitdi M : yürüdü yine eline gitdi dir B

<sup>32</sup> sâ‘at ki ileri vardı B : mikdâr ki ilerü gitdi M

bağdı gördi ki bu ağacın beş budağı vardır. Bir levh yazulu (B 265a) bu ağacın budağında.  
Dervîş teferrüc eyledi, derdini dile geldi, eydür ki:<sup>33</sup> (M 168a)

‘Aceb cism ü şüret ‘aceb cānam ben  
‘Aceb gencem ‘acāyib vīrānam ben

Yine bu gün ‘aceb hāle şataşdum  
Şüretüm insān oldı pinhānam ben

didi dir. [Bir] şükr eyledi oturdu bir cümle.<sup>34</sup> Dervîş zahmet çok çekmişti, rāhat oldu, uykuya vardı. Düşinde gördi şad hezārān Mūsā<sup>35</sup> her cihetde “*Rabbi erinī*” diyüp [diyüp] turur. İkileyin bağdı, gördi ki şad hezārān İbrāhīm ü Mūsā vü ‘İsā tırmışlar, her biri bir köşede intizārda.<sup>36</sup> Dervîş uykudan<sup>37</sup> belinledi, gözün açdı, bağdı gördi ki düşidür, “*Sübhānallāh!*” didi, yine yatdı. Didi ki: “Eger rahmānī düş ise (M 168b) gine görine.” didi dir. Gördi ki yine<sup>38</sup> bu ağacın dibinde yığınağ olmuşdur. Cümle peygamberler bunda gelmişler. [Dīvān tururlar.] Dervîş didi ki: “Vay ne hoş [şerīf] yire<sup>39</sup> irişdüm!” dir. Tiz tırdı, gözün açdı, hāzır oldu, bunlar ne söyleşürler [göre]. Dervîş gördi ki ihtiyār yirinde Muḥammed Muştafā oturmuşdur. Peygamberler su’āl iderler ki: “Yā Resūlullāh! Bu develerün ḥod büyügi devedür; türk uşacuklarına<sup>40</sup> köşek dirler, deve degül midür?” Muḥammed Muştafā dir ki: “Devedür veli uşacuk<sup>41</sup> olduğün köşek dirler.” didi dir. Dervîş tiz [yirinden] tırgeldi, eydür ki: “Yā Resūlullāh! Bu müşkilün (M 169a) içinde kaldum.” dir. “Bu şahrā ne yirdür, bu vādi ne vādīdür?” didi dir. Seyyid-i kā’ināt (B 265b) bağdı, gördi ki bir dervîşdür, sağalı kırkık, “*Yā cemilü’s-settār!*”<sup>42</sup> didi dir. Dervîş didi ki: “Yā Resūlullāh! Beni

<sup>33</sup> derdini dile geldi; eydür ki B : tırdı bu şı’ri didi M

<sup>34</sup> cümle B : mikdār M

<sup>35</sup> Mūsā M : Mūsā vü ‘İsā B

<sup>36</sup> intizārda M : intizār B

<sup>37</sup> uykudan B : uykusından M

<sup>38</sup> yine B : -M

<sup>39</sup> yire B : maḳāma M

<sup>40</sup> türk uşacuklarına B : türkī uşaklarına M

<sup>41</sup> uşacuk B : uşak M

<sup>42</sup> The correct phrase is found in the manuscript MS A1107, 92r.

‘aceblersin, [ola mı?]” didi dir. Seyyid [-i ‘ālem] eydür ki: “Yā ‘abdullāh! Sen ne kişisin?” didi dir. Dervīş cūşa geldi, dir ki:

‘Aceb niçün nihān oldum bu tende  
Sa‘ādet genciye m çün bu vīrānda

‘Acebdür ki beni gören ‘acebler  
Zīrā bilmez ki sultānam yabanda

didi dir. İkikeyin dervīş şordı ki: “Yā Resūlullāh! Bu maḳām ne yirdür?” Resūlullāh didi kim: “Bu [maḳām] kābe ḳavseyndür, bu ağaç şeceretü’l-islāmdur, ol beş budaḳ ki (*M 169b*) görürsin, beş erkāndur İslām içinde.” didi dir. [Pes] dervīş ihtiyāt eyledi, gördi ki bu ağacuñ iki budaḳına gün toḳınur [ve] üç budaḳına toḳınmaz. Dervīş<sup>43</sup> düşinden uyandı, gördi ki *leyse fi’ d-dāri ḡayrunā deyyār*. Ten-i tenhā hemān özidür, daḳı hiç kimesne yoḳ. Dervīş yine şı’r bünyād eyledi, eydür ki:

Göñüllerde benem sırr-ı ilāhī  
Ser-ā-ser cümle varlık māh tā māhi<sup>44</sup>

Benem ḥüsni ḳamu şekl ü şūretüñ  
Ḳamu başda benem devlet külāhı

didi dir. [Daḳı] dört yaña baḳdı,<sup>45</sup> ten-i tenhā hemān özidür. Velī yiri [ve] göḳi gördi ki vücūdınıñ içinde sırr olmış. Yirde [ve] gökde [olan] eşyā ki var şadāsın (*M 170a*) işitdi, öz vücūdından gelür. Özine fikr eyledi, eydür ki: “Ben bu yirüñ göḳün içindeyidüm, şindi bu benüm [içümde görünür,] (*B 266a*) düşümdür ola mı?” dir. Gözin açdı, baḳdı, gördi ki çindür, düşi degüldür. Bu kez eydür ki:

---

<sup>43</sup> dervīş B : -M

<sup>44</sup> māh tā māhi B : tā be māhi M

<sup>45</sup> baḳdı B : nazar itdi gördi M

‘Ālem küllī şadef gevher ben oldum  
Bu cümle ‘āleme<sup>46</sup> defter ben oldum

Ḳamu varlık yakīn bende bulındı  
Yakın ırak kem ü bisyār ben oldum

didir. Çün cümle ‘ālemi öz vücūdında gördi, haber-dār oldu ki cümle ‘ālemden maksūd öziymiş. Bu kez ‘aql bāzārına girdi, ‘aqlile baqdı, gördi ki sultān Muḥammed Muştafādur. ‘Işk bāzārına baqdı, ‘ışk bāzārında ‘Alīyi sultān (*M 170b*) gördi. Yürüdi ilerü ki sultāna ḥālin ‘arz kıla. Şāh-ı merdān ‘Alī dervīşi gördi, söyledi ki: “Dervīş, yukarı baq!” Dervīş yukarı baqdı, gördi ki hemān eşyā yirlü yirinde ber-kemāl. Cümleyi teferrüc eyledi,<sup>47</sup> tamām gördi, hiç noqşānı yok. Secde-i şükr kıldı, baş götürdi, gördi ki cümle eşyā faşih kelāmile tañrınıñ<sup>48</sup> birliğine tanuqlık virür. Dervīş bu şevķile cūşa geldi, dir ki:

Ḥaḳķa minnet ki ḥaḳķ oldu mu‘ayyen  
Ḥicāb gitdi ‘ıyān görindi burhān

Görindi āfitāb zerrem içinde  
Hemān oldu görüñ ḳaṭremde ‘ummān

didir. Dervīş şordı ki şāh-ı merdān ‘Alīye: (*M 171a*) “Bu şayvan<sup>49</sup> ki bunda tutulmuşdur, şāhibi ḳandadır? Hiç görimezem.” didir. Şāh-ı merdān ‘Alī didi ki: “Şayvanuñ<sup>50</sup> şāhibi içinde biledür.”<sup>51</sup> dir. Dervīş eydür: “Yā ‘Alī! Ben görimezem!” didir. ‘Alī didi ki: “Bu şüretler ki (*B*

---

<sup>46</sup> ‘āleme B : varlığa M

<sup>47</sup> teferrüc eyledi : -M

<sup>48</sup> tañrınıñ B : ḥaḳķūñ M

<sup>49</sup> şayvan B : eyvān M

<sup>50</sup> şayvanuñ B : eyvānuñ M

<sup>51</sup> içinde biledür B : içindedür M



266b) var, bu şüretlerüñ içinde cünbiş kılan [ve] şu‘bede gösteren sayvanuñ<sup>52</sup> şāhibidür ahi.” dir. Dervīş ki bu sözi işitdi, şād oldı. Eydür ki:

Hakka minnet bu gün sulţānı gördüm  
Bī- hicāb cism içinde cānı gördüm

Zerreyidüm nāgāh güneşe<sup>53</sup> irdüm  
Çatrem maḥv eyledi ‘ummānı gördüm

didı dir. [Böyle diyüp] tiz ilerü yürüdi, şāh-ı merdān ‘Alīnūñ elin öpdı. Eydür ki: “Yā ‘Alī! Ben saña mürīd oluram.” dir. “Erkān töre (*M 171b*) bilmezem,” dir, “öğrenmek içün” dir. [Dervīş] bir zamān şāh-ı merdān kulluğında oldı. Bir gün şordı ki: “Yā ‘Alī, ben ileri bu ten yoğıdı. Ben<sup>54</sup> cānidüm. Ol vaqtin düşümde gördüm ki bu cümle ‘ālem benüm gölgemdür.”<sup>55</sup> dir. “[Pes] bu düşümüñ ta‘bīri nedür?” dir. Bu sözi ki dervīş söyledi, tiz şāh-ı merdān ‘Alī bu dervīşüñ yüreginde gizlendi. Dervīş dört yaña bağıdı, hiç kimesne<sup>56</sup> yok. Ten-i tenhā hemān özidür. Eydür ki:

Ezel baña görüñ ne taqdır oldı  
Çamu ‘ālem vücūdumda sırrı oldı

Çamu dil söyledi sırr-ı ene’l-ḥakḳ  
Çamu şeyde ḥakīkat meşhūr oldı<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> sayvanuñ B : eyvānuñ M

<sup>53</sup> nāgāh güneşe B : bī-ḥaber şemse M

<sup>54</sup> ben B : -M

<sup>55</sup> gölgemdür B : gölgede idi M

<sup>56</sup> kimesne B : nesne M

<sup>57</sup> In M, in the margins figures the following note by the copyist: “Baba Çaygusuzuñ kâfiye ‘ilmin bilmedüğinden degüldür. Çâfiyeye ri‘āyet itmedüğü belki abdālāna vü basıṭ ümmiyāna olmaḳ murād idinüp buyururlar.”

didir. Öz derdiyle özi hayrân kaldı. Bir müddet geçdi (*M 172a*). Bir niçe deverân u rûzigârdan soñra<sup>58</sup> bir gün<sup>59</sup> dervîş düşinde<sup>60</sup> gördi ki Süleymân peygamber zamânında. Süleymân peygamberüñ dîvânı tırmuş. Şâh-ı merdân ‘Alîyi gördi ki Süleymân peygamberüñ (*B 267a*) kirpügi altından bakar. Dervîş der-hâl bildi, tazarru‘ eyledi. Didi ki: “Yâ şâh-ı merdân! Ben intizârda kaldum, senüñ катуңda maqşûdum çokdur.”<sup>61</sup> didi dir. Şâh-ı merdân ‘Alî dervîşe dışın kısdı, “Söyleme!” dir. “Süleymân peygamberile bile geldüm.” dir. “Süleymân peygamber beni özini şanur, dek tır, hâtırı kalmasun.” didi dir. [Pes] dervîş hâmüş oldu. Bir zamân fırsat gözledi. Bir gün şâh-ı merdân ‘Alîyi halvet buldı, eydür ki: “Yâ ‘Alî, (*M 172b*) Yûsuf peygamberden su‘âl eyledüm ki: ‘Seni kuyuya düşdi dirler, toğrı mıdur?’ didüm. Eydür: ‘Beli, kuyu didükleri bu cism idi.’<sup>62</sup> Bu kuyudan ki çıkdum Mışra sultân oldum’ didi dir. Toğrı mıdur?” dir.<sup>63</sup> Şâh-ı merdân-ı ‘Alî eydür ki: “Dervîş, bak!” Dervîş bakdı, gördi ki yüz biñ yigirmi dört biñ peygamber, cümle evliyâ [vü] enbiyâ [‘aleyhim esselâm] tırmuşlar, her birisi taḥsîn iderler ‘Alîye. Dervîş Muḥammed Muştafâyı [‘aleyhisselâm] gördi. Nûrından yir [ü] gök aydın olmış. Cümle peygamberlerüñ öñince düşmiş, Allâh dergâhına varur.<sup>64</sup> Dervîş eydür ki: “Ben daḥı bile varayın.” dir. “Vaqt ola, toya varurlar ola.” dir. (*M 173a*) Uydı, bile vardı. Gördi ki Allâhu ta‘âlânüñ dergâhına geldiler. Muḥammed Muştafâ ilerü yürüdi. Eydür ki: “İlâhî ve ḥüdâyâ! Bu cümle maḥlûkât ki yaratmışsın, rahmetüñle yarlıgağıl.” dir. Allâhu ta‘âlâ eydür ki: “Yâ Muḥammed! Sen saña degeni dile. Her peygamberüñ benümle bir mu‘âmesi vardır.” (*B 267b*) Dervîş gördi ki bunlar bu hâlde, tiz ilerü yürüdi. Eydür ki: “İlâhî [ve] ḥüdâvend-i ta‘âlâ! Ben miskîne daḥı bir nazar eyle.” Bu [kutlu] kaderüñ içinde dervîş uykudan belinledi, gördi ki düşidür. “Sübḥānallāh!” didi, yine yatdı. Gördi ki Yûnus peygamber çileden çıkmış. (*M 173b*) Peygamberler derilmişler, toydur. Dervîş eydür: “Ne hoş yire geldüm!” dir. Tiz tırıgeldi, keşkülün eline aldı ki parsa ura.<sup>65</sup> Şeytân nâgâh çıqıp geldi. Bakdı dervîş, gördi ki şeytândur

<sup>58</sup> bir niçe deverân u rûzigârdan soñra M : deverân u rûzigâr B

<sup>59</sup> bir gün B : -M

<sup>60</sup> düşinde B : -M

<sup>61</sup> intizârda kaldum senüñ катуңda maqşûdum çokdur M : senüñ катуңda intizâr kaldum maqşûdum çokdur B

<sup>62</sup> bu cism idi B : cismüm idi M

<sup>63</sup> toğrı mıdur dir : -M

<sup>64</sup> varur B : varurlar M

<sup>65</sup> ura B : ide M

geldi.<sup>66</sup> Dervîş eydür ki şeytāna:<sup>67</sup> “Hay şeyhü’n-naḥs! Yine mi geldüñ?” dir. Şeytān tiz yine ‘aşāsın çekdi, dervîşüñ üstine sürdi.<sup>68</sup> Dervîş gördi ki üstine gelür, tiz kötegin çıkardı, karşıasına yürüdi. İkişi dīvān içinde ber-ā-ber oldılar. Peygamberler düş düşin söylesdiler ki: “Şol miskīn dervîşi şeytān şindi<sup>69</sup> öldürür, komañ!” didiler. Dervîş kepenegin yire ıodı. Tıtdı (*M 174a*) şeytānı, mecāl virmedi. Ma’reke içinde başdı. Bu ıaderüñ içinde peygamberler dervîşe taḥsīn eylediler. Şeytān feryād eyledi. Dervîş şeytānı ıodı, vardı kepenegin geydi oturdı. Muḥammed-i Muştafā [‘aleyhisselām] dervîşe eydür ki: “Eyi varduñ.” dir. “Dervîş eydür: “Yā Resülullāh! Kimesnem yoı, ğarībem. ıarnum daıı açdur.” dir. Tiz dervîşe yemek virdiler,<sup>70</sup> yedi. Bu ıaderüñ içinde dervîş uyandı, gördi ki düşüdü. Şi’r didi, eydür ki:

Bu cümle ‘āleme sultān ben oldum  
Sa’ādet cevherine kān ben oldum

Ben ol baıır-ı muḥītam her göñülde  
Eyerçi şüretā<sup>71</sup> insān ben oldum

didi dir. (*B 268a*) Bu ıaderde (*M 174b*) gördi ki ten-i tenhā hemān özidür. [Pes] *leyse fi’d-dārı ğayrunā deyyār*. Hiç kimesne yoı. Ol şöbet cānına kār itdi. Meger dervîş fikr eyledi ki: “Ben ne hoş şöbetdeyidüm.” dir. “Şindi ıanı ol?” dir. Bu ıaderüñ içinde dervîşe uyıku ḥavāle oldı. Düşinde gördi ki hemān ol şöbetdür ki görmişidi.<sup>72</sup> Ol şöbet yine hemān tırmış yirlü yirinde.<sup>73</sup> Dervîş şāh-ı merdān ‘Alīye<sup>74</sup> şorar ki: “Yā ‘Alī, ol şahş<sup>75</sup> ki benümile şavaşurdı, ıanı ol?” dir. Nāğāh şeytān ııkup geldi. Dervîş gördi ki ḥarīf yine bundadır. Dervîş eydür: “Yā ‘Alī, ben bu

<sup>66</sup> dervîş gördi ki şeytāndur geldi B : dervîşi gördi M

<sup>67</sup> şeytāna B : -M

<sup>68</sup> sürdi B : yürüdi M

<sup>69</sup> şeytān şindi B : şimdi şeytān M

<sup>70</sup> virdiler B : getürdiler M

<sup>71</sup> eyerçi şüretā M : velī bu dem şüret B

<sup>72</sup> görmüşidi B : evvel gördi idi M

<sup>73</sup> hemān tırmış yirlü yirinde B : tırmış yirlü yirince M

<sup>74</sup> dervîş şāh-ı merdān ‘Alīye B : şāh-ı merdān-ı ‘Alīye dervîş M

<sup>75</sup> şahş B : şeyh M

kez şeyhile<sup>76</sup> bir yaña olurum.” dir. Şeyh dağı gördi ki (*M 175a*) dervîşüñ hareketi ağdıķ. “Bu ne belāyidi uğradum!”<sup>77</sup> dir. Dervîş kepenegin ķodi, [sürdi]. Yine tıtdı. Şeyh dağı tıtdı, muħkem tıtuşdılar.<sup>78</sup> Hengāme tırdı. Cümle teferrüc iderler.<sup>79</sup> Dervîş nāgāh şeytānı başdı.<sup>80</sup> Cümle peygamberler yine taħsīn eylediler. Şeyh kaçdı, kenāra çıķdı. Eydür ki: “Seni ħalvetde bulam!” dir. Dervîş kepenegin geydi, geldi oturdı. [Dervîş] yine şāh-ı merdān ‘Alīye<sup>81</sup> sorar ki: “Yā ‘Alī, bu şeyh benümile ne ķatı uruşdı?” dir. Şāh[-ı merdān] eydür: “Ĥāzır ol!” dir, “Bundan<sup>82</sup> ġāfil olma.” dir. Dervîş özine yörendi. Eydür ki:

Ĥaķķa minnet (*M 175b*) seferüm<sup>83</sup> yāre irdi  
Cān u dil<sup>84</sup> vuşlat-ı dildāra irdi

İrişdüñ vuşlata ķalmadı hicrān  
Diken ġıtdı yolum ġülzāra irdi

didı dir. Bu ķaderüñ içinde, tıydur,<sup>85</sup> sımāt çekildi. Dervîş bir ķolay yir ġözledi, baķdı gördi ki cümle eşyā rüşen ġorinür. Şeş cihetde her ne ki varise mu‘ayyen ġördi. Dervîş baķdı, (*B 268b*) taħte’s-şerādan tā şüreyyā ‘ıyān oldu. Dervîş cenneti ġördi, dir ki: “Yā ‘Alī, bu [ne maķām ve] ne yirdür?” Şāh[-ı merdān] eydür: “Uçmaķdur.” Dervîş teferrüc eyledi cümle cenneti. Nāgāh baķdı, tāmuyı ġördi. Bir ‘ibret yirdür. Taħte’s-şerāya baķdı. Ferşi, öķüzi, balıġı, deryāyı teferrüc eyledi. [Yuķarı baķdı, (*M 176a*)<sup>86</sup> ‘arşı ġördi. Ėöklerüñ tıbaķaların ġördi, teferrüc eyledi. Burclara baķdı,

<sup>76</sup> bu kez şeyhile B : bu şeyhile bu kerre M. Generally in M, the word “kerre” is used in place of “kez.”

<sup>77</sup> bu ne belāyidi uğradum B : ne belāya uğradum M

<sup>78</sup> dağı tıtdı muħkem tıtuşdılar M : ikisi tıtuşdılar B

<sup>79</sup> iderler M : itdiler B

<sup>80</sup> şeytānı başdı B : yine başdı şeyhi M

<sup>81</sup> şāh-ı merdān ‘Alīye B : şāh-ı merdān-ı ‘Alīye M

<sup>82</sup> dir bundan B : dervîş bu şeyhden M

<sup>83</sup> seferüm B : yolum çün M

<sup>84</sup> cān u dil B : dil ü cān M

<sup>85</sup> tıydur : -M

<sup>86</sup> In M, in the margins figures the following note by the copyist: “Dārü’s-selām, dārü’l-ķarār, dārü’l-ħuld, cennetü’l-me’vā, cennet-i ‘adn, cennet-i na‘īm, dārü’l-āħire, cennetü’l-firdevs.”

ārāste gördi. Cümle eşyānuñ aşlını ve fer‘ini hoş teferrüc eyledi.] Dervīşüñ göñli cūşa geldi.<sup>87</sup>  
Eydür ki:

Haḫḫa minnet cānum küllī nūr oldı  
İçüm taşum nūr ile ma‘mūr oldı

Uyandı devletüm ğaflet ḥ̣ābından<sup>88</sup>  
Birile küllī varlıgum<sup>89</sup> bir oldı

didı dir. Dervīş nāgāh baḫdı; yirde [ve] gökde cümle eşyā [ki var,] faşīḥ kelāmıle söyler ki:

Haḫḫa minnet ki haḫḫ cümlede mevcūd  
Ḳamu şeyde görinen nūr-ı ma‘būd

Ne kim vardur hemān nūr-ı tecellī  
Ticāretde ḫamusı buldılar sūd

didı dir. Dervīş gördi ki cümle ‘ālem dil olmış, tevḥīd söyler. Cümle nūra mustağrak olmışlar. (*M 176b*) Cümlesinüñ ortasında bir çıraḫdur, yanar. Dervīş cūşa geldi, eydür ki:

Haḫḫa minnet tenüm daḫı cān oldı  
Güneş zerrem içinde pinhān oldı

Bu tevḥīdden cānum göñlüm<sup>90</sup> ser-ā-ser  
Sa‘ādet cevherine ma‘den oldı

---

<sup>87</sup> cūşa geldi B : feraḫ oldı M

<sup>88</sup> ḥ̣ābından B : deminden M

<sup>89</sup> küllī varlıgum B : varlıgum küllī M

<sup>90</sup> bu tevḥīdden cānum göñlüm B tolu cān u göñül haḫḫdan M

didir. Uykudan belinledi. Derviş gördi ki *leyse fi 'd-dārı gayrunā deyyār*. Hiç kimesne yok, hemān özidir. Derviş yine şı'r didi, eydür ki:

Yā Rabb bu düş midür yoksa hayālüm  
Bī-mişl ü bī-mānend oldı mişālüm

Özüm direm işidürem sözümi<sup>91</sup> (B 269a)  
Dağı kim var kime diyem bu hālüm

didir. Derviş fikr eyledi bu 'ibretleri, mütaḥayyir kaldı. Nāgāh bağıdı, bu ḳaderün içinde<sup>92</sup> 'İsā peygamberi gördi ki geliyor. Derviş eydür: "Yā Rabb! Bu ne (M 177a) hoş ve güzel maḥbüb<sup>93</sup> kişidür!" dir. İleri vardı,<sup>94</sup> selām virdi. 'İsā peygamber dervişe dir ki:<sup>95</sup> "Bunda ne istersin?" dir. Derviş eydür: "Sultānum, bu ne yirdür?" dir. 'İsā peygamber ['aleyhisselām] eydür: "Bu kervān-serāyı mı şorarsın?" didir. "Bunda çoklar ḳondı [ve] göşdi [derviş]." dir. "Üşte bir ḳāfile dağı geliyor." dir. Derviş bağıdı, gördi ki Fir'avndur. Şeytānı özine pīr tutunmuş, geliyor. Hiç tınmadı. Bunlar geldi, ḳondı. Çetr [ü] ḥayme [vü otağ] tutuldu.<sup>96</sup> Fir'avn oturdı, dīvān tırdı. Nāgāh bağıdılar, iki derviş oturur [gördiler]. Fir'avna didiler ki: "İki kişi (M 177b) oturur şunda." Fir'avn eydür ki:<sup>97</sup> "Gel diñ." dir. [Vardılar,] gel didiler. Bunlar dağı geldiler.<sup>98</sup> 'İsā peygamber eydür: "Derviş<sup>99</sup> sen tınma." dir. "[Bunlaruñla] ben söyleşeyin." dir. Derviş dir ki: "Neme gerek, [yüzlerin öli yuyıcı görsün!]" dir. Bu ḳaderün içinde<sup>100</sup> irişdiler,<sup>101</sup> selām virdiler. Şeytān 'İsā

---

<sup>91</sup> özüm direm işidürem sözümi B : özüm direm irişdüm öz özüme M

<sup>92</sup> bu ḳaderün içinde B : -M

<sup>93</sup> bu ne hoş ve güzel maḥbüb M : bu kişi ne 'aceb B

<sup>94</sup> vardı B : yürüdi M

<sup>95</sup> dervişe dir ki B : 'aleyhisselām eydür ki derviş M

<sup>96</sup> tutuldu B : tıtdılar M

<sup>97</sup> Fir'avna didiler ki iki kişi oturur şunda Fir'avn eydür ki B : Fir'avn eydür şunda iki derviş oturur varuñ M

<sup>98</sup> geldiler B : ḳalkup vardılar M

<sup>99</sup> derviş M : dervişe B

<sup>100</sup> bu ḳaderün içinde B : -M

<sup>101</sup> irişdiler B : vardılar M

peygamberi<sup>102</sup> bildi, velî dervîşi bilimedi. Dervîş şeytânı bildi, [lîkin] hiç tınmadı. Şeytân dir ki ‘Îsâ peygamber için [Fir‘avna]: “Bu kişidür ki eydür ‘özge tañrı vardır’<sup>103</sup> dir. [İmdi] eyi bulduq.” dir. “Bunu cezâsın virelüm.”<sup>104</sup> dir. Dervîş [dağı] bunları teferrüc eyler. Fir‘avn dir ki ‘Îsâ peygambere: “Sen mi didüñ ki tañrı (*M 178a*) vardır diyî?”<sup>105</sup> ‘Îsâ peygamber dir ki: “Beli.” Fir‘avn eydür ki:<sup>106</sup> “Sen<sup>107</sup> gördüñ mi?” dir. “Yoksa<sup>108</sup> kıyâs ile mi söylersin?” dir. Şeytân dir ki ‘Îsâ peygambere: “Cümleyi azdırdüñ cāzūluğıla; bunu dağı azdıрмаq mı<sup>109</sup> istersin?” dir. Dervîş dir ki ‘Îsâ peygambere: “Bunu bildüñ mi kimdür?” dir. ‘Îsâ (*B 269b*) dir ki:<sup>110</sup> “Pes bilmez miyem,” dir, “şeytândur.” dir. Dervîş eydür: “Pes hâzır ol.” dir. Fir‘avn şeytâna şorar ki: “Bu kişiyi [bilür misin?” dir, “ve bundan ğayrı yirde] dağı<sup>111</sup> gördüğüñ var mıdır?” dir. Şeytân dir ki: “[Bilürem,] cāzūdur. Şağın bundan.”<sup>112</sup> dir. Bu kez dervîş tırdı (*M 178b*) yirinden,<sup>113</sup> dir: “Yâ şeyh-i naħs! Dağı fođulluğıñ<sup>114</sup> komađuñ mı?” dir. Şeytâna ğayret geldi. Tırdı yirinden, sürdi dervîşün üstine.<sup>115</sup> Dervîş kepenegin kodi, tıtdı yine şeytânı.<sup>116</sup> Dir ki:

İlâhî cümleñün sırrın bilen haqq

Baňa bir nazır eyle hâlüme baq

<sup>102</sup> ‘Îsâ peygamberi B : ‘aleyhillâne hâzret-i ‘Îsâyı ‘aleyhisselâm M

<sup>103</sup> eydür özge tañrı vardır B : tañrı vardır diyü da‘vâ eyler M

<sup>104</sup> bunu cezâsın virelüm B : tamâm haqqından geledüm M

<sup>105</sup> dir ki ‘Îsâ peygambere sen mi didüñ ki tañrı vardır diyî B : dağı hâzret-i ‘Îsâya ‘aleyhisselâm eydür vâki‘de sen misin tañrı vardır diyen dir M

<sup>106</sup> ‘Îsâ peygamber dir ki belî Fir‘avn eydür ki B : -M

<sup>107</sup> sen B : yoksa M

<sup>108</sup> yoksa B : veyâhüd M

<sup>109</sup> şeytân dir ki ‘Îsâ peygambere cümleyi azdırdüñ cāzūluğıla bunu dağı azdıрмаq mı B : bu arada şeytân eydür hâzret-i ‘Îsâya ‘aleyhisselâm ki cümle-i ‘âlemi cādūluğıla azdırdüñ şāhib-i devleti dağı mı azdıрмаq M

<sup>110</sup> dir ki ‘Îsâ peygambere bunu bildüñ mi kimdür dir ‘Îsâ dir ki B : döñdi ‘Îsâ peygambere eydür bu harîfi bilür misiz dir ‘Îsâ ‘aleyhisselâm eydür M

<sup>111</sup> dağı B : -M

<sup>112</sup> şağın bundan B : bundan ziyâde şağın M

<sup>113</sup> tırdı yirinden B : yirinden tırigeldi M

<sup>114</sup> fođulluğıñ B : azğunluğıñ M

<sup>115</sup> yirinden sürdi dervîşün üstine B : dervîşün yine üzerine sürdi M

<sup>116</sup> tıtdı yine şeytânı B : yine şeytânı tıtdı M

Cāzūdur halkı azdurdı yolından  
‘Īsā peygamber için dir bu küstāh

didi dir. Tıtdı şeytānı, der hāl başdı.<sup>117</sup> Bir torbası ve bir ‘aşası varmış, [çekdi, zorile] elinden aldı. Şeytān bakdı, gördi ki bu ol dervīşdür, [hemān] kaçmağa yüz urdı. Bu kaderüñ içinde<sup>118</sup> Fir‘avn gördi ki pīri<sup>119</sup> kaçdı, eydür ki: “Dervīşi tutuñ!” dir. Dervīş der hāl<sup>120</sup> şapanın çıkardı, (*M 179a*) şapan taşıyla leşkeri şındurdu.<sup>121</sup> Her kişi bir yaña gitdi dir. Fir‘avnı tıtdı, börkin aldı. Şeytānuñ ‘aşasın tobrasın elinden aldı.<sup>122</sup> Geldi, oturdu. ‘Īsā peygamber dervīşe dir ki: “Cānum saña kurbān olsun!” dir.<sup>123</sup> Dervīş şeytānuñ tobrasın [başı aşāğa] akdardı, gördi ki ne kadar [hīlesi ve] cāzūlığı varsa bu tobradaymış. [Pes] ikisi [dağı hoş fāriğu’l-bāl olup] oturdılar. Fir‘avnuñ leşkeri girü bir bir<sup>124</sup> dirildi. Şeytān geldi, Fir‘avna dir ki: “Gel berü, kerem eyle, ol tobrayı ola ki baña girü alıviresin.”<sup>125</sup> dir. Elçileşdiler (*M 179b*) ki tobrayı börki ‘aşayı vir diyi.<sup>126</sup> ‘Īsā peygamber [‘aleyhisselām dervīşe] dir ki: “[Tobrayı ve sâ’ir esbāblarını] vir [gitsün. Gavgādan] kırtulalum, gidelüm.”<sup>127</sup> dir. Dervīş dir ki: “[Hele bir miqdār] şabr eyle.”<sup>128</sup> didi. Bu kaderüñ (*B 270a*) içinde<sup>129</sup> Fir‘avnuñ başı keçelmiş, utandı. Şeytān [dağı] tobrası için nāmūslandı. Tırdılar. İkileyin [yine] karğaşa eylediler. Dervīş yine dir ki ‘Īsā peygambere: “Hāzır ol!” dir.<sup>130</sup> [Tekrār] dervīş kötegin çekdi, [yüridi,] tartağan eyledi. Şeytānı tıtdı, Fir‘avn kaçdı. Dervīş şeytānı

<sup>117</sup> tıtdı şeytānı der hāl başdı B : dağı muhkem tıtdı götürdi yire urdı M

<sup>118</sup> bu kaderüñ içinde B : -M

<sup>119</sup> pīri B : pīr M

<sup>120</sup> der hāl B : fi’l-hāl M

<sup>121</sup> leşkeri şındurdu B : Fir‘avnuñ leşkerin şıdı M

<sup>122</sup> börkin aldı şeytānuñ ‘aşasın tobrasın elinden B : Fir‘avnuñ börkin ve şeytānuñ ‘aşasın ve tobrasın ellerinden M

<sup>123</sup> dervīşe dir ki cānum saña kurbān olsun dir B : ‘aleyhisselām dervīşe cānum saña kurbān olsun diyü istihsānlar itdi M

<sup>124</sup> girü bir bir M : geldi B

<sup>125</sup> gel berü kerem eyle ol tobrayı ola ki baña girü alıviresin M : ol tobrayı alıvir B

<sup>126</sup> ki tobrayı börki ‘aşayı vir diyi B : tobrayı ve börki ve ‘aşayı istediler M

<sup>127</sup> gidelüm B : -M

<sup>128</sup> eyle B : eyleñ görüñ M

<sup>129</sup> bu kaderüñ içinde B : -M

<sup>130</sup> dir ki ‘Īsā peygambere hāzır ol dir B : hāzret-i ‘Īsāya ‘aleyhisselām hāzır oluñ didi M



getürdi,<sup>131</sup> bir ayağından aşdı. Dir ki: “Behey mel‘ün! Niçe [bir] fitne eylersin?” dir. Şeytān ‘Īsā peygamberüñ [‘aleyhisselām] elin öpdü ki “[Luṭf eyle!] Beni (*M 180a*) bu kişinüñ elinden<sup>132</sup> kırtar!” diyi.<sup>133</sup> Velī<sup>134</sup> ‘Īsā peygamber [‘aleyhisselām] dervīşe dir ki: “[Gel] tobrasını al, kendüyi<sup>135</sup> kıo kıtsün.” dir. Dervīş dir ki: “Yā ‘Īsā, bu şeytāndur. Yahşı tutduk.” dir. “[Gel, kerem eyle,] şefkat eyleme.” dir. ‘Īsā peygamber<sup>136</sup> eydür: “Cānum bu beni ne<sup>137</sup> bildi kim ‘Īsāyam?” dir. Dervīş dir ki:

Ḥaqqā minnet ki ḥaqq oldı baña yār  
Cānum içinde<sup>138</sup> bulındı bu esrār

Müberrāyam kamu fikr ü ḥayālden  
Ne küfr ü dīn ne tesbīḥ ü<sup>139</sup> ne zünnār

didü dir. Der-ḥāl şeytān zārīlık eyledi ki: “Dirliğüm ol tobra iledür, baña anı virüñ!” dir. ‘Īsā peygamber<sup>140</sup> eydür: “Daḥı tobrasın vir, varsun yoḳlasun.”<sup>141</sup> dir. Dervīş [daḥı ‘Īsā peygamberüñ emriyle şeytānuñ tobrasın] (*M 180b*) getürdi, eline virdi. Aldı öñine tobrayı dökdi. İçinde olan esbābını ḥesāb kitāb eyledi. Tekledi, çiftledi. Gördü esbābından nesnesi gitmemiş, hemān bayağıdur. Bu ḥālde dervīş uyanıgeldi,<sup>142</sup> gördü ki düşidür. Ten-i tenhā hemān özidür, kimesne yoḳ. Bu kez<sup>143</sup> [dervīş] eydür ki:

---

<sup>131</sup> getürdi B : tutdı M

<sup>132</sup> kişinüñ elinden M : kişiden B

<sup>133</sup> diyi B : didü M

<sup>134</sup> velī B : -M

<sup>135</sup> kendüyi M : bunı B

<sup>136</sup> peygamber B : ‘aleyhisselām M

<sup>137</sup> cānum bu beni ne B : bu şeytān beni neden M

<sup>138</sup> cānum içinde B : benüm cānumda M

<sup>139</sup> tesbīḥ ü M : şavma‘a B

<sup>140</sup> peygamber B : ‘aleyhisselām M

<sup>141</sup> daḥı tobrasın vir varsun yoḳlasun M : vir bunuñ tobrasını B

<sup>142</sup> aldı öñine tobrayı dökdi içinde olan esbābını ḥesāb kitāb eyledi tekledi çiftledi gördü esbābından nesnesi gitmemiş hemān bayağıdur bu ḥālde dervīş uyanıgeldi M : ḥesābladı tobrasını hemān içindeki bayağı dervīş uyandı B

<sup>143</sup> bu kez : -M

İlāhī ben miyem ol şūḥ u<sup>144</sup> ‘ayyār  
Benüm cānumda bulundı bu esrār

Bu gün benem<sup>145</sup> kamu ‘ālem içinde  
Murād-ı<sup>146</sup> şavma‘a maqşūd-ı zünnār

didir. Secde-i şükr kıldı. Secdeden baş getürdi. (B 270b) Gördi ki irte olmuş, güneş toğmuş, nūr u zulmet, irte gice, ırāk yakın<sup>147</sup> bir olmuş. Cümle eşyā şafāyile<sup>148</sup> söyler ki:<sup>149</sup> (M 181a) “*Lā ilāhe illallāh!*” dir. Dervīş çün<sup>150</sup> bu hikmeti gördi, özine yörendi. Bir cümle<sup>151</sup> fikr eyledi, [girü] uykuuya vardı. Düşinde gördi ki cümle ‘ālemde [olan] yaradılmış eşyā [hep] bir yire gelmiş, bir şahrāda gezer. İster [ve] biri birinden şorarlar ki: “Bu bārgāh [ve bu] sayvan<sup>152</sup> ki bunda tutulmuş, ‘aceb bunuñ şāhibi kıanda ola?” dirler, birbirinden şorarlar.<sup>153</sup> Dervīş nāgāh irişıdi, bunları gördi. Bunlar daḥı<sup>154</sup> dervīşi gördiler. Aldılar dervīşi [ve] bir hoş yire geldiler, oturdılar. Dervīşden şordılar ki: “Sen daḥı bu bisāta [ve bu] sayvana<sup>155</sup> geldüğüñ var mıdur?” didiler. Dervīş [daḥı] dir ki: “Belı, Ādem peygamber dirler idi bir kışi (M 181b) geldi,<sup>156</sup> bir zamān bu cihānda oldı. Şindiki ādemler ki var, andan üredi.” Bunlar didiler ki: “Yā Rabb, anlar gördiler mi ki bu sayvanı<sup>157</sup> düzen kimdür?” Bu kıaderüñ içinde gördiler ki Ādem peygamber [daḥı] çıkıp geldi.

---

<sup>144</sup> ilāhī ben miyem ol şūḥ u M : yā rabb ben miyem ol dilber-i B

<sup>145</sup> benem B : benven M

<sup>146</sup> murād-ı M : ḥācet-i B

<sup>147</sup> irte gice ırāk yakın B : ü ırāk u yakın u irte vü gice M

<sup>148</sup> şafāyile M : şavtile B

<sup>149</sup> söyler ki B : -M

<sup>150</sup> çün M : ki B

<sup>151</sup> cümle B : miqdār M

<sup>152</sup> sayvan B : eyvān M

<sup>153</sup> birbirinden şorarlar B : -M

<sup>154</sup> bunları gördi bunlar daḥı M : geldi bunlara bunlar B

<sup>155</sup> sayvana B : eyvāna M

<sup>156</sup> geldi B : -M

<sup>157</sup> sayvanı B : eyvānı M

Dervîş dir ki: “Üşte Âdem peygamber geldi.” dir. Âdeme<sup>158</sup> bunlar karşı vardılar, selâm virdiler. Âdemün elin öpdiler. Şordılar ki: “Bu sayvanuñ issi<sup>159</sup> kanda olur?” dirler. Âdem [peygamber ‘aleyhisselâm] dir ki: “Vallâhi, biz dağı geldük, [bunı] hemân şöyle gördük.” dir. Dervîş bu kez<sup>160</sup> dir ki:

Yâ Rabb bu sırr ki gönümde nihândur  
Vücüdumda kamu hükmi revândur<sup>161</sup>

Ya’nî fikr ile ‘aqlum buña irdi  
Bu cândur ki kamu ‘âlemde cândur

didir. Dervîş ki bu sözi söyledi, Âdem (*B 271a*) peygamber [‘aleyhisselâm] bunlara (*M 182a*) şorar ki: “Bu [kişi] ne kişidür?” dir. Bunlar didiler ki: “Biz dağı şindi<sup>162</sup> gördük.” didiler. Bu kez Âdem [‘aleyhisselâm] dir ki: “Karındaş, sen ne kişisin?” dir. Dervîş dir ki: “Ben dağı müsâfirem.” dir. “Evvel ki bu yire geldüm,” dir,<sup>163</sup> “senüñle bile geldüm.” dir. Âdem [‘aleyhisselâm] dir ki: “Ben bilmezem seni.” dir. Dervîş dir ki: “Ben senüñ vücüduñda bileydüm.” dir. Bir bir nişân virdi. Âdemün başına gelen hikâyetleri, Âdemden soñra Âdem oğlanlarınıñ başına gelen hâlleri<sup>164</sup> bir bir söyledi. Âdem [‘aleyhisselâm dervîşe] dir ki: “İbrâhîm peygamberi [‘aleyhisselâm] Nimrüd oda atmak istemiş. Turigel,<sup>165</sup> bile varalum.” dir. Dervîş [‘ale’r-re’s diyüp tırdı,] bile vardı.<sup>166</sup> Bir zamân<sup>167</sup> ki yürüdiler, gördiler ki bir yirde galabalık var,<sup>168</sup> dîvân tırmış. Bunlar dağı [vardılar,] irişdiler. (*M 182b*) Bir halvet yir tıtdılar, oturdılar.

---

<sup>158</sup> geldi dir Âdeme B : budur M

<sup>159</sup> sayvanuñ issi B : eyvânuñ şâhibi M

<sup>160</sup> bu kez B : cûşa gelüp M

<sup>161</sup> vücüdumda kamu hükmi revândur M : kamu vücüduma hükmi revândur B

<sup>162</sup> şindi B : bunda M

<sup>163</sup> dir B : idi M

<sup>164</sup> Âdemden soñra Âdem oğlanlarınıñ başına gelen hâlleri : -M

<sup>165</sup> turigel B : gel M

<sup>166</sup> vardı B : gitdi M

<sup>167</sup> zamân B : miqdâr M

<sup>168</sup> galabalık var M : kalaba B

Gördiler ki Nimrūd tırmuş, söyler ki: “Odun getirüñ, yarağ eyleñ.” dir. Dervîş bağıdı, gördi ki şeytān Nimrūduñ varlığı olmuş. Ne ki şeytān dirse Nimrūd anı tutar. Dervîş Ādeme [‘aleyhisselām] dir ki: “Şol ĥod Nimrūddur, [yā] ol ağ sağallu [ħarīf] kimdür bilür misin [hiç?” dir]. Ādem dir ki: “Bilmen.”<sup>169</sup> dir. Dervîş dir ki: “Şeytāndur. [Niçün bilmezsin?” dir. Bu ħaderüñ<sup>170</sup> içinde Nimrūd bunları gördi, dağı şeytāna şordı<sup>171</sup> ki: “Ol ne kişilerdür?”<sup>172</sup> Şeytān bağıdı, [ħazret-i] Ādemi gördi. Nimrūda dir ki: “Benüm düşmenüm budur ağı.” dir. Nimrūd dir ki: “Bu kimdür?” dir. Şeytān (*M 183a*) dir ki: “Bu ol kişidür ki bunuñ ucından [benüm] başuma neler geldi.”<sup>173</sup> dir. “Ammā<sup>174</sup> eyi bulduğ!” dir, “Cezāsın virelüm!” dir. Nimrūd dir ki: “Ol kişilere gel diñ.”<sup>175</sup> dir. Vardılar, “Gelüñ, sizi beg ister.” didiler.<sup>176</sup> Bunlar dağı tırıgeldiler, Nimrūduñ öñine geldiler.<sup>177</sup> Nimrūd dir ki: “Oturüñ şöyle.”<sup>178</sup> [Oturdılar.] (*B 271b*) Nimrūd<sup>179</sup> şeytāna şorar ki: “Ķankısıdur [senüñ düşmenimdür] didüğüñ?” dir. Ādemi gösterdi<sup>180</sup> velī dervîşi bilimedi. Oturdılar. Od yandı, mancanığ düzüldi, yarağ tamām oldu. İbrāhīm peygamberi getürdiler. Şeytān dir ki İbrāhīme:<sup>181</sup> “Tañrı vardır dirsın. Gel bu küfr<sup>182</sup> sözleri terk eyle, seni ħoyalum.”<sup>183</sup> dir. (*M 183b*) Dervîş ħatlanımadı, tırdı yirinden.<sup>184</sup> Dir ki: “Bu ne küfr<sup>185</sup> söyledi?” dir. Şeytān dir ki: “Nimrūdı tañrılığa begenmez.” dir. “Eydür ki özge tañrı vardır.”<sup>186</sup> dir. Dervîş dir ki: “[Bu]

<sup>169</sup> dir ki bilmen B : ‘aleyhisselām bilmezem M

<sup>170</sup> ħaderüñ B : ĥāl M

<sup>171</sup> dağı şeytāna şordı M : dir B

<sup>172</sup> ol ne kişilerdür B : şol kişiler kimlerdür M

<sup>173</sup> neler geldi B : bunca belālar gelmişdür M

<sup>174</sup> ammā M : bunu B

<sup>175</sup> diñ B : diñüz M

<sup>176</sup> vardılar gelüñ sizi beg ister didiler M : geldiler B

<sup>177</sup> tırıgeldiler Nimrūduñ öñine geldiler M : geldi B

<sup>178</sup> şöyle : -M

<sup>179</sup> Nimrūd B : -M

<sup>180</sup> gösterdi B : gösterivirdi M

<sup>181</sup> dir ki İbrāhīme B : İbrāhīm peygambere ‘aleyhisselām eydür M

<sup>182</sup> küfr B : cins M

<sup>183</sup> ħoyalum B : ħoyuvirelüm M

<sup>184</sup> tırdı yirinden B : tırıgeldi M

<sup>185</sup> küfr B : yaramaz M

<sup>186</sup> dir eydür ki özge tañrı vardır B : özge tañrı vardır diyü söyler M

Nimrūd tañrı mıdır?” dir. “Ben [hod] bunuñ tođduđın bilürem.” dir. “Hırasan memleketinde bir mecüsünüñ<sup>187</sup> ođlıdur.” dir. “Bu kaçan tañrı olmuşdur?” dir. Bu söze şeytān kađıdı, dir ki şeytān: “Bunu söyletme!”<sup>188</sup> dir. “Bunu sözile kimse<sup>189</sup> yeñse olmaz.” dir. “[Hemān] oda şal,<sup>190</sup> yansunlar.” dir. Nimrūd dir ki: “[Hele] evvel Āzer ođlın şaluñ,” dir, “yüregüm sovsun.”<sup>191</sup> dir. Tıtdılar İbrāhimi ki mancınıka uralar. Ādem peygamber dir ki: “[Derviş] tur, biz gidelüm bāri.” dir. Şeytān dir ki: “[Evvel] şol köseyi dađı<sup>192</sup> [oda] şaluñ.” (*M 184a*) dir. Ādeme dađı<sup>193</sup> yapışdılar [ki oda şalalar]. Derviş yirinden tırdı,<sup>194</sup> eydür ki:

İlāhī cümleye puşt u penāhsın  
Kamu ‘ālem içinde pādişāhsın

Seni haqq bilene eyle ‘ināyet<sup>195</sup>  
Yaraşur saña kurtarmağ<sup>196</sup> ilāhsın

didi dir. Allāhı yād kıldı, evliyādan [ve] enbiyādan isti‘āne diledi. Derviş kepenegin çıkardı, tañrınıñ ‘ināyetin geydi. Şeytān bađdı, gördi ki bu ol dervişdür ki bunuñ (*B 272a*) tobrasın almışdı. Nimrūda dir ki: “Hay<sup>197</sup> ne turursın başuña! Meded<sup>198</sup> eyle!” dir. Bu kâderde<sup>199</sup> derviş karvadı, tıtdı şeytānı. Tevhid ipiyle elin bađladı. Nimrūdı [dađı] tıtdı, getürdi. Kalan leşker [bunu gördi,] kađdı. (*M 184b*) Bu ikisini tıtdılar, getürdiler. Bu kâderüñ içinde,<sup>200</sup> yüz biñ [dađı] yigirmi

<sup>187</sup> bir mecüsünüñ M : Beykozlı Bıcānuñ B

<sup>188</sup> söyletme B : söyletmeñ M

<sup>189</sup> bunu sözile kimse M : sözile bunları B

<sup>190</sup> şal B : atuñ M

<sup>191</sup> şaluñ dir yüregüm soğusun B : atuñ ola ki ola ki yüregüm soğuya M

<sup>192</sup> dađı B : -M

<sup>193</sup> dađı B : -M

<sup>194</sup> tırdı B : tırigeldi M

<sup>195</sup> eyle ‘ināyet M : ‘ināyet eyle B

<sup>196</sup> yaraşur saña kurtarmağ M : zırā şey’ bendedür hemān B

<sup>197</sup> hay B : -M

<sup>198</sup> meded M : madara B

<sup>199</sup> bu kâderde B : fi’l-hāl M

<sup>200</sup> bu kâderüñ içinde B : fi’l-hāl M

dört biñ peygamber, cümle evliyā vü enbiyā, yedi t̄abaqa gökde [ve] yedi t̄abaqa yirde berr ü baħr içinde cümle yaratılmış eşyā<sup>201</sup> orada h̄azır oldılar. Cümlesi taħsīn eylediler dervīše. Didiler ki: “Nimrūduñ şuçı yokdur.” didiler. “Bu işleri hep şeytān işler.” didiler. T̄ıtdılar, getürdiler şeytānı ki işkence vireler. Şeytān zārлік<sup>202</sup> eyledi, eydür ki: “Bu kez çoñ,” dir, “daħı fuzüllük eylemeyin.” dir.<sup>203</sup> Vardı Daqyanos, dir ki: “[Hele bir] p̄ir kişidür.” dir. “[Bu kerre] bağışlañ bunı.” dir. Dervīş t̄ırdı yirinden, dir ki: "Her kişi kendü başına (*M 185a*) maşlaħat görsün."<sup>204</sup> dir. “Ādem peygamber zamānından beri tā bu deme degin bunca şālihler neler eyledi bu, bilür misin?”<sup>205</sup> dir. Bu qaderde<sup>206</sup> İbrāhīm peygamber [‘aleyhisselām] dir ki: “Yā Resūlullāh, Nimrūd haħķında ne dirsın?” dir. Muħammed Muştafā [‘aleyhisselām] dir ki: “Dervīş ne dirse anı t̄utuñ.” dir. Dervīş dir ki: “Şeytānı baña virüñ.” dir. “İşüm var anuñla.”<sup>207</sup> dir. [Şeytānı dervīşe virdiler.] Dervīş şeytānı aldı, bir h̄alvet<sup>208</sup> yire geldi. T̄ıtdı şeytānı,<sup>209</sup> elin [ve] ayağın bağladı. Kötegin çıkardı. Dir ki: “[Di imdi] tevbe eyler misin ki daħı şeytānlık eylemeyesin?” dir. Şeytān feryād eyledi. Cümle peygamberler yine bunda geldiler. (*M 185b*) Didiler ki: “Yā dervīş, bir s̄a‘at şābr eyle [hele].” didiler. (*B 272b*) Bu qaderde<sup>210</sup> gördiler ki şeytānuñ mürīdleri Fir‘avn [u] Daqyanos [u] Şeddād [u] Nimrūd çıkup geldiler. Didiler ki: “Dervīş, gel bize bu şeyħi şat.” didiler. “Saña kepenek idivirelüm” didiler, “[ve] bir dik palan daħı virelüm.” didiler. Dervīş didi ki: “Yār-i güft-i kadem! Getür berü!” Nimrūd dir ki: “Qo<sup>211</sup> bizi, yine<sup>212</sup> yirimize varalum.” dir. “Qulluğa [murādca] t̄ırmışuz.” dir. Dervīş eydür ki:

Yā Rabb ol dilber-i ‘ayyār benem mi

<sup>201</sup> cümle yaratılmış eşyā B : ne kadar maħlūk var ise M

<sup>202</sup> zārлік B : zārлікler M

<sup>203</sup> kez çoñ dir daħı fuzüllük eylemeyin dir B : kerre beni şalıvirüñ ayruq fođulluk itmeyem diyü and içdi M

<sup>204</sup> kendü başına maşlaħat görsün M : kendü işine maşlaħat eylesün B

<sup>205</sup> bu bilür misin B : siz bunı bilür misiz M

<sup>206</sup> qaderde B : h̄āl içinde M

<sup>207</sup> işüm var anuñla B : benüm anuñla işüm vardur M

<sup>208</sup> h̄alvet M : kolay B

<sup>209</sup> şeytānı B : şeytānuñ M

<sup>210</sup> bu qaderde B : -M

<sup>211</sup> qo B : koyver M

<sup>212</sup> yine B : -M

Ḳamu varlık kem ü bisyār benem mi

Benem bu söyleyen bu dil<sup>213</sup> içinde

Şadef miyem veyā gevher benem mi<sup>214</sup>

didi dir. Dervīş çün ki bu şi‘ri didi,<sup>215</sup> bunlar dört yaña baqdılar, didiler ki: “Bu dervīşüñ bizden ferāgati var, [nidelüm.]” (*M 186a*) didiler. Bu kıaderde<sup>216</sup> dervīş uyıkudan belinledi. Gözin açdı, baqdı,<sup>217</sup> gördi ki hiç kimesne yođ. Bu şıfatlar ki şeytān [u] Nimrūd [u] Fir‘avn, hırs u heves ü gayrı endişelerimiş vücūdında. Dervīş [turdı,] dört yaña baqdı. Gördi ki hemān ten-i tenhā özidür. Allāhuñ birligin yād eyledi. Öz derdin dile geldi, eydür ki:

Yā Rabb ben cān mıyam bu ten içinde

Yā ol fülān mıyam insān içinde

Hemān benem dađı çün u çerā yođ

Hüner issi<sup>218</sup> bu gün meydān içinde

didi dir. Dervīş tırdı yirinden,<sup>219</sup> müsāfir oldı. Bir zamāndan soñra dervīş irişdi Bağdāda.<sup>220</sup> Gördi ki Bağdād bir hoş şehrdür, bir ulu şu ortasına (*M 186b*) varur. Şāhib-i devletler [ve] ‘āķiller vardur. Dervīş (*B 273a*) yürüdi ileri,<sup>221</sup> düşünün ta‘bīrin şormađa. Gördi ki Behlül-i dīvāne geliyorur. İlerü yürüdi. Dervīş selām virdi.<sup>222</sup> [Dervīşle] görüşdiler. Geldiler bir ĥalvet yire

---

<sup>213</sup> bu dil M : vücūd B

<sup>214</sup> The version of the verse in B is erroneous due to its lack of rhyme.

<sup>215</sup> çün ki bu şi‘ri didi M : şi‘r bünyād eyledi B

<sup>216</sup> bu kıaderde B : -M

<sup>217</sup> baqdı B : -M

<sup>218</sup> hüner issi M : şāhib-hüner B

<sup>219</sup> tırdı yirinden B : yirinden tırdı M

<sup>220</sup> dervīş irişdi Bağdāda B : Bağdāda irişdi M

<sup>221</sup> ileri B : -M

<sup>222</sup> dervīş selām virdi B : -M

oturdılar. Dervîş başladı,<sup>223</sup> başından geçeni hikâyet idüp bir bir<sup>224</sup> söyledi. Behlül-i dīvâne cūşa geldi. Bu hikâyeti söyledi ki: “Bir düş gördüm.” dir. “Düşümde cümle ‘âlem yüzüme karşı secde kıılır.” dir. “Sağ yanıma bakdum.” dir. “Gördüm ki Mūsā peygamber [‘aleyhisselām] tırımışdur. Selām virdüm.” dir. “Şordum ki: ‘Bu sulţānuñ milki bunda düzüldüğü vaqtin sen kıanda idüñ?’ didüm.” dir. “Mūsā peygamber [‘aleyhisselām] dir ki: ‘Tevrît ki baña geldi, tañrı tebâreke ve ta‘âlâ dir ki: ‘Cümleyi ki (*M 187a*) yaratdum,’ dir, ‘bu şüretlerüñ içinde ħüsn ü revnaķ benem. Dağı kim var?’ dir.’ ” “Uyanıgeldüm.” dir. “Gördüm ki düşümdür.” dir. Bu kıaderde<sup>225</sup> gördi ki dervîş bu<sup>226</sup> Behlül kıuş dilin söyler. Dervîş dir ki:

Evvel<sup>227</sup> bu ten yoğıdı cānidüm ben  
Kul degüldüm o dem sulţānidüm ben

Vücüdum yoğıken cān gülşeninde  
Gülistān-ı gül-i ħandānidüm ben

didi dir. Dervîş ki bu sözi söyledi, Behlüle ħoş geldi.<sup>228</sup> Yürüdi dervîşi kıoşdı. Dervîşüñ yaķasından içeri girdi. Dervîş uyandı, gördi ki hemān özidür. Ne Bağdād var, ne şehr var. Dağı ħiç kıimesne yoķ. ħayrān kıaldı. Dervîş fikr eyledi, bu gördüğü hikâyetleri añdı. Bu kıaderde<sup>229</sup> (*M 187b*) uyķuya vardı. Düşinde (*B 273b*) gördi ki cümle ‘âlem dil olmış, ħaķķuñ birligin söyler. Yırde [ve] gökde cümle eşyā rüşen görünür. Cümle eşyā faşıħ kelāmile söyler ki: “*Lā ilāhe illāllāh Muhammedün resūlullāh ‘Aliyyün veliyyullāh.*”<sup>230</sup> dir. Dervîş bu ħâli ki gördi, ‘ibret-i nazar ile baķdı, gördi ki cihān başdan başa görünür. Dervîş baķdı, gördi ki bir yırde kıalaba dīvān tırımış. Sürdi geldi, gördi ki tañrı didikleri bir nürimiş. [Nāgāh] nür balķıdı. Cümle eşyā uyandı.

---

<sup>223</sup> başladı B : -M

<sup>224</sup> geçeni hikâyet idüp bir bir M : geçen hikâyetleri söyledi B

<sup>225</sup> bu kıaderde B : -M

<sup>226</sup> ki dervîş bu B : dervîş ki M

<sup>227</sup> evvel B : ezel M

<sup>228</sup> Behlüle ħoş geldi M : Behlül cūşa geldi B

<sup>229</sup> bu kıaderde B : fi’l-ħāl M

<sup>230</sup> ‘Alī veliyyullāh B : -M



Her birisi kendü dilince haqqıñ birligine şükr eyler. Bu kâderde<sup>231</sup> dervîş baqdı, gördi ki hısâb günidür, şormaq istemek günidür. Muhammed Muştafa ser-efrâz olmış, (*M 188a*) cümleñün ortasında ay u güneş gibi rüşen. Ol nûra qarşu halâyıq tırmişlar, söyleşürler ki: “Zihî kerîm sultân ki cümleñün ‘aybın getürüp yüzine urmadı.<sup>232</sup> Her birinün maqşudı neyse virdi.” dirler. Dervîş nâgâh baqdı, ol nûrı gördi ki yirde [ve] gökde cümle eşyâ bu nûruñ tecellîsinden yolını görmiş, işin tamâm kılmış. Her birisi kendü hâlinde, gönli hoş. Dervîş gördi ki her bir şey<sup>233</sup> öz cinsiyle çok çok zevk ü şafâya düşmişler. Bu kâderde<sup>234</sup> dervîş gördi ki hısâb tamâm olmış. Cümleñün şuçı bağışlanmış. Tañrınıñ (*M 188b*) hâşşları bir yire gelmişler, tûbâ ağacı dibinde şöhet eylerler. Dervîş irişigeldi, gördi ki bunlar bu hâlde, selâm virdi dir. Bir halvet yirde oturdu. Bunları teferrüc (*B 274a*) eyler. Nâgâh dervîş baqdı, gördi ki şeytân ton degşürmiş, bu arada biledür. Dervîş bildi, hiç tınmadı. [Şeytân] aşğa yukarı hizmete meşgûl olmış. Bunlar şeytânı bilmezler. [Bir] zâhid sûretinde gizlemiş özini.<sup>235</sup> Şîrîn şîrîn söyler, şatır şatır hizmet eyler, cümlesine kulluk eyler,<sup>236</sup> hikâyetler ider, ilerüden gerüden geçenleri söyler, nedîmlikler eyler. Cümlesi bunu hoş kişidür dirler. Dervîş bunu [gördi,] (*M 189a*) keşfledi. Bu kâderde<sup>237</sup> didiler ki: [Dervîş,] gel kırbân al.” didiler. “Yiri götüren öküzün [ve] balıgıñ işi bitmiş.” didiler. “Dervîşlere haqq tebareke ve ta‘âlâ öküz ü balıgı kırbân virmiş.” didiler. Dervîş tırdu ki vara. Mûsâ peygamber dir ki dervîşe: “Kırbânı aluñ, bunda geluñ.” dir. “Şoşbet eyleyelüm.” dir. Şeytân dir ki: “Bunlardan ne umarsın?” dir. Dervîş muqayyed olmadı.<sup>238</sup> Sürdi, geldi. Gördi ki balıgı öküzü yükletmişler, geliyorurlar. Dervîş ilerü yürüdi, selâm virdi dervîşlere. Dervîşler dağı şordılar ki: “Hiç bir şöhet yiri var mıdur?” didiler. “Beli, vardur.” didi.<sup>239</sup> Dervîş başladı, bu meclise getürdü. (*M 189b*) Bunlar gördiler ki dervîşler dağı bunda geldiler. Selâm virdiler. Bunlar dağı “Şafâ geldüñüz.” didiler. “Kadem getürdüñüz.” didiler. Bunlar dağı yirlü yirin aldılar, oturdılar. Pişmek kıtarılmaq oldu. Didiler ki: “Her biriñüz bir hikâyet söyleñ.” didiler. Şeytân

---

<sup>231</sup> bu kâderde B : fi'l-hâl M

<sup>232</sup> getürüp yüzine urmadı M : yüzine getürmedi B

<sup>233</sup> bir şey M : eşyâ B

<sup>234</sup> kâderde B : hâlde M

<sup>235</sup> gizlemiş özini B : özini gizlemiş M

<sup>236</sup> eyler M : yetürür B

<sup>237</sup> kâderde B : hâlde M

<sup>238</sup> olmadı M : oldu B

<sup>239</sup> var mıdur didiler belî vardur didi B : gördüñ mi didiler M

custalık eyler, dil yügrükligin eyler, hikāyetler söyler,<sup>240</sup> gazeller okur. (B 274b) Bunlar şöhbete meşgül. Dervîş yirinden tırıgeldi, eydür ki:

Cānān idüm ezelde cāna geldüm  
Cānam vücūd geyüp<sup>241</sup> meydāna geldüm

Teferrüc kılmağa milk-i cihānı  
‘Ārifem şüret-i insāna geldüm

didî dir. Dervîş ki bu sözi<sup>242</sup> söyledi, şeytān dervîşe baqdı. Eydür ki: “Şol kişiyi dağı gördüğüm vardur.” dir. Dervîş dir ki: “Bir hikāyet bilürem,” dir, “söyleyeyin [mi]?” dir. (M 190a) Cümle didiler ki: “Nola, söyle dervîş.” Bünyād eyledi, dir ki: “Ben ol zamān ki cihān yoğidi, tañrı tebāreke ve ta‘ālā vardı. Diledi ki cümle ‘ālemi vücūda getüre. Evvel Muḥammed Muştafānuñ cānın yaratdı. Muḥammed Muştafānuñ cānından<sup>243</sup> cümle ‘ālemi vücūda getürdi. Yırde [ve] gökde küllî eşyā tamām oldu. [Tā] ol demden bu deme degin her şey kendü ḥāline meşgül.” Evvel ü āḫir her ne ki [var] hikāyet geçdi, dervîş söyledi. Geldi ādemüñ hikāyetine. Her ne ki ādemüñ hikāyeti<sup>244</sup> vardı, söyledi. Şeytān diñledi, gördi ki bu dervîş ol dervîşdür ki ‘aşāsın, börkin<sup>245</sup> [ve] tobrasın almışdı. Şeytān (M 190b) feryād eyledi, dir ki: “Hiç kırtulamaz mıyam [bu dervîşüñ elinden]!” dir. Tırdı, sürdi dervîşüñ üstine. Dervîş gördi ki üstine gelür, tırıgeldi [yirinden]. Eydür ki:

Yine geldi bize bayram olan gün  
Cānum sultānile hemdem olan gün

Yine fūrşat eli vuşlata irdi

---

<sup>240</sup> söyler B : ider M

<sup>241</sup> geyüp M : bigi B

<sup>242</sup> ki bu sözi B : bu hikāyeti M

<sup>243</sup> cānından B : cānında M

<sup>244</sup> hikāyeti M : ḥāli B

<sup>245</sup> ‘aşāsın börkin B : börkin ‘aşāsın M

‘Āşıklar ‘ışık ile der-hem olan gün

didi dir. Tıttı şeytānı, meclis içinde yire vurdı. Elin ayağın bağladı. Geldi, oturdu. Eydür ki:

Ezel ben<sup>246</sup> cān idüm ten niçün oldum (B 275a)

Bu ten içinde pinhān niçün oldum

Ben ol sırram ki ‘ālemde yegāne

‘Aceb şüret-i insān niçün oldum

(M 191a) didi dir. [Pes] cümle ehl-i meclis<sup>247</sup> didiler ki: “Dervīş, şol miskinüñ elin [ve] ayağın bağladuñ. Günāhı nedür? [Bāri bilsüñ.]” didiler. Dervīş dir ki: “Biz ol zamān cihānda ki varıduğ, ol vaqt yir [ü] gök var idi. Ay u gün toğar [ve] tolnurdu. Ol vaqt dirlerdi ki ‘tañrı [vü] peygamber [ü] dünyā [vü] āhiret [ü] rahmān [u] şeytān’ dimezler miydi? [İmdi] bu ol şeytāndur.” didi dir. Bunlar didiler ki: “Rāst dirsın. İşidürdük velī görmemişüz.<sup>248</sup> Billāhi elin [ve] ayağın ço bendin.<sup>249</sup> [Bundan] bir haber şoralum.” didiler. [Pes] bendin çözdü, çodı.<sup>250</sup> Şeytān dile geldi, dir ki: “Benüm hālüme baquñ [ki] neye (M 191b) irişdüm [ve ne zamāna kaldum ki] evliyā [vü] enbiyā benüm elümden ser-gerdān olmışlardı, bu kadarca kişinüñ elinden ‘āciz ve beste oldum. Baña neler ider, billāhī görüñ!”<sup>251</sup> dir. Bu kâderde<sup>252</sup> dervīş uykuđan belinledi. Tırgeldi, görđi ki *leyse fi’ d-dāri gayrunā deyyār*, kimesne yok.<sup>253</sup> Dervīş dile geldi,<sup>254</sup> eydür ki:

Yolum niçün ‘aceb şahrāya düşđi

Bu sevdādan başum sevdāya düşđi

---

<sup>246</sup> ezel ben M : ben ezel B

<sup>247</sup> ehl-i meclis B : meclis ehli M

<sup>248</sup> görmemişüz B : görmemiş idük M

<sup>249</sup> ço bendin B : koyuvir M

<sup>250</sup> çözdü çodı B : şalıvirdi M

<sup>251</sup> kişinüñ elinden ‘āciz ve beste oldum baña neler ider billāhī görüñ M : kişi beni gör neyley B

<sup>252</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>253</sup> kimesne yok B : -M

<sup>254</sup> dile geldi B : derdin dile getirüp M

Ezel *naħnu ҡasemnāda* naşībüm<sup>255</sup>

Bile sultān ile hem-sāye düşdi

didir. Bu ҡaderde<sup>256</sup> [bunı] gördi ki cümle ‘ālem beşāret eyler. Güneş toğmış. Yirde [ve] gökde cümle eşyā bir vücūd [ve] bir baş olmuş, faşīh kelāmıle (*M 192a*) söyler ki:

Cihān başdan başa nūr-ı sa‘ādet

Hemān birdür ne hicrān var ne vuşlat

Neye baksañ hemān ‘ayn-ı kemāldür

Şıfāt yokdur haķīkatde ҡamu zāt

didir. (*B 275b*) Bu ҡaderde<sup>257</sup> [yine] uyku havāle oldu. Dervīş uyku<sup>258</sup> gördi ki küllī kā’ināt bir serāyüdür. Orta yirde bir āyine-i ҡadīm [ü] muķīm tırmuş. Her eşyā ki var bu serāyuñ dīvārında [ve] kenārında [ve] ortasında naķş olmuş, ‘aksi bu āyinede görünür. Dervīş teferrüc eyledi. Nāgāh öz şūretinüñ naķşın bu āyinede gördi. Hāyrān oldu,<sup>259</sup> eydür ki:

Ben olmuşam<sup>260</sup> baña maķşūd cihānda

‘Iyān oldu nişānum bī-nişānda

Benem söz ü beni söyler ҡamu dil (*M 192b*)

Benem genc-i sa‘ādet her<sup>261</sup> vīrānda

---

<sup>255</sup> naşībüm M : tāli‘üm B

<sup>256</sup> bu ҡaderde B : -M

<sup>257</sup> bu ҡaderde B : -M

<sup>258</sup> uyku<sup>258</sup> B : uyudu M

<sup>259</sup> hāyrān oldu B : -M

<sup>260</sup> olmuşam M : imişem B

<sup>261</sup> sa‘ādet her M : nihān her bir B

didir. Bu hâlde söylenürken dervîş gördi ki Süleymân peygamber gemiye girmiş [ki] ebed milkinde gide. Deñiz mevce gelmiş, keşti uşanmış, bu kenâra çıkmış. Bununu dağı [hâli ve] yolu bu serâyâ irişdi. Dervîş gördi ki Süleymân peygamber dağı bunda geldi. İki bir yire geldiler, oturdılar. Süleymân peygamber şükr eyledi ki yine birâderüm<sup>262</sup> gördüm diyü. Bunlar bu hâlde nâgâh gördiler ki bu serâyâda bir müşerref ü şerîf menzil, âb-ı revân [u] murğ-zâr [u] bâğ u bostân [u] gülistân ârâste gördiler.<sup>263</sup> Süleymân peygamber dir ki: “Ne laţîf yerdür! Gel varalum, bir lağza oturalum.” dir. [Pes] geldi[ler], [dervîş ile bir miğdâr] oturdılar. Meger bu mağâm<sup>264</sup> (*M 193a*) şoğbet yeriyimiş. Çok çok âdemler peydâ oldu. Geldiler, gördiler ki iki kişî oturur. Selâm virdiler. Bunlar dağı “‘aleyküm es-selâm” didiler.<sup>265</sup> Bile oturdılar. Bir sâ‘at geçdi, gördiler ki bunlar ğarîbdür. Şordılar ki: “Siz ne kişîlersiz [ve] gelişüñüz ne yirdendür?”<sup>266</sup> didiler. Süleymân peygamber başladı ki: “Ben Dâvüd (*B 276a*) peygamber oğlıyam.” dir. “Atam öldi. [Yirine pâdişâh olup] bir zamân ben dağı hüküm [ü hükümet] eyledüm bu cihânda.” dir. Başladı, dîv ü perîyi hükmine fermân olduğın söyledi. Cümleye ‘adl u dâd eyledügin, bu cihândan murâd aldugın,<sup>267</sup> âhîr çarğ elinden (*M 193b*) ser-gerdân olduğın söyledi. Bu kişîler katı ta‘accüb kıldılar. Didiler ki: “[Hoş seni bildük ve yâ] ol yoldaşuñ ne yirdendür?”<sup>268</sup> didiler. Süleymân peygamber eydür ki: “Ben dağı [bu dervîşi] bunda<sup>269</sup> gördüm.” dir. Dervîş hiç tınmaz. [Pes] didiler ki: “Yâr, [hey söyle,] senüñ hâlüñ nedür? [Sen dağı aĥvâlüñi bize beyân eyle.]” didiler. Dervîş şî‘r bünyâd eyledi, dir ki:

İlâhî<sup>270</sup> kadayam bu hâl ne hâldür  
Nedür mağşüd baña bu ne ĥayâldür

<sup>262</sup> birâderüm M : bir âdem B

<sup>263</sup> gördiler B : vü perâste M / The correct form of the last word is “perâside.”

<sup>264</sup> meger bu mağâm M : bir ĥamle ki geçdi bu B

<sup>265</sup> ‘aleyküm es-selâm didiler B : ‘aleyke aldılar M

<sup>266</sup> ne yirdendür B : niredendür M

<sup>267</sup> bu cihânda dir başladı dîv ü perîyi hükmine fermân olduğın söyledi cümleye ‘adl u dâd eyledügin bu cihândan murad aldugın B : tamâm dünyâda diyü didi ve ĥayvân u insân u tıyür u ‘anâşır-ı erba‘a ve sâ‘ir ĥayvân her ne var ise Allâh emri ile hükmine muţî‘ vü münkâd olduğın ĥikâyet eyledi M

<sup>268</sup> ne yirdendür B : niredendür M

<sup>269</sup> bunda B : bu arada M

<sup>270</sup> ilâhî M : yâ Rabb B

Vücūdumda cihān<sup>271</sup> mevcūd olupdur

Görüñ hālüm benüm neye mişāldür

didir. Dervîş ser-âgâz eyledi;<sup>272</sup> düşinden belinledi. [Tırigeldi,] gördi ki düşidür. Allāhı yād eyledi, yine<sup>273</sup> yatdı. (*M 194a*) Düşinde gördi ki hem girü ol meclisdür, oturmuşlar. Dervîş şorar ki: “Yārenler, bu yir ne yirdür ve siz ne kişilersiz?” dir. [Pes] bunlaruñ içinden bir kişi [çıkdı,] dir ki: “[Dervîş] bunlar tañrı hāşşlarıdır.” dir. “Evvel ü āhir, evliyā enbiyā küllī<sup>274</sup> bundadır.” dir. [Pes] dervîş ‘aqlın devşürdi başına,<sup>275</sup> dir ki: “Ne hūb [u ne lañf] meclise yetdüm!”<sup>276</sup> dir. Göñli ferāh oldı [ve] başından geçen hikāyetleri müfaşşal beyān u ‘ıyān itmege<sup>277</sup> dile geldi, dir ki:” Benüm bir tonum var idi. Adı Ādem idi. Ol tonile bu cihāna geldüm.” dir. “Dañı hiç kimesne yoğidi. Ben [dañı] tenhā eglenimedüm. Allāha yüz urdum, didüm ki: ‘[Bu ne giñ yirdür!] Baña bir yār (*M 194b*) [u] yoldaş olsa!’ didüm. Tañrı tebāreke ve ta‘ālā baña bir yār virdi. (*B 276b*) Bir zamān bu serāyda oldum. Oğlum [ve] kızum oldı. Āhirü’l-emr ol tonum eskidi, gitdi. Anı baña pādişāh hıl‘at virmiş idi. Ben sürdüm, yine sultān katına<sup>278</sup> vardum. Ehl ü ‘ıyālüm bunda qaldı. Dañı adum yoğidi. Ben bir zamān sultān katında oldum. Uyandum, gördüm ki haqq tebāreke ve ta‘ālā baña bir hıl‘at virmiş ki yine ol hıl‘ata beñzer. Tırdum, secde-i şükr kıldum. [Secdeden] baş getürdüm. Kulağuma bir āvāz geldi ki ‘yine ol serāya var’ diyü. Yine [Allāh emriyle] geldüm bu serāya.<sup>279</sup> Gördüm ki ehl ü ‘ıyālümden üremiş. Tertīb (*M 195a*) düzülmiş. Ben dañı geldüm, selām virdüm. Bunlara hālüm söyledüm. Bunlar hiç baña bilişlik virmediler. Bir bir nişān virdüm ol zamānda geçen hāli. ‘Nişānuñ toğrı [līkin] seni gördüğümüz yok.’ didiler. Süleymān peygamber zamānydı geldüğüm. Sürdüm katına geldüm, hālümü söyledüm. Üşte Süleymān peygamber dañı oturur, toğrısın disün.” dir. Dervîş ki bu sözi söyledi, cümle dirler ki: “Süleymān

---

<sup>271</sup> cihān M : ‘ālem B

<sup>272</sup> ser-âgâz eyledi B : -M

<sup>273</sup> eyledi yine B : idüp girü M

<sup>274</sup> evliyā enbiyā küllī B : külliyyen evliyā vü enbiyā M

<sup>275</sup> devşürdi başına B : başına devşürdi M

<sup>276</sup> yetdüm B : yetişdüm M

<sup>277</sup> müfaşşal beyān u ‘ıyān itmege M : añladı B

<sup>278</sup> sultān katına B : pādişāh huzūrına M

<sup>279</sup> geldüm bu serāya B : bu serāya geldüm M

peygamber kimdür?” didiler. Yoldaşın gösterdi. Süleymān peygamber [‘aleyhisselām] dir ki:  
“Cānum<sup>280</sup> bu virdügi nişān içinde, cümleñüz bilesiz. Hiç ‘akluñuz (*M 195b*) irer mi,<sup>281</sup> ne dir bu  
dervīş?”<sup>282</sup> Cümle<sup>283</sup> didiler ki: “Bilmezüz.” Dervīşüñ gönli cūşa geldi, eydür ki:

‘Aceb ben ne vücūdam bu cihānda  
Ne aşşıda işüm var ne ziyānda<sup>284</sup>

Gāhi ‘ıyān gāhi pinhān geçerem<sup>285</sup>  
Benüm hālüm buyidi her zamānda

didi dir. Dervīş oturdu. Bu қaderde<sup>286</sup> uyanıg geldi. (*B 277a*) Gördi ki irte olmuş, cihān başdan başa  
nūr olmuş, ırak yaқın, gice [vü] gündüz yeksān olmuş. Dervīş Allāhı yād eyledi [ve] secde kıldı.  
Secde üstinde [girü] uyқuya vardı. Bu şevқile ki cihānı görmiş idi, düşinde gördi kendözini<sup>287</sup> ki  
Қuds-ı Şerīfde (*M 196a*) seyrān ider.<sup>288</sup> Yevmü’l-hisāb olmuş. Şaff-ender-şaff cümle yaratılmış<sup>289</sup>  
eşyā тұрmuşlar. Terāzū қurulmuş. [Sā’ir ‘alāmet hep yirlü yirinde. Dervīş] irişi geldi. Gördi ki hāl  
böyle, [hemān] şı’r bünyād eyledi. Eydür ki:

Vücūdum terk idelden cān ben oldum  
Haқıқat-ı ‘ālem yeksān ben oldum

Ne ki var zāhir ü bāṭın<sup>290</sup> cihānda

---

<sup>280</sup> cānum B : -M

<sup>281</sup> irer mi M : irmez mi B

<sup>282</sup> ne dir bu dervīş B : dervīşüñ didüğine M

<sup>283</sup> cümle B : cümlesi M

<sup>284</sup> ne aşşıda işüm var ne ziyānda M : ne sūd-ı şümār oldum ne ziyānda B

<sup>285</sup> geçerem B : geçerdüm M

<sup>286</sup> didi dir dervīş oturdu bu қaderde B : diyüp тұrurken dervīş M

<sup>287</sup> gördi kendözini B : kendözin gördi M

<sup>288</sup> Қuds-ı Şerīfde seyrān ider M : Қudüsdedür B

<sup>289</sup> yaratılmış B : -M

<sup>290</sup> ne ki var zāhir ü bāṭın M : zāhir bāṭın ne kim vardur B

Sāhib-i gerdiş ü devrān ben oldum

didi dir. Dervīş ki bu sözi söyledi, söz ağızından āhir olmadın<sup>291</sup> bağıdı, gördi dervīş<sup>292</sup> ki cümle yaradılmış eşyā [ve] yaradan [hālīk-ı bī-çün] bu arada cem‘ olmuşdur. Dervīş bir kolay yiri avladı. Geçdi,<sup>293</sup> oturdu. Bunları teferrüc eyler, şol<sup>294</sup> hadde degin ki bunlaruñ (*M 196b*) işi bitdi. Her maḥlūk<sup>295</sup> kendü cinsiyle gürūh gürūh seyrde.<sup>296</sup> [Pes] cümle eşyānuñ ortasından bir kişi [çıktı,] ileri yürüdi, ḥazret-i ‘izzete selām virdi. Eydür: “Ey ḥudāvend-i<sup>297</sup> kerīm! Bize daḥı ne buyurursın?” dir. Dervīş düşüniden beliñledi. Gözin açdı, gördi ki düşidür. Şi‘r didi, eydür ki:

Benem vücūd be-küllī cān benümdür

Şāhib-i meydānam meydān benümdür

Eger zāhir eger bāṭın kamu naqş<sup>298</sup>

Ḥikāyet kışşa vü destān benümdür

didi dir. Bu kâderde<sup>299</sup> dervīşe uyku ḥavāle oldı. Düşinde gördi ki [hemān ol dīvān, hemān ol mecmū‘ girü ṭurmuş. Bu] cümle eşyā içinden (*M 197a*) bir kişi çıktı ki<sup>300</sup> (*B 277b*) Muḥammed<sup>301</sup> Muştafādur. Bir köhne muraqqa‘ ḥırka geymiş. Bu naqş u ḥayāl ki var, zāhirde ve bāṭında bu şüretler ki görünür, bu geydügi<sup>302</sup> köhne ḥırkanuñ reng reng vaşlası olmuş. Daḥı [artuq kimesne yok.] *Leyse fi’ d-dārı gayrunā deyyār*, kimesne yok. Dervīş bu ḥāli ki gördi, özine yörendi. Eydür

<sup>291</sup> dervīş ki bu sözi söyledi söz ağızından āhir olmadın B : -M

<sup>292</sup> gördi dervīş B : dervīş gördi M

<sup>293</sup> avladı geçdi M : aldı B

<sup>294</sup> şol M : tā B

<sup>295</sup> maḥlūk M : eşyā B

<sup>296</sup> gürūh gürūh seyrde M : gürūhidi B

<sup>297</sup> ḥudāvend-i M : ḥudā B

<sup>298</sup> eger zāhir eger bāṭın kamu naqş M : zāhir bāṭın ne kim naqş u ḥayāl var B

<sup>299</sup> bu kâderde B : pes girü M

<sup>300</sup> ki B : adı M

<sup>301</sup> Muḥammed B : Muḥammed-i M

<sup>302</sup> var zāhirde ve bāṭında bu şüretler ki görünür bu geydügi M : eşyādur tolu gördi bu B



ki: “[Be] cānum, bir vaqt varidi ki yir [ü] gök varidi. Eşyā ve şüretler ve hayāller<sup>303</sup> görünürdi. Bizüm mollalar her bir nesteye<sup>304</sup> bir dürlü ad virürleridi.<sup>305</sup> Bu hod küllī Muhammed Muştafa imiş ahi.” dir.<sup>306</sup> [“Ne ‘aceb nesne olur bu?” diyüp] dervīş bu<sup>307</sup> şevkle cūşa geldi, eydür ki:

Kamu dürlü hāle bünyād benem ben

Benümdür (*M 197b*) ker-hāne üstād benem ben

Sırr oldı şüretümde zāt u şifāt<sup>308</sup>

Hemān<sup>309</sup> küllī şürete zāt benem ben

didı dir. Bu қaderde<sup>310</sup> dervīş uyandı,<sup>311</sup> gördi ki ten-i tenhā [hemān] özidür. Dervīş fikr eyledi, dir ki: “[‘Aceb] ne hayāl idi şol düşümde gördüğüm?” dir. Bu қaderde<sup>312</sup> dervīşe uyku havāle oldı. Uyku içinde gördi ki dört kişi bir nesteyi getürdiler, қodılar. Dervīş yahşı nazar eyledi. Gördi ki yir [ü] gök [ve] yirde gökde her nesdane<sup>313</sup> ki varidi;<sup>314</sup> dünyā [vü] āhıret, ‘arş [u] ferş, ne ki varidi;<sup>315</sup> [cümle pergārı] dāiresiyle, müdevveriye<sup>316</sup> getürdiler қodılar. Söyleşürler: “Açalum, қoyalum.<sup>317</sup> Yırlü yirince her nesteyi ārāyiş [ü ziynet] idelüm ki<sup>318</sup> (*M 198a*) şindi

---

<sup>303</sup> eşyā ve şüretler ve hayāller M : eşyā şüretlü hayāller B

<sup>304</sup> nesteye B : şeye M

<sup>305</sup> virürleridi B : dirler idi M

<sup>306</sup> ahi dir B : -M

<sup>307</sup> bu B : -M

<sup>308</sup> sırr oldı şüretümde zāt u şifāt M : zāt u şifāt şüretümde sırr oldı B

<sup>309</sup> hemān B : bu gün M

<sup>310</sup> bu қaderde B : -M

<sup>311</sup> uyandı B : uyanı geldi M

<sup>312</sup> dir bu қaderde B : diyü тұrurken M

<sup>313</sup> nesne B : ne M

<sup>314</sup> varidi B : var M

<sup>315</sup> varidi B : var M

<sup>316</sup> müdevveriye B : -M

<sup>317</sup> қoyalum B : -M

<sup>318</sup> ki M : dirler B

pādişāh gelür.” dirlər. Dervīş teferrüc eyler. Bunlar<sup>319</sup> pes açdılar, [evvel] qodılar yili. Bir nesne dağı getürdiler ki deñiz idi. Yili qodılar, deñizi qodılar, balığı qodılar, öküzi qodılar. Mā-bākī ferş üstinde yidi tabaqa yiri, toquz felegi, ‘arşu’l- (B 278a) mecīdi ārayiş eylediler yirlü yirince. Bu qaderde<sup>320</sup> dervīş cūşa geldi, eydür ki:

Zihī fūrşat<sup>321</sup> bu gün sultānı gördüm  
Açıldı ten hicābı cānı gördüm

İkilik āfetin<sup>322</sup> terk eyleyelden  
Birimiş gevherüm ol kānı<sup>323</sup> gördüm

dididir. Bu qaderde dervīş bu hāl içinde<sup>324</sup> nāgāh gördi ki bir şahş geldi. Kırk başı var, yidi eli var, üç gözi var, bir vücüddür. Dervīş bunu gördi, (M 198b) dir ki: “Zihī meclise irişdüm.” dir. Tırıgeldi yirinden,<sup>325</sup> bu şahşa selām virdi. Bu kişi gördi ki bir dervīşdür, çok zahmet çekmiş, her dürlü hālinden vuqūfı var.<sup>326</sup> Dir ki: “Dervīş öñdin bunda mı idüñ, yoksa müsāfir mi geldüñ?” dir. Dervīş cūşa geldi, [bu şı‘ri didi,] eydür ki:

Zihī eyyām zihī devrāna irdüm  
Top u çevgānile<sup>327</sup> meydāna irdüm

Murādum buyidi maqşūd bulındı  
Gör ağı ne laţif sultāna irdüm

---

<sup>319</sup> bunlar B : bunları M

<sup>320</sup> bu qaderde B : bunları görince M

<sup>321</sup> fūrşat B : devlet M

<sup>322</sup> āfetin M : hayālin B

<sup>323</sup> gevherüm ol kānı M : gevher-i ma’deni B

<sup>324</sup> bu qaderde dervīş bu hāl içinde B : bu fikr içinde iken M

<sup>325</sup> tırıgeldi yirinden B : yirinden tırıgeldi M

<sup>326</sup> hālinden vuqūfı var M : hālden B

<sup>327</sup> top u çevgān ile M : çevgānumda bu top B

didir. Bu kâderde<sup>328</sup> gördi ki dervîş,<sup>329</sup> leşker irişdi. Yemîn ü yesâr [ü pîş ü pes ü kalb] yirlü yirin aldı,<sup>330</sup> tûrdı. Taht kûruldu. Pâdişâh tahta geşdi, oturdı. Her kişi [öz] kendü hâline meşğûl<sup>331</sup> oldu. (*M 199a*) Münâdiler çağırdılar ki: “Ey tañrı bendeleri! Milk bir, sultân bir. Her şey ki vücûda geldi, vücûda getüreni geyüp geldi.” dir. “Hâl hayâl içindedür.” dir. “Bu hayâli bilen hâli bildi.” dir. Bu kâderde<sup>332</sup> dervîş gördi ki hâl böyle, yirinden tûrdı. Ser-âgâz eyledi, eydür ki.<sup>333</sup>

Zihî fûrşat<sup>334</sup> bu gün sultânı gördüm

Bu resme gerdiş-i<sup>335</sup> devrânı gördüm (*B 278b*)

Vücûdum milkini seyrân iderken

İçinde şâhib-i dîvânı<sup>336</sup> gördüm

didir. Dervîş ki bu sözi söyledi, pâdişâh kulağına degdi.<sup>337</sup> [Pâdişâh] eydür: “Şol dervîşe gel diñ.” dir. Dervîş ilerü yürüdi, pâdişâha selâm virdi. Hıdmete<sup>338</sup> (*M 199b*) karşı tûrdı. Bağıdı dervîş, gördi ki bu<sup>339</sup> pâdişâh yirinde oturan tañrı aşlanı ‘Alîdür. Tiz ileri yürüdi. Elin öpdî, etegine yapışdı ki hâlin ‘arz kıla. Uyğudan belîñledi. Gözin açdı, gördi ki elinde öz kepeneginüñ etegidür, tûtmış.<sup>340</sup> Özi ten-i tenhâ. *Leyse fi ’d-dârı gayrunâ deyyâr*, [hiç] kimesne yok. Dervîşüñ göñli cûşa geldi, eydür ki:

---

<sup>328</sup> bu kâderde B : diyince M

<sup>329</sup> gördi ki dervîş B : dervîş gördi ki M

<sup>330</sup> yirin aldı B : yirince M

<sup>331</sup> meşğûl B : nâzır M

<sup>332</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>333</sup> tûrdı ser-âgâz eyledi eydür ki B : tûrıgeldi ser-âgâz idüp bu şi’ri okudı M

<sup>334</sup> zihî fûrşat B : bihamdullâh M

<sup>335</sup> gerdiş-i M : eyyâm u B

<sup>336</sup> dîvânı M : meydânı B

<sup>337</sup> degdi B : girdi M

<sup>338</sup> hıdmete B : hıdmetine M

<sup>339</sup> bu B : -M

<sup>340</sup> tûtmış B : -M

‘Aceb benüm hālüm nedür neyem ben  
Dağı hiç kimsenem<sup>341</sup> yok tenhāyam ben

Ḳamu şekl ü şūretde pinhān oldum  
Ḳamu başda ḥayāl ü sevdāyam ben

didi dir. [Fi’l-hāl] tırıgeldi yirinden,<sup>342</sup> dört yaña bağıdı. Fıkr eyledi ki: “Ben ne hoş yirde, ne ḥüb meclisdeyidüm!” dir. “Benüm (*M 200a*) vücūdumuñ ‘aksi imiş, ola mı!” dir. Bu ḥayālde söylenürken dervīşe uyku ḥavāle oldı,<sup>343</sup> uyudu. Düşinde gördi ki girü hemān<sup>344</sup> ol meclis tırımış, ārāste [ve] ber-kemāl. Dervīş ki bu hāli gördi, şevke geldi, dir ki:

Ḳamu ‘ālem vücūdumda ḥayāldür  
Bu fıkr içre<sup>345</sup> cihān nokta mişāldür

Vücūdum ḳatresi bahra düşelden  
Yine bağıdum ḳadīm ü ber-kemāldür

didi dir. Bu ḳaderde<sup>346</sup> dervīş bağıdı, gördi ki çok çok [bölük bölük] kişiler peydā (*B 279a*) oldı. Geldiler, oturdılar cinsi<sup>347</sup> cinsiyle. Dervīş bağıdı gördi ki şeyḥler gürühıdur, zāhidler [ve] ‘ābidler, peygamberlerdür. Her kişi kendü gürühıyla pādişāha selām virdi, (*M 200b*) tırdu şöyle.<sup>348</sup> Dervīş bunları teferrüc eyler. Şāh-ı merdān<sup>349</sup> ‘Alī dir ki: “Ey tañrı bendeleri! [Bu yaña] bağıduñ!” Bunlar bağıdılar. Dervīş dağı bağıdı, gördi ki ferşden tā sidretü’l-müntehāya degin

---

<sup>341</sup> kimsenem N : kimsene B

<sup>342</sup> tırıgeldi yirinden B : yirinden tırıgeldi M

<sup>343</sup> ḥavāle oldı B : geldi M

<sup>344</sup> girü hemān M : hemī B

<sup>345</sup> fıkr içre M : ḥayālde B

<sup>346</sup> bu ḳaderde B : -M

<sup>347</sup> cinsi B : cinslü M

<sup>348</sup> virdi tırdu şöyle B : virüp şöyle tırdu M

<sup>349</sup> merdān B : merdān-ı M

göürnür. Her eşyā ki bunlaruñ arasındadır, mu‘ayyen gördi. Bu kıaderde<sup>350</sup> dervīş cūşa geldi, dir ki:

Bu ne hāldür kıamu varlık ben oldum  
Kıamu ‘ālem vücūddur<sup>351</sup> cān ben oldum

Vücūdum kıatresinde şıđdı ‘ummān  
Bu resme hāl içinde pinhān oldum

didi dir. Dervīş ki bu sözi söyledi, cümle bađdılar. Bir kışi ara yirlerinden şorar ki: “Şol kimdür söyleyen?”<sup>352</sup> dir. Dervīşi gösterdiler. Eydür ki: “Hay söyleme! (*M 201a*) Pādişāhdan edeb eyle!” dir. Dervīş bađdı, gördi ki zāhidler gürühınuñ içinden bir müşekkelce<sup>353</sup> kışidür. Kendözini ārāyiş eylemiş bunlaruñ arasında, cüstçe cüstçe<sup>354</sup> söyler. Bu kıaderde<sup>355</sup> dervīş [dağı] nuţka geldi, eydür ki:

Kıamu naķş u hayāl benüm sāyemdür  
Kıamunuñ nađdı benüm ser-māyemdür

Benem hüsni kıamu şekl ü şüretüñ  
Ādemsin gör ağı ādem ādemdür

didi dir. Dervīş ki bu sözi söyledi, bu söze<sup>356</sup> ol kışi kaķıdı. Bir ‘aşası varmış, çekdi, sürdi dervīşüñ üstine.<sup>357</sup> [Dervīş] bađdı, gördi ki kendünüñ<sup>358</sup> üstine gelür. Tırıgeldi (*B 279b*)

---

<sup>350</sup> mu‘ayyen gördi bu kıaderde B : rüşen olup görindi M

<sup>351</sup> vücūddur B : vücūd u M

<sup>352</sup> kimdür söyleyen B : söyleyen kimdür ola M

<sup>353</sup> müşekkelce B : müşekkel M

<sup>354</sup> cüstçe cüstçe B : tizce tizce M

<sup>355</sup> bu kıaderde B : -M

<sup>356</sup> dervīş ki bu sözi söyledi bu söze B : -M

<sup>357</sup> sürdi dervīşüñ üstine B : dervīşüñ üstine sürdi M

<sup>358</sup> kendünüñ B : bu kışi dervīşüñ M

yirinden,<sup>359</sup> hâzır oldı. Bu dađı [geldi,] iriřdi. [Dervîřle] ikisi (*M 201b*) tutuřdılar. Hemân ol sâ‘at dervîř bunı<sup>360</sup> getürdi, yire urdı. [Bir] tađarcıđı varmıř, elinden aldı. Geldi, oturdı. řah-ı merdân ‘Alî teferrüc eyler ve sâ‘ir mađlûkât bunları seyrân ider.<sup>361</sup> Bu kiři feryâd eyledi ki: “Bu ne belâdur, beni rüsvây eyledi! [Hađkumı bu kimseden alıvirüñ!]” dir. Bu kıaderde<sup>362</sup> yine ol gürühdan bir kiři çıđdı,<sup>363</sup> eydür ki: “řol miskînüñ ařlâ günâhı yokdur, niçün böyle eyledüñ dervîř?” diyüp yol sürdi.<sup>364</sup> Dervîř [dađı] dir ki: “Yârenler size bir su‘âlüm var. [Ne buyurursız? İcâzet olursa] řoraram.” dir. Cümle didiler ki: “řor.”<sup>365</sup> Dervîř dir ki: “Ol<sup>366</sup> nedür [ki] bařı yumrı, ařađası çatal, dört dîvârı var, altı kıapudur. Cümle yaradılmıřuñ ‘aksi anda mu‘ayyen<sup>367</sup> (*M 202a*) görinür.” dir. Biri<sup>368</sup> dir ki legleg ola didügün<sup>369</sup> dir. Biri dađı dir ki: “Nisbet degül.” dir. “Vađt ola, didügün minâre gölgesi ola.” dir. Bu kıaderde<sup>370</sup> bu kiřinüñ tađarcıđın almıřdı, kıakdı yirinden, řurıgeldi.<sup>371</sup> [Muđkem kıakıyup hıřmile] sürdi, [geldi,] yine dervîři tıtdı. Dervîř gördi ki hâl böyle, cüřa geldi, bu iki beyti söyledi:

Řamu vechüñ benem hüsn ü cemâli

Řamu ‘âkıllerüñ fikr ü hayâli

Hađıķati benem cümle vücüduñ

Zâť u řıfâtı yemîn ü řimâli

---

<sup>359</sup> řurıgeldi yirinden B : yirinden řurıgeldi M

<sup>360</sup> bunı B : bu ĥarîfi M

<sup>361</sup> ve sâ‘ir mađlûkât bunları seyrân ider M : cümle bunlar bađdı B

<sup>362</sup> bu kıaderde B : -M

<sup>363</sup> çıđdı B : -M

<sup>364</sup> ařlâ günâhı yokdur niçün böyle eyledüñ dervîř diyüp yol sürdi M : günâhı nedür dir B

<sup>365</sup> cümle didiler ki řor B : řor dervîř didiler M

<sup>366</sup> ol B : řol M

<sup>367</sup> mu‘ayyen B : rüřen M

<sup>368</sup> biri B : birisi M

<sup>369</sup> didügün B : -M

<sup>370</sup> biri dađı dir ki nisbet degül dir vađt ola didügün minâre gölgesi ola dir bu kıaderde B : birisi eydür belki minâre gölgesidir diyü her biri bir söz söyledi bu hâlde iken M

<sup>371</sup> kiřinüñ tađarcıđın almıřdı kıakdı yirinden B : tađarcıđı alınan ĥarîf M

didir. Bu kâderde<sup>372</sup> dervîş dađı bunı<sup>373</sup> tutdı, ma‘reke içinde bařdı,<sup>374</sup> yire urdı. Bunuñ fitne perdesi yüzine bađıyımıř, bađı üzıldı. Dervîş gördi ki bunı şeytândur. Cümle ehl-i meclis (*B 280a*) teferrüc eylediler. (*M 202b*) Bu kâderde<sup>375</sup> řâh-ı merdân ‘Alî dir ki: “Ol<sup>376</sup> dervîşe gel diñ, [berü gelsün.]” dir. Dervîş tiz vardı, řâhuñ elin öpdı. Bu kez<sup>377</sup> şeytân tiz<sup>378</sup> turıgeldi, [vardı,] bu üzilen<sup>379</sup> âletleri devřürdi. Cümle<sup>380</sup> gördiler [ve bildiler ki] bu şeytândur. Dervîşe [hezârân] tađşin eylediler. Şeytân münfa‘il oldı,<sup>381</sup> puřtvârı gitdi řođbetden. Dervîş uykuđan belinledi. Gözin açdı, gördi ki [bu] gördüđi hikâyetler öz kepeneginüñ gölgesidür. Dađı hiç<sup>382</sup> kimesne yok. Dervîş ři‘r bünyâđ eyledi:

Benem mađřüd kamu ehl-i yađine

Ne kim varise eřraf u<sup>383</sup> kemine

Benem ednâ kılan seng-i siyâhı<sup>384</sup>

Benem kıymet viren (*M 203a*) dürr-i semine

didir. Bu kâderde<sup>385</sup> dervîş öđin devřürdi. Bađdı, gördi ki vücudı bir cihândur. Her nesne ki cihân řüretlü görünürdi,<sup>386</sup> vücudınuñ ‘ađsi imiř. Ol vađtin ki var idi bu cihânda,<sup>387</sup> her bir

---

<sup>372</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>373</sup> bunı B : muđkem M

<sup>374</sup> bařdı B : -M

<sup>375</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>376</sup> ol B : řol M

<sup>377</sup> bu kez B : fi‘l-đâl M

<sup>378</sup> tiz B : yirinden M

<sup>379</sup> üzilen B : bozulan M

<sup>380</sup> cümle M : min küllî B

<sup>381</sup> münfa‘il oldı M : infi‘alidi B

<sup>382</sup> dađı hiç B : artuđ M

<sup>383</sup> eřraf u M : kâmil ü B

<sup>384</sup> siyâhı M : đârâyı B

<sup>385</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>386</sup> řüretlü görünürdi B : řüretinde gördi M

<sup>387</sup> var idi bu cihânda B : bu cihânda var idi M

şahrâyı geçince [ve] tağı [taşı] aşınca çok zahmet çekerdi. Şimdi gördi ki kendü vücūdudur. Turdı, bil bağladı [ki] teferrüc eyleye. Nāgāh dervīşe uyku geldi. Düşinde gördi ki yir [ü] gök [ve] yirde gökde cümle yaradılmış eşyā kendünün vücūdı gölgesidir. ‘Acebledi,<sup>388</sup> şevke geldi. [Bu iki beyti söyledi.] Eydür ki:<sup>389</sup>

Ḥaḳīkat-ı cihān bende bulındı

Be-küllī cism ü cān bende bulındı

Vücūdum (*M 203b*) maḥv idelden ‘ışık içinde

Bī-niṣāna niṣān bende bulındı

didir. Bu kâderde<sup>390</sup> dervīş gözin açdı, dört yaña bağıdı, gördi ki özi ten-i tenhādur. *Leyse fi’ d-dāri* (*B 280b*) *gayrunā deyyār*, kimesne yok. Velī bir alaba avgā gelür. Dervīş dört yaña bağıdı, gördi ki hemān özidür, hiç kimesne<sup>391</sup> yok. Fikr eyledi, özine yörendi, gördi ki bu alaba öz vücūdından gelür. oynına bağıdı, gördi ki yirde [ve] gökde cümle yaradılmış eşyā öz oynındadır. Bu kâderde nāgāh<sup>392</sup> güneş tođdı. Dervīş bağıdı, gördi ki yidi abaa yir [ve] bu yidi abaa gökde<sup>393</sup> okuz felek, ‘arşu’l-mecīd ü kürsī vü levḥ ü alem, [her] nesdane ki bu pergāl içinde varidi, cümlesin kendü oynında gördi. Düşinden beliñledi, (*M 204a*) urıgeldi. Gözin açdı, gördi ki düşidür. “*Sübḥānallāh!*” didi, yine yatdı. Eydür ki:<sup>394</sup> “[Pes] eger raḥmānī düşise yine görine.” dir. [Yaşduđa] baş odı, uykuya vardı. Düşinde gördi ki cümle bu gördüđi şıfatlar yirlü yirinde tamāmdur. Dervīş cūşa geldi, eydür ki:

Benem bu genc-i ma‘müre<sup>395</sup> vīrāna

---

<sup>388</sup> ‘acebledi M : ‘acāyibledi B

<sup>389</sup> eydür ki B : -M

<sup>390</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>391</sup> gördi ki hemān özidür hiç kimesne M : nesne B

<sup>392</sup> bu kâderde nāgāh B : fī’l-ḥāl M

<sup>393</sup> bu yidi abaa gökde B : -M

<sup>394</sup> yine yatdı eydür ki B : -M

<sup>395</sup> genc-i ma‘müre M : genc ü ḥazīne B



Benem revnağ<sup>396</sup> bu cümle cism ü cāna

Ꞑamu varlıꞓ yaꞓın bende bulundu

Benem aꞓı nişān ol bī-nişāna

didi dir. Bu ꞓaderde<sup>397</sup> dervīş ögin divşürdi, özine yörendi. Fikr eyler ki: “[Benüm] bu düşümdür ola mı?” dir. Gördi ki düşi degüldür,<sup>398</sup> vāꞓı‘adur. Bu kez dervīş tırıgeldi, eydür ki: “Ben bu şehri ol vaꞓtın teferrüc itmek isteridüm.” dir. “Şimdi bu benüm ꞓoynumda bulundu.” dir. (*M 204b*) “Pes<sup>399</sup> bunu [bir oñat] teferrüc ideyin.” dir. Dervīş tırdı yirinden,<sup>400</sup> bil baꞓladı ki bu şehri teferrüc eyleye.<sup>401</sup> Gördi ki bir ꞓişi geliyorur. Dervīş dir ki: “Hele bu ꞓişi geldi,<sup>402</sup> vaꞓt ola bu yirlü ola.” dir. Bu ꞓaderde bu ꞓişi daꞓı<sup>403</sup> [geldi,] irişi. Selām viridi. [‘Aleyke alup] oturdılar. (*B 281a*) H̄aber şoruşdılar. Ol ꞓişi bir ‘aceb hikāyet söyledi. Bileyimiş,<sup>404</sup> ol dervīş rivāyet eyler ki ol [ꞓişi] müsāfir [imiş,] eydür: “Bir yire irişdüm [ki],” dir, “bu cihān ki bunda var bunuñ gölgesi düşmiş.” dir. “Ol daꞓı bir bu cihān şüretlü şekl baꞓlamış.” dir. “Her nesdane ki bu cihānda var, gölgesi vücūdı gibi anda düşmiş.”<sup>405</sup> dir. “Nāgāh yolum irişi.” dir. “Anda iki şınur<sup>406</sup> arasına irişdüm.” dir.<sup>407</sup> “Şöyle ki ikisi daꞓı (*M 205a*) görünürdi.” dir. “Göñlüm oldı ki varayın, teferrüc ideyin. Vardum.” dir. “Teferrüc eyledüm.” dir. “Gördüm.” dir.<sup>408</sup> “Ol daꞓı hemān bu cihāna<sup>409</sup> beñzer.” dir. “Bundaꞓı şeylerüñ<sup>410</sup> gölgesi debrendügi anda düşmiş.” dir. “Ol daꞓı buña beñzer,

---

<sup>396</sup> revnağ M : varlıꞓ B

<sup>397</sup> bu ꞓaderde B : -M

<sup>398</sup> düşi degüldür B : düş degül M

<sup>399</sup> pes M : ben B

<sup>400</sup> tırdı yirinden B : yirinden tırdı M

<sup>401</sup> bu şehri teferrüc eyleye M : teferrüc eyleye bu şehirde B

<sup>402</sup> bu ꞓişi geldi B : bir ꞓişidür geliyorur M

<sup>403</sup> bu ꞓaderde bu ꞓişi daꞓı B : -M

<sup>404</sup> söyledi bileyimiş B : söylemiş M

<sup>405</sup> düşmiş B : düşmişdür M

<sup>406</sup> şınur B : cihānuñ M

<sup>407</sup> irişdüm dir B : -M

<sup>408</sup> göñlüm oldı ki varayın teferrüc ideyin vardum dir teferrüc eyledüm dir gördüm dir B : -M

<sup>409</sup> hemān bu cihāna B : buña M

<sup>410</sup> şeylerüñ B : eşyānuñ M

bir cihān şüretlü nesdane olmuş.” dir. “Anda teferrüc iderken,” dir, “bu yirüñ [ve] gögüñ aşlını, her nesdane ki yirde [ve] gökde var idi, cümlesin hoş teferrüc eyledüm.” dir. “Hikāyet çok.” dir. “Şindi gelişüm andandır.” dir. Dervīş diñledi, gördi ki bu bir ‘aceb hikāyet söyler. Dervīş dir ki: “Yār, sen söyledüñ. Benüm hālümü dañı diñle.” dir. “Bir vaqt<sup>411</sup> vardı ki benüm bu tenüm yoğıdı, ben cānidüm.” dir. “Henüz sulţān vücūdında biridüm.” dir. “Sulţāndan hıl‘at geldi, geydüm.” dir. “Seyrāna geldüm.” dir. “Nāgāh baқdum, bu şayvan görindi.” dir. “Sürdüm, geldüm, gördüm ki bu şayvan<sup>412</sup> tutulmuş.” dir. “Bisāt döşenmiş.” dir. “Her zerrede şad hezārān ‘acāyib gördüm.” dir.<sup>413</sup> (M 205b) “Yürüdüm.” dir. “Hoş teferrüc eyledüm.” dir. Bu hālde söyleşürken ikisinüñ sözi<sup>414</sup> karşı düşdi. Şavaşdılar, el urdılar. Biri birini tutdılar. Dervīş degdi, bu kişinüñ<sup>415</sup> (B 281b) yaқasına yapışdı. Bu қaderde<sup>416</sup> dervīş uyқudan beliñledi. Tırıgeldi, gördi ki gölgesi imiş. Elinde öz yaқasıdır, tutmuş. Dervīşüñ gönli cūşa geldi. Şi‘r<sup>417</sup> oқudı, eydür ki:

Zāhir bāţın қamu ‘ālem ben oldum  
Ne kim varise puhte hām ben oldum

Ne kim vardur ‘ıyān gizlü cihānda  
Gör ağı cümlesi der-hem ben oldum

didı dir. Dervīş ki bu sözi söyledi, özine yörendi. Fikr eyledi, eydür ki: “[Ey yār,] nice<sup>418</sup> gezmek, bunca hāl bunuñ içündür ki (M 206a) bir kişi bulam, haber şoram ki bu irte gice қandan gelür қanda gider [ve] kimdür ki bu pergāli düzüpdür. Bizüm düzülecek<sup>419</sup> degirmenümüz var idi, anı

---

<sup>411</sup> vaqt B : zamān M

<sup>412</sup> dir seyrāna geldüm dir nāgāh baқdum bu şayvan görindi dir gördüm geldüm gördüm ki bu şayvan B : sürdüm geldüm gördüm ki bir eyvān M

<sup>413</sup> gördüm dir B : görünür M

<sup>414</sup> sözi B : sözleri M

<sup>415</sup> bu kişinüñ B : bunuñ M

<sup>416</sup> bu қaderde B : fi‘l-hāl M

<sup>417</sup> şi‘r B : bu şi‘ri M

<sup>418</sup> nice B : bunca M

<sup>419</sup> düzülecek B : düzecek M

öz<sup>420</sup> artuğdur dirler. Bize ol gerekdür.” didi dir. Bu kıaderde<sup>421</sup> derviş gördi ki *leyse fi'd-dāri gayrunā deyyār*, [hiç] kimesne yok. Derviş fikr eyledi ki: “[Be] cānum, ben bunca zamāndan berü bunu isterdüm.” dir. Başından gezen hikāyetleri añdı. Çendān<sup>422</sup> fikr eyledi, öz vücūdından artuğ nesdane görmedi.<sup>423</sup> Gördi ki hemān özidür. Bu kez bu hayālden ümīdini kesdi. Özine geldi, bir cümle<sup>424</sup> fikr eyledi. Bu kıaderde<sup>425</sup> dervişün göñli cūşa geldi, bu iki beyti söyledi: (*M 206b*)

Benem bu cümle cism ü cān ki dirler

Be-küllī bende vü sultān ki dirler

Hemān benem<sup>426</sup> dağı çün u çerā yok

Göñülde esrār-ı<sup>427</sup> pinhān ki dirler

didi dir. [Pes] derviş bu uyıkuda düşünde gördi ki yolu nāgāh bir şehre irişdi. Gördi ki bir mu‘azzam şehir.<sup>428</sup> Üç kıat bārūsı var, on iki burcdur, (*B 282a*) on iki kıapusu var, yidi yüz yetmiş yidi maħallesi var, dört yüz kırık dört çarşu [ve] bāzārı var, üç yüz altmış altı arķ su yürür<sup>429</sup> içinde. Bir nişānı dağı bu ki iki direk üstinedür.<sup>430</sup> Bir nişānı dağı bu kim muķīm degül bir yirde, seyyārdur, gezer. Derviş bu şehirde gördi ki iki sultān<sup>431</sup> var. Birinün adı kıabül-ı (*M 207a*) rahmān, birinün adı maķbül-ı şeytān. [İkisi] dā'im muķābil tırmışlar, ceng iderler. Bir nişānı dağı bu ki bu şehir āyineye beñzer. Şeş cihetde her eşyā ki var ‘aksi bu āyinede görünür. Derviş nāgāh gördi bu hālī, cūşa geldi. Eydür ki:

---

<sup>420</sup> öz B : özi M

<sup>421</sup> bu kıaderde B : -M

<sup>422</sup> çendān B : ol kıadar M

<sup>423</sup> görmedi B : yok M

<sup>424</sup> cümle B : miķdār M

<sup>425</sup> bu kıaderde B : pes M

<sup>426</sup> benem B : benven M

<sup>427</sup> esrār-ı B : nokta-i M

<sup>428</sup> mu‘azzam şehir B : şehir-i mu‘azzam M

<sup>429</sup> yürür B : aķar M

<sup>430</sup> bir nişānı dağı bu ki iki direk üstinedür B : -M

<sup>431</sup> bu şehirde gördi ki iki sultān B : bu şehri gördi ki iki sultānı M

Benem mevcūd olan cümle vücūdda  
Benem maḳṣūd hemān Ka‘bede putta

Benem neheng benem deryā vü ummān  
Benem kıymetlü kân baḫr-ı muḫīṭde

didir. Bu ḳaderüñ içinde<sup>432</sup> dervīṣ bu<sup>433</sup> āyinede gördi ki toḳuz felek ḳubbelere beñzer ki biri birinüñ içinde yapılmıṣ ola. ‘Arṣa baḳdı, [ol daḫı bunuñ] miṣli ḳubbeler üstine<sup>434</sup> ulu<sup>435</sup> ṣayvan tütulmıṣ ola. Burclara, ılduzlara baḳdı; gördi ki şöyle ḳandillere (*M 207b*) beñzer, ḳubbeler içine aşılmıṣ ola. Yirüñ dā’iresine baḳdı, gördi Rum [u] Ṣam [u] Mağrib [ü] Zeng-bār [u] Ḥabeṣ [u] Mıṣr [u] Yemen [ü] Ṭā’if, Diyārbekir [ü] Bağdād [u] ‘Irāk [u] Ḥorasan [u] Türkistān [u] Bedaḫṣān [u] Hürmüz [ü] Hindistān [u] Kiṣmīr [ü] Çīn [ü] Ḥaṭāy [u] Ḥotan [u] Deṣt-i Bulğār bir adadur. Bundan<sup>436</sup> taṣrasın deñiz gördi. Yirlerüñ taḫaṣasına baḳdı, yidi ḳat yiri gördi. Ferṣe baḳdı, öküzü [ve] balığı gördi. Deñizi gördi. Deñizden aṣağa baḳdı. Yili gördi, bī-ḫadd [ü] bī-ṣumār. Toḳuz felek, ‘arṣ u yidi taḫaḳa yir ü öküz ü balık u deñiz (*B 282b*) yilüñ üstinde<sup>437</sup> tütulmıṣ, bir şiṣe gibi oynadur. Min küllī<sup>438</sup> pergāl içindeki ḫālī (*M 208a*) teferrüc eyledi. Gördi ki çarḫ<sup>439</sup> yıl degirmeninüñ çarḫına beñzer. Yıl toḳınur, bu ḳubbe [vü] bārgāḫ yilüñ heybetinden döner. Ol<sup>440</sup> bir ılduzdur ki adı güneṣdür. Tolap olup döner, varup yine gelince adımı ırte [vü] gice ḳomıṣlar Ādem oğlanları. Öz ‘aḳlınca bu temāṣāda iken<sup>441</sup> dervīṣ uyḳudan beliñledi. Uyandı, [tırıgeldi,]

---

<sup>432</sup> bu ḳaderüñ içinde B : -M

<sup>433</sup> bu B : -M

<sup>434</sup> üstine B : üstinden M

<sup>435</sup> ulu B : -M

<sup>436</sup> bundan B : bunda M

<sup>437</sup> üstinde M : üstine B

<sup>438</sup> min küllī B : külliyyen M

<sup>439</sup> çarḫ B : çarḫı M

<sup>440</sup> ol B : şol M

<sup>441</sup> bu temāṣāda iken M : bu ḳaderde B

gördi ki *leyse fi'd-dāri gayrunā deyyār*. Kimesne yok, özi ten-i tenhādur.<sup>442</sup> Dervīş cūşa geldi, bu iki beyti söyledi:

Benem bülbül benem gülşen benem gül  
Benem cümle sebebde ḥall-i müşkil

Benem 'āşık benem ma'şūk benem 'ışk  
Benem ḥüsn-i laṭif turre-i sünbil

didir. Bu kâderde<sup>443</sup> [girü] uyku geldi dervīşe.<sup>444</sup> Uyku içinde (*M 208b*) gördi ki bu gördüğü naqş u ḥayāller ki var, bu şehriñ her cihetinde āyinedür, görünür. Dervīş yüridi, bu adayı teferrüc ider. Gördi ki ḥaqq [u] bâṭıl [u] yol [u] erkān [u] ḥıṭāb [u] kitāb dimek, bu ḥikāyetler bu ada içindedür. Dervīş bunları teferrüc eyledi. Bundan taşrasın deñiz gördi. Bir yüce yire oturdu, teferrüc eyledi. Çepçevre deñizden artuq nesdane görünmez. Başladı,<sup>445</sup> 'aql tahtasından [bir] gemi düzdi. Fikr mihıyla mihladı. Tevekkül şakızıyla berkitdi. İkrār<sup>446</sup> ipini tınāb çekdi. Kanā'ati azıq u şabrı yaraq<sup>447</sup> eyledi. Himmetin lenger eyledi. 'İşk yili geldi, sürdi gemiyi. Bir zamān deñiz yüzünde kaldı. Circīs peygamber zamānydı dervīşüñ gittüğü, Yūnus peygamber (*M 209a*) zamānı olmuş. Bunca zamāndan soñra dervīş bu<sup>448</sup> adaya çıkdı. Ayağı (*B 283a*) qurı yire başdı.<sup>449</sup> Gördi ki qurı<sup>450</sup> yirdür. Dervīş eydür:<sup>451</sup> "Hele bu adayı teferrüc ideyin." dir. Dervīş<sup>452</sup> gemiyi qurıya çekdi, kendü teferrüce düşdi. Nāgāh bu adada gördi ki dīvler [ve] ehremenler ṭolmuşlar.

---

<sup>442</sup> özi ten-i tenhādur B : özidür ten-i tenhā M

<sup>443</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>444</sup> geldi dervīşe B : galebe eyledi dervīş M

<sup>445</sup> başladı B : -M

<sup>446</sup> ikrār B : karar M

<sup>447</sup> kanā'ati azıq u şabrı yaraq M : kana'ati şabrı azıq yarağın B

<sup>448</sup> bu M : bir B

<sup>449</sup> qurıya irişdi B : qurı yire başdı M

<sup>450</sup> qurı B : -M

<sup>451</sup> dervīş eydür B : -M

<sup>452</sup> dervīş B : -M

Dervîşi ki gördiler, cümle kaçdılar, pâdişâhları katına geldiler. Pâdişâhları katında<sup>453</sup> bir araya cem‘ oldılar. Gördükleri yok nesteyidi. Dervîşi görmek istediler. Bu kaderde<sup>454</sup> dervîş gördi ki Süleymân peygamber bunlaruñ sultânıdır.<sup>455</sup> Bakdı, dervîşi ki gördi, leşkere söyledi<sup>456</sup> ki: “Siz turuñ.” Leşker<sup>457</sup> tırdı. Süleymân peygamber ilerü yürüdi, dervîşe (*M 209b*) selâm virdi. Dervîş ‘aleyke aldı.<sup>458</sup> İki oturdılar, söyleşdiler, bir zamân kelecı eylediler.<sup>459</sup> Süleymân peygamber eydür: “Ben Şâm milkinde ‘Azîz Kilis dirler, andanam.” dir. “Sen niredensin [dervîş]?” dir. Dervîş eydür: “Ben orta köyden degirmencinüñ oğlıyam.” dir. İki bilişdiler. Süleymân peygamber dervîşi aldı, geldi. Tahtına çıkdılar, oturdılar. Dîvler perîler karşılarına tırdılar.<sup>460</sup> Bir zamân böyle geçdi. Dervîş Süleymân peygamberden<sup>461</sup> kuş dilin öğrendi. Süleymân peygamberüñ cümle hünerini öğrendi. Bir gün şordı Süleymân peygambere<sup>462</sup> ki: “Dağı yir var mıdır teferrüc itmege?” dir. Süleymân peygamber eydür: “Bu adadan rüb‘-i meskûna yetmiş biñ yıllık yoldur.” dir. “Sen nice geldüñ bunda<sup>463</sup> [dervîş]?” (*M 210a*) dir. Dervîş başından geçen hâli söyledi.<sup>464</sup> Gemi düzdügin, tâ bu araya geldügin [bir bir] söyledi. Süleymân peygamber eydür: “Bir ada vardır.” dir. “Kuşlar adası dirler.” dir. “Dürlü dürlü<sup>465</sup> kuşlar vardır anda.” dir. “Bu dîvlerüñ (*B 283b*) kôrkuşu andandır.” dir. “Ol kuşlar bu dîvlerden<sup>466</sup> kâpar, yir.” dir. “Gel varalum, anı teferrüc idelüm.” dir. Dervîş dir ki: “Hoş nola, gidelüm.” dir.<sup>467</sup> [Tırdı.] Süleymân peygamber yarağ eyledi, dervîş ile gemiye girdiler. Dervîş<sup>468</sup> bu iki beyti söyledi, [eydür]:

<sup>453</sup> katında B : ile M

<sup>454</sup> kaderde B: hâl içinde M

<sup>455</sup> sultânıdır B : içinde sultândur M

<sup>456</sup> leşkere söyledi B : ‘askere buyurdı M

<sup>457</sup> leşker B : ‘asker M

<sup>458</sup> ‘aleyke aldı M : ‘aleyküm es-selâm didi B

<sup>459</sup> kelecı eylediler B : muşâhabetden sonra M

<sup>460</sup> dîvler perîler karşılarına tırdılar B : dîv ü perî karşılarına tırdı M

<sup>461</sup> böyle geçdi dervîş Süleymân peygamberden M : bir zamân kaldı dervîş Süleymân peygamberile B

<sup>462</sup> şordı Süleymân peygambere B : Süleymân peygambere şordı M

<sup>463</sup> nice geldüñ bunda B : bunda nice geldüñ idi M

<sup>464</sup> hâli söyledi B : ser-güzeşti hikâyet eyledi M

<sup>465</sup> dürlü B : -M

<sup>466</sup> dîvlerden B : dîvleri M

<sup>467</sup> hoş nola gidelüm M : hoş ola B

<sup>468</sup> ile gemiye girdiler dervîş M : gemiye oturdı B

‘Aceb sırram amu eyāda mevcūd  
amu dillerde benven kϋllī maşūd

Sebeb benven amu dϋrlϋ ayālden  
Benem mamūd benem ikrāh u merdūd<sup>469</sup>

Dervī ki bu sϋzi tamām eyledi, Sϋleymān peygamber daı iki beyt sϋyledi (*M 210b*):

Bu tevidde amu ‘ālem yegāne  
Bir oldu cϋmle almadı bīgāne

ayāl itme hemān ol mihribāndur  
Gϋnϋlden sϋz viren cϋmle lisāna

didir. Bunlar<sup>470</sup> yara eylediler. Sultānuñ tahtın yil gϋtϋrdi. Dervī gemiye girdi, revān oldılar. Bir zamān ki aradan gedi, ulara haber oldu ki: “Sϋleymān peygamber leker eylemi, bunda gelϋr.” didiler.<sup>471</sup> ular cem‘ oldılar, pādiahları ātına geldiler. [Ephem diyϋp dīger oldılar.] Tϋrdılar ϋyle.<sup>472</sup> Bunlaruñ daı yolu bunda [geldi,] iridi. Sϋleymān peygamber [‘aleyhisselām] iridi bu adaya,<sup>473</sup> ondı bir ho yire.<sup>474</sup> Dervī daı<sup>475</sup> gemiyi uruya ekdi, secde-i ϋkr ıldı. Bir cϋmle<sup>476</sup> oturdılar. Bunlar bu hāle [iken] ular cem‘ oldılar, bir yire geldiler. Sϋleymān

---

<sup>469</sup> ‘Aceb sırram amu eyāda mevcūd / amu dillerde benven kϋllī maşūd / Sebeb benven amu dϋrlϋ ayālden / Benem mamūd benem ikrāh u merdūd / dervī ki bu sϋzi tamām eyledi Sϋleymān peygamber daı iki beyt sϋyledi  
M : -B

<sup>470</sup> bunlar B : -M

<sup>471</sup> eylemi bunda gelϋr didiler B : dϋrmi bunda geliyorur M

<sup>472</sup> ϋyle B : -M

<sup>473</sup> iridi bu adaya B : -M

<sup>474</sup> bir ho yire B : -M

<sup>475</sup> daı B : -M

<sup>476</sup> cϋmle B : midār M

peygamberüñ [‘aleyhisselām] karşısına (*M 211a*) [dīvān] tırdılar. Şöyle biri<sup>477</sup> ileri geldi, şorar, eydür<sup>478</sup> ki: “[Evvelā] siz<sup>479</sup> ne kişilersiz [ve] bunda niye geldüñüz [ve maqşūduñuz murāduñuz nedür]?” didiler. Süleymān peygamber [dağı] eydür: “Teferruce geldük.” dir. Bu qaderde<sup>480</sup> kuşlar [hemān] dīvlerden kapmağa düşdiler,<sup>481</sup> gavgā peydā oldı. Dervīş baqdı, gördi ki bunlar bu halde, sürdi, geldi. Gördi dervīş bunları. Kuşlar dervīşi ki gördiler, cümle hevāya kalkdılar.<sup>482</sup> Dervīş Süleymān peygamber<sup>483</sup> katına geldi. Süleymān peygamber<sup>484</sup> eydür: “Gördüñ mi dervīş? [Kuşlar seni dağı kapmağıçün hevāya ağıdılar. Tedārük eyle!]” dir. Dervīş der-hāl<sup>485</sup> tuzak kurdı. Bir kuş tutdı, gördi ki tutılan kuş (*B 284a*) baykuş [kuşı]dur. [Meger] ‘Antakya vīrān olduğı vaktin dervīşle [bu baykuş] ikisi bir vīrānede (*M 211b*) bileyimişler.<sup>486</sup> Bilişdiler, haber şoruşdılar. Dervīş baykuşa şorar ki: “Sen bu cihānuñ harāblıgın [ve] avadanlıgın nice keret gördüñ ola?” dir. Baykuş eydür: “Yüz biñ Süleymān [u Süleymān] mişli<sup>487</sup> pādişāh görmiş olam.” dir. Bu qaderde<sup>488</sup> dervīş baqdı, gördi ki bu kubbe vü bārgāh, bu hāl [u] hayāl cümlesi bu şehrüñ āyinesinde görünür. Dervīş ikileyin baqdı, gördi ki bu hāl [u] hayāl min külli<sup>489</sup> bu şehrüñ gölgesiymiş. Dervīş bu heybetden uyandı,<sup>490</sup> gördi ki *leyse fi’ d-dāri gayrunā deyyār*. [Hiç] kimesne yok, [özi] ten-i tenhādur. Göñli<sup>491</sup> cūşa geldi, eydür ki:<sup>492</sup>

<sup>477</sup> şöyle biri B : kuşlaruñ birisi M

<sup>478</sup> eydür B : -M

<sup>479</sup> siz B : -M

<sup>480</sup> bu qaderde B : -M

<sup>481</sup> düşdiler B : başladılar M

<sup>482</sup> ki bunlar bu halde sürdi geldi gördi dervīş bunları kuşlar dervīşi ki gördiler cümle hevāya kalkdılar B : kuşlar sürüp gelürler ki dervīşi dağı kapalar M

<sup>483</sup> peygamber B : nebī ‘aleyhisselām M

<sup>484</sup> peygamber B : nebī ‘aleyhisselām M

<sup>485</sup> der-hāl B : -M

<sup>486</sup> bileyimişler B : bile olmuşlar imiş M

<sup>487</sup> mişli B : mişällü M

<sup>488</sup> bu qaderde B : pes M

<sup>489</sup> min külli B : külliyyen M

<sup>490</sup> uyandı B : uyanıgeldi M

<sup>491</sup> göñlü B : -M

<sup>492</sup> eydür ki B : bu iki beyti söyledi M



Benem cümle ḥayāl u ḥāl<sup>493</sup> ki dirler

Yemīn ü hem daḥı<sup>494</sup> şimāl ki dirler (*M 212a*)

Benem naḳḳāş bu cümle naḳş u pergāl

Cevāb u hem daḥı<sup>495</sup> su’āl ki dirler

didi dir. Dervīşe girü uyḡu ḡalebe oldı, dervīş uyudı.<sup>496</sup> Düşinde gördi ki bu şehir ki āyineye beñzerdi, öz vücūdı imiş. Kendözini bu şehirde sultān gördi. Cümle [yaradılmış] eşyāyı ḥükmine fermān<sup>497</sup> gördi. Özi özine feraḡ oldı, eydür ki:

Benem aşşı ziyān cümle bāzārda

Benem yaḡtu kamu ‘ayn u nazārda

Kamu eşyā ki ḥisāb u şumārdur

Benem ḥisāb olan cümle şumārda

didi dir. Bu ḡaderde dervīş<sup>498</sup> baḡdı, gördi ki Muḡammed Muştafā geliyorur. Dervīş ḡarşu yürüdi,<sup>499</sup> selām virdi, elin öpdı. Eydür: “Yā Resūlullāh, ben faḡire bir nazār eyle!” dir. Muḡammed Muştafā sorar ki: “Dervīş, (*M 212b*) gelişüñ niredendür?” dir. Dervīş dir ki: “Sultānum, gelişüm dünyā milkindendür.” dir. (*B 284b*) Peyḡamber [‘aleyhisselām] sorar ki: “Ḳanḡı milkdensin? dir. Dervīş dir ki: “Rūmdan.”<sup>500</sup> [Resūlullāh ‘aleyhisselām eydür:] “Şāmı daḥı gördüḡüñ var mıdur?” dir.<sup>501</sup> “Teferrüc eyledüñ mi?” dir. Dervīş dir: “Beli, [seyrān

---

<sup>493</sup> ḥayāl u ḥāl M : ḥāl u ḥayāl B

<sup>494</sup> yemīn ü hem daḥı M : be-küllī yemīn ü B

<sup>495</sup> cevāb u hem daḥı M: ḡamunun cevābı B

<sup>496</sup> dervīşe girü uyḡu ḡalebe oldı dervīş uyudı M : dervīş bu ḥayālde nāḡāḡ uyḡu geldi dervīş uyḡuda B

<sup>497</sup> fermān B : muḡı’ vü münḡād M

<sup>498</sup> bu ḡaderde dervīş B : -M

<sup>499</sup> yürüdi B : vardı M

<sup>500</sup> Rūmdan B : Rūm milkindenem M

<sup>501</sup> gördüḡün var mıdur dir B : -M

itmişüzdür.” Resülullāh eydür:] “‘Aceb<sup>502</sup> bizüm ‘āşıklarumuz varidi anda, onlaruñ hāli nicedür?<sup>503</sup> [Eyüler midür, nice bilürsin?]” dir. Dervīş eydür: “Sulṭānum,” dir, <sup>504</sup> “biri birine uymazlar.” dir. “Dürlü dürlü yollar peydā eylediler.” dir. “Şindi görseñ anları ki neler iderler.”<sup>505</sup> dir. Resülullāh eydür: “Ḥaḫ tebāreke ve ta‘ālā [anlaruñ] dükelinuñ günāhların bağışladı.” dir. “Velī şol Nāblus kaçısınuñ rişvet alduğı birez müşkildür.” dir. Dervīş (*M 213a*) dir ki: “Sulṭānum,” dir, “bizüm Kelşurat[?] kaçısı[nuñ hāli nedür dirsünüz?] Bütün bütün ıarpuzlar yudar, rişvet nola dirsın!”<sup>506</sup> dir. Dervīşüñ bu laṭıfesi Resülullāha<sup>507</sup> hoş geldi. Peyğamber<sup>508</sup> eydür ki: “[Berü] gel [bizüm ile,] bir kaç gün<sup>509</sup> yoldaş olalum. [Muşāḥabet idelüm. Bir hoşça dervīşsin anca.” dir. Dervīş: “Na‘am yā Resülullāh! Ayağın tozına arzümend idük. Elḥamdülillāh ki müyesser oldı, ıulluqlar idelüm.”] dir. İki bir cümle<sup>510</sup> yoldaş oldılar. Muḥammed Muştafā [‘aleyhisselām] eydür: “Dervīş, müsāfir görünürsin.” dir. “Nireyi<sup>511</sup> teferrüc eyledüñ [ü nireler müsāfirisin]?” dir. Dervīş dir ki: “Sulṭānum, her ıarınca ıadar nice miğdārı dimişler. Miğdārumuzca seyrān daḫı (*M 213b*) itmişüzdür.”<sup>512</sup> dir. Muḥammed Muştafā başladı.<sup>513</sup> “‘Arşı [vü] ‘arşuñ dā’iresin [ve] tedvīrin [ve] toḫuz felegi, burcları [ve] ılduzları [ve] yidi ṭabaḫa yiri [ve] ferşi [ve] öküzi [ve] balığı [ve] deñizi [ve] yili ve] bu menzilgāhları [külli] teferrüc eyledüñ mi [dervīş]?” dir. Dervīş dir ki: “Beli sulṭānum, [eyledüm.]” dir. Muḥammed Muştafā dir ki: “Dervīş,<sup>514</sup> bir şehir vardur, iki direk üstinedür. Hiç anı gördüñ mi?” dir. Dervīş iki yaña oldı, [fıkr ider ki: “‘Aceb] yirde midür [ve]yā gökde [midür?” dir]. Resülullāh dir ki: “İkisinüñ arasındadır.” dir. Dervīş fıkr eyledi, özine yörendi. Eydür ki:<sup>515</sup>

<sup>502</sup> ‘aceb M : yā Rabb B

<sup>503</sup> ‘āşıklarumuz varidi anda onlaruñ hāli nicedür B : anda ‘āşıklarumuz vardı hālleri nice ola M

<sup>504</sup> sulṭānum dir B : yā Resülullāh M

<sup>505</sup> anları ki neler iderler M : anlaruñ hālleri nedür B

<sup>506</sup> nola dirsın B : ne imiş M

<sup>507</sup> bu laṭıfesi Resülullāha M : sözi B

<sup>508</sup> peyğamber B : -M

<sup>509</sup> bir kaç gün M : bir cümle B

<sup>510</sup> ikisi bir cümle B : pes bir miğdār M

<sup>511</sup> müsāfir görünürsin dir nireyi B : müsāfire beñzersin nireleri M

<sup>512</sup> her ıarınca ıadar nice miğdārı dimişler miğdārumuzca seyrān daḫı itmişüzdür M : ıadrümce B

<sup>513</sup> başladı B : eydür M

<sup>514</sup> dervīş B : -M

<sup>515</sup> eydür ki B : bu iki beyti söyledi M

Benem ol gevher-i vaḥdet ki dirler  
Benem cümle şıfāt u zāt ki dirler (B 285a)

Bu gün Manşūr benem nuṭṭum *ene 'l-ḥakk*<sup>516</sup> (M 214a)  
Benem ‘ayyār benem Bağdād ki dirler

didi dir. Bu kâderde<sup>517</sup> dervîş uyḡudan belinledi. [Uyanıgeldi.] Gözin açdı, görđi ki *leyse fi 'd-dārı ġayrunā deyyār*. Kimesne yoḡ, özi ten-i tenhādur.<sup>518</sup> Dört yaña baḡdı, görđi ki ne şeh̄r var, ne bāzār [var]. Güneş toḡmış; ırte, gice, ırak, yaḡın, cümlesi yeksān olmış. Ne yol var,<sup>519</sup> ne yolcı, ne menzil [var]. Cümle ‘ālem [bir olmış ve] bir vücūd [ve] bir baş olmış. Dervîş cūşa geldi, bu iki beyti söyledi:

‘Ālem küllī vücūdumdur vücūdum  
İder özüm özüme pes<sup>520</sup> sücūdum

Özüm özüme söylerem sözümi  
Özüm şeyḡem özümdür hem<sup>521</sup> mürīdüm

didi dir. Bu kâderde<sup>522</sup> dervîşe uyḡu geldi. Düşinde görđi ki yir ü gök, (M 214b) cümle ‘ālem bir hırḡadur kendünüñ üstinde. Bu hırḡada şad hezārān dürlü reng vaşlalar<sup>523</sup> var. Dervîş baḡdı, bu hırḡa eskimekten [ve] yeñi olmakdan fāriḡdür.<sup>524</sup> Dervîş eydür: “Kepenegüm dikmekden cāna geldüm.” dir. “[Vay] ne hoş köhne hırḡa elüme girdi.” dir. Çıḡardı, şeyle ḡodı. Teferrüc eyler.

---

<sup>516</sup> Bu gün Manşūr benem nuṭṭum *ene 'l-ḥakk* M : Benem Manşūr benem dem-i *ene 'l-ḥakk* B

<sup>517</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>518</sup> özi ten-i tenhādur B : özidür ten-i tenhā M

<sup>519</sup> var B : -M

<sup>520</sup> ider özüm özüme pes M : özüm özüme kııuram B

<sup>521</sup> şeyḡem özümdür hem M : şeyḡüm ve hem özüm B

<sup>522</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>523</sup> dürlü reng vaşlalar M : vaşla reng reng B

<sup>524</sup> fāriḡdür B : berīdür M

Gördi ki her reng şad hezārān hayāle<sup>525</sup> birağur kişiyi. Dervîş fikr eyledi bu gördüğü düşleri [ve] başından geçen işleri [ve] avladuğı kuşları [ve] gözledüğü tuşları. Bu kaderde<sup>526</sup> nāgāh bağıdı, gördi ki iraq [u] yakın [ü] derd ü dermān bir şîşe içinde bizüm hıvāce Naşr bāzırgānuñ dükkānında aşılıp tırur.<sup>527</sup> Dervîş eydür: “Bu hilāfdur.”<sup>528</sup> (M 215a) dir. “Bu kendü kendüden mi geldi ki?” dir. (B 285b) “Yoksa şayyādlar avladı mı getürdi [ola]?” dir. Dervîş bu fikrde nāgāh bağıdı, gördi özini Hotan milkinde. Süleymān peygamber [‘aleyhisselām] av şalmış ki<sup>529</sup> bu müşki olan geyigi avlar. Dervîş bir hoş yiri avlamış, teferrüc eyler. Süleymān peygamber avlayu [avlayu] dervîşüñ katına geldi, selām virdi. Dervîş “‘aleyküm es-selām” didi.<sup>530</sup> Bu kaderde<sup>531</sup> dervîş eydür: “Ne avlarsın sulţānum?” dir. Süleymān peygamber [‘aleyhisselām] dir ki: “Geyik avlaram.” dir. Dervîş dir ki: “Nice geyikdür avladuğun?”<sup>532</sup> dir. Süleymān peygamber<sup>533</sup> dir ki: “Şol müşki olan geyigi avlaram.” dir. Bu kaderde<sup>534</sup> dervîş [bağıdı,] gördi ki bir geyicek (M 215b) şahrāda gezer. Eydür: “Şol mıdur avladuğun geyik?”<sup>535</sup> dir. Süleymān [peygamber ‘aleyhisselām] bağıdı, gördi ki istedügidür. “Hay av bağılañ!” dir, “Yolları tutuñ!” dir.<sup>536</sup> Ğavğā peydā oldı.<sup>537</sup> Bu<sup>538</sup> geyigün ardınca [segirttiler. Geyik] kaçacak yir bulımadı. Yüz urdı, dervîşe toğrı tağdan yaña kaçdı. Geldi dervîşüñ katına. Gölgesine ki irişdi, nā-peydā oldı. Bunlar Ğavğāda. Dervîş dört yaña bağıdı, kimesne görünmez.<sup>539</sup> Bunlar dervîş katına geldiler ki geyik bunda geldi diyi.<sup>540</sup> [“Kanı ve nice oldı?” didiler. Dört yaña bağıdılar.] Gördiler ki hemān dervîşdür, artuğ nesne

<sup>525</sup> hayāle B : fikre M

<sup>526</sup> bu kaderde B : -M

<sup>527</sup> aşılıp tırur M : tırmuş B

<sup>528</sup> hilāfdur M : ihtilāfdur B

<sup>529</sup> şalmış ki B : idüp M

<sup>530</sup> ‘aleyküm es-selām didi B : ‘aleyke aldı M

<sup>531</sup> bu kaderde B : -M

<sup>532</sup> nice geyikdür avladuğun B : avladuğun nice geyikdür M

<sup>533</sup> peygamber B : nebī ‘aleyhisselām M

<sup>534</sup> bu kaderde B : pes M

<sup>535</sup> şol mıdur avladuğun geyik B : avladuğun şol cins geyicek midür M

<sup>536</sup> tutuñ dir B : tıtdılar M

<sup>537</sup> peydā oldı B : kopdı M

<sup>538</sup> bu B : -M

<sup>539</sup> kimesne görünmez B : görmez M

<sup>540</sup> diyi B : idi M

yok.<sup>541</sup> Dervîş [dağı] dört yaña bağıdı, bu geyigün ayağı tağıldısı öz vücūdından gelür. (*M 216a*)  
Tınmadı. Bu kâderde dervîş uyğudan beliñledi. Gözin açdı,<sup>542</sup> gördi ki ten-i tenhâ hemân özidür.  
Dağı [hiç] kimesne yok. Dervîş cüşa geldi, eydür ki:

Benem ferd-i vâhid fâ‘il-i muṭlak<sup>543</sup>

Benem cümle gönülde sırr-ı muğlak

Benem bāṭın olan cümle zāhirde (*B 286a*)

Benem mellâḥ benem muḥîṭ ü zevrak

didi dir. Bu kâderde<sup>544</sup> dervîşe girü uyğuş galebe itdi.<sup>545</sup> Düşinde gördi ki bu geyik kendünün içindedür. Süleymân peygamber [‘aleyhisselâm] eydür: “Dervîş,<sup>546</sup> geyigi [çıkar,] getür [berü]!” dir. Dervîş dir ki: “Ben avumı kimseye virmezem.”<sup>547</sup> dir. İkisi<sup>548</sup> kârğuşaya düşdiler. Süleymân peygamber [‘aleyhisselâm] degdi, dervîşi tütüdü. Dervîş dağı bunı<sup>549</sup> tütüdü. Bu ikisi bu hâlde [iken] nâgâḥ gördiler ki Muḥammed Muştafâ (*M 216b*) geliyorur. Bu kâderde<sup>550</sup> irişdi, bunlarun [bu] hâlini gördi, kârğuşa eylerler. Dervîş Muḥammed Muştafâyı ki gördi, şîr-merd oldı. Tütüdü Süleymân peygamberi, mecâl virmedi. Bu kâderde dervîş uyğuşdan beliñledi, uyandı, gördi ki düşidür. Ser-âgâz eyledi, bu iki beyti söyledi:<sup>551</sup>

<sup>541</sup> hemân dervîşdür artuğ nesne yok M : hemân dervîş var bunda dağı kimesne yok B

<sup>542</sup> kâderde dervîş uyğuşdan beliñledi gözin açdı B : hâlde iken dervîş uyanıgeldi M

<sup>543</sup> fâ‘il-i B: kâyyüm-ı M

<sup>544</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>545</sup> girü uyğuş galebe itdi M : uyğuş geldi B

<sup>546</sup> dervîş B : dervîşe M

<sup>547</sup> kimseye virmezem M : saña mı virürüm B

<sup>548</sup> ikisi B : -M

<sup>549</sup> bunı B : Süleymân peygamberi ‘aleyhisselâm

<sup>550</sup> bu kâderde B : fi‘l-hâl M

<sup>551</sup> kârğuşa eylerler dervîş Muḥammed Muştafâyı ki gördi şîr-merd oldı tütüdü Süleymân peygamberi mecâl virmedi bu kâderde dervîş uyğuşdan beliñledi uyandı gördi ki düşidür ser-âgâz eyledi bu iki beyti söyledi B : dervîş bağıdı gördi ki Resülullâḥ ‘aleyhisselâm tûrur dervîş Muḥammed Muştafâya şevkından şîr-merd olup cür’et eyledi dağı ziyâde tütüdü bu hâlde iken dervîş uyanıgeldi gördi ki düşidür bu iki beyti oğudı M

Benem cümle vücūd u cān ki dirler

Benem ḥaḳīkat-i insān ki dirler

Benem şarrāf benem mehekk u altun

Benem kıymetlü gevher kān ki dirler

didi dir. Bu ḳaderde<sup>552</sup> dervīş [girü] uyḳuya vardı. Düşinde gördi ki ne geyik var, ne şahrā [var].  
*Leysel fi 'd-dārı gayrunā deyyār*. Kimesne yoḳ, özidür [ten-i tenhā]. Hemān<sup>553</sup> dört yaña baḳdı,  
ḳadīr [ü] ber-kemālden artuḳ kimesne yoḳ. Bu kez eydür ki:<sup>554</sup> (*M 217a*)

Benem ḥall u benem müşkil ki dirler

Benem yolcu benem menzil ki dirler

Benem puthānede Ka'bede maḳşūd

Benem cümlesi ḥaḳḳ u bāṭıl ki dirler<sup>555</sup>

didi dir. Dervīş bu sözi söyleriken uyḳusu geldi, uyudu. Düşinde gördi ki bu cümle gördüğü düş öz  
ḥayālidür, öz vücūdunuñ ḥālidür. Daḫı hiç kimesne yoḳ. Dervīş fikr (*B 286b*) eyledi, özine  
yörendi, gördi ki hemān özidür. Nice ki düşinde gördi, eyledür. Artuḳ eksük nesne yoḳ. Bu kez  
dervīş dir ki:

Ḥaḳḳa minnet ki ḥall oldu bu müşkil

Bir oldu ma'nāda sultān ile ḳul<sup>556</sup>

---

<sup>552</sup> bu ḳaderde B : -M

<sup>553</sup> hemān B : -M

<sup>554</sup> kez eydür ki B : kerre bu iki beyti söyledi M

<sup>555</sup> benem puthānede Ka'bede maḳşūd / benem cümlesi ḥaḳḳ u bāṭıl ki dirler B : benem cümlesinüñ fikri ḥayāli /  
benem sāḳī vü cām-ı mül ki dirler M

<sup>556</sup> benem puthānede Ka'bede maḳşūd / benem cümlesi ḥaḳḳ u bāṭıl ki dirler / didi dir dervīş bu sözi söyler iken  
uyḳusu geldi uyudu düşinde gördi ki bu cümle gördüğü düş öz ḥayālidür öz vücūdunuñ ḥālidür daḫı hiç kimesne yoḳ  
dervīş fikr (*B 286v*) eyledi özine yörendi gördi ki hemān özidür nice ki düşinde gördi eyledür artuḳ eksük nesne yoḳ  
bu kez dervīş dir ki / ḥaḳḳa minnet ki ḥall oldu bu müşkil / bir oldu ma'nāda sultān ile ḳul B : -M

Benem cümle şeyüñ fikr ü hayâli  
Benem şişe benem sâkı benem mül

didi dir. Bu kâderde<sup>557</sup> dervîş düşinden belinledi. Uyandı, gördi ki Mısr cāmi‘ içindedür.<sup>558</sup>  
Cümle ‘âlem [hep] bu arada cem‘ olmuşdur. Dervîş [tiz yirinden] turıgeldi. Bil bağladı. Zenbîlin  
boynına taktı, parsaya varmağa<sup>559</sup> niyyet eyledi. Evvel bu sözi söyledi ki:<sup>560</sup>

Ḳadîr ü ber-kemâl u hem hâzîrsin  
Nazîrûñ yoḳ cihānda<sup>561</sup> bî-nazîrsin

Benem ben sen didüğümden murādum<sup>562</sup>  
Bilürsin<sup>563</sup> ben degülem sen habîrsin

didi dir. Dervîş evvel el uzatdı, Allāh didi. Cömerd ḳaşşāb dükkānydı. Cömerd [ḳaşşāb] eydür:  
“Hay dervîş, (M 217b) senüñ bu ḳadar ḳudretüñ var mıdur ki bu adı añasın?”<sup>564</sup> dir. Dervîş [cüşa  
geldi,] eydür ki:<sup>565</sup>

Benem ol ki ḳamuda yoldaş oldur  
Ḳamu başlarda sevdā vü<sup>566</sup> baş oldur

---

<sup>557</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>558</sup> Mısr cāmi‘ içindedür M : Mısr cāmi‘dür içinde B

<sup>559</sup> varmağa B : gitmege M

<sup>560</sup> evvel bu sözi söyledi ki B : bu iki beyti didi M

<sup>561</sup> cihānda M : ‘âlemde B

<sup>562</sup> murādum M : murād bu B

<sup>563</sup> bilürsin M : ya‘nî ki B

<sup>564</sup> hay dervîş (M 217v) senüñ bu ḳadar ḳudretüñ var mıdur ki bu adı añasın B : dervîş sende ol ḳadar ḳudret var  
mıdur ki bu adı añarsın M

<sup>565</sup> eydür ki B : bu iki beyti didi M

<sup>566</sup> başlarda sevdā vü M : başdağı sevdā ol B

Ben anda gizlüyem ki şol filānda  
Ḥaḳīḳat sālīm oldur ser-keş oldur

didi dir. Geçdi dir. Dervīş kendü işine vardı.<sup>567</sup> Mışr Cāmi‘yle sevād-ı a‘zamı<sup>568</sup> gördi. Dervīş özine yörendi, göñli cūşa geldi. Bu iki söyledi, eydür ki:

Zihī cānam zihī menzile irdüm  
Zihī ḥall olııcı müşkile irdüm

Neye irdüm ise iki cihānda  
Hemān ol sulṭānile bile irdüm

didi dir. Dervīş ki (*B 287a*) bu sözi söyledi,<sup>569</sup> sağ yaña baqdı, gördi ki bir çār-sūda. Ğalebe ğavġā<sup>570</sup> var. Dervīş [daḫı] eydür: “Vaḳt ola<sup>571</sup> düğün var ola.” (*M 218a*) dir. Sürdi, geldi, gördi ki sulṭānuñ dīvānı tırmuş. Yemīn ü yesār ārāste, çavuşlar yirlü yirinde. Cümle yaradılmış eşyā sulṭān dīvānında cem‘ olmuşlar. Her birisi sulṭānile göñli hoş. Dervīş nāġāh sulṭānı gördi, eydür ki:

Selām olsun eyā sulṭān-ı ekber  
Ḥaḳīḳat ma‘deni kıymetlü gevher

‘İnāyetüñ ḳamuya destigirdür<sup>572</sup>  
Ḳamuya daḫı luṭfuñ oldı<sup>573</sup> rehber

---

<sup>567</sup> vardı B : gitdi M

<sup>568</sup> Mışr Cāmi‘yle sevād-ı a‘zamı M : Mışr Cāmi‘dür sevād-ı a‘zamdur B

<sup>569</sup> ki bu sözi söyledi B : -M

<sup>570</sup> ğavġā B : -M

<sup>571</sup> vaḳt ola B : şāyed M

<sup>572</sup> ‘ināyetüñ ḳamuya destigirdür B : ‘ināyetle ḳamunuñ destigiri M

<sup>573</sup> ḳamuya daḫı luṭfuñ oldı M : ki luṭfuñ cümleye delil ü B



didi dir. Dervîş ki bu sözi söyledi, sultân [dahı] baqdı, gördi ki bir dervîşdür. Dir ki:

‘Aleyküm es-selâm dervîş-i miskîn

Ƙamu Ƙavli bütün cümle işi çin

Müberrâsın Ƙamu zann u gümândan

HaƘıƘata yakîn sultâna emîn (*M 218b*)

didi dir. Dervîş ki bu sözi işitdi, uyanıgeldi. Eydür ki:

Şükür gördüm seni ey şâh u sultân

Yüzüñdür cümleye Ƙible vü imân

Senüñ sâyende eşyâ cümle sâkin<sup>574</sup>

İşüñ dâ'im Ƙamuya luƢ u ihsân

didi dir. Dervîş ki bu sözi söyledi,<sup>575</sup> sultân eydür ki:

Ey yüzi Ƙutlu sözi tatlu dervîş

HaƘıƘat gevheri devletlü dervîş

Göriccek dâne pirinci<sup>576</sup> taƒaƒda

Ƙağan arslan bigi heybetlü dervîş

didi dir. Çün ki sultândan dervîş bu sözi işitdi,<sup>577</sup> eydür ki:

Eyâ sultân ki sen hayy u Ƙadîmsin (*B 287b*)

---

<sup>574</sup> senüñ sâyende eşyâ cümle sâkin M : sâyen altında cümle şey sâkindür B

<sup>575</sup> ki bu sözi söyledi B : çün bunu didi M

<sup>576</sup> göriccek dâne birinci M : dâne birinci göriccek B

<sup>577</sup> çün ki sultândan dervîş bu sözi işitdi M : dervîş ki bu sözi işitdi B

Bu cümle iş içinde sen hakımsin

Virürsin maqşūdın cümle t̄alibe<sup>578</sup>

Senüñ işüñ keremdür sen kerımsin

(M 219a) didi dir. Dervîş ki bu sözi söyledi, sulṭān eydür ki:

Berü gel otur ey dervîş-i müfred<sup>579</sup>

Bu hikmet bahrı içre dürr-i vaḥdet<sup>580</sup>

Āşinālara bīgāne degülsin

Bilişile bilişsin yadile yad

didi dir. Dervîş ki<sup>581</sup> bu sözi işitdi, geldi, [edeb ile] oturdı. Sulṭāna du‘ā eyledi. Eydür ki:

Eyā sulṭān ki sen ihsān idersin

Ḳamuya ser-be-ser yeksān idersin

Deñizi şaqladuñ kaṭre içinde

Güneşi zerrede pinhān idersin

didi dir. Bu kâderde<sup>582</sup> ni‘met çekildi. Cümleye pâdişāh h̄vānından nevāle degdi. Dervîş teferrüc eyler. Gördi ki cümle yaradılmış eşyā kadarlu kadarınca kısmetin aldı, tesellî oldı. Bu kâderde<sup>583</sup> dervîşüñ (M 219b) gönli ferah oldı. Ayağ üstine kalkdı. Bu iki beyti ser-āğāz ile oḳudı.<sup>584</sup>

---

<sup>578</sup> maqşūdın cümle t̄alibe B: cümlenüñ maqşūdını sen M

<sup>579</sup> müfred B : sîret M

<sup>580</sup> bu hikmet bahrı içre dürr-i vaḥdet M : iy hikmet deryāsı gevher-i vaḥdet B

<sup>581</sup> ki B : çün M

<sup>582</sup> bu kâderde B : hemān M

<sup>583</sup> oldı bu kâderde B : buldı pes M

<sup>584</sup> ayağ üstine kalkdı bu iki beyti ser-āğāz ile oḳudı M : tırıgeldi eydür ki B

Ġarībem kimsenem yoġdur cihānda  
Bī-niṣān olmıṣam cümle niṣānda

Beni ister amu talib olanlar  
Bu ivn-ı zamn kll meknda<sup>585</sup>

didir. Bu aderde<sup>586</sup> dervıŝ uyudan uyandı, grdi ki *leyse fi'd-darı gayrun deyyr*. Kimesne yoġ, [zidr] ten-i tenhdur. Fikr eyledi bu dŝinde grdgi nesteleri. Ngh uyuya vardı. Dŝinde grdi ki cümle cihn aŝkre grdgi dŝinde [grdgi] kendnn vcdı glgesi imiŝ. Kendzini vcdı iinde sultn grdi. Her cihetden<sup>587</sup> ki baġdı, grdi ki hkm (B 288a) kendnndr. Bu kez eydr ki:

ŝkr ki emn oldum bu hylden  
Bu taht u fev<sup>588</sup> u yemn  ŝimlden (M 220a)

Bu sen ben sende ya bende demekden  
Ber<sup>589</sup> oldum ŝkr ki l u klden

didir. Bu aderde<sup>590</sup> dervıŝ uyudan beliledi. Gzin adı, baġdı, grdi ki cümle ‘lem yzine arŝu secde ılurlar. Dervıŝ eydr: “[Be] cnum bunlar neye scd iderler [ki]?” dir. Bu aderde dervıŝ<sup>591</sup> baġdı, grdi ki vcdı bir cihndr ki [iinde] yz bi bu cihn bigi nesdane yatur, her bir kŝesinde byle. Dervıŝ baġdı, grdi ki [bu cihn ve] her nesdane ki bu cihnda vardr, min kll<sup>592</sup> kendnn vcddur. Hyrn ald, bu iki beyti syledi:

---

<sup>585</sup> bu ivn-ı zamn kll M : Kll zamn u ivn-ı B

<sup>586</sup> bu aderde B : -M

<sup>587</sup> cihetden M : cihetine B

<sup>588</sup> taht u fev B : fev u taht M

<sup>589</sup> ber M : friġ B

<sup>590</sup> bu aderde B : ngh M

<sup>591</sup> bu aderde dervıŝ B : -M

<sup>592</sup> min kll B : klliyen M

‘Aceb<sup>593</sup> bu cümleye nüşha mıyam ben  
Kamuda şūr ile<sup>594</sup> ğavġā mıyam ben

Kamu gōñüllerüñ fikr ü hayāli  
Kamu başlardaġı sevdā mıyam ben

(M 220b) didi dir. Bu kâderde<sup>595</sup> dervīş baġdı, gördi bu cihān [u] cihān şūretlü görinen hayāller küllī<sup>596</sup> kendünüñ vücūdı gölgesidür. Dervīş cūşa geldi, eydür ki:<sup>597</sup>

Benem cümle vücūd içindeki cān  
Benem küllī şıfāt her dürlü erkān

Benem Leylā benem Mecnūn ki dirler  
Benem ol ki özüm özüme hayrān

didi dir. [Pes] bir dervīş düşünde bunuñ gibi bir hikāyet görmiş. Düşinden belinlemiş. Gözin açmış, görmüş ki Şamaķı şehrinde bir külhan bucaġında yatur, hemān bayaġı dervīşdür. Yir [ü] gök yirli yirinde. Pes gördi ki aġvāli bu kitāb içinde yazılmış ki zāyi‘ olmaya ve yazup dimiş ki:<sup>598</sup> “Ben bir dervīş gördüm. Şayıġladum, şayıġladuġum [daġı] yazdum. ‘Āriflere şoruñ, bu düşün ta‘bīrini ‘ārifler size (M 221a) eydivirsün ve her ne kim şayıġladum ‘āriflerden şorasız, bilesiz.”<sup>599</sup> (B 288b) V’allāhu a‘lem bi’ş-şavāb. Peyġamber cānına eş-şalāt. Kitāb-ı maġlata.<sup>600</sup>

---

<sup>593</sup> ‘aceb M : cānum B

<sup>594</sup> şūr ile M : şūr u ‘ışķ B

<sup>595</sup> bu kâderde B : -M

<sup>596</sup> küllī B : -M

<sup>597</sup> eydür ki B : bu iki beyti söyledi M

<sup>598</sup> aġvāli bu kitāb içinde yazılmış ki zāyi‘ olmaya vü yazup dimiş ki M : bu kitābı yazmış kitāb içinde yazmış ki B

<sup>599</sup> ‘ārifler size eydivirsün ve her ne kim şayıġladum ‘āriflerden şorasız bilesiz M : bu söz ne demek olur ‘ārifler ma‘nāsın söylerler B

<sup>600</sup> peyġamber cānına eş-şalāt kitāb-ı maġlata B : -M

## The Book of Prattle

*In the name of God, the Compassionate, the Merciful.*

The guide towards the good, the book of the *abdâl*, the notebook of the wayfarer, the secret of the gnostic, the imagination of the ignorant; this book is a tale of heartache and the language of birds, the light of lovers' gaze. *Our prayers for Muhammad.*

In his dream, a dervish found himself in an endless desert. He looked around attentively and saw a great path reaching out from it. There was no one around. He wanted to ask somebody about the state he was in but saw that he was all alone. He said to himself: "Well now, better to take the path than to get lost in the wild." The dervish took this great path and after walking for some time, he realized that it had no end. He said to himself: "I may as well call out; if there is someone around, he might hear me and inform me." Upon calling out, he once again became aware of his solitude. He reassured himself and decided to keep safe. Yet again he saw that the desert was limitless and that the path was endless. He had an outpour of emotion; he said:

The entire universe is nothing but body, yet the soul I have become

The body's soul and the soul's beloved I have become

( *M 165v*)

Whoever sees my form thinks I am man

In form the attribute of the All-Compassionate I have become

He composed a poem. The dervish realized that he was not in the least bit sure of himself. He wished there were someone whom he could ask about his state. Yet he saw no one; he was all alone. He turned upon himself and wondered if he was dreaming. Comprehending that it was certainly not so, he lost all hope. He contemplated himself and noticed that his head was out of the chimney and that his eyes were fixed on this desert. Immediately he pulled his head inside. He became aware that there was no desert and no path, that it was only his own self that he was seeing. Again, he composed a poem:

In all things I am the substance of reality

I am the attributes of the absolute essence, the ocean of wisdom

Me it is, no questions asked

There is no *I am God*, no Mansûr and no Baghdad

As he muttered to himself in this state, he saw that a master with a white beard, a rosary around his neck, and a prayer rug on his shoulder was coming his way. The master stopped his invocation and put down his rosary. The dervish thought to himself: "Thank God that he's here; now I can ask him for some information. He seems a little peculiar, but I can still find out what kind of a desert I'm in." The dervish walked forward to greet the sheikh. As soon as the sheikh saw the dervish, he said "*God gracious!*" The dervish said: "O sheikh! What happened to you that you are in so much fear?" The sheikh had a staff; he immediately drew it and made a move to attack the dervish. The dervish thought to himself: "Can he be Satan?" He swiftly drew his club and sprang ahead. When the sheikh saw the dervish coming towards him, he turned to escape. The dervish gained courage and said: "Do you think I will let you escape?" He ran after the sheikh and caught up. The sheikh saw that things were not looking good. He said:

- Don't kill me, and I shall give you my staff.

- I just want to ask you for information.

- I'm scared of you. Who are you? I am a wanderer of the earth and sky. I am a sheikh; I have many aspirants. Yet I have never seen someone like you. You scared me badly. Ask me what information you need.

- It's not impolite to ask? First of all, who are you?

- My tale is long. It's better if you just ask your question.

- This desert that I have reached, what kind of a place is this?

- That's what you want to know? This place is the prairie of alas! Prophet Solomon grew up here.

- O sheikh! You're Satan, aren't you?

- O beloved! Why do you ask about my state? I was a person in the court of (His) glorious presence. I had performed so many acts of service and worship. I became the devil for the entire world; Adam became the devil for me. This nickname was given to me.

When the dervish saw that it was indeed Satan, he said “May God help him” and let him go. He thanked God for escaping such misfortune and continued his way. After going for some time, he saw that a great tree had grown inside the desert. He thought: “Well now, here’s a place, a station.” When he approached, he saw that at the foot of this great tree a fountain was running. He wondered what kind of a place he had come to. He looked up and saw that the tree had five shoots on which a written tablet was hung. The dervish contemplated the tree. He spoke his heartache thus:

I am the marvelous body and form, the marvelous soul  
The rare treasure, the wondrous ruins

Once again a strange state has come over me  
I have acquired human form and yet hidden I remain

The dervish thanked God and sat down for a little while. He had been in a lot of pain and difficulty. He made himself comfortable and fell asleep. In his dream, he saw hundreds of thousands of Moses in every direction repeating the words “*My Lord! Show me!*” [2: 260, 7: 143]. When he looked for a second time, he saw that hundreds of thousands of Abraham, Moses, and Jesus were standing in wait all around. He suddenly woke up and realized that he had been dreaming. He said “*good Lord!*” and thought to himself: “If that was a dream sent to me by the All-Compassionate, may I see it again.” He went back to sleep.

The dervish saw that at the foot of the tree crowds had gathered. All the prophets were present, all standing in veneration. He said: “What a nice and honorable place I have reached!” He stood alert and paid attention to see what they were discussing. He saw that Muhammad Mustafâ was sitting in the position of chief. The prophets were asking him: “O Messenger of God! The big ones among these camels are called camels, yet they call young Turkish camels ‘*köşek*’<sup>1</sup>. Aren’t they also camels?” Muhammad Mustafâ said: “Yes they are, but they are called *köşek* because they are young.” The dervish immediately rose from his place and said: “O Messenger of God! I’m stuck inside this problem that I can’t seem to solve. What kind of a place

---

<sup>1</sup> Turkish word for ‘young camel’.

is this desert, and what kind of a valley is this valley?” The chief of the universe turned to look at him. When he saw a dervish with a shaved beard, he said “*O God All-Gracious who veils!*” The dervish said: “O Messenger! Why do you find me strange?” The chief of the world said: “O servant of God! What kind of a person are you?” The dervish had an outpour of emotion. He said:

I wonder why I hide inside this skin,  
Is it because I am the treasure of felicity in these ruins?

It is strange that those who see me find me strange  
As they do not know that I am the sultan in the wild

Again the dervish asked: “O Messenger of God! What place is this station?” The Messenger of God said: “This is the station of two bows’ length, and this tree is the genealogical tree of Islam. Those five shoots that you see are the five pillars of Islam.” Thereupon the dervish looked attentively and saw that sunlight fell on two of the shoots and did not fall on the other three. He woke up and saw that *in the house there is no one but us monks*,<sup>2</sup> that there was nothing but his own self. Once again he composed a poem:

I am the divine secret in the hearts  
All beings on all corners (of the world), from the moon to the fish

I am the beauty of all shapes and forms  
I am the cap of prosperity on all heads

He looked all around and became fully aware of his solitude. And yet he realized that the earth and sky had become secrets inside his own body. He heard the sound of all beings that existed in the earth and sky, and understood that the sound was coming from his own body. He became aware of himself. He thought: “I used to be inside this earth and sky, and now they appear inside

---

<sup>2</sup> Common saying of unknown origin; see İsmail Hakkı Bursevî, *Kitâb al-Anwâr*, quoted in Ömür Ceylan, *Tasavvufi Şiir Şerhleri* (Istanbul, Kitabevi, 2000), 72.



me. Can this be a dream?" He opened his eyes and saw that what he saw was the truth and not a dream. This time he said:

The entire universe is a shell, and I have become the pearl  
I have become the record book for the whole universe

With certainty all beings are found in me  
The close and the far, the few and the plenty I have become

Upon seeing the whole world inside his own existence, he became aware that the aim of the whole world was his own self. This time he entered the marketplace of the intellect. He observed with the intellect and saw that the sultan was Muhammad Mustafâ. He looked inside the marketplace of love and saw 'Alî as the sultan. He walked forward to present his state. 'Alî the King of Men saw the dervish and told him to look up. The dervish looked up and saw that all things were in their right places, in perfection. He contemplated and observed that everything was complete, that nothing was missing. He prostrated in thankfulness. He raised his head and saw that all things were attesting to the unity of God with chaste and eloquent words. With this desire the dervish got carried away. He said:

Thank God for becoming manifest  
Now the veil is removed, and the proof has appeared in plain sight

The sun has shown itself in my speck of light  
Look and see, this very instant in my drop of water the ocean has emerged

The dervish asked 'Alî the King of Men:

- This canopy that was made to cover us, where is its owner? I cannot see him.
- The owner of the canopy is inside it.
- O 'Alî! I can't see!

- Brother, the one who moves about and does tricks inside these existing forms is its owner.

When the dervish heard these words, he became happy. He said:

Thank God today I saw the sultan  
With no veil, inside the body I saw the soul

I was a speck of light, beside myself I attained the sun  
It destroyed my drop of water; I saw the ocean

Upon saying this he quickly moved forward and kissed the hand of ‘Alî the King of Men. He said: “O ‘Alî! I want to be your aspirant. I don’t have any knowledge of principles and customs. I want to learn them from you.” For a while the dervish stayed in the service of the King of Men. One day he asked: “O ‘Alî! Before me this body didn’t exist; I was soul. At that time, I dreamt that this whole universe was my shadow. What is the interpretation of this dream?” As soon as the dervish said these words, ‘Alî the King of Men hid inside his heart. The dervish looked all around and saw no one. His own self was all there was. He said:

See what was destined to me in preeternity  
The whole universe became a secret in my existence

All tongues spoke the secret of *I am God*  
Reality became manifest in all things

He was stupefied by his own suffering. After many cycles of time, one day the dervish dreamt that he was in the times of Prophet Solomon. Prophet Solomon was holding council. The dervish saw that underneath the eyelashes of Solomon, it was ‘Alî who was looking out. He immediately knew what this meant and begged for mercy. He said to ‘Alî the King of Men: “I had been waiting in impatience for so long. Now that I am in your presence, I have so many wishes to realize.” ‘Alî the King of Men made a sign for the dervish to remain silent and said: “Don’t say

anything. I've come (to earth) with Prophet Solomon. He thinks that I am his own self. Remain silent so that he doesn't feel hurt." Thereupon the dervish remained silent and began waiting for the right moment. One day he found 'Alî the King of Men all by himself. He said: "O 'Alî! I asked Prophet Joseph whether it was true that he had fallen in a well. He said: 'Yes, that which they called a well was this body. It was when I succeeded to get out of that well that I became the sultan of Egypt.' Is that right?" 'Alî the King of Men told the dervish to look up. The dervish looked up and saw that a hundred and twenty-four thousand prophets as well as all saints were present. They were all in admiration of 'Alî. He saw Muhammad Mustafâ; the earth and sky were illuminated with his light. He was leading all the prophets to the court of God. The dervish thought to himself: "Why don't I go with them; maybe they will arrive at a banquet." He followed them and saw that they arrived at the court of God. Muhammad Mustafâ walked forward and said: "O God Almighty! All these creatures that you have created, judge them with compassion." God *—may He be exalted—* said: "O Muhammad! Wish for what is of direct concern for you. Each prophet has his own dealing with me." Upon seeing this state of theirs, the dervish immediately walked ahead and said: "O God and Divine Master! Take a look at this poor man." At this blessed moment the dervish suddenly woke up. Upon realizing that he had been dreaming, he said "*good Lord!*" and went back to sleep.

(In his dream) the dervish saw that Prophet Jonas was out of his retreat of suffering and all prophets were assembled at a banquet. He thought to himself: "What a pleasant place I have reached!" He stood up immediately and took his bowl in his hand to start begging. All of a sudden Satan showed up. The dervish saw him and said: "O Sheikh of evil fortune! It's you again!" Once more Satan drew his staff in an instant and sprang ahead to attack the dervish. Seeing that Satan was coming towards him, the dervish drew his club right away and also leaped ahead. Inside the council the two came face to face. The prophets were discussing shoulder to shoulder, saying: "Satan will now kill this poor dervish, we must not let him!" The dervish put down his shepherd's cloak. He grabbed hold of Satan and kept him from moving. He emerged victorious from the battlefield. Thereafter the prophets spoke words of admiration for the dervish. Satan gave a cry. The dervish let go of Satan, went to put on his cloak and sat down. Muhammad Mustafâ told the dervish that he fought well. The dervish said: "O Messenger of God! I have no one. I am poverty-stricken and hungry." Immediately the dervish was brought something to eat.

As he was eating, he woke up. Realizing that he had been dreaming, he composed a poem. He said:

I have become the sultan for the whole world  
I have become the mine for the jewel of felicity

Though human form I have assumed  
In all hearts, I am the all-surrounding ocean

At that moment, the dervish once again became aware that there was nothing but his own self; *in the house there is no one but us monks*. The spiritual companionship he witnessed touched his soul. He thought: "I was part of such a pleasant spiritual gathering; where is it now?" At that moment sleep took hold of him; he dreamt that he was at the same gathering, which had remained in its exact place. The dervish asked 'Alî the King of Men: "O 'Alî! That man who fought with me, where is he?" As soon as he said these words, Satan appeared. Upon seeing this, the dervish told 'Alî that this time he wanted to be alone with the sheikh. The sheikh saw that the dervish's attitude was not favorable and lamented his misfortune. The dervish put down his shepherd's cloak, sprang ahead and once again grabbed Satan. In turn Satan grabbed the dervish, and they held each other tightly. Turmoil arose; everybody looked attentively. The dervish beat Satan in the blink of an eye, and again all prophets expressed their admiration. Satan escaped to the side; he said: "I will get my hands on you when you are alone!" The dervish put his shepherd's cloak back on and sat down. Again he asked 'Alî the King of Men: "O 'Alî! How come this sheikh fought with me so badly?" The King of Men told him: "Dervish, be attentive, don't stay ignorant of this sheikh." The dervish turned to himself. He said:

Thank God my journey has reached the beloved  
The heart and the soul have united with the captor of hearts

I have attained union; separation has ended  
The thorns have given way; I have reached the rose garden

In the meanwhile, the table was set for the feast. The dervish looked for a convenient place to sit. He noticed that all things were visibly manifest; he saw with clarity everything that existed in all six directions. From deep down inside the earth to the Pleiades all had become apparent. The dervish saw paradise and asked ‘Alî what kind of a place it was. When ‘Alî told him, he contemplated it in its entirety. All of a sudden he saw hell, a place of admonition. He looked underneath the earth, contemplated the earth’s surface, the steer, the fish, and the sea. He looked up, saw the throne and the spheres of the skies and contemplated them. He looked at the constellations of the Zodiac, saw them laid out and ornamented. He contemplated the roots of all things. His heart became light with happiness. He said:

Thank God that now my soul is nothing but light  
Inside and out I am illuminated by divine light

My prosperity is awake from the sleep of ignorance  
My existence has become one with the One

Suddenly the dervish saw that all beings which existed in earth and sky said with clarity and eloquence:

Thank God that God is present in all  
He is the light of worship visible in all things

All that exists is the light of theophany  
All have found profit in this trade

The dervish realized that the entire universe had become one heart and was speaking unity. All was gorged with light, and in the middle of everything a lamp-wick was burning. The dervish had an outpour of emotion and said:

Thank God that my body turned to soul  
The sun hid itself inside my speck of light

The soul and the heart are filled with God to the brim  
They have become mines to the gem of felicity

The dervish woke up and saw that *in the house there is no one but us monks*. Again he composed a poem. He said:

O Lord! Is this a dream or my own imagination?  
My image has no equal and no likeness

I express myself, and it is myself I hear  
Who else is there, to whom can I tell my state?

The dervish contemplated these moral lessons and became stupefied. All of a sudden he saw Prophet Jesus approach him. He thought: “O Lord! What a nice and beautiful, lovable person!” He walked ahead and saluted Jesus. Prophet Jesus asked the dervish: “What is it that you are looking for here?”. When the dervish replied that he was enquiring about the nature of the place he was in, Prophet Jesus said: “You are referring to this caravanserai? Many have lodged here and moved on. Look, here is a caravan approaching.” The dervish saw that Pharaoh was coming towards them and had taken Satan as his master. He didn’t say a word. The caravan halted. Tents were installed and lodgings were prepared; council was set up. Suddenly Pharaoh’s men saw two dervishes sitting down. When they informed him, Pharaoh told his men to go and summon the dervishes. When these two stood up to approach, Jesus said to the dervish: “You don’t speak; let me do the talking.” The dervish replied: “Why would I? Let the washer of the dead see their faces!” When they approached and saluted, Satan recognized Jesus but could not recognize the dervish. The dervish knew Satan but said nothing. Referring to Jesus, Satan told Pharaoh: “This person claims that there is another God. It’s good that we found him; now we can give him the punishment he deserves!” The dervish continued to observe. Pharaoh asked Prophet Jesus: “Are you the one that says God exists?” When Prophet Jesus replied in the affirmative, Pharaoh continued to ask: “Have you seen Him/Her or do you say this by way of reasoning?” Then Satan said to Prophet Jesus: “You have led the entire world astray with your witchcraft; now you want

to corrupt Pharaoh as well?" The dervish asked Prophet Jesus if he recognized the man speaking. Jesus said: "Of course I know him! He's Satan!" The dervish said: "Well then, be ready." Pharaoh asked Satan: "Do you know this person? Have you seen him anywhere else? Satan replied: "Yes, I do. He's a witch. Be vigilant of him." This time the dervish rose from his place. He said: "O sheikh of evil fortune! Haven't you let go of your debauchery?" Satan gained fervor, rose up and once again sprang at the dervish. The dervish put down his shepherd's cloak and grabbed hold of Satan. He said:

O God, the Divine Truth who knows the secrets of all  
Take a look at me, see my state

Saying that he is a witch and has debauched the people from their path  
This insolent (devil) is defaming Prophet Jesus

The dervish held Satan tight and overpowered him instantly. Satan had a sack and a staff; the dervish took them away by force. Satan realized that this was the same dervish from before; he made an attempt to escape. When Pharaoh saw his master running away, he ordered his men to take hold of the dervish. The dervish instantly took out his slingshot and with its stones trounced Pharaoh's army. The soldiers scattered in all directions. He then took hold of Pharaoh, took away his cap along with Satan's staff and sack. He sat down. Prophet Jesus commended the dervish, saying: "May my soul be sacrificed for you!" The dervish turned Satan's bag upside down and saw that all his tricks and witchcraft were inside. Thereupon the two of them became liberated of all care and sat down. Pharaoh's soldiers rose one by one. Satan went to the Pharaoh and said: "Come on, show kindness, maybe you can take back my sack." They sent a messenger and asked for the sack, the cap, and the staff. Prophet Jesus said to the dervish: "Give back the sack and their other garments, so that we can be free of fighting and get going." The dervish told him to be patient for a little bit. In the meanwhile Pharaoh was embarrassed, because his head was bald. Satan in turn gave a shameful look to get his sack back. They remained quiet for a while but then once again stirred up trouble. The dervish told Prophet Jesus once more to be ready. Again the dervish drew his club, walked ahead and routed them. He grabbed hold of Satan, but Pharaoh escaped. The dervish hung Satan upside down from one foot. He said: "O damned creature! How

long will you continue your mischief?” Satan kissed the hand of Prophet Jesus and said: “Show your grace; save me from this person!” Prophet Jesus told the dervish to keep Satan’s sack and let him go. The dervish said: “O Jesus! This is Satan! We’ve done well by catching him. Be kind, but don’t show pity!” Jesus said: “How did Satan know that I am Jesus?” The dervish said:

Thank God that God has become my beloved  
These secrets have been found inside my soul

I am free of all thought and image  
Whether disbelief or religion, rosary or the belt of infidelity

At that instant Satan began to weep, saying: “My livelihood depends on that sack, please give it back to me!” Jesus told the dervish: “Give him his sack; let him look inside.” Upon the order of Prophet Jesus, the dervish gave the sack back to Satan. Satan emptied it out and counted his materials. He saw that nothing was missing, that all was exactly as before.

In this state the dervish woke up and realized that he had been dreaming. There was no one but his own self. This time he said:

O God! Am I that trickster, that impudent rogue?  
These secrets were discovered inside my soul

Today inside the whole world  
I am the object of the hermitage, the purpose of the belt of infidelity

He prostrated in thankfulness. When he raised his head, he saw that the day had dawned and the sun was up. Light and dark, day and light, distant and nearby were all united. All things were repeating with peace and delight: “*There is no god but God.*” When the dervish saw this point of wisdom, he turned to himself and remained in reflection for some time. Then he went back to sleep. He dreamt that all creatures of the universe had gathered in one place and were roaming in one desert. They were asking one another: “This court and this canopy that are held in place, where might their possessor be?” The dervish quickly approached them. When he saw them, they



saw him too. They took the dervish with them, came to a pleasant place, and sat down. They asked the dervish: “Have you ever come to this (abode made of) carpet and canopy?” The dervish replied: “Yes, a person named Prophet Adam came to this universe and stayed here for a while. All men (*ādemler*) who exist now are descended from him.” The creatures said: “O Lord! Have they seen who it is that set up this canopy?” At that moment, they saw Prophet Adam arriving. The dervish said: “Here he is; this is Prophet Adam.” The creatures approached Prophet Adam and greeted him. They kissed his hand and asked him where the possessor of the canopy could be found. Prophet Adam said: “By God, when we came, we saw it the way it is now.” This time the dervish said:

O Lord! This secret that is hidden in my heart,  
All its divine orders flow in my body.

That is to say, my mind and intellect have attained this  
This is the soul, the soul of the entire universe.

When the dervish spoke these words, Prophet Adam asked the creatures who he was. They responded that it was the first time they had seen him. So Adam asked the dervish: “O brother, who are you?” The dervish replied: “I am a traveler. The first time I came to this place I came with you.” Adam said: “I don’t know you.” The dervish replied: “I was with you in your own existence.” One after another he showed signs. One by one he told the tales of the things that happened to Adam and the states that came upon the sons of Adam after him. Adam said to the dervish: “I heard Nimrod wants to throw Prophet Abraham in the fire. Let us go there together.” The dervish said “with pleasure,” stood up and went with him. After walking for a while, they saw a gathered crowd; a council was being held. They approached and found an empty spot to sit. They saw Nimrod standing, telling his people to bring wood and start preparations. The dervish saw that Satan had become Nimrod’s own existence, that Nimrod was doing whatever Satan was ordering him. The dervish asked Adam: “That one’s Nimrod; how about the man with the white beard? Do you know who he is?” Adam said that he did not know. The dervish said: “It’s Satan. Why don’t you recognize him?” In the meanwhile, Nimrod saw them and asked Satan who they were. Satan looked and saw Adam; he said to Nimrod: “Brother, this is my enemy.” When

Nimrod asked who he was, Satan said: "This is the man because of whom so much misfortune has come my way. But it's good that we found him; we can give him the punishment he deserves." Nimrod told his people to summon Adam and the dervish. When told that the master was asking for them, Adam and the dervish stood up and approached. Nimrod told them to sit down and they sat. He then asked Satan which one of the two was his enemy. Satan showed Adam but did not recognize the dervish. As they continued to sit, the fire was lit, the catapult was set up, all the preparations were complete. Prophet Abraham was brought. Satan said to Prophet Abraham: "You say that God exists. Abandon these blasphemous words, and we will let you go." The dervish lost his patience; he stood up and asked: "What blasphemy has he spoken?" Satan said: "He doesn't consider Nimrod fit for being God. He says there is another God." The dervish said: "You say this Nimrod is God? I know when he was born. He is the son of a fire worshipper in the land of Khorasan. When did he become God?" Satan became angry at these words; he said: "Don't let him talk. It is impossible to beat him with words. Throw him in the fire immediately; let them burn." Nimrod said: "First throw the son of Âzar, so my heart may be relieved." They took hold of Abraham to attach him to the catapult. Prophet Adam said: "Dervish, get up, we may as well go." Satan said: "First throw that bald and beardless one." The people grabbed Adam to throw him in the fire. The dervish rose from his place; he said:

O God! You are the protection and shelter of all

You are the king of the entire universe

Bestow your grace upon those who acknowledge your divinity

It suits you to rescue, you are God

The dervish recollected God. He asked the prophets and saints for assistance. He took off his shepherd's cloak and put on God's grace. Satan saw that this was the same dervish who had taken his sack. He said to Nimrod: "Why are you waiting by yourself? Help me!" Instantly the dervish grabbed hold of Satan and tied his hands with the rope of unity. He took hold of Nimrod and brought him next to Satan. When Nimrod's soldiers saw this, they all ran away. Now the hundred and twenty-four thousand prophets and all the saints as well as all created beings which existed on land and sea, in the seven spheres of the sky and the seven layers of the earth became present;

they all made laudatory remarks to the dervish and told him: “Nimrod is not guilty; Satan is the one who commits all of these acts.” They put Satan in the middle with the intent of torturing him. Satan began to weep and promised that if released, he would no longer commit acts of pride. Diocletian approached and said: “This is an old man; pardon him this time.” The dervish rose from his place and said: “Everybody should mind his own business. Don’t you know what he did to so many pious people from the times of Adam to our day?” In this state of things Prophet Abraham said: “O Messenger of God! What do you say regarding Nimrod?” Muhammad Mustafâ said: “Do what the dervish says.” The dervish said: “Give Satan to me. I have business with him.” When they gave Satan to him, the dervish took Satan and came to a retired spot. He tied up Satan’s hands and feet, drew his club, and said: “Now will you repent and promise that you will end your diabolical acts?” Satan gave a cry and all the prophets came to the sound of it; they asked the dervish to be patient for some time longer. In the meanwhile, they saw that Satan’s aspirants; Pharaoh, Diocletian, Shaddâd, and Nimrod showed up. Satan’s aspirants asked the dervish: “Come on dervish, sell us this sheikh. We shall give you a full gunnysack and a paddle.” The dervish said: “O dear beloved who speaks words of good fortune! Bring them along!” Nimrod said: “Release us; let us go back to our place. We have completed our service as desired.” The dervish said:

O Lord! Am I that captivator of hearts, that tricky vagabond?

Am I all of existence, the few and the plenty?

It is I who speak inside this heart

Am I the shell or the pearl?

Because the dervish spoke these words, Satan’s aspirants looked around and said: “This dervish is free of all his concerns about us; what can we do?” At that instant, the dervish woke up. He saw that there was nobody around, that these attributes which were Satan, Nimrod, and Pharaoh were in fact nothing but ambition, desire, and other cares which existed inside his own body. He stood up and looked around; he saw that there was nothing but his own self. He recollected God’s unity. He poured into words his true inner suffering. He said:

O Lord! Am I the beloved inside this body?  
Or that so and so among all people?

For sure it is me, no questions asked  
The skillful hand inside this esplanade

The dervish rose from his place and set out to travel. After a while he reached Baghdad. He saw that Baghdad was a pleasant city, with a large river going across, home to many rulers and scholars. He walked around looking for someone to interpret his dream. He saw that mad Bahlûl was approaching and walked ahead to greet him. Together they went and sat at a retired spot. The dervish began to tell his story; one by one he told everything that had happened to him. Mad Bahlûl had an outpour of emotion and told this story:

I had a dream. In my dream the entire world was prostrating with their bodies facing towards me. I looked to my right and saw Prophet Moses. I greeted him and asked: “Where were you when the lands of this sultan were put together?” Prophet Moses said: “In the Torah which was brought to me, God –*glorified and exalted be He*– says: ‘I have created all. I am the beauty and splendor inside these forms. Who else can there be?’” I woke up and realized that I had been dreaming.

At that instant, the dervish became aware that Bahlûl was speaking the language of birds. He said:

In preeternity this body did not exist, I was soul  
I was not a servant, at that moment I was the sultan

In the flower garden of the soul when my body did not exist  
I was the rose garden of the laughing rose

Bahlûl was pleased by these words; he hugged the dervish and went inside his collar. The dervish woke up and saw that there was neither Baghdad, nor any other city –nothing but his own self.

He became stupefied. He sat in contemplation, recollected the stories he had witnessed. At that moment he fell asleep. He dreamt that the whole universe had become one tongue and was speaking the unity of God. All beings in the earth and sky were clearly manifest. All things spoke with eloquence and precision: “*There is no god but God; Muhammad is God’s Messenger, ‘Alī is God’s Friend.*” The dervish’s gaze revealed to him hidden moral lessons. He noticed that all corners of the universe were visible.

The dervish saw a crowded assembly that had gathered. When he approached, he perceived that what people called ‘God’ was actually a divine light. All of a sudden the light began to radiate. All beings awoke. Each one thanked God’s unity in its own tongue. The dervish realized that it was the day of judgement, the day of weighing and questioning. Muhammad Mustafā was conspicuous, brightly shining in the middle of all, like the sun and the moon. All created beings were facing that light, saying to one another: “Bravo to our kind sultan! He did not shame anyone by telling his fault to his face. He gave everyone what he wished for.” Suddenly the dervish saw that light the theophany of which showed their paths to all beings in the earth and sky. Having seen its path, each being had completed its affairs and was preoccupied with its own state, its heart content. All beings were in great pleasure and delight with their own kind. In this state the dervish saw that the judgement was complete, the sins of all were pardoned.

God’s elect were gathered in one place, discussing beneath the Tûbâ tree. The dervish reached them and saw the state they were in. He greeted the assembly and sat in an empty spot. He began to observe. All of a sudden he saw that Satan had changed his disguise and was among them. The dervish recognized him but remained silent. Satan was going up and down, busy with service. Nobody was aware of who he was. He had concealed his identity in the guise of an ascetic. He spoke sweetly, slowly attended to the crowd, paid servitude to everyone, told stories of things past and present, and acted like a boon-companion. Everyone was thinking of him as a nice person. When the dervish saw this, he had an unveiling. While in this state, he was told: “Dervish, come here and take some religious sacrifice. The steer and the fish that used to carry the earth are slaughtered. God –*glorified and exalted be He-* gave them as an offering to the dervishes.” The dervish rose from his place to go and see. Prophet Moses told him: “Take the offering and come here, so we can have a spiritual gathering.” Satan said: “What can you possibly expect of them!” The dervish did not mind his words. He reached the approaching dervishes and saw that they had loaded the fish on the steer. When he greeted them, they asked

him if there was a spiritual gathering anywhere. He said yes and led the way to the assembly. God's elect saw the dervishes arrive. They replied to the greetings of the dervishes with a warm welcome and said that they had brought good luck. The dervishes took their places; the food was cooked and served. Everyone was asked to tell a story. Satan was moving around with ease, feigning a heart rush, telling stories, chanting ghazals. Everybody else was busy conversing. The dervish stood up and said:

In preeternity I was the beloved, I yielded myself to the soul  
My soul wore body and I came to the esplanade

To travel this universe, the lands of God,  
I, a gnostic, have yielded myself to the human form

When the dervish said these words, Satan looked at the dervish and wondered if he had seen him before. The dervish said: "I know a tale; can I relate it?" Everyone told him to go ahead. The dervish composed a story. He said: "At the time when the universe didn't exist, God –*glorified and exalted be He*– existed. He wished to create the whole universe. First he created the soul of Muhammad Mustafâ. From Muhammad Mustafâ's soul he brought the entire universe into being. All beings in the earth and sky became whole and complete. From that time to our day all beings were occupied with their own states." The dervish continued to tell the story of everything that happened past and present. He came to the tale of Adam and told all of his stories. While listening, Satan realized that this was the same dervish who had taken his staff, cap, and sack. He gave a cry, saying: "Is there no way for me to escape this dervish?" He stood up and rushed to attack the dervish. When the dervish saw Satan coming towards him, he also stood up and said:

Again the day of the feast has arrived for us  
The day of my soul's intimate companionship with the sultan

Again the hand of opportunity has touched union  
The day when lovers are bewildered with love

The dervish grabbed hold of Satan and knocked him down. He tied up his hands and feet and sat down. He said:

In preeternity I was soul, why did I become body?  
Why was I hidden inside this body?

I am that secret which is unique in the universe  
I wonder, why have I acquired human form?

Thereupon all members of the assembly said: “Dervish, you’ve tied up the hands and feet of that poor man. What is his sin? At least let him know.” The dervish said: “When we used to exist in the universe, when the land and sky also existed and the sun and the moon used to rise and set, at that time didn’t people use to talk about God, prophets, the world and afterlife, the All-Compassionate and Satan? Well now, this is that same Satan.” Everyone said: “You’re right, we used to hear about him but we had never seen him. For God’s sake, untie his hands and feet so that we can ask him some questions.” Hence the dervish untied the rope and Satan began to speak. He said: “Look at the state I’m in; look at what has happened to me, what times I have witnessed! Saints and prophets were bewildered because of me, yet now I have become bound and powerless in the hands of this insignificant person. For the sake of God, look at what he is doing to me!” At that instant the dervish woke up. He saw that *in the house there is no one but us monks*; there was nobody around. He spoke the following words:

I wonder why my path has led to the desert  
From this dark passion my head has fallen in darkness

In preeternity, in “*we have apportioned*” [43:32], the lot fallen to me  
Has been to share the sultan’s shadow

At that moment, he saw that the whole world was announcing a joyful event. The sun was up; all things in the earth and sky had assumed the form of one body and one head, and were saying with eloquence and precision:

On all corners the universe is filled with the light of felicity  
All is one, there is no separation and no union

All you look at is the eye of perfection  
There is no attribute, in reality all is essence

Thereafter once again sleep began to weigh on him. In his sleep the dervish saw that the whole universe was a palace in the middle of which an ancient and stationary mirror was standing. All existing things were drawn on the walls, corners, and center of this palace and appeared in this mirror. The dervish began to contemplate. Suddenly he saw the image of his own form in the mirror. He became stupefied and said:

In the universe I have become my own purpose  
My trace has manifested itself in the untraceable

I am the word; all tongues speak me and only me  
I am the treasure of felicity in all ruins

As he continued to mutter in such a state, the dervish saw that Prophet Solomon had boarded a ship to sail to the land of eternity. He was caught in a sea storm and his boat was damaged. Solomon was driven ashore. Solomon's state and path also reached this palace. The dervish saw Solomon arriving. They met and sat down together. Prophet Solomon thanked God, saying: "How lucky am I to have met my brother once again!". While they were in this state they saw that in this palace there was a nobly furnished stopping place. In it was a stream, a garden for birds, orchards, rosaries, and other gardens, all decorated and spread all around. Prophet Solomon said: "What a charming place! Come on, let us go there and sit for a moment." Thereupon they reached the stopping place and sat together for a while. It turned out that this station was a place of spiritual gathering. Many people showed up; they came and saw that two people were sitting there. They greeted Solomon and the dervish and their greetings were returned. They sat down next to the two of them. After an hour or so had passed, they saw that there was something



strange about these two men. They asked Solomon and the dervish who they were and where they had come from. Prophet Solomon began to tell his story: “I am the son of Prophet David. After my father died, I became the emperor and ruled for some time in the world.” He explained that giants and fairies were under his command, that he ruled over all beings with justice and munificence, that he obtained his wish in this world. He said that later he became bewildered in the hands of fate. The people at the gathering were deeply astonished. They said: “Now we know you, but what about your companion? Where is he from?” Prophet Solomon said that he had also just met the dervish. The dervish remained silent. The people asked him: “Beloved friend, what is your state? Let us know.” The dervish composed a poem. He said:

O God! Where am I? What kind of a state is this?  
What is intended for me; what is this image?

The universe is present in my body  
See my state, again an example for all

The dervish awoke from his dream. Upon realizing that he had been dreaming, he recollected God and went back to sleep. He dreamt that he was back at the same assembly. He asked: “Dear friends, what place is this and who are you?” One of the people came out and said: “Dervish, these are the elect of God. All prophets and saints of the past and present are here.” After this the dervish came to his senses. He said to himself: “What a beautiful and charming assembly I have come to!” His heart was filled with joy and he began to relate and disclose in detail the stories of the things that happened to him. He said:

I had a guise. His name was Adam. I came to this universe with that guise. At that time nobody else existed. I did not want to spend time on my own and called upon God, saying: ‘What a large place this is! I wish I had a friend or companion.’ God –*glorified and exalted be He-* gave me a companion. I stayed in this palace for some time. I had sons and daughters. In the end my garb grew old. The king had given it to me as a robe of honor. Again I appeared before Him. My household remained here. I had no name then. I stayed in the presence of the sultan for some time. When I awoke, I saw that God –

*glorified and exalted be He-* had given me a robe that resembled that same robe of honor. I prostrated in thankfulness. When I lifted my head, I heard a voice telling me to go back to that palace. Upon God's order, I came to this palace and saw that my household had grown, that all was put in order. I approached and greeted them, told them my state. They did not recognize me. One by one I gave them signs of the states and conditions of the past. They said: 'The signs you give are true, but we've never seen you'. My arrival had taken place during the time of Prophet Solomon. I appeared before him and explained to him my state. There he is, sitting among you. Ask him if I'm right.

When the dervish said this, they all asked who Solomon was. The dervish showed his companion. Prophet Solomon said: "My soul is in these signs that he is giving; all of you must know that. But is there any way you can understand what the dervish says?" Everyone agreed that they did not know. The dervish had an outpour of emotion. He said:

What kind of an existence do I have in this universe, I wonder

I have no interest in either profit or loss

I live either manifest or hidden

This is what my state has been at all times

Then the dervish awoke and saw that the day had dawned. The whole universe was filled with light on all corners; far and nearby, night and day all appeared the same. The dervish recollected God and prostrated. As he was in prostration, he went back to sleep. With the same ardor he had felt upon seeing the universe, he saw himself traveling in Holy Jerusalem. It was the day of judgement. All beings were standing row by row; the scale was set up; all other signs were in place. When the dervish saw this state of things, instantly he composed a poem. He said:

Since I have abandoned my body I have become soul

The reality of the universe in its entirety

All that exist in the universe, the exoteric and the esoteric

I have become the one who makes the earth revolve

Before the dervish finished his words, he saw that all created beings and the unique Creator had come together in one place. The dervish looked for a convenient spot and sat down. He continued to observe until each one had finished its affair. All creatures were going along in groups with their own kind. Then at one moment a person came out from amongst all the creatures and walked ahead to greet His glorious presence. He said: “O kind Master! What do you command us?” The dervish awoke from his dream. Upon realizing that he had been dreaming, he recited a poem. He said:

I am the body, in totality I am the soul  
I am its possessor, the esplanade belongs to me

The exoteric and the esoteric, all that has been given shape  
The story, the fable, and the legend are mine

Once again sleep began to weigh on the dervish. He dreamt that he was back at the same assembly. All beings were once again gathered together. A person came out from amongst all of these creatures. His name was Muhammad Mustafâ. He was wearing a worn out patched cloak. All the designs and images that exist, all the forms which appear in the exoteric and the esoteric realms were colorful patches of this old cloak. There was no one else; *in the house there is no one but us monks*. When the dervish saw this state, he turned his contemplation to his own self. He said: “O beloved, there was a time when the earth and the sky existed. Beings and forms and images were manifest. The *mollâ* from among us used to call everything with a different name. O brother, apparently all of that was Muhammad Mustafâ. What a strange thing this is!” With ardor the dervish poured out his heart. He said:

I am the foundation on which rest all different states  
The manufactory belongs to me, I am the master

Inside my form the essence and the attributes have become secrets

I am the essence for all forms

At that moment, the dervish awoke and saw that there was nothing but his own self. He thought: "I wonder what that image was that I dreamt." As he continued to wonder, sleep began to weigh upon him. He dreamt that four people brought an object and put it down. The dervish paid close attention and saw that all that existed in the earth and sky, the world and the afterlife, the throne of God and the face of the earth as well as everything that surrounded them was brought and set down. The four people began to discuss among themselves, saying: "Let us open it and one by one set the objects in their right places so we can adorn and ornament this place. The king is about to arrive." The dervish continued to observe them. They opened the object and first put the wind in its place. Second they put the sea, and then the fish and the steer. Afterwards they adorned the ground with the seven layers of the earth and the nine spheres, and lastly the Most Glorious Throne. When everything was in place, the dervish had an outburst of emotion. He said:

Bravo to this opportunity, today I have seen the sultan  
The veil of the body has opened, I have seen the soul

Having abandoned the calamity of duality  
My jewel was one, I have seen that mine

Suddenly he saw a figure with forty heads, seven hands, three eyes, and one body. When the dervish saw it approach, he thought: "How well have I done by reaching this assembly!" He rose from his place and greeted the figure. The figure saw that it was a dervish who had suffered deeply, who had knowledge of all of his states. It said: "Dervish, were you here before, or did you stop here while traveling?" The dervish had an outburst of emotion and he recited this poem:

Bravo to me that I have reached time indefinite  
With a ball and a hooked stick I have reached the esplanade

This was my desire, its object was found  
O brother! See what a charming sultan I have reached!

After this the dervish saw the army arrive. The right and the left, the front, the back, and center of the army all took their proper places. The throne was set up and the king sat down. Everybody was occupied with his/her own state. The public criers shouted out: “O servants of God! The land is one; the sultan is one! All that came into existence did so by wearing the one who brought them into existence. The state is to be found inside the image. Those who know the image know the state.” When the dervish saw this state of things, he came to the front and recited this poem:

Bravo to this opportunity, today I have seen the sultan  
Thereby I have seen the movement of the skies

As I was contemplating the domains of my body  
Inside I saw the holder of the council of state

The king heard the dervish’s words and told his people to go and summon the dervish. The dervish approached and greeted the king. He stood ready for service. Upon a closer look the dervish saw that it was ‘Alî the lion of God who sat in the king’s throne. He immediately kissed his hand and held his skirt, began to entreat him with the wish to present his state. Suddenly he woke up and saw that he was holding the skirt of his own cloak, that he was all alone, that *in the house there is no one but us monks*. The dervish had an outpour of emotion. He said:

I wonder what my state is, what am I?  
There is no one else, I am all alone

I have become concealed in all shapes and forms  
I am the imagination and dark passion in all heads

Right away he stood up and looked around. He thought: “What a beautiful place, what a pleasant assembly I was at! And now I realize that it was nothing but the reflection of my own existence. How is that so?” As he continued to mutter in this fancy, the dervish felt sleepy. In his sleep, he

dreamt that the same assembly had gathered, that preparations were complete and all was perfect. Upon seeing this state of things, the dervish was filled with mirth. He said:

The whole world is an image in my existence  
Within this idea the entire universe is like a single dot

Since the drop of my existence fell inside the ocean  
I have looked again, and it remains age-old and perfect

At that instant, the dervish saw large groups of people appear. They sat down, each with its own kind. The dervish realized that these were groups of sheikhs, of ascetics, worshippers, and prophets. Each of them greeted the king with his/her own group and stepped aside. As the dervish continued to observe, ‘Alî the King of Men said: “O servants of God! Look this way!” When the dervish looked with all the others, he saw that from the face of the earth all the way to the Lotus-tree in the seventh heaven all was visible. Everything that existed in between became illuminated and manifest. The dervish had an outburst of emotion; he said:

What state is this? All of existence I have become  
The whole world is body; the soul I have become

The ocean fit into the drop that is my body  
In such a state concealed I have become

When the dervish said these words, everyone turned and looked at him. Somebody asked who was speaking. When the others showed him the dervish, he said: “Don’t speak! Respect the king!” The dervish saw that this was a huge man who belonged to the group of ascetics. He had found a beautiful disguise among them and was speaking very quickly. The dervish felt the urge to speak. He said:

All design and image is nothing but my shadow  
The cash of all is my capital

I am the beauty of all shapes and forms

You're a man, o brother, see this, that a man is a man

The huge man became angry at these words. He drew his staff and sprang at the dervish. When the dervish saw him coming, he stood up and prepared himself. They grabbed one another. Immediately the dervish took the man down and took his bowl from him. 'Alî the King of Men was carefully observing them and all the other creatures were looking on. The man gave a cry: "What a calamity! He publicly disgraced me. Get justice for me!" Again somebody came out of the group; he said: "That poor man has no sin; why did you act this way?" and walked away. The dervish said: "Dear friends, I have a question for you. I would like to ask, if you would allow me." After he was given permission, he said: "Its head is a knob; its body is a fork; it has four walls and six doors; the reflections of all creatures are manifest inside it. What is this?" One person said that it was the stork; another said that it might be the shadow of a minaret, no pun intended. In the meanwhile, the man whose bowl he had taken reappeared. He was furious and flung himself at the dervish in a rage. Again he grabbed hold of the dervish. When the dervish saw that such was the state, he had an outpour of emotion and recited these two couplets:

I am the beauty and grace on all faces

The thoughts and fancies of the intelligent

I am the reality of all existence

The essence and the attribute, the right and the left

The dervish held the man firmly and threw him down inside the battlefield. The veil of the man's mischief was tied to his face; when it came off the dervish realized that it was Satan. All members of the assembly were watching carefully. 'Alî the King of Men then summoned the dervish. The dervish approached immediately and kissed the king's hand. At that instant Satan rose from his place and collected his broken tools. Everyone became aware that this was Satan. They made thousands of laudatory remarks to the dervish. Satan became annoyed; he stood up

and left the gathering. The dervish awoke and saw that the stories he had witnessed were nothing but the shadow of his own shepherd's cloak. There was no one else. He composed a poem:

I am the aim of all devotees of certainty  
Of all that exists, the noble and the humble

I am the one who gives the black stone its low quality  
The one who grants value to the pearl

After this the dervish gathered his wits and became aware that his body was in truth a universe. All objects visible in the form of the universe were actually reflections of his own body. When he used to exist in this universe, he used to go into great trouble to pass each desert and go over each mountain. Yet now he realized that all of that was his own body. He stood up with the intention of looking around, but suddenly he felt sleepy. He dreamt that the earth and sky as well as all created beings inside them were the shadow of his own body. He marveled at this vision and was filled with mirth. He recited these two couplets:

Inside me the reality of the universe is found  
Inside me in totality body and soul are found

Since I destroyed my bodily existence in love  
Inside me the trace leading to the untraceable is found

The dervish looked around and saw that he was all alone; *inside the house there is no one but the homeowner*. Yet he was hearing a tumult. He looked around again and saw no one. He reflected upon himself and became aware that the noise was coming from his own body. He looked inside his bosom and saw that all creating beings in the earth and sky were in there. At that moment the sun rose. The dervish saw inside his bosom the seven layers of the earth, the nine spheres in the seven layers of the sky, the Most Glorious Throne, the Footstool, the Tablet, and the Pen as well as all things that existed within. He awoke from his dream and realized that he had been dreaming. He said: "*Good Lord*"; if this was a dream sent to me by the All-Compassionate, may it



appear again.” He then put his head back on the pillow and went to sleep. He dreamt that the attributes he had seen before were all in place and complete. The dervish had an outburst of emotion; he said:

I am the flourishing treasure inside the wreck

I am the splendor of all body and form

All of existence was found inside me with certainty

O brother! I am the trace which leads to the untraceable

The dervish gathered his wits; he came back to himself and thought: “Could I be dreaming?” Yet he saw that this was not a dream, that it was a true occurrence. This time the dervish stood up and thought to himself: “At that time I wanted to visit this city. Now it is found inside my bosom. Well then, that means I can explore it thoroughly.” When he began to explore the city, he saw somebody approach. The dervish wondered if this was a native of the place. When the person arrived, they greeted one another and sat down together. They asked each other how they were doing. This person told a strange story and the dervish is relating from him: “This person was a traveler. He said:

I reached a place where the shadow of this universe had fallen, a place which had taken shape in its form. The shadows of all things in this universe had fallen there in resemblance of their actual bodies. Suddenly I reached this place which stood between the two realms and from where both realms were visible. My heart wished to explore it and when I did so, I saw that it was very much like this universe, that when the shadows of the things in this universe moved, they fell on this other universe and became objects in the form that the same objects had in this universe. When I was exploring there, I contemplated the roots of this earth and sky and all objects which existed in them. I have many stories; I just came from there.

The dervish listened to him and understood that he was telling a very strange story. He said:

“Dear friend, you have spoken; now please listen to my state. There was a time when my body

didn't exist; I was soul. I was one with the sultan inside the sultan's existence. He gave me a robe of honor; I wore it and came here. I saw that a canopy was set, a carpet was spread, and hundreds of thousands of wonders were manifest in every speck of light. I contemplated with pleasure." As they continued to discuss in this state, they came to a disagreement and began to fight. They grabbed one another; the dervish managed to grab the man's collar. At that instant, the dervish woke up and saw that it was his own shadow, that in his hand he was holding his own collar. His heart overflowed with emotion; he recited this poem:

The exoteric and the esoteric, the whole world I have become  
All that exists, the mature and the inexperienced I have become

All that is manifest or hidden in the universe  
O brother! See me, all of them bewildered I have become

When the dervish said these words, he came back to himself. He reflected: "O friend! All of this traveling, all of these states are only to find somebody to consult his knowledge on where this day and night come from and where they go, on who has built this universe. We had a mill to build. They say it's no longer necessary, but that's what we need." The dervish saw that *inside the house there is no one but the homeowner*; there was nobody. He thought: "O dear! I've wanted this for so long!" He recollected the incidents he had been through. However much he thought, he was unable to perceive any object other than his own self. His existence was all there was. This time he gave up all hope of this fancy. He came back to himself and reflected for a while. Then his heart overflowed with emotion and he recited these two couplets:

I am all that is named body and soul  
What they call servant and sultan, in entirety

Me it is, no questions asked  
What they call the hidden secrets in the heart

After this the dervish slept and dreamt that he suddenly reached a city. He saw that this was an immense city with a castle wall of three levels and twelve towers. It had twelve doors, seven hundred seventy-seven neighborhoods, four hundred forty-four markets and bazaars, three hundred sixty-six trenches in which water was running. Another mark of the city was that it stood on two poles, and another was that it was not stationary but rather on the move. The city had two sultans. One of them was named “Acceptable to the All-Compassionate” and the other was named “Estimable to Satan.” The two of them were forever in opposition and kept fighting. Another sign was that this city resembled a mirror. The reflections of the things which existed in every direction manifested themselves in this mirror. The dervish instantly became aware of this state and had an outpour of emotion. He said:

I am the existent in all of existence

I am the aim of the Kaaba and the idol

I am the shark; I am the sea and the ocean

I am the valuable mine in the all-surrounding waters

In the mirror the dervish saw that the nine spheres of the sky resembled domes which were built inside one another. He looked at the throne and saw that it was like a great canopy suspended over these domes. He looked at the constellations of the zodiac and the stars, and they seemed like oil lamps which were hung inside the domes. He looked at the realm of the earth and saw that Anatolia, Damascus, Maghreb, Zanzibar, Ethiopia, Egypt, Yemen, Taif, Diyarbakır, Baghdad, Iraq, Khorasan, Turkestan, Badakhshan, Ormuz, India, Cashmere, China, Cathay, Khotan, and the steppes of Bulgaria were all one island. Outside them was the sea. He saw the seven layers of the earth. He looked at the face of the earth and saw the steer, the fish, and the sea. He looked under the sea and saw the infinite and immeasurable wind. The nine spheres of the sky, the throne, the seven layers of the earth, the steer, the fish, and the sea were all held on top of the wind and were moving like a bottle. He explored the state of the universe in its totality; he saw that the sky resembled the wheel of the windmill. The dome and the king’s court were spinning with the wind’s power of grandeur. The star named the sun was also revolving; its movement away and back was named day and night by the sons of Adam. As he was

contemplating with his intellect, the dervish awoke and saw that *inside the house there was no one but the homeowner*; there was nothing but his own self. He had an outburst of emotion; he recited these two couplets:

I am the nightingale, I am the rose garden, I am the rose  
I am the solution of difficulty, whatever the cause

I am the lover, I am the beloved, I am love  
I am the subtle beauty, the locks of the hyacinth

Again sleep took hold of him and in his sleep the dervish saw that the images he had witnessed were visible in the mirrors which existed in every direction of this city. Then the dervish explored the island and realized that what they call true and false, the path, the pillars, the sermon and the book, all these stories were located inside this island. The dervish contemplated them all; he saw the sea which surrounded them. Then he sat at a high spot and looked on. From where he sat nothing was to be seen but the all-surrounding sea. Using the wood of the intellect, he built a ship. He nailed it with the nail of the idea, strengthened it with the mastic of trust in God, pulled the rope of the declaration of faith, made acceptance his food and patience his supply. He fixed his spiritual power as the anchor. The wind of love blew and drove the ship. For some time, the ship continued to sail on the sea. His departure had taken place in the times of Prophet George; he came back to the island in the times of Prophet Jonas, after so much time had passed. He stepped on dry land and deciding to explore the island, he pulled ashore. After he began his exploration, he suddenly saw that the island was filled with giants and evil spirits. Upon seeing the dervish, they all ran away and came to the presence of their king. What they had seen was an unprecedented thing; they wanted to see the dervish again. In the meantime, the dervish saw that the sultan was Prophet Solomon. Solomon saw the dervish and ordered his army to stand back. He walked ahead and greeted the dervish. The dervish returned his greeting; they sat down together and began to talk. They kept each other company and conversed for some time. After a while Prophet Solomon said: "There is a place called Holy Kilis in the land of Damascus; I am from there. What about you dervish; where are you from?" The dervish said: "I am the son of the miller from the middle village." They became acquainted. Prophet Solomon took the dervish with

him and they went and sat together at his throne. The giants and fairies stood facing them. Some time passed; the dervish learned the language of birds from Prophet Solomon. He learned all of his skills. One day he asked Prophet Solomon: "Is there anywhere else left to explore?" Prophet Solomon said: "From this island to the inhabited portion of the earth's surface it would take you seventy thousand years. How did you manage to come here?" The dervish related his adventures. He explained one by one how he had built a ship and how he had arrived there. Prophet Solomon said: "There is an island called the island of birds. In it are many different kinds of birds. That is why these giants are so scared; the birds there catch these giants and eat them. Let us go there and explore it." The dervish said: "Okay, why not?" and stood up to go. Prophet Solomon made preparations and boarded the ship. The dervish recited these two couplets:

I am a marvelous secret present inside all things  
I am the wish that every tongue speaks

I am the reason for all the different kinds of images  
I am the praiseworthy, the loathsome and rejected

When the dervish completed his words, Prophet Solomon also spoke two couplets:

In this unification the whole universe is One  
All is united, none remain distant and alone

Do not imagine things; He is the affectionate one  
Who bestows upon all language the word that comes from the heart

They loaded their supplies. The sultan's throne got taken away by the wind. The dervish boarded the ship and they departed. After they sailed for some time, the birds learned that Prophet Solomon had assembled his army and was coming their way. They assembled and came to the presence of their king. As they stood, they lost their mood and became silent. Prophet Solomon and the dervish reached the island. Solomon landed at a fine spot and the dervish pulled the ship ashore. He prostrated in thankfulness. They sat down for some time. In the meanwhile, the birds

came and stood before Prophet Solomon. One of them moved forward and asked: “First of all, tell us, who are you, why are you here. and what is your purpose and desire?” Prophet Solomon replied that they had come to explore the island. At that instant the birds began to catch the giants; a tumult arose. The dervish saw the state the giants were in and went towards them. Upon seeing the dervish, all the birds rose in the air. The dervish went next to Prophet Solomon. Solomon said to him: “Dervish, did you see the birds rise in the air to catch you? Prepare yourself.” The dervish set a trap and caught a bird. He saw that the bird he caught was an owl. It turned out that when Antioch used to be in ruins, the dervish and this owl were together in the same remains. They recognized one another and asked how they were doing. The dervish asked the owl: “How many times have you seen this universe devastated and flourishing?” The owl replied: “I have seen a hundred thousand Solomons and similar kings.” Then the dervish noticed that this dome and court of God, this state and image were all manifest in the mirror of this city. The dervish looked again and saw that this state and image were in entirety shadows of this city. The dervish awoke from this grandeur and saw that *inside the house there is no one but the homeowner*; there was no one but his own self. His heart overflowed with emotion; he said:

I am all of what they call images and states  
What they call the right and also the left

I am the designer, the design and all worldly things  
What they call the question and also the answer

Again sleep began to weigh over the dervish. He slept and dreamt that the city which resembled a mirror was actually his own body. He saw himself the sultan of this city; all created beings were under his command. Looking at himself, he felt open and cheerful. He said:

I am the profit and loss in all markets  
I am the brilliance in every eye and gaze

In all things counted and calculated  
I am the one counted with every number

The dervish saw Muhammad Mustafâ approaching. The dervish went to greet him, kissed his hand and said:

- O Messenger of God! Take a look at this poor man!
- Dervish, where do you come from?
- My sultan, I come from the lands of the earth.
- What land are you from?
- From the land of Rûm.
- Have you ever seen Damascus? Have you explored it?
- Yes, I have.
- We had lovers there; I wonder what their states are. Are they well; do you know?
- My sultan, they don't act in conformity with one another; they have come up with many different paths. If you see the things they do, you will be astonished!
- God –*glorified and exalted be He*- has pardoned the sins of each one of them, but I am not certain about the qadi of Nablus who took bribes.
- My sultan, what about the qadi of Kelşurat<sup>3</sup>; what do you say of his state? He eats watermelons without even cutting them into pieces; next to that, a bribe is nothing.

The Messenger of God liked this joke; he said: “Come with us, let us keep each other company for a few days. You're a nice dervish.” The dervish said: “Aye, o Messenger of God! I was longing for the dust under your feet. Praise be to God for facilitating my service.” After this they were companions for some time. (One day) Muhammad Mustafâ said:

- Dervish, you look like a traveler. Where have you visited?
- My sultan, they say that each ant has its own measure of load. I also have traveled in my own measure.
- Have you seen the throne and its revolution, the nine spheres, the constellations of the zodiac, the stars, the seven layers of the earth, the face of the earth, the steer, the fish, the sea, the wind, and all the stopping places?

---

<sup>3</sup> I was unable to establish a definite reading for this word.

- Yes, my sultan, I have.
- There is a city which stands on two poles; have you seen it?

The dervish was hesitant; he thought: "I wonder if it's on earth or in the sky." The Messenger of God said that it was between the two. The dervish meditated and came back to himself. He said:

I am what they call the pearl of unity  
I am all attributes and what they name the essence

Today I am Mansûr, my speech is *I am God*  
I am the vagabond, the city they call Baghdad

The dervish awoke and saw that *in the house there is no one but us monks*; he was all alone. He looked around and saw that there was no city and no market. The sun was up; day and night, far and nearby, all was unified. There was no path, no traveler, and no stopping place. The whole universe was one –one body and one head. The dervish had an outpour of emotion. He recited these two couplets:

The whole universe is my body, my existence  
Hence it is before my self that I prostrate

To my self I speak these words  
I myself am the sheikh, myself my aspirant

Thereupon sleep took hold of the dervish. He dreamt that the earth and the sky, the entire universe was a cloak that he himself was wearing. On the cloak were patches of hundreds of thousands of different colors, and it was free of aging and regeneration. He thought: "When I stopped sewing my cloak, I reached my soul. What a beautiful old cloak has come into my hands!" He took it off, put it aside, and began to contemplate it. He saw that each color carried the viewer away to a hundred thousand visions. The dervish reflected on the dreams he had dreamt, the adventures he had experienced, the birds he had hunted down, the places he had



contemplated. Suddenly he saw that the far and the nearby, the pain and the remedy were in a bottle hung inside the shop of our Nasreddin Hoca the merchant. “This must be a mistake; has this come here by its own or have hunters hunted it down and brought it here?” said the dervish as he continued to contemplate. All of a sudden he saw himself in the land of Khotan. Prophet Solomon was hunting down a deer with musk. The dervish found himself a pleasant spot and began to observe. As he hunted, Prophet Solomon reached the place where the dervish was sitting. They greeted one another. The dervish asked: “My sultan, what are you hunting?” Prophet Solomon replied that he was hunting deer. When the dervish asked what kind of deer, Solomon said: “Deer with musk.” Soon after, the dervish saw that a cute little deer was wandering in the desert. He said: “That’s the deer you were looking for?” Prophet Solomon looked that way and saw the deer he desired; he ordered his people to begin the hunt and block all the paths. A tumult arose, and they all ran after the deer. The deer could not find a place to escape and headed towards the dervish, in the direction of the mountain. When it reached the dervish’s shadow, it disappeared. Solomon’s men were busy with their clamor and did not notice what happened. The dervish looked around and could not see the deer. When Solomon’s men approached him, they asked: “We saw the deer come this way. Where is it now; what happened to it?” They searched around and saw that there was no one but the dervish. The dervish himself looked around once again and realized that the sound of the rattling of the deer’s feet was coming from his own body. He remained silent. In this state the dervish woke up and saw that there was nothing but his own self. He had an outpour of emotion; he said:

I am the unique individual, the absolute agent

I am the recondite secret in all hearts

I am the esoteric in all exoteric

I am the sailor, the boat, and the all-surrounding ocean

Again sleep took hold of the dervish. He dreamt that the deer was inside him and Prophet Solomon was asking him to take it back out. The dervish said: “I won’t give away my hunt to anyone.” They began to argue. Prophet Solomon grabbed hold of the dervish and the dervish held him back. While they were in this state, they saw Muhammad Mustafâ arriving. He approached

them and saw them fighting. When the dervish saw the Messenger of God, he gained courage and held Solomon with greater strength, not letting him move. At that moment, the dervish woke up and realized he had been dreaming. He began to recite these two couplets:

I am all they refer to as body and soul  
I am what they name the reality of man

I am the goldsmith, the touchstone, and the gold  
I am the valuable jewel, what they call the mine

The dervish went back to sleep. In his dream he saw that there was no deer and no desert; *inside the house there is no one but the homeowner*. There was nothing but his own self. He looked around and saw no one but the almighty and perfect. This time he said:

I am the solution; I am what they call the difficulty  
I am the traveler; I am what they term the stopping place

I am the purpose of the house of idols and the Kaaba  
I am all that is described as true and false

As the dervish said these words, he began to feel sleepy. In his sleep, he dreamt that all his dreams had been his own imagination, the states of his existence. There was no one else. The dervish meditated and came back to himself. He saw that his self was all there was, that whatever he had dreamt was the truth, nothing more, nothing less. This time the dervish said:

Thank God that this difficulty is solved  
The sultan and the servant are now united in meaning

I am the idea and image in the minds of all beings  
I am the bottle, the wine bearer, the wine

The dervish awoke from his dream and saw himself inside the mosque of Egypt. The entire world was assembled in one place. He stood up immediately, prepared himself, and put his basket around his neck with the intention of going begging. First he said these words:

You are almighty, perfect, and all-present  
Nothing in the universe resembles you; you are without likeness

When I say 'you', my desire is 'me'  
You know this; you are the all-knowing and not me

The dervish reached out his hand and said "*Allāh.*" He was at the shop of Cömerd the butcher. Cömerd the butcher said: "Dervish, do you have that much power that you speak this name?" The dervish had an outburst of emotion; he said:

I am the one who is everyone's companion  
Leading all dark passion in all heads

I am hidden in that random man  
He is the reality, firm and sound, the upright man

Then the dervish went his way. He saw the mosque of Egypt and Mecca. He came back to himself, had an outpour of emotion, and recited these two couplets:

Bravo to me, I am the soul and have attained my stopping place  
Bravo to me, I have arrived at the difficulty to be solved

Wherever I have reached in the two worlds  
I have reached together with the sultan

When the dervish spoke these words, he looked to his right and saw a noisy crowd gathered in the marketplace. He wondered if he had come upon a feast. Upon arriving he saw the sultan's council

being held. The whole area was decorated, and the sultan's officers were all in place. All created beings were assembled at the sultan's council, all hearts content with the sultan's company.

Suddenly the dervish saw the sultan. He said:

Peace be unto you, o great sultan!

The mine of reality, the precious jewel

Your kindness is the protection of all

Your favor is everyone's guide

When the dervish said these words, the sultan looked at him and saw that he was a dervish. He said:

And unto you peace, poor dervish!

Whose speech is sound, whose acts are pure

You are free of all surmise and doubt

Certain of truth, trustworthy of God

Upon hearing these words, the dervish awoke; he said:

Thank God I have seen your face, o my King and Sultan!

Your face is the qibla and faith of all

With your assistance all beings are appeased

Your favor and beneficence are always at work

The sultan replied:

O dervish of sweet words and a blessed face!

The pearl of reality, dervish of good fortune!

Who is filled with majesty like a roaring lion  
Upon seeing a single grain of rice in his plate!

The dervish replied:

O sultan, you are the ever-living and pre-eternal  
In all acts you are the wise and all-knowing

To all who desire you give their wish  
Your job is kindness; you are beneficent

The sultan replied:

O special dervish! Come here and sit with me!  
The pearl of unity in the sea of wisdom!

You are no stranger to the intimate  
Acquainted with the acquainted, alien to the alien

Upon hearing these words, the dervish sat with polite manners and prayed for the sultan. He said:

O Sultan! You who offer your kindness  
With equality to all, from first to last

You have concealed the sea inside the water drop  
You hide the sun in the speck of light

At that time God's blessings were set on the table. To each being a share of the king's meal was given. The dervish continued to contemplate; he saw that all created beings took their proper

portions and found consolation. Thereupon the dervish's heart was filled with mirth. He stood up and began to recite these two couplets:

I am a poor man; I have no one in the world  
I have become the lost sign in all signs

It is me all seekers search for  
The brothers of the time in all places

The dervish awoke and saw that *inside the house there is no one but the homeowner*; there was no one but his own self. He meditated on the things he had dreamt. Suddenly he went back to sleep. He dreamt that what he had witnessed in the dream in which the entire universe was manifest was in fact the shadow of his own body. He saw himself as sultan inside his own body. He looked at himself from every direction and realized that the rule belonged to him. This time he said:

Thank God that I have let go of this image and gained certitude  
I have let go of the above and below, the right and the left

Of saying 'you' and 'me', 'yours' or 'mine'  
Thank God I have become free of foolish chatter

Thereafter the dervish awoke from his sleep and saw that the whole universe was prostrating before him. He thought to himself: "Oh my! I wonder what they are prostrating at!" At that instant, he realized that his body was a universe in which lay a hundred thousand universes just like this one. The dervish became aware that this universe and all beings in it were in their totality his own existence. He became stupefied and recited these two couplets:

I wonder, am I the exemplar for all beings?  
Am I the noisy uproar in all things?

The idea and image in all hearts,  
The dark passion in all heads?

The dervish became aware that this universe and all the images which held its form were the shadow of his own body. He had an outpour of emotion; he said:

I am the soul inside every body  
I am all attributes, the pillars of religion

I am Layla, the one named Majnun  
Whose self is stupefied at himself

Hence a dervish dreamt such a story. He woke up and saw himself inside the city of Shamakhi, lying in the corner of a bath furnace. He looked just like before; the earth and the sky were in place. Then he saw that his states were written in this book to prevent their loss. He wrote and said: "I have seen a dervish. I have talked in my sleep and written down everything I said. Ask the interpretation of this dream to the gnostics. They can tell you. All that I have deliriously repeated, you can learn from the gnostic. *God knows best.* Prayers for the soul of the prophet. The Book of Prattle.

## Commentary

The *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* can be termed as the culmination point of aygusuz Abdāl’s work. That is why many of the topics discussed in this commentary parallel and complement the discussions in the previous chapters. In this work, aygusuz Abdāl offers us two major venues of interpretation. One of these constitutes the doctrinal aspect of his thought, while the other exhibits the features of a social commentary. These two venues are deeply intertwined, via aygusuz Abdāl’s critiques of the commonly held views on dreams, the path to perfection, and Satan, among others. aygusuz also creates an intricate balance between the intellectual and the experiential aspects of his text, thus combining many of the doctrinal subjects treated in chapter two with the experiential features of the *ṣaṭhiyye* investigated in the third chapter.

This commentary envisions a close reading which will allow us to evaluate the structural and literary features of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* side by side with its social and doctrinal positioning. I will begin with a discussion of the way in which aygusuz plays with the Islamic notions of God-sent and Satanic dreams. I will demonstrate how he overturns commonly accepted notions of dreams in order to create the experiential aspect of his narrative while also providing a social commentary. The latter is especially pronounced in aygusuz’s portrayal of religious scholars, ascetics, and Sufis. I will investigate the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*’s portrayal of Satan and how this relates to aygusuz’s notions of self (*nefs*) and perfection. I will examine the relationship between the text’s formal aspects and its construction of the states of dream and wakefulness in which its protagonist participates. I will show that throughout the text, the protagonist oscillates between dream and wakefulness, prose and poetry, fear and certainty, as well as ignorance and knowledge, while for each pair the two opposite poles begin to merge as the text progresses.

I will then investigate several doctrinal aspects of the text, which closely mirror the topics discussed in the second chapter. These discussions will focus on the concepts of perfection and immanence, the portrayal of Muḥammad and ‘Alī, the notions of preeternity and afterlife, the depiction of spiritual travel, the relationship between the microcosmos and the macrocosmos, and finally, the concept of imagination. I will conclude the commentary with a discussion of the work’s symbolic language, with a focus on how it reproduces many of the aspects of the Turkish *ṣaṭhiyye* discussed in the third chapter.



I will not try to establish whether aygusuz’s narratives are actually his own dreams and visions, as he seems to suggest at the end of the work. As many studies on the Islamic literature on dreams have shown and as I will also underline further on, the literary historian’s concern is not with the truthfulness of the account, but with the dynamics behind the act of narration or transmission. aygusuz himself seems to be well aware of the notion that dream narration in all its forms is a literary device. This translates into his powerful use of various narrative strategies all of which convey layers of social and doctrinal meaning.

As a dream narrative intertwined with moments of wakefulness expressed in couplets, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* incorporates many stylistic elements which mimic the general aspects of dreams. First of all, aygusuz Abdāl breaks our notion of a linear progression, which is the expected convention of storytelling. Although the dervish comes across Satan and fights with him several times in a row, Satan never manages to recognize him. Similarly, Solomon first calls the dervish his brother, then a little while later fails to know who he is. Most of the time, the prophets do not recognize Satan. Yet in one instance, they do recognize him.<sup>1</sup> In contrast to these examples, several consecutive times, the dervish finds himself in the same dream (that of an assembly in heaven) after waking up and going back to sleep. This conflicts with the lack of linear plot and instead approaches the dream to waking reality. Perhaps these are waking visions which the dervish consciously seeks? As we will see further on, this confusion between dream and wakefulness is a deliberate ploy by aygusuz.

The contents of the dream episodes also mimic the general qualities of dreams. There is no apparent order to the dervish’s encounters with the prophets. These encounters depend rather on the dervish’s recollection of the given prophet. One example is the encounter with Adam, who appears immediately as the dervish is talking about him to the creatures. Together with Adam, the dervish saves Abraham from Nimrod. Such instances show us that we are well beyond historical time. It is thus no surprise that the dervish fights against Pharaoh with Jesus and not with Moses, as would be in a story truer to historical reality. Yet we have to use the word “true” with reservation, because as we will see, aygusuz only breaks our conventional definitions of truth to create his own.

---

<sup>1</sup> See p. 248. Due to the placement of this commentary immediately after the edition and translation, I will cite directly from my own translation.

In the same vein, the episode in which the dervish trounces the Pharaoh's army with the stones of his slingshot can be an echo of the defeat of Goliath through David's slingshot. What seems like a confusion on the part of the dreamer is further deepened when the dervish sees Satan among God's elect in heaven. According to Islamic belief, such an episode can only take place in an utterly confused dream. As we will see, Kaygusuz Abdāl is well aware of the Islamic classifications of dreams. In fact, his whole text can be read as a commentary on Islamic tradition, one which radically subverts many of the established categories.

### **A True Dream or a Satanic Nightmare?**

The Islamic tradition puts strong emphasis on the classification of dreams as well as their interpretation, as evidenced by the proliferation of dream manuals up to our era. Prophetic traditions provide us with two major ways of classifying dreams. According to one set of traditions, there are two types of dreams, one sent by God (the good dreams, *manāmāt ṣāliha*) and the other originating from Satan (the jumbled dreams, *adġāth ahlām*).<sup>2</sup> According to a second set of traditions, dreams can be separated into three types: the true dreams sent by God, dreams arising from the dreamer's own soul, and the Satanic nightmare.<sup>3</sup> According to both classifications, God-sent dreams can only be experienced by pious people. The good dream belongs to the realm of truth, in that the angel of dreams (*Ṣiddīqūn*) always speaks the truth and enlightens the pious believer on what is written on the Preserved Tablet (*lawḥ maḥfūz*).<sup>4</sup> In a

---

<sup>2</sup> See Leah Kinberg, "Dreams", in *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*, Ed. Kate Fleet, et al., Consulted online on 24 December 2016 <[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912\\_ei3\\_COM\\_26091](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_26091)>

First published online: 201297; Leah Kinberg, "Literal Dreams and Prophetic Ḥadīṡs in Classical Islam: A Comparison of Two Ways of Legitimation," *Der Islam* 70/2 (1993): 289.

<sup>3</sup> See Pierre Lory, *Le Rêve et ses interprétations en Islam* (Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 2003), 42; Dwight F. Reynolds, "Symbolic Narratives of Self: Dreams in Medieval Arabic Autobiographies," in Philip F. Kennedy (ed.), *On Fiction and Adab in Medieval Arabic Literature* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005), 265; John C. Lamoreaux, *The Early Muslim Tradition of Dream Interpretation* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002), 116; John C. Lamoreaux, "An Early Muslim Autobiographical Dream Narrative: Abū Ja'far al-Qāyīnī and His Dream of the Prophet Muhammad," in Louise Marlow (ed.), *Dreaming Across Boundaries: The Interpretation of Dreams in Islamic Lands* (Boston: Ilex Foundation, 2008), 78-79.

<sup>4</sup> See Lory, *Le Rêve*, 131.

saying ascribed to one of the leading dream-interpreters, Muḥammad b. Sīrīn (d. 110/728), a notion of the good dream as coming from a realm of truth is underlined: “Whatever the deceased tells you in sleep is truth (*ḥaqq*), for he stays in the world of truth.”<sup>5</sup>

In his article entitled “The Cultural Function of the Dream as Illustrated by Classical Islam,” Von Grunebaum presents an Islamic view of dreams as consisting of objective facts and conditions. He states: “The dream is seen as possessed of cognitive force in regard to otherwise inaccessible sectors of objective reality, especially such as the future and the hereafter, or, more generally, truths bearing on man’s relation to the divine.”<sup>6</sup> We may thus say that even Satanic dreams, despite their distance from the realm of truth, have their source outside of the dreamer,<sup>7</sup> and thus exist in a suprapersonal body of relations, giving information about the dreamer’s lack of piety and righteousness. However, in that they are considered to be beyond the realm of truth, such dreams are excluded from the field of oneiromancy, which occupies itself only with God-sent dreams.<sup>8</sup>

According to one set of traditions, the difference between God-sent dreams and Satanic dreams can be discerned through the level of clarity of their messages. While the Satanic dreams are “jumbled dreams” (Q 12:44),<sup>9</sup> in the God-sent dream the message is clear and bright.<sup>10</sup> Whereas dreams delivering “glad tidings” (Q 10:64) can only be God-sent dreams, nightmares are typically Satanic, unless they deliver a message of warning.

On the other hand, true dreams are also of two types: those which are clear and explicit (*zāhira*), and those which are symbolic or allegorical (*marmūza*). The former usually consist of an open message delivered by an angel or a dead person, thus requiring no interpretation. The

---

<sup>5</sup> Kinberg, “Literal Dreams,” 288; Leah Kinberg, “Interaction Between This World and the Afterworld in Early Islamic Tradition,” *Oriens* 29/30 (1986): 296.

<sup>6</sup> G. E. Von Grunebaum, “Introduction: The Cultural Function of the Dream as Illustrated by Classical Islam,” in G. E. Von Grunebaum and Roger Caillois (eds.), *The Dream and Human Societies* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966), 6.

<sup>7</sup> See Lamoreaux, *The Early Muslim Tradition*, 4; Reynolds, 269.

<sup>8</sup> See Lory, *Le Rêve*, 42.

<sup>9</sup> See Reynolds, 265.

<sup>10</sup> Kinberg, “Literal Dreams,” 289.

latter require a skilled dream interpreter to interpret them, thus resulting in the rich literature of dream manuals to which they serve as content.<sup>11</sup>

While scriptural sources establish a clear distinction between God-sent and Satanic dreams, the oneirocritical tradition renders a more complex picture. Al-Dīnawārī's *al-Qādirī fī al-Ta'bīr* offers one such categorization. According to this work, the third of five truthful dream categories contains those dreams in which the angel Ṣiddīqūn presents information coming from the *Umm al-Kitāb* in the form of symbols requiring interpretation. As Pierre Lory explains, Satan can intervene in these dreams by sending images intended to deceive the dreamer, or by mixing incoherent data with a true dream, or by awakening the dreamer to interrupt a healthy dream.<sup>12</sup> On the other hand, truthful dreams with clear messages can also contain meetings with Satan, in which case it is not Satan himself which is seen, but rather an image of him as a symbol for hostile forces.<sup>13</sup> Dīnawārī and the tradition he represents thus offer several venues of interaction with Satan or his image in God-sent dreams.

Dīnawārī's classification of Satanic dreams also shows a similar complexity. Among the seven categories of false dreams which Dīnawārī delineates, the fifth is particularly difficult to diagnose. These are imitations of truthful dreams brought upon by Satan, in which one can see false images of God, angels, or the Prophet, which can nonetheless be identified when forewarned.<sup>14</sup> According to Pierre Lory, "all the dreams reversing the realities, absurd, are to be classified in this category. [...] Oneiromancy is only interested in what the coherence of reality presents, to the exclusion of what seems phantasmagoric."<sup>15</sup> As we will see, this statement is vital for our understanding of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*.

Also interesting is the fact that under this category are dreams in which "a scholar is seen spreading depravity,"<sup>16</sup> as occurs several times in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* where Satan disguises himself as a religious scholar, ascetic, or Sufi. In *Satan's Tragedy*, Peter Awn mentions two ways in which Satan tricks the mystic on the path. In the first, Satan takes the role of the deceiving

---

<sup>11</sup> Reynolds, 265; Lamoreaux, *The Early Muslim Tradition*, 71.

<sup>12</sup> Lory, *Le Rêve*, 132.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 170.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 134.

friend or pseudo-shaykh. In the second, he dupes his target with a vision or dream resembling a vision of God, in which he takes the guise of divinity by sitting on a majestic throne in splendor.<sup>17</sup> As we will see in detail below, both types of visions are present in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, where the dervish frequently encounters Satan in the guise of a shaykh and has more than one vision of God. In this case, how are we to know that these visions of God are accurate, and not some trickery provoked by Satan? Or to extend to the question of the dream narratives themselves, how are we to know if these are God-sent dreams, creations of the dervish's soul, or Satan's ruses?

The protagonist of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* himself seems to be confused about the answer, as evidenced by the couplet below:

O Lord! Is this a dream or my own imagination?  
My image has no equal and no likeness<sup>18</sup>

The answer to this question is particularly important for the dervish, as it establishes not only his piety or lack thereof, but also his spiritual level. The second line reveals that his visions lead the dervish to equate his ontological status with God. He is thus either at the highest possible spiritual level or in the greatest depths of blasphemy.

The jumbled, non-linear, and confusing aspects of the dream narratives of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* seem to indicate that its dreams are not veridical. Or if they are among the true dreams, they would have to belong in Dīnawarī's third category above, in which Satan intervenes to either deceive the dreamer, or awaken him to interrupt a healthy dream. Several times in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, the dervish wakes up from a banquet in the presence of God or the Prophet, only to be disappointed to have been awakened from such a moment of felicity. These awakenings could perhaps be considered as a Satanic interruption. On the other hand, as we saw above, dreams of "glad tidings" belong to the category of truthful dreams. It is the dreamer himself who serves as the true judge of his dreams and determines their status. It thus becomes particularly clear that by preventing its protagonist from reaching a definite conclusion, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* puts the categorization of its dream narratives permanently on hold.

---

<sup>17</sup> Peter J. Awn, *Satan's Tragedy and Redemption: Iblīs in Sufi Psychology* (Leiden: Brill, 1983), 185.

<sup>18</sup> p. 251.

How are we to interpret the fact that none of the prophets the dervish meets recognize Satan, but he himself can recognize him, even when Satan is disguised among the elect in heaven? Perhaps this is a case in which the dream element should be explained by its contrary, wherein K̄ayḡusuz makes use of the given mode of interpretation in oneiromancy.<sup>19</sup> It would then mean that the dervish is the only one among his companions who fails to recognize Satan for what he really represents. Such an interpretation may identify Satan a symbol for hostile forces, most likely the dervish's own base self, and not actually Satan himself. This in turn would establish the dervish as a righteous believer. It would also give meaning to the relationship between the dreams and the dervish's waking utterances, in which he describes himself as the Perfect Man, equal in status to prophets and even God himself. We will delve deeper into this matter, but for now, one thing is certain: The confused and confusing character of the dream episodes are in full contrast with the singular message of the interrupting couplets which are represented as moments of absolute certainty and perfect knowledge.

One such area of confusion is the vision of the Prophet. According to a prophetic tradition, a dream vision of the Prophet is considered to be equal to his actual appearance, because Satan cannot take the Prophet's form.<sup>20</sup> A startling aspect of the dervish's first encounter with the Prophet in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* is that the Prophet does not recognize him. Furthermore, the Prophet is surprised and repulsed by the dervish's uncanny appearance, resulting as we are told from his lack of a beard, but possibly also from his practice of the four blows (although this is not explicitly mentioned). After expressing his resentment to the Prophet, the dervish speaks the following couplets:

It is strange that those who find me strange  
As they do not know that I am the sultan in the wild<sup>21</sup>

The episode is remarkable in that according to the tradition, the Prophet would never fail to recognize the pious Muslim he visits. Even if we wish to take his reaction to the dervish to be one of warning, the dervish's response does not allow us to do so. Even more interesting in this

---

<sup>19</sup> See Lory, *Le Rêve*, 133; Ibn Sīrīn, *L'Interprétation des rêves*, tr. Dominique Penot (Lyon: Alif éditions, 1998), 76.

<sup>20</sup> See footnote in Kinberg, "Literal Dreams," 285 for a list of sources. See Ibn Sīrīn, 22-23 for the traditional interpretations of a dream of the Prophet or other prophets.

<sup>21</sup> p. 245.

respect is the contrast between this episode and the dervish's other meetings with the Prophet, in which the Prophet not only recognizes him, but also gives him authority on which actions the community should take. We are thus once again left in a state of uncertainty: Does the Prophet approve of the dervish or not? Are these real visions of the Prophet or not? If not, does this mean that ̘aygusuz Abdāl is going against established tradition in his narrative?

Other prophets also alternate between having intimate relations with the dervish and not even recognizing him. This recurrent theme is closely linked with the inner turmoil of the dervish himself, who oscillates between moments of fear and confusion and those of certainty and felicity. As we will see further on, the meaning given to this oscillation is an intricate part of ̘aygusuz Abdāl's notion of knowledge and perfection as defined in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*. There is no doubt that the creation of uncertainty is a literary device which explicates and sometimes hides ̘aygusuz Abdāl's doctrinal perspective. However, there is a second aspect to this literary device which is equally important: its effect on the reader or listener.

Why does ̘aygusuz Abdāl want to confuse the reader as to the precise nature of the dervish's dreams and thus his spiritual status? Why does he make the dervish into a queer being in the eyes of the Prophet, while at the same time elevating him to the status of a saint and a close companion to the prophets? Why does our author want to confuse the reader into thinking that '̘aygusuz Abdāl' does not know the prophetic tradition regarding the vision of the Prophet? The answers to these questions lie in ̘aygusuz Abdāl's critical perspective on society and his use of the dream as a medium to voice his criticism.

### **Social Criticism via Dreams**

True dreams, especially of the non-symbolic type, play an intricate role in Islamic society as sources of legitimacy and means of edification. According to the Islamic tradition, the pious dreamer has the capacity to distinguish between good and bad dreams, to decide whether a dream is genuine or rather of devilish origin. This is evidenced by a tradition ascribed to the Prophet: "If any of you sees a dream he likes, it is from Allah; he should thank God for it and tell it [to others]." <sup>22</sup> This notion confers authority on the dreamer and the dream itself, which is considered

---

<sup>22</sup> See Kinberg, "Literal Dreams," 290.

as an absolutely reliable source of knowledge. In fact, as Leah Kinberg puts it, even in dream visions of the Prophet, “it is the dream itself, not the Prophet, that creates the legitimate authority.”<sup>23</sup>

As mentioned earlier, the capacity to have truthful dreams belongs solely to the pious Muslim. In this sense, the details of the dreamer’s identity are relatively insignificant; good and bad dreams are distinguished based on their content. There is a priori confidence in the dream deemed good by the pious Muslim. Yet the definition of a ‘pious Muslim’ is itself a social one, based on performed categories. As we have already seen in previous chapters, the performance of established signs of piety is a subject of vehement critique for Ẓayğusuz Abdāl. The same critique extends to the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, where Ẓayğusuz describes the guise of Satan as “a master with a white beard, a rosary around his neck, and a prayer rug on his shoulder.”<sup>24</sup>

Moreover, receptiveness towards God-given dreams is considered to depend largely on social status. According to Sijistānī’s *Kitāb al-Sunan*, prayer leaders, judges, jurists, and religious scholars are those whose dreams are the most truthful. The dreams of women and slaves are inferior to the dreams of free men; the dreams of the poor are inferior to those of the rich.<sup>25</sup> The legitimacy of a person’s dream thus depends on the values and conventions of the social network in which he participates. As we saw in the third chapter, the importance given to social status is also a matter which Ẓayğusuz Abdāl criticizes, as he displays the vast array of public opinion about him, ranging from blasphemy to sainthood, none of which should matter in the eyes of the true friend of God.

Even though God-given dreams can be seen by all pious Muslims, their circulation and interpretation are largely determined by the class of religious scholars, who make the conscious decision on which dream narratives are mentioned and which are passed in silence.<sup>26</sup> Most oneirocritics belong to the class of religious scholars. They are the ones who elaborate the discourse on dreams and use the dream to confirm or perpetuate the common Sunni dogma. As Pierre Lory explains, this also results in an act of de-legitimization of all beliefs and practices that

---

<sup>23</sup> Leah Kinberg, “Qur’ān and Ḥadīth: A Struggle for Supremacy as Reflected in Dream Narratives,” in Louise Marlow (ed.), *Dreaming Across Boundaries*, 29.

<sup>24</sup> p. 243.

<sup>25</sup> See Lamoreaux, *The Early Muslim Tradition*, 83.

<sup>26</sup> See Lory, *Le Rêve*, 92.



fall outside of this dogma. All dream content which is considered ‘heterodox’ is attributed to the lacking spiritual state of the dreamer or his capacity for interpretation.<sup>27</sup> Among the types of dreams Leah Kinberg refers to as “legitimizing-edifying dreams,”<sup>28</sup> an important group consists of dreams admonishing *sunna* (orthodox Islamic practices) and prohibiting *bid‘a* (innovation).<sup>29</sup>

Edifying dreams generally achieve their aim by describing the pleasant conditions attained by the dead in heaven, usually in a dream visitation by the dead person or a third party describing the dead person’s status in afterlife. On the other hand, the opposite can also be told: a dead man’s poor condition in the afterworld can be described, which would then serve to delegitimize the social status and teachings of that person and his living followers.<sup>30</sup> In this sense, dreams can serve to assert or revoke the status of an individual, or of a specific ruling or decision related to that individual.<sup>31</sup> They can be a medium for promoting one’s own interests and ideas, making use of the notion that the good dreams of a pious Muslim are unquestionably true. Reynolds explains the inclusion of dream narratives in works in the following manner: “Almost all of these dream narrations are tied, in one way or another, to issues of authorial anxiety: the author argues in dream narrations (dreamt by himself or others) points that he feels he cannot

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 158.

<sup>28</sup> Leah Kinberg, “The Legitimization of the Madhāhib through Dreams,” *Arabica* 32/1 (Mar. 1985): 48.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., 294.

<sup>30</sup> See ibid., 295; also see Leah Kinberg, “Dreams as a Means to Evaluate Ḥadīth,” *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 23 (1999), 79.

<sup>31</sup> See Reynolds, 269. See the work of Leah Kinberg for numerous examples on the roles of dreams in legitimizing religious groups, traditions, and teachings. See the work of Aslı Niyazioğlu for examples from the Ottoman realm: Aslı Niyazioğlu, “Dreams, Ottoman Biography Writing, and the *Halveti-Sünbülü Şeyhs* of 16th Century Istanbul,” in Ralf Elger and Yavuz Köse (eds), *Many Ways of Speaking About the Self: Middle Eastern Ego-Documents in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish (14th-20th century)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010), 171-184; Aslı Niyazioğlu, “How to Read an Ottoman Poet’s Dream? Friends Patrons and the Execution of Fiğānī (d. 938/1532),” *Middle Eastern Literatures* 2013: 1-12; Aslı Niyazioğlu, “In the Dream Realm of a Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Biographer: Taşköprizade and the Sufi Shaykhs,” in John J. Curry and Erik S. Ohlander (eds), *Sufism and Society: Arrangements of the mystical in the Muslim world, 1200-1800* (London and New York: Routledge, 2012), 243-257. Also see the following edition of the dream journal of a 17th century Ottoman woman Sufi by Cemal Kafadar, which includes a long introduction: Üsküplü Asiye Hatun, *Rüya Mektupları*, ed. Cemal Kafadar (Istanbul: Oğlak Yayıncılık, 1994).

argue on his own authority.”<sup>32</sup> This indicates that, whether dreamed or imagined, a dream narrative is almost always a rhetorical device.

Dream narratives prevalent in Sufi circles display a second aspect of dream narration, also related to the question of authority. Shahzad Bashir defines hagiographical dreaming as “an activity through which individuals in lower ranks of spiritual achievement receive guidance in the course of their quests.”<sup>33</sup> Those seen in dreams thus typically have higher spiritual status than the wayfarers who see them. Such dreams are often seen by Sufis in the early stages of their careers. In such cases, the dreams act as a sort of “spiritual barometer, indicative of the degrees of purity and impurity within the dreamer’s psyche.”<sup>34</sup> Even though such dreams deal with personal realities as opposed to objective ones, their source and meaning still exist in the outside world, placed in an interpretive tradition based on conventions regarding authority.

All of this discussion brings us back to our previous question: Why would Ẓayğusuz Abdāl purposefully play with commonly established notions of dreams? By now, our knowledge of Ẓayğusuz’s worldview offers us a pretty good guess: He is most probably well aware of the way in which the traditional narrative on dreams relates to social status and authority. Many times in the text of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, the dervish turns to himself as the only source of his knowledge, the only source capable of producing absolute certainty. Many of the couplets in the work directly express this perspective, which also provides the interpretation for the most frequently repeated theme of the work: A dervish looking for a master to answer his questions about the world, his own spiritual level, and God, who realizes that his own existence is all there is. While we will discuss the theoretical aspect of this perspective further on, we should remember that for Ẓayğusuz Abdāl, a mystic who considers the here and now to be the only place of salvation, theoretical notions are always linked to the social world in which they are constantly performed. Thus, the exoteric meaning of the text is located in its social implications, which once again take the shape of a radical subversion of concepts of authority.

---

<sup>32</sup> Reynolds, 276.

<sup>33</sup> Shahzad Bashir, “Narrating Sight: Dreaming as Visual Training in Persianate Sufi Hagiography,” in Özgen Felek and Alexander D. Knysh (eds.), *Dreams and Visions in Islamic Societies* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012), 236.

<sup>34</sup> Jonathan G. Katz, “Dreams in the Manāqib of a Moroccan Sufi Shaykh: ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Dabbāgh (d. 1131/1719),” in Louise Marlow (ed.), *Dreaming Across Boundaries*, 272.

Our short review of the conventions of dream literature established prior to aygusuz’s era shows that social status and authority are main factors in determining the meaning of a dream narrative. Yet here we have a dervish who can be either an innovator (*bid‘a*), as the Prophet’s initial reaction to him suggests, or a saint of the highest level. Which are we to believe, and where are we to look to support our belief? In the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, the owl is seen as friend of the dervish, with whom he lived when Antioch was in ruins.<sup>35</sup> In the book of dream interpretation ascribed to Ibn Sīrīn, the owl seen in a dream is described as “a small gangster without size, without partisan and without auxiliary.”<sup>36</sup> It thus seems that the dervish is particularly proud of his low social status, which he has no intention of hiding. In fact, as we will see later, he stresses his dervish practices, undertaking begging even at an assembly in heaven, and on more than one occasion describes prophets with dervish traits. For aygusuz Abdāl, social acceptance is a great danger, which can divert the wayfarer from the spiritual path, by conferring authority on others and making one lose his inner sense of certainty. As we saw in the first chapter, for aygusuz the level of certainty is the true ‘barometer’ of the spiritual wayfarer, who achieves perfection by actualizing his selfhood, by recognizing his self as the selfhood of God.<sup>37</sup> Yet another aspect of dreams is that they can create a false sense of certainty. By depending on the dreamer’s categorization of his own dreams, they can provide legitimization to the fancies and ideas of the base self. This is because, for aygusuz, all search for legitimacy and status in the world of multiplicity has its source in the base self.

The treatment of Satan in traditional dream narratives and oneiromancy is also an aspect towards which aygusuz would be deeply critical. According to one prophetic tradition, the cure for Satanic dreams is spitting three times to the left and changing the sleeping position.<sup>38</sup> Another tradition asserts that Satan urinates in the ear of a man who sleeps all night through,<sup>39</sup> indicating in the Sufi context the recommendation of night prayers. Other methods of protection from Satan

---

<sup>35</sup> See p. 275.

<sup>36</sup> Ibn Sīrīn, 146.

<sup>37</sup> This view has many similarities to the notion of perfection in Aḥmad Ghazālī. For Aḥmad Ghazālī’s perspective on dreams, see Eric Ormsby, “The Poor Man’s Prophecy: Al-Ghazālī on Dreams,” in Louise Marlow (ed.), *Dreaming Across Boundaries*, 142-151.

<sup>38</sup> See Awn, 49 for a list of sources.

<sup>39</sup> See *ibid.*, 72.

are described as going to the mosque, reading the Quran, praying, and asceticism.<sup>40</sup> The focus in all of these examples is on the exoteric dimension of practices, which are representative of established dogma. As we have already seen, aygusuz Abdāl deems exoteric observance to be an inadequate tool in obtaining spiritual perfection. This notion is not only exemplified by Satan’s guise as a scholar, ascetic, and shaykh in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaa*, but also opens a pathway into understanding why aygusuz may have situated Satan among the pious Muslims in heaven, none of whom can recognize him.

According to the Sufi tradition, shaykhs and holy men have the capacity of remaining free of Satan’s trickeries. They can defend themselves towards Satan’s attacks, and more importantly, they can physically overpower Satan and inflict harm on his person.<sup>41</sup> It is thus particularly interesting that in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaa*, the protagonist is the only character who has this capacity, allowing him to save prophets from Satan on more than one occasion. Once again, we are brought back to the notion of the self as the only source of power and authority.

aygusuz Abdāl’s use of dream narrative as social criticism becomes evident in his portrayal of the figure of the *mollā*, the Muslim scholar. According to aygusuz, the practices of the class of *mollā* serve to highlight the aspect of multiplicity in the created world, while passing in silence the aspect of unity, which is in fact the true aim and source of knowledge. The protagonist of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaa* expresses this notion in the following manner:

When the dervish saw this state, he turned his contemplation to his own self. He said: “O beloved, there was a time when the earth and the sky existed. Beings and forms and images were manifest. The *mollā* from among us used to call everything with a different name. O brother, apparently all of that was Muammad Mutaafā. What a strange thing this is!”<sup>42</sup>

Another social group which gets its share of the dervish’s criticisms is that of the ascetics. When the dervish speaks in the presence of God, ‘a man belonging to the group of ascetics’ tells him: “Don’t speak! Respect the king!”<sup>43</sup> The ascetic thus attacks the dervish for his so-called lack of manners. The dervish later finds out that this person was in fact Satan, wearing the image of

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 75.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 111.

<sup>42</sup> p. 264.

<sup>43</sup> p. 267.

the ascetic as a veil. In another episode, Satan is among the assembly of God's elect, in the guise of the ascetic. Here is how the dervish describes Satan's actions:

Satan was going up and down, busy with service. Nobody was aware of who he was. He had concealed his identity in the guise of an ascetic. He spoke sweetly, slowly attended to the crowd, paid servitude to everyone, told stories of things past and present, and acted like a boon-companion. Everyone was thinking of him as a nice person. When the dervish saw this, he had an unveiling.<sup>44</sup>

Satan is described here to have perfect manners, to act in ways which seem pleasing even to God's elect. Just like the ascetic in *Ḳayğusuz Abdāl's* world, disguised Satan uses social norms and values to create an identity for himself, which will be acceptable to all. From our discussions in Chapter 1 and 3, we can guess that such a line of action is the opposite of the social behavior belonging to the dervish group with which *Ḳayğusuz* identifies. In fact, as is made clear by the ascetic's identification with Satan, *Ḳayğusuz* regards the display of exoteric observance as a ruse created by the base self to trick oneself and others.

In *Satan's Tragedy*, Peter Awn describes Satan's ability to appear in the forms of different people, allowing him to approach unsuspecting men and women in a non-threatening fashion. He defines one of Satan's most sophisticated ruses as taking the guise of a man seeking religious truth.<sup>45</sup> Satan's greatest success in disguising himself takes place not in waking life, but in the realm of dream.<sup>46</sup> Peter Awn describes *Sanā'ī's* perspective on Satanic trickery and disguise in the following manner:

The more Iblīs-like a man becomes in his inner being, the more proficient he becomes at putting on the external airs of a pious Muslim. To have mastered the art of feigning the spiritual guide is to have achieved the pinnacle of satanic achievement, for nothing corrupts quicker the naive and unsuspecting novice than the false counsel of a pseudoshaykh.<sup>47</sup>

Such a perspective is almost identical to the portrayal of Satan, ascetics, Sufis, and religious scholars in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*. The frequency of the theme of the Satanic guise in the work allows for the existence of a layer of social criticism which runs throughout the text. This

---

<sup>44</sup> p. 258.

<sup>45</sup> Awn, 49.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, 49.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 155.

layer is intricately linked with the notion of the dream, which also departs from the generally accepted classification and interpretation of dreams, as both of these are established by those classes of society which put greatest emphasis on and acquire the greatest social benefit from a prioritization of exoteric observance.

### **Incessant Battle with Satan**

So far we have discussed several aspects of *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*'s dream narratives which serve to confuse the reader and create an ambivalence of meaning. The treatment of Satan also appears to be one such aspect. Although the dervish emerges victorious from each of his battles with Satan, that victory only lasts until Satan's next appearance, which once again results in a physical confrontation. In the beginning of the work, upon realizing that the old master he encounters is Satan himself, the dervish says "May God help him," and lets him go. He thanks God for escaping misfortune.<sup>48</sup> Elsewhere in the work, Satan's aspirants Pharaoh, Diocletian, Shaddād, and Nimrod ask the dervish to give Satan back to them in return for a gunnysack and a paddle. The dervish accepts this offer. As a response, Nimrod says to him: "Release us; let us go back to our place. We have completed our service as desired."<sup>49</sup> Part of this service seems to be that of tricking the dervish with worldly compensation. These episodes and others bring up the following question in the mind of the reader: Has the dervish really reached perfection as he claims? If so, why does he continue to fight Satan?

The answer to this question lies in Ḳaygusuz Abdāl's definition of Satan and perfection as expressed by the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*. Upon seeing Nimrod with Satan, the dervish remarks that "Satan had become Nimrod's own existence, that Nimrod was doing whatever Satan was ordering him."<sup>50</sup> Similarly, when the dervish defeats Nimrod and Satan, all prophets and saints as well as other created beings tell him: "Nimrod is not guilty; Satan is the one who commits all of these acts."<sup>51</sup> Upon waking up, the dervish realizes "that there was nobody around, that these attributes which were Satan, Nimrod, and Pharaoh were in fact nothing but ambition, desire, and

---

<sup>48</sup> See p. 244.

<sup>49</sup> p. 256.

<sup>50</sup> p. 254.

<sup>51</sup> p. 256.

other cares which existed in his own body.”<sup>52</sup> The dervish thus openly gives us his definition of the Satanic metaphor as the base self against which one battles one’s entire life. That is why even pious people cannot escape Satan’s claws. The dervish expresses this in a moment of resentment towards the members of the assembly who fail to understand him: “Don’t you know what he did to so many pious people from the times of Adam to our day?”<sup>53</sup>

Satan’s identification with the base self is hinted at during the dervish’s conversation with his spiritual director ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, in which ‘Alī replies to the dervish’s questioning regarding Satan’s guise with the words: “Dervish, be attentive, don’t stay ignorant of this sheikh.”<sup>54</sup> In some episodes, Satan appears as soon as the dervish questions his whereabouts,<sup>55</sup> thus indicating that the appearance of Satan is closely linked to the dervish’s mental state. Elsewhere in the text, the dervish takes away Satan’s sack which contains all his tricks and witchcraft, only to give it back upon Jesus’s order. When Satan empties out his sack, he realizes that none of his materials are missing.<sup>56</sup> We are thus made aware that although the dervish has access to all of the ploys employed by Satan, he does not make use of any of them. This makes more sense when we remember that Satan is disguised as a Muslim scholar or ascetic. The dervish thus has all the capacity to display religious knowledge and observance to obtain a higher social status. His refusal to do so is a sign of his spiritual perfection.

This spiritual perfection is also evidenced in one of the dervish’s battles with Satan, in which the dervish takes off his shepherd’s cloak and puts on God’s grace.<sup>57</sup> Only after this change of outfit does Satan recognize him as the man who beat him up before. This indicates that the battle with Satan does not imply a lack of perfection. When we remember that the dervish’s battles with Satan save several prophets from their immanent deaths, we have the impression that just the opposite is true: Perfection is defined by a perpetual battle against Satan, in which no victory should be considered final. In fact, the idea of an absolute victory is what puts the wayfarer in a position of lethargy, which makes him vulnerable to unexpected attacks by Satan,

---

<sup>52</sup> p. 256.

<sup>53</sup> p. 256.

<sup>54</sup> p. 249.

<sup>55</sup> See p.249.

<sup>56</sup> p. 252.

<sup>57</sup> p. 255.

as explained to the dervish by his master ‘Alī and also evidenced in the work with the appearance of Satan even among God’s elect in heaven. The following passage from the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* paints an intricate picture of the wayfarer’s relationship to Satan:

[The dervish] came to the tale of Adam and told all of his stories. While listening, Satan realized that this was the same dervish who had taken his staff, cap, and sack. He gave a cry, saying: “Is there no way for me to escape this dervish?” He stood up and rushed to attack the dervish. When the dervish saw Satan coming towards him, he also stood up and said:

Again the day of the feast has arrived for us  
The day of my soul’s intimate companionship with the sultan

Again the hand of opportunity has touched union  
The day when lovers are bewildered with love<sup>58</sup>

The prose and verse counterparts of the episode create a close link between battling Satan and intimacy with God. This is due to the fact that the battle with Satan is one of the two major aspects of what it means to be human. This is expressed in a passage in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* where the dervish explains human nature by using the city as a metaphor:

Another mark of the city was that it stood on two poles, and another was that it was not stationary but rather on the move. The city had two sultans. One of them was named “Acceptable to the All-Compassionate” and the other was named “Estimable to Satan.” The two of them were forever in opposition and kept fighting.<sup>59</sup>

In his book on the Ottoman mystic Niyāzī Mıṣrī, Paul Ballanfat asserts that the best translation for the word *nafs* would be the word subjectness (subjectité). He claims that subjecthood is created in the very combat which takes place within oneself: “The *nafs* is revealed only in combat, of course combat of the *nafs* against the *nafs*, enlightened by the intelligence (‘*aql*) which it espouses, internal combat which establishes this subjectness as tension from the onset.”<sup>60</sup> According to Ballanfat, the combat achieves its maximal intensification in the Perfect

---

<sup>58</sup> p. 259.

<sup>59</sup> p. 272.

<sup>60</sup> Paul Ballanfat, *Messianisme et sainteté: Les poèmes du mystique ottoman Niyazi Misri (1618-1694)* (Paris: l’Harmattan, 2012), 306.



Man.<sup>61</sup> These words greatly enhance our understanding of Ẓayğusuz Abdāl's portrayal of Satan and his relationship to perfection. We can now answer the question we posed in the beginning of the section: Are the dervish's battles with Satan in contrast with his claims to perfection?

Ẓayğusuz once again answers us by forcing us to turn all of our preconceived notions upside down: The wayfarer's spiritual power is born out of his struggles with his base self. There is no end to the accumulation of that spiritual power, which lies only in one's own selfhood. As such, there is no end to true inner struggle.

Unlike his treatment of other dream elements, Ẓayğusuz Abdāl's depiction of Satan as the base self is not in conflict with the established tradition. According to Islamic belief, "every human being is accompanied by two angels who write down his actions, and also by a jinnī, or by Satan himself, who tries by suggestion to lead him into temptation either in a dream or while awake."<sup>62</sup> The constant fight with Satan thus resonates with general Islamic belief. Moreover, as Pierre Lory explains, dream manuals depict a fundamental relationship between Satan and desire, which betrays a state of being tested by the imperatives of the carnal soul. As a result, dominion over Satan in dreams suggests the obtainment of great power. Satan symbolizes the egotistical and hedonistic tendencies of the human being. Thus, dreaming of killing Satan means that one has or will have great power over oneself.<sup>63</sup> In addition, according to the Sufi tradition, sleep and dreaming help Sufis in recuperating force in their battles against the base self.<sup>64</sup>

Ẓayğusuz Abdāl thus draws his metaphoric references to Satan from the established tradition, while at the same time subverting this tradition with startling elements, such as the Perfect Man's endless fight with Satan and the presence of Satan among God's elect in heaven. There is nothing in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* or elsewhere in Ẓayğusuz Abdāl's oeuvre to indicate that Ẓayğusuz Abdāl views Satan in a positive light in the line of the Hallajian tradition. The episodes in which Satan continues to be in disguise in the heavenly assemblies and tricks God's elect into

---

<sup>61</sup> Interestingly, these views which Ballanfat identifies as those of Niyāzī Mıṣrī also resemble those espoused by Panjābī author and poet Muḥammad Iqbāl. For the importance of evil in strengthening selfhood in Iqbāl, see Sayyid Naimuddin, "Evil and Freewill in Rūmī and Iqbāl," *Islamic Culture* 46/1 (1972): 227-234.

<sup>62</sup> Fritz Meier, "Some Aspects of Inspiration by Demons in Islam," in Von Grunebaum and Caillois (eds.), *The Dream and Human Societies*, 424.

<sup>63</sup> Lory, *Le Rêve*, 169.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 209.

loving him should rather be read as a redefinition of the base self as a force which can only be temporarily subdued, but never completely killed.

### **Dream and Wakefulness**

Sufi tradition does not posit an ontological difference between waking visions and dreams. The lack of specification in the narratives often prevents the reader from knowing which is the case.<sup>65</sup> According to Shahzad Bashir, “this ambiguity further enforces the notion that what matters most is not the purported state of the person whose life is being narrated but the fact of seeing, the content of the vision, and interpretive glosses provided by authoritative commentators.”<sup>66</sup> The capacity to have waking visions is generally linked to a higher spiritual status.<sup>67</sup> While the ordinary Muslims can receive visions only in dreams, the mystic can receive them in sleep, wakefulness, or a state between the two.<sup>68</sup>

From the onset, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* begins by blurring the lines between sleep and wakefulness. Although we are told in the beginning of the work that the dervish is dreaming, after speaking his first couplets, the dervish realizes that he is not –perhaps no longer– dreaming.<sup>69</sup> The fact that the dervish can go back to the same dream after waking up also indicates a level of control over the visionary process. At the end of the work, the dervish has a conversation in couplets with the sultan, possibly identified with God, or ‘Alī, or both. The conversation begins while the dervish is asleep, but continues after the dervish has awakened.<sup>70</sup>

Several times in the work, the dervish wakes up only to realize that he is all by himself. He repeats the Arabic phrase: “In the house there is no one but us monks.” As the narrative develops, we have a better understanding of what Ḳaygusuz means by the phrase, which refers to the dervish’s awareness of his own selfhood as the locus of absolute truth and unity. In one episode, the dervish sees ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib sitting on the king’s throne. He kisses ‘Alī’s hand and

---

<sup>65</sup> See Bashir, 235.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, 236.

<sup>67</sup> See Lory, *Le Rêve*, 236.

<sup>68</sup> See Meier, 422.

<sup>69</sup> See p. 242.

<sup>70</sup> See p. 281.

holds his skirt. Upon waking up, he realizes that he had been holding the skirt of his own cloak.<sup>71</sup> Later on, the dervish gets involved in a physical fight with an unidentified person. He grabs the man's collar, only to wake up and realize that he had been fighting his own shadow and holding his own collar.<sup>72</sup> In contrast to the depiction of this episode as a dream, a few lines before this fight, the dervish questions his state and decides that "this was not a dream, but a true occurrence."<sup>73</sup> It thus seems that the dervish considers wakefulness as a higher truth, in which the multiplicity of the world has disappeared to give way to unity as embodied in the person of the dervish.

On the other hand, this hierarchy is annulled by other expressions, such as when the dervish sees that "his self was all there was, that whatever he had dreamt was the truth, nothing more, nothing less."<sup>74</sup> In this sense, the dream and waking state are both true, as long as the dream is interpreted correctly. In the work, this interpretation is expressed as follows: "He dreamt that the earth and sky as well as all created beings inside them were the shadow of his own body."<sup>75</sup> The dream is thus a metaphor for the world of multiplicity. Another metaphor for the same concept is the dervish's cloak, which symbolizes the exoteric aspect of reality. Only by letting go of his attachment to his own exoteric existence could the dervish open himself up to the experience of the exoteric as a totality:

He thought: "When I stopped sewing my cloak, I reached my soul. What a beautiful old cloak has come into my hands!" He took it off, put it aside, and began to contemplate it. He saw that each color carried the viewer away to a hundred thousand visions. The dervish reflected on the dreams he had dreamt, the adventures he had experienced, the birds he had hunted down, the places he had contemplated.<sup>76</sup>

As we will examine below, the dervish's selfhood as expressed through the metaphor of the city is a mirror image of this exoteric reality.<sup>77</sup> Yet we can see this perspective change at other instances. Several times within the text, the dervish identifies the exoteric world as a "shadow of

---

<sup>71</sup> See p. 266.

<sup>72</sup> See p. 271.

<sup>73</sup> p. 270.

<sup>74</sup> p. 279.

<sup>75</sup> p. 304.

<sup>76</sup> p. 277-8.

<sup>77</sup> See p. 275.

his own body.”<sup>78</sup> In one episode, the deer hunted by Solomon disappears into the dervish’s shadow, after which the dervish begins hearing the deer’s rattling from inside his own body.<sup>79</sup> aygusuz thus transforms our definition of the exoteric, turning the concept on its head. The following is one such phrase which expresses this strategy: “He dreamt that what he had witnessed in the dream in which the entire universe was manifest was in fact the shadow of his own body.”<sup>80</sup> From the perspective of a higher truth, the manifestation of the universe is merely a dream. For the erroneous interpreter, God seems to be hidden inside the created world. For the Perfect Man, the perfect interpreter of truth, the created world is a shadow image of fully-manifest God, an image which becomes almost invisible under the powerful light of His all-too-visible sun.

Generally in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaa*, dream narratives are written in prose, while moments of wakefulness are articulated in couplets (although towards the end, the line between dream and wakefulness becomes increasingly blurred). These couplets singularly express the dervish’s spiritual experience of the oneness of being, i.e. the unity of his selfhood with the selfhood of God who is the only true being. The oscillation between the sleeping and waking states thus mirrors the formal oscillation between prose and poetry, both oscillations signifying a change of awareness between the two aspects of truth which are multiplicity and unity.

In one passage in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaa*, public criers shout: “The state (*hāl*) is to be found inside the image (*hayāl*). Those who know the image know the state.”<sup>81</sup> These words introduce another terminology for the state of unity and the world of multiplicity. They also express that the path to unity is via the world of images which, when properly identified for what they are, can lead the wayfarer to the ultimate truth. Indeed, this truth is nothing but the uncovering of the fact that both sides of the pairs of opposites are God’s self-manifestations, as the dervish states through the mouth of God:

I am the solution, I am what they call the difficulty

---

<sup>78</sup> See p. 269 as well as two passages on p. 283-4.

<sup>79</sup> See the passage on p. 278. For an overview of the deer motif in Turkish folklore, see Zekeriya Karadavut and Ünsal Yılmaz Yeşildal, “Anadolu-Türk Folklorunda Geyik,” *Milli Folklor* 19/76 (2007): 102-112.

<sup>80</sup> p. 283.

<sup>81</sup> p. 266.

I am the traveler; I am what they term the stopping place<sup>82</sup>

Hence by slowly eradicating the distinction between wakefulness and dream, Kaygusuz also blurs the lines between unity and multiplicity, or as the dervish would say: he turns multiplicity into a shadow image of unity. That is why, as the text goes on, the dream episodes begin to treat scenes belonging to the preeternal pact or achieved perfection in heaven, in which all beings attest to the unity of God.

The oscillations between dream and wakefulness, prose and poetry, multiplicity and unity also have an emotional component: the dervish's fluctuation between states of fear and certainty. In Chapter 1, I have discussed how fear is an emotion which indicates the lowest level in the spiritual hierarchy. Certainty, on the other hand, is a sign of experienced unity, in which the potential for spiritual perfection is actualized. According to Pierre Lory, in the Sufi tradition, "the messages transmitted in dreams mark stages in a spiritual journey, in a journey of the soul to his Lord. Or [...] they announce aids furnished to overcome doubts, trials, etc."<sup>83</sup> Hence we could stipulate that over the course of the work, the dervish's dream visions and journeys slowly enable him to overcome doubt. In the beginning of the work, the dervish's fear and doubt are expressed in the following manner: "The dervish realized that he was not in the least bit sure of himself. He wished there were someone whom he could ask about his state. Yet he saw no one; he was all alone. He turned upon himself and wondered if he was dreaming."<sup>84</sup> On the other hand, halfway through the work, after the dervish speaks a pair of couplets expressing the oneness of being, his certainty is expressed in the following way by his adversaries:

Because the dervish spoke these words, Satan's aspirants looked around and said: "This dervish is free of all his concerns about us; what can we do?" At that instant, the dervish woke up. He saw that there was nobody around, that these attributes which were Satan, Nimrod, and Pharaoh were in fact nothing but ambition, desire, and other cares which existed inside his own body.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> p. 279.

<sup>83</sup> Lory, *Le Rêve*, 203.

<sup>84</sup> p. 242.

<sup>85</sup> p. 256.

The dervish's realization of the meaning of existence is thus directly related to his lack of fear and doubt. At the end of the work, during the intimate conversation between the dervish and his sultan which takes place in the form of couplets, the sultan tells him:

And unto you peace, poor dervish!  
Whose speech is sound, whose acts are pure

You are free of all surmise and doubt  
Certain of truth, trustworthy of God<sup>86</sup>

Soon after this episode, the dervish himself expresses the degree of certitude he has attained:

Thank God that I have let go of this image and gained certitude  
I have let go of the above and below, the right and the left

Of saying 'you' and 'me', 'yours' or 'mine'  
Thank God I have become free of foolish chatter<sup>87</sup>

In parallel with his transformation, the dervish stops seeking a master and learns that he himself is the ultimate source of his knowledge. His changing self-perception expressed through the following words:

To my self I speak these words  
I myself am the sheikh, myself my aspirant<sup>88</sup>

This is in line with the general Sufi understanding of dreams, where the "glad tidings" which the dream bestows on the wayfarer are understood as the announcement of the wayfarer's spiritual degree or achievement. As Pierre Lory explains, many times the dream is understood as a substitute to the concrete presence of a master who would pay special attention to the disciple's spiritual evolution.<sup>89</sup> As such, unlike the popular tradition of dream interpretation, the Sufi understanding of dreams focuses not on the disciple's future but rather on the identification and

---

<sup>86</sup> p. 281.

<sup>87</sup> p. 283.

<sup>88</sup> p. 277.

<sup>89</sup> Lory, *Le Rêve*, 229.

confirmation of his immediate state.<sup>90</sup> As a work which actively engages with this tradition, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* is a narrative of successive dream states which lead from fear to certainty, despite their non-linear progression.

On the other hand, the couplets which cut through the prose text tell a different story. The first lines of the prose text describe the dervish's unfamiliarity with his environment, resulting in fear and doubt.<sup>91</sup> Yet this narrative is interrupted by the following couplets:

The entire universe is nothing but body, yet the soul I have become  
The body's soul and the soul's beloved I have become

Whoever sees my form thinks I am man  
In form the attribute of the All-Compassionate I have become<sup>92</sup>

Thus, even at its height, the dervish's fear is never absolute. It is as though his fear is nothing but the shadow of his certainty, as his dreams are a shadow of his waking state, as multiplicity is the shadow of oneness. I will deal with the concept of time at length further on. However, it may suffice to say this here: Even at the height of his fear and ignorance, the dervish has always already obtained perfection. This will become all the more important when we discuss the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*'s relationship to the genre of the *ṣaṭhiyye*. Yet our previous discussion of the *ṣaṭhiyye* can give us a preliminary perspective. Considering the disintegration of one's acquired knowledge and the creation of confusion as the ultimate transforming act, we may think that the dervish's perfect ignorance (his ignorance of his whereabouts, of his mental state, of the way to interpret what he sees) is perhaps not all that far from his absolute knowledge.

## **Dervishhood and Perfection**

For many of his interlocutors, the dervish is a strange figure. Satan tells him he has never seen someone like him; Muḥammad and other prophets are surprised by his appearance. In both

---

<sup>90</sup> See Jonathan G. Katz, "Dreams and Their Interpretation in Sufi Thought and Practice," in Felek and Knysh (eds.), *Dreams and Visions in Islamic Societies*, 184.

<sup>91</sup> Here Kaygusuz uses the common metaphor of the house to refer to the self (soul). Thus by stating that the dervish's head was out of the chimney, he indicates that the dervish had lost his awareness of his selfhood.

<sup>92</sup> p. 242.

the prose sections and the couplets, the dervish's singularity is also interpreted in a different manner, as he is depicted as the only being to actually exist. After the dervish's conversation with Bahlūl, Bahlūl hugs the dervish and goes inside his collar.<sup>93</sup> The dervish realizes that Bahlūl was in fact his own self. Similarly, after holding 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib's skirt, the dervish wakes up to realize that he was holding the skirt of his own cloak.<sup>94</sup> The dervish is identified with the esoteric dimension of all of existence, which renders all of existence into a mere image of himself. As we have seen above, the dervish dreams that "the earth and the sky, the entire universe was a cloak that he himself was wearing."<sup>95</sup> In another dream episode, the dervish becomes aware that "what he had witnessed in the dream in which the entire universe was manifest was in fact the shadow of his own body."<sup>96</sup> Elsewhere in the text, Muḥammad is described as wearing a patched cloak. The description of the patched cloak identifies Muḥammad as the esoteric aspect of all of reality:

A person came out from amongst all of these creatures. His name was Muḥammad Muṣṭafā. He was wearing a worn out patched cloak. All the designs and images that exist, all the forms which appear in the exoteric and the esoteric realms were colorful patches of this old cloak. There was no one else; in the house there is no one but us monks.<sup>97</sup>

When taken together, these expressions tell us that Ḳayḡusuz defines perfection as an ontological identification with the essence of Muḥammad, the locus of absolute unity.

We will delve deeper into this perspective once we discuss the dervish's notion of immanence and his representation of the light of Muḥammad. However so far it seems clear that for the dervish, the categories of Perfect Man, saint, prophet, and dervish are ontologically identical. Indeed, we observe no hierarchy between prophets and saints in the text. We could say that by defining perfection through *walāya*, Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl shows very little regard for *nubuwwa*.<sup>98</sup> On the other hand, as we will see, the portrayal of *walāya* in the *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṭa* moves away from the traditional notion of a reciprocal relationship as the text progresses. For

---

<sup>93</sup> See p. 257. This reminds us of the imagery regarding the physical union of Muḥammad and 'Alī in the *Faṣīlet-nāme* mentioned in the fourth chapter.

<sup>94</sup> See p. 266. I will treat the relationship with 'Alī separately in the pages below.

<sup>95</sup> p. 277.

<sup>96</sup> p. 283.

<sup>97</sup> p. 264.

<sup>98</sup> For the relationship between dreams and prophecy, see Kinberg, "Dreams."



Ḳayğusuz, absolute unity with God as God is the only true meaning of perfection. Defined as becoming the Muḥammadan essence who is the all-encompassing esoteric, the achievement of absolute unity thus negates the possibility of a hierarchy of perfection, which would allow for a distinction between saints and prophets. This perspective is also in line with our discussion of Ḳayğusuz's religious doctrine in Chapter 2.

Ḳayğusuz defines dervishhood as the ultimate expression of attained unity. As a result, even prophets are depicted with dervish traits in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*. The following excerpt describes Prophet Adam as a man practicing the four blows:

They took hold of Abraham to attach him to the catapult. Prophet Adam said: "Dervish, get up, we may as well go." Satan said: "First throw that bald and beardless one." The people grabbed Adam to throw him in the fire.<sup>99</sup>

The people who see Solomon and the dervish together find the two men to be strange (*ğarīb*).<sup>100</sup> In addition, the protagonist's dervish practices are particularly highlighted in the text. Upon seeing Muḥammad, the dervish says to him: "O Messenger of God!" I have no one. I am poverty-stricken and hungry."<sup>101</sup> He is subsequently brought food to eat. Elsewhere in the text, the steer and the fish believed to carry the world are slaughtered and given by God as an offering to the dervishes.<sup>102</sup> The dervish finds himself in the mosque of Egypt in which the entire world is assembled. He stands up immediately and starts begging.<sup>103</sup> Perhaps the most humorous passage in this regard consists of the Sultan's reply to the dervish at the end of the work, where He says:

O dervish of sweet words and a blessed face!  
The pearl of reality, dervish of good fortune!

Who is filled with majesty like a roaring lion  
Upon seeing a single grain of rice in his plate!<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> p. 255.

<sup>100</sup> See pp. 261-2.

<sup>101</sup> p. 248.

<sup>102</sup> See p. 258.

<sup>103</sup> See p. 280.

<sup>104</sup> p. 282.

Never has the celebration of poverty sounded more literal! As a dervish himself, aygusuz is indeed proud not only of his spiritual level, but also of his physical condition and material practices.

## **Immanence**

The *Kitāb-ı Maqlata* contains two complementary perspectives on the dervish's relationship to God. While the first of these indicates a reciprocal relationship in which the dervish serves as God's exoteric dimension, the second identifies the dervish with God's essence, hence displaying a vision of absolute unity. In the beginning of the work, the dervish's couplets identify him with God's attributes:

Whoever sees my form thinks I am man  
In form the attribute of the All-Compassionate I have become<sup>105</sup>

In all things I am the substance of reality  
I am the attributes of the absolute essence, the ocean of wisdom<sup>106</sup>

In preeternity, in "we have apportioned" [43:32], the lot fallen to me  
Has been to share the sultan's shadow<sup>107</sup>

As such, the dervish encompasses all of existence:

And yet he realized that the earth and sky had become secrets inside his own body. He heard the sound of all beings that existed in the earth and sky, and understood that the sound was coming from his own body. He became aware of himself. He thought: "I used to be inside this earth and sky, and now they appear inside me. Can this be a dream?"<sup>108</sup>

In this approach, there continues to be a distinction between the creator and the created, as the dervish comes to recognize the divine aspects of his being:

The sun has shown itself in my speck of light  
Look and see, this very instant in my drop of water the ocean has emerged<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> p. 242.

<sup>106</sup> p. 242.

<sup>107</sup> p. 260.

<sup>108</sup> p. 243-4.

<sup>109</sup> p. 246.

One such passage is the discussion between ‘Alī and the dervish, in which ‘Alī confers upon God a position of absolute interiority with respect to His or Her creation:

The dervish asked ‘Alī the King of Men:

- This canopy that was made to cover us, where is its owner? I cannot see him.
- The owner of the canopy is inside it.
- O ‘Alī! I can’t see!
- Brother, the one who moves about and does tricks inside these existing forms is its owner.<sup>110</sup>

This perspective which maintains the difference between the creator and the created is what allows for Kaygusuz’s visions of God, where God sits on a throne and addresses his creatures.<sup>111</sup>

On the other hand, as the text progresses, the focus of the couplets shift from God’s attributes to his essence. The existence of the form and attribute are negated, establishing the essence as the only reality:

On all corners the universe is filled with the light of felicity  
All is one, there is no separation and no union

All you look at is the eye of perfection  
There is no attribute, in reality all is essence<sup>112</sup>

In line with this perspective, the dervish’s self-description also changes. He begins to identify himself not with God’s attributes, but with the essence itself. This ‘essence’ embodies both form and attribute; it is the entirety of creation:

I am the foundation on which rest all different states  
The manufactory belongs to me, I am the master

Inside my form the essence and the attributes have become secrets  
I am the essence for all forms<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> p. 246.

<sup>111</sup> For the interpretation of visions of God in dream manuals, see Lory, *Le Rêve*, 141-143. As Lory explains, seeing God in the form of a sultan is common. It is also common to see Him as a light dispossessed of attributes, in which case the dream is definitely a benediction. This type of vision is also present in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*. On all occasions, the words spoken by God are meant to be understood literally.

<sup>112</sup> p. 261.

<sup>113</sup> p. 264-5.

I am the existent in all of existence  
I am the aim of the Kaaba and the idol

I am the shark; I am the sea and the ocean  
I am the valuable mine in the all-surrounding waters<sup>114</sup>

As such, the dervish becomes identical to the forms, attributes and essence of God, i.e. all of what constitutes the creator and the created:

I am what they call the pearl of unity  
I am all attributes and what they name the essence<sup>115</sup>

Such a union reminds us of the teaching of the absolute immanence of God in *Ḳaygusuz*'s other works, which we saw to belong to the gate of truth (*ḥaḳīḳat*) in the second chapter. In being God Himself, the dervish acquires true existence. Just as God is singular, the dervish also becomes singular. Indeed, all dervishes who have achieved this rank partake in this singularity. The dervish's certitude on this matter gives us the meaning behind the frequently repeated phrase: "In the house there is no one but us monks." The passage below expresses the dervish's divinity in the most radical and absolute terms:

The dervish awoke and saw that in the house there is no one but us monks; he was all alone. He looked around and saw that there was no city and no market. The sun was up; day and night, far and nearby, all was unified. There was no path, no traveler, and no stopping place. The whole universe was one –one body and one head. The dervish had an outpour of emotion. He recited these two couplets:

The whole universe is my body, my existence  
Hence it is before my self that I prostrate<sup>116</sup>

Although the dervish says that he prostrates before himself, and that all of existence is one body and one head, these expressions should not be taken as a divinization of man. The Perfect Man is defined here as the locus of the oneness of being, the embodiment of unity:

I am the unique individual, the absolute agent  
I am the recondite secret in all hearts

---

<sup>114</sup> p. 272.

<sup>115</sup> p. 277.

<sup>116</sup> p. 277.

I am the esoteric in all exoteric  
I am the sailor, the boat, and the all-surrounding ocean<sup>117</sup>

The depiction of the totality of existence as ‘one body and one head’ brings us back to the dervish’s understanding of experiential knowledge, wherein he considers his selfhood to be the only true source of the knowledge of God and the universe. Rıza Tevfik names this perspective in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* as “subjectivisme” and defines it as “the philosophy which posits that everything is subjective, that everything should be sought in man.”<sup>118</sup>

At the very end of the work, the dervish wakes up to realize that all of his dream visions were expressions of his states:

Hence a dervish dreamt such a story. He woke up and saw himself inside the city of Shamakhi, lying in the corner of a bath furnace. He looked just like before; the earth and the sky were in place. Then he saw that his states were written in this book to prevent their loss.<sup>119</sup>

Once again, the dervish is proud of his material poverty. In Ḳaygusuz’s characteristic fashion, with his tone he creates an ambiguity of meaning: Should we take these visions seriously as the dream states of a man who has achieved highest perfection? Or should we dismiss them as the possibly Satanic imaginings of a wretched soul? Ḳaygusuz tells us that if we do not know the right answer, we should ask the gnostics, because they would know how to interpret the dervish’s dreams. They would be careful not to take Ḳaygusuz’s musings at face value. They would say to us: the very proof of the dervish’s divinity is the poor material condition and social status he is left with upon awakening. The truth hides itself in an appearance which negates it and only comes out by destroying this appearance altogether.

## **Muḥammad and ‘Alī**

I have treated the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*’s depiction of Muḥammad and ‘Alī in the second chapter. However the topic merits a closer look here as well. In the text, Muḥammad and ‘Alī are portrayed to be in an exoteric-esoteric relationship. As discussed before, Ḳaygusuz designates

---

<sup>117</sup> p. 278.

<sup>118</sup> Rıza Tevfik Bölükbaşı, “Ḳaygusuz Sultan ve Azmî Baba Hakkında,” in *Tekke ve Halk Edebiyatı Makaleleri*, 135.

<sup>119</sup> p. 284.

Muḥammad as the sultan in the market of the intellect, while designating ‘Alī as the sultan in the market of love. We know from the discussion in the first chapter that Ḳayḡusuz sees the capacity of love as the esoteric dimension of the intellect. On the other hand, Ḳayḡusuz’s portrayal of Muḥammad also has esoteric and exoteric aspects. In his first encounter with Muḥammad, the dervish sees him sitting in the position of chief among his people and answering questions on matters regarding the material world.<sup>120</sup> In the dervish’s visions of judgement day, Muḥammad acts as intercessor and as the guide leading all created beings to the presence of God.<sup>121</sup> Muḥammad’s communal role can be considered as his exoteric aspect, while his esoteric aspect is his role as the first created being, the Perfect Man dormant in all of reality. This is expressed by the dervish’s narrative of creation:

At the time when the universe didn’t exist, God –glorified and exalted be He– existed. He wished to create the whole universe. First he created the soul of Muḥammad Muṣṭafā. From Muḥammad Muṣṭafā’s soul he brought the entire universe into being. All beings in the earth and sky became whole and complete. From that time to our day all beings were occupied with their own states.<sup>122</sup>

The dervish expresses the Muḥammadan essence and its role regarding all of creation with the following words: “The *mollā* from among us used to call everything with a different name. O brother, apparently all of that was Muḥammad Muṣṭafā. What a strange thing this is!”<sup>123</sup> The entire universe is illuminated with Muḥammad’s light. On the day of judgement, all beings face his light.<sup>124</sup> As we have seen earlier, the Muḥammadan essence is the manifest aspect of God. For any wayfarer, uniting with God takes place via an ontological identification with the light of Muḥammad. It is the wayfarer’s duty to remember and reactualize the preeternal truth of his existence as the light of Muḥammad.

Although the Islamic tradition grants the function of intercession to Muḥammad and Muḥammad only, the *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaṭa* denies him this function, as when God replies to his intercession: “O Muhammad! Wish for what is of direct concern for you. Each prophet has his

---

<sup>120</sup> See p. 244.

<sup>121</sup> See p. 248 and 258.

<sup>122</sup> p. 259.

<sup>123</sup> p. 264.

<sup>124</sup> See p. 258.

own dealing with me.”<sup>125</sup> Here reference is being made to Muḥammad’s exoteric aspect as a political and historical figure. In his typical surprising manner, Kaygusuz reminds us that there is no hierarchy between the prophets, who are all manifestations of the Muḥammadan light. All Perfect Men share the same spiritual degree.

In the beginning of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, the dervish enters the service of ‘Alī and becomes his disciple. Upon seeing ‘Alī, the dervish says to him: “O ‘Alī! I want to be your aspirant. I don’t have any knowledge of principles and customs. I want to learn them from you.”<sup>126</sup> ‘Alī explains to the dervish how to acquire a vision of God by looking at His creation, how to interpret Quranic episodes such as that of Joseph, how to beware of Satan. In his spiritual travels, the dervish is accompanied by ‘Alī, who helps him identify and contemplate paradise.<sup>127</sup> In the following episode, when the dervish dreams of his own ontological and spiritual perfection, ‘Alī hides in his heart:

One day he asked: “O ‘Alī! Before me this body didn’t exist; I was soul. At that time I dreamt that this whole universe was my shadow. What is the interpretation of this dream?” As soon as the dervish said these words, ‘Alī the King of Men hid inside his heart. The dervish looked all around and saw no one.<sup>128</sup>

Not only is ‘Alī the dervish’s interior guide, he is also the truth hidden in all Perfect Men, as well as all prophets. This is expressed through an episode in which ‘Alī blinks behind the eyes of Solomon:

After many cycles of time, one day the dervish dreamt that he was in the times of Prophet Solomon. Prophet Solomon was holding council. The dervish saw that underneath the eyelashes of Solomon, it was ‘Alī who was looking out. He immediately knew what this meant and begged for mercy. He said to ‘Alī the King of Men: “I had been waiting in impatience for so long. Now that I am in your presence, I have so many wishes to realize.” ‘Alī the King of Men made a sign for the dervish to remain silent and said: “Don’t say anything. I’ve come (to earth) with Prophet Solomon. He thinks that I am his own self. Remain silent so that he doesn’t feel hurt.”<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>125</sup> p. 248.

<sup>126</sup> p. 247.

<sup>127</sup> See p. 250.

<sup>128</sup> p. 247.

<sup>129</sup> p. 247-8.

As I have previously underlined, on the day of judgement when all sins have been pardoned, all beings speak in understandable languages the Shi'i profession of faith: "*Lā ilāha illallāh Muḥammadur rasūlullāh 'Aliyyun waliyyullāh* (There is no God but God. Muḥammad is the messenger of God. 'Alī is the friend of God)." All prophets and saints are in admiration of 'Alī.<sup>130</sup> Halfway through the work, the dervish sees the king arrive with his army. He identifies the king as 'Alī:

The king heard the dervish's words and told his people to go and summon the dervish. The dervish approached and greeted the king. He stood ready for service. Upon a closer look the dervish saw that it was 'Alī the lion of God who sat in the king's throne. He immediately kissed his hand and held his skirt, began to entreat him with the wish to present his state.<sup>131</sup>

At the end of the work, the dervish reaches the sultan's banquet, a feast in which all beings are in the presence of God. Here the sultan is identified with God. The dervish addresses God with the following words:

Peace be unto you, o great sultan!  
The mine of reality, the precious jewel

Your kindness is the protection of all  
Your favor is everyone's guide<sup>132</sup>

We are thus left partly puzzled: Is the king 'Alī the lion of God and the dervish's spiritual director, or God Himself? Is 'Alī identified with God or not? After his conversation with the sultan, the dervish realizes that he himself is the sultan. Does this mean that the dervish is identified with God, or 'Alī, or both? In addition, we are also told that "what people called 'God' was actually a divine light."<sup>133</sup> Does this mean that God is the light of Muḥammad?

We are by now well aware that any ambiguity in the text is a deliberate literary ploy. If we look closely, we see that both 'Alī and God are referred to by the titles King and Sultan throughout the text. On the other hand, this title is generally not given to Muḥammad. We can thus posit that while 'Alī is God Himself, Muḥammad is the first created being, who contains and

---

<sup>130</sup> See p. 248.

<sup>131</sup> p. 266.

<sup>132</sup> p. 281.

<sup>133</sup> p. 258.



is contained by all of existence. In fact, as we will soon see, in the preeternal moment, the time frame from which all perfection disperses and to which all perfection ultimately returns, Muḥammad is the only being to exist. He is the Perfect Man, the unique manifestation of God to Himself. He is the self-manifestation of ‘Alī, who is hidden in all Perfect Men.

## **Preeternity and Afterlife**

In the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, preeternity and afterlife are depicted as two facets of the same state, which is that of blissful unity with God. Almost halfway through the work, the dervish arrives at the presence of God, where he witnesses the day of resurrection:

The dervish saw a crowded assembly that had gathered. When he approached, he perceived that what people called ‘God’ was actually a divine light. All of a sudden the light began to radiate. All beings awoke. Each one thanked God’s unity in its own tongue. The dervish realized that it was the day of judgement, the day of weighing and questioning. Muḥammad Muṣṭafā was conspicuous, brightly shining in the middle of all, like the sun and the moon.<sup>134</sup>

All beings greet their king, identified with ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, in their respective groups. The esoteric has become manifest and the entire universe is visible:

At that instant, the dervish saw large groups of people appear. They sat down, each with its own kind. The dervish realized that these were groups of sheikhs, of ascetics, worshippers, and prophets. Each of them greeted the king with his/her own group and stepped aside. As the dervish continued to observe, ‘Alī the King of Men said: “O servants of God! Look this way!” When the dervish looked with all the others, he saw that from the face of the earth all the way to the Lotus-tree in the seventh heaven all was visible. Everything that existed in between became illuminated and manifest.<sup>135</sup>

Ḳaygusuz Abdāl describes the day of resurrection as a feast with beautiful decorations and a delightful meal in which all beings take their share and feel content in God’s presence.<sup>136</sup> Moreover, this is a time in which all sins are pardoned:

All created beings were facing that light, saying to one another: “Bravo to our kind sultan! He did not shame anyone by telling his fault to his face. He gave everyone what he wished for.” Suddenly the dervish saw that light the theophany of which showed their paths to all beings in the earth and

---

<sup>134</sup> p. 258.

<sup>135</sup> p. 267.

<sup>136</sup> See pp. 280-81.

sky. Having seen its path, each being had completed its affairs and was preoccupied with its own state, its heart content. All beings were in great pleasure and delight with their own kind. In this state the dervish saw that the judgement was complete, the sins of all were pardoned.<sup>137</sup>

As such, Kaygusuz negates the existence of hell, although earlier in the text he does contemplate it and calls it “a place of admonition.”<sup>138</sup> This doctrinal perspective is in line with Kaygusuz Abdāl’s understanding of heaven and hell discussed in the second chapter. At the end of the work, in his conversation with God, the dervish says to God:

With your assistance, all beings are appeased  
Your favor and beneficence are always at work<sup>139</sup>

These lines indicate the notion that the blessings of paradise are always already present in this world. Such a perspective becomes all the more important when we remember Kaygusuz Abdāl’s understanding of the Preeternal Pact, which forms an integral part of his thought. In the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, the dervish expresses his state in preternity with the following words:

In preternity this body did not exist, I was soul  
I was not a servant, at that moment I was the sultan

In the flower garden of the soul when my body did not exist  
I was the rose garden of the laughing rose<sup>140</sup>

These words are virtually identical to the words that the dervish uses to describe his present state. Indeed, many of Kaygusuz’s visions of unity do not differentiate between preternity and afterlife. In one dream vision, the dervish sees that “the whole universe had become one tongue and was speaking the unity of God,”<sup>141</sup> expressed via the Shi’i profession of faith. This attestation of unity by created beings is repeated several times throughout the text:

Suddenly the dervish saw that all beings which existed in earth and sky said with clarity and eloquence:

Thank God that God is present in all

---

<sup>137</sup> p. 258.

<sup>138</sup> p. 250.

<sup>139</sup> p. 281.

<sup>140</sup> p. 257.

<sup>141</sup> p. 258.

He is the light of worship visible in all things<sup>142</sup>

He prostrated in thankfulness. When he raised his head, he saw that the day had dawned and the sun was up. Light and dark, day and light, distant and nearby were all united. All things were repeating with peace and delight: “There is no god but God.”<sup>143</sup>

In Chapter 2, I discussed aygusuz Abdāl’s definition of perfection as the act of return to the preeternal present which is the moment of unity with God. In the same line of thought, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaa* demonstrates the ontological sameness of all moments of unity with God, whether in preeternity, the present, or afterlife. The time frame of unity is the point of origin from which all theophany dissipates and to which all theophany returns. Linear time is a concept belonging to created things, incapable of expressing the singularity of meaning and cyclical trajectory of the divine’s journey. At each instance, the Perfect Man is always already at the moment of preeternity from which he has emerged and on the day of resurrection to which he has returned. This is why, throughout the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaa*, prophets, saints, and other created beings become present after an important act by the dervish in order to commend him.<sup>144</sup> They are always already present, because linear time as the exoteric dimension of reality has dissipated in order to make manifest the esoteric dimension, which is that of *a-lastu bi-rabbikum*.

## Spiritual Travel

Another theme linked to those of preeternity and afterlife is travel. This theme has two complementary aspects. One of these is spiritual travel, which the dervish undertakes during the course of the narrative.<sup>145</sup> The second is the soul’s travel from the creator to the created world, from the moment of unity to the world of multiplicity. The following passage exemplifies the extent of the dervish’s spiritual travels:

---

<sup>142</sup> p. 250.

<sup>143</sup> p. 253.

<sup>144</sup> See for instance pp. 255-6.

<sup>145</sup> aygusuz Abdāl is definitely drawing from the classical literature on such visions. Compare the dervish’s spiritual travels with those of Abū Yazīd al-Biāmī studied in Lory, *Le Rêve*, 218-222. aygusuz makes reference to al-Biāmī in his *Delīl-i Budalā*, along with other famous figures of Sufism; see aygusuz Abdāl, *Delīl-i Budalā*, 69.

From deep down inside the earth to the Pleiades all had become apparent. The dervish saw paradise and asked ‘Alī what kind of a place it was. When ‘Alī told him, he contemplated it in its entirety. Suddenly he saw hell, a place of admonition. He looked underneath the earth, contemplated the earth’s surface, the steer, the fish, and the sea. He looked up, saw the throne and the spheres of the skies and contemplated them. He looked at the constellations of the Zodiac, saw them laid out and ornamented. He contemplated the roots of all things. His heart became light with happiness.<sup>146</sup>

While the dervish travels through the whole macrocosmos in this passage, elsewhere in the text he visits the city which is a metaphor for his individual existence as a human being.<sup>147</sup> As we will see later on, he draws parallels between the two realms of travel, wherein the microcosmos becomes a mirror image of the macrocosmos, or vice versa. His visions of the universe are linked to the fact that all of existence has become manifest to him. The distinction between esoteric and exoteric has been obliterated, as has the difference between part and whole.

The second aspect of travel is related to the notion of theophany discussed in Chapter 2, where God is said to travel through his creation by ‘wearing’ His creatures, especially man. The following couplets express this notion:

In preeternity I was the beloved, I yielded myself to the soul  
My soul wore body and I came to the esplanade

To travel this universe, the lands of God,  
I, a gnostic, have yielded myself to the human form<sup>148</sup>

In a long passage, the dervish explains his travel through the universe in this way, by continuously changing garments as they grow old.<sup>149</sup> He states that due to his change of garment, the people of the assemblies he visits do not recognize him. This perspective may explain the previously discussed inconsistent behavior of prophets towards the dervish, who sometimes exhibit a deep spiritual companionship with him and sometimes fail to recognize him. Elsewhere in the text, the dervish says that the reason for all his travels was his search for a master to consult.<sup>150</sup> Considering that in the course of the narrative, the dervish initially recognizes ‘Alī as

---

<sup>146</sup> p. 250.

<sup>147</sup> See p. 270.

<sup>148</sup> p. 259.

<sup>149</sup> See pp. 262-3.

<sup>150</sup> See p. 271.

his master, and then identifies himself as his own master, we could posit that his travels in the material world have ended, as he has obtained blissful union in afterlife. Or rather, he has never departed from the beloved's preeternal presence. From the perspective of the singular moment of unity in which he experiences his visions, both are equally true.

### **The Microcosmos and the Macrocosmos**

The *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* identifies God as the esoteric dimension of the created world: “All that came into existence did so by wearing the one who brought them into existence.”<sup>151</sup> The work describes the day of judgement as the time when the esoteric and the exoteric become one in a state of absolute manifestation and visibility. On the other hand, in the moments of awareness of his singularity and solitude, the dervish realizes that “the earth and the sky had become secrets inside his own body.”<sup>152</sup> Such expressions indicate that the esoteric and the exoteric have changed places. As the esoteric dimension of the world, the dervish becomes the locus for all of existence:

The dervish looked around and saw that he was all alone; inside the house there is no one but the homeowner. Yet he was hearing a tumult. He looked around again and saw no one. He reflected upon himself and became aware that the noise was coming from his own body. He looked inside his bosom and saw that all creating beings in the earth and sky were in there. At that moment, the sun rose. The dervish saw inside his bosom the seven layers of the earth, the nine spheres in the seven layers of the sky, the Most Glorious Throne, the Footstool, the Tablet, and the Pen as well as all things that existed within.<sup>153</sup>

In these descriptions, the dervish's interiority to the created world is replaced with a position of absolute exteriority, which is in line with the absolute manifestation of truth happening as the dervish achieves perfection. Elsewhere in the text, the dervish designates the macrocosmos as a mirror image of his existence, as he becomes “aware that his body was in truth a universe. All objects visible in the form of the universe were actually reflections of his own

---

<sup>151</sup> p. 266.

<sup>152</sup> p. 245.

<sup>153</sup> p. 269.

body.”<sup>154</sup> In a passage which likens the dervish’s own being to a city, the mirror image is not the macrocosmos, but the dervish himself:

He saw that this was an immense city with a castle wall of three levels and twelve towers. It had twelve doors, seven hundred seventy-seven neighborhoods, four hundred forty-four markets and bazaars, three hundred sixty-six trenches in which water was running. Another mark of the city was that it stood on two poles, and another was that it was not stationary but rather on the move. The city had two sultans. One of them was named “Acceptable to the All-Compassionate” and the other was named “Estimable to Satan.” The two of them were forever in opposition and kept fighting. Another sign was that this city resembled a mirror. The reflections of the things which existed in every direction manifested themselves in this mirror.<sup>155</sup>

Upon a closer look, we realize that the descriptions of the city refer mostly to the dervish’s body. The twelve towers parallel the twelve signs of the zodiac, which in turn parallel twelve parts of the human body.<sup>156</sup> The twelve doors refer to the twelve holes in the human body.<sup>157</sup> Seven hundred seventy-seven neighborhoods refer to the number of nerves.<sup>158</sup> Four hundred forty-four markets refer to the number of bones.<sup>159</sup> Three hundred sixty-six trenches refer to the number of veins.<sup>160</sup> The two poles are a metaphor for the two legs. The human body, i.e. man’s exoteric existence is responsible for actions which are either morally sound or sinful. Yet as we saw earlier, this notion of morality does not apply to man’s esoteric dimension which, as the light of Muḥammad, remains in the state of purity of the Preeternal Pact. It is this dimension which embodies all of existence within it.

We could thus say that, while man’s exoteric dimension is a mirror image of the universe, the universe is a mirror image of man’s esoteric dimension, its shadow which is farther away from the all-encompassing sun of God. Interestingly, upon realizing that “the city which

---

<sup>154</sup> p. 269.

<sup>155</sup> p. 272.

<sup>156</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Vücūd-nāme*, 136. The three levels may possibly refer to the Alevi saying “*eline, beline, diline* (to your hand, to your waist, to your tongue)”; see Korkmaz, *Alevilik ve Bektaşilik Terimleri Sözlüğü*, 695.

<sup>157</sup> See Korkmaz, 334. Also see Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşâ*, 88.

<sup>158</sup> See *ibid.*, 88; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Vücūd-nāme*, 142; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Delil-i Budalā*, 64. In all of these works the number appears as seven hundred seventy.

<sup>159</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Dil-güşâ*, 88; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Vücūd-nāme*, 142; Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Delil-i Budalā*, 64. In the *Delil-i Budalā*, the number appears as four hundred forty.

<sup>160</sup> See Kaygusuz Abdāl, *Vücūd-nāme*, 142.

resembled a mirror was actually his own body,”<sup>161</sup> the dervish sees himself as the sultan of the city. Hence it is possible to guess that his conversations with the sultan, identified with ‘Alī and/or God, are his conversations with his own self. This would be perfectly in line with the general premise of ̘aygusuz’s work, which posits the uncovering of the self as the only true path to perfection.

## Imagination

In the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, the intellect (‘*aḳl*) is identified with the faculty of imagination while the faculty of love (‘*işk*) is identified with the capacity to experience unity. The passage below expresses that the dervish’s travels and visions are a function of his intellect:

He explored the state of the universe in its totality; he saw that the sky resembled the wheel of the windmill. The dome and the king’s court were spinning with the wind’s power of grandeur. The star named the sun was also revolving; its movement away and back was named day and night by the sons of Adam. As he was contemplating with his intellect, the dervish awoke and saw that inside the house there was no one but the homeowner; there was nothing but his own self. He had an outburst of emotion; he recited these two couplets.<sup>162</sup>

The couplets which follow this passage match the general traits of the couplets in the work as expressions of unity. The outburst of emotion which the dervish experiences is a product of his faculty of love. Evidently, the prose sections of the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* express the dervish’s visions and contemplations, while the couplets display a contrast with these colorful visions, due to their singular content and emotion. We could thus say that the alternation between prose and poetry in the form of the work is the result of an oscillation between the faculties of the intellect and love, the former embodied in Muḥammad and the latter embodied in ‘Alī.

As we saw earlier, ̘aygusuz defines the images the dervish sees (*hayāl*) as the exoteric dimension of his inner state (*hāl*). In parallel to this, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* portrays the intellect as the exoteric aspect of the faculty of love. The following allegorical passage expresses this notion:

Using the wood of the intellect, he built a ship. He nailed it with the nail of the idea, strengthened it with the mastic of trust in God, pulled the rope of the declaration of faith, made acceptance his

---

<sup>161</sup> p. 275.

<sup>162</sup> pp. 272-3.

food and patience his supply. He fixed his spiritual power as the anchor. The wind of love blew and drove the ship. For some time, the ship continued to sail on the sea.<sup>163</sup>

Thus, the path towards God also has a body and a soul. We saw previously that the universe was likened to a cloak which Muḥammad was wearing. When the dervish begins contemplating this cloak, he realizes that “each color carrie[s] the viewer away to a hundred thousand visions.”<sup>164</sup> These visions draw the dervish to the remembrance of all of his travels and experiences. At the end of the work, the dervish acknowledges that all of his dream adventures were nothing but “his own imagination, the states of his existence.”<sup>165</sup> At the same time, he designates these dreams as the truth, an aspect of truth which is complementary to the truth of unity experienced by the faculty of love.

In one passage, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* makes reference to a world very much resembling the concept of the imaginal world (‘*ālam al-mithāl*). This world is the place in which the dervish’s dreams take place, the locus of his imaginative faculty. The passage is told through the mouth of another traveler whom the dervish encounters:

I reached a place where the shadow of this universe had fallen, a place which had taken shape in its form. The shadows of all things in this universe had fallen there in resemblance of their actual bodies. Suddenly I reached this place which stood between the two realms and from where both realms were visible. My heart wished to explore it and when I did so, I saw that it was very much like this universe, that when the shadows of the things in this universe moved, they fell on this other universe and became objects in the form that the same objects had in this universe. When I was exploring there, I contemplated the roots of this earth and sky and all objects which existed in them. I have many stories; I just came from there.<sup>166</sup>

This intermediate world could also be a metaphor for the human being, who brings together the esoteric and exoteric realms, the divine and the profane, the spiritual and the material. The human existence mirrors both aspects of reality. The faculties of the intellect and love are what make it possible to experience multiplicity and unity at the same time.

---

<sup>163</sup> p. 273.

<sup>164</sup> p. 277.

<sup>165</sup> p. 279.

<sup>166</sup> p. 270.



The imagination is also what allows different beings to worship God in their own manner and grasp God according to their own capacities.<sup>167</sup> The following lines in which the dervish speaks through the mouth of God indicate this multiplicity in the created beings' experience of God:

Today inside the whole world  
I am the object of the hermitage, the purpose of the belt of infidelity<sup>168</sup>

I am the purpose of the house of idols and the Kaaba  
I am all that is described as true and false<sup>169</sup>

I am the one who is everyone's companion  
Leading all dark passion in all heads<sup>170</sup>

I wonder, am I the exemplar for all beings?  
Am I the noisy uproar in all things?

The idea and image in all hearts,  
The dark passion in all heads?<sup>171</sup>

These lines refer to Islam as only one of the multiplicity of ways in which the human being can grasp God. This lack of hierarchy between religions reminds us of the lack of hierarchy between prophets and saints mentioned earlier. In addition, the lines draw an important parallel between the love of God and passion: Any longing, even when it appears to be profane, is in its esoteric aspect a longing for God. All beings long for their unity with God during the Preeternal Pact, the memory of which they carry into the material world, with or without their awareness.<sup>172</sup> The linear time of our material existence constitutes the exoteric aspect of our reality, while its esoteric aspect is the singular moment of unity from which, as embodiments of the light of Muḥammad, we actually never depart. As such, our longing for God and our unification with

---

<sup>167</sup> This reminds us of Ibn 'Arabī's concept of God created in individual faiths (*al-Ilāh al-makhlūq fī al-mu'taqadāt*), wherein the image of God's theophany depends on the individual capacity of each man; see Corbin, *L'Imagination créatrice*, 209-214.

<sup>168</sup> p. 253.

<sup>169</sup> p. 279.

<sup>170</sup> p. 280.

<sup>171</sup> p. 284.

<sup>172</sup> The fact that Adam does not remember Satan in the work can be an allegory for birth into the world of multiplicity whereby the memory of the preeternal moment becomes temporarily inaccessible.

Him exist as two parts of a single whole. That is why all beings speak the language of unity, not only on the day of resurrection, but at all times. What allows us to speak this language is our imagination, which can unite our memory of the esoteric truth's self-manifestation with our material existence in the here and now.

The *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*'s interpretation of religion and worship is expressed in the narrative of Bahlūl's dream, where Moses relates the content of the Torah: "In the Torah which was brought to me, God –glorified and exalted be He– says: 'I have created all. I am the beauty and splendor inside these forms. Who else can there be?' ”<sup>173</sup> The message here is that the Word of God is the same, no matter when and where it is spoken, as long as it is interpreted correctly. This is why the concept of language plays an intricate part in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*, where it is deeply linked with the imaginative faculty.

## **Symbolic Language**

When Bahlūl finishes narrating his dream mentioned above, the dervish becomes aware that Bahlūl is speaking the language of birds.<sup>174</sup> The language of birds is not only symbolic language, but also the esoteric dimension of all speech, which designates the unity of God:

I am the word; all tongues speak me and only me  
I am the treasure of felicity in all ruins<sup>175</sup>

While the singular esoteric dimension of the divine language is expressed in couplets which serve as the clear manifestation of the hidden meaning, the exoteric dimension is found in the prose sections, which are replete with symbolic content. Solomon explains the difficulty of understanding the dervish's words in the following manner:

Prophet Solomon said: "My soul is in these signs that he is giving; all of you must know that. But is there any way you can understand what the dervish says?" Everyone agreed that they did not know. The dervish had an outpour of emotion.<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>173</sup> p. 257.

<sup>174</sup> p. 257.

<sup>175</sup> p. 261.

<sup>176</sup> p. 263.

In addition to the general symbolic meaning of the narrative, individual symbols are also frequent. The work begins with a dervish lost in the desert who decides to take a path, indicating probably the mystical path, as evidenced by the dervish's search for a spiritual director. The correlation between getting lost in the desert and losing the Path to God is common in traditional imagery. The hierarchy of saints known as the *abdālān* is symbolized in the work as "a figure with forty heads, seven hands, three eyes, and one body."<sup>177</sup> Some of these symbols appear in the form of riddles. The dervish asks the people at the assembly: "Its head is a knob; its body is a fork; it has four walls and six doors; the reflections of all creatures are manifest inside it. What is this?"<sup>178</sup> Nobody thinks of the human being as the answer. Perhaps Kaygusuz wants to indicate to us that we never turn to our own selves as our source of knowledge, although in truth there can be no other source. Interestingly, a similar riddle comes up in the dervish's conversation with Muḥammad, who asks him whether he has visited the city standing on two poles. The question initially confuses the dervish, but he subsequently meditates and comes back to himself, after which he understands the meaning of the question.<sup>179</sup>

After becoming 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib's disciple, on two occasions the dervish asks him the interpretation of his dream. In the first, 'Alī hides inside the dervish's heart instead of giving him an answer. In the second occasion, 'Alī tells the dervish to look up, after which the dervish sees all prophets and saints in admiration of 'Alī.<sup>180</sup> We can guess that Kaygusuz Abdāl is critical of the Sufi practice of dream interpretation which was an integral part of the spiritual director's relationship to his disciple. At the end of the work, the protagonist says to his readers: "Ask the interpretation of this dream to the gnostics. They can tell you. All that I have deliriously repeated, you can learn from the gnostic."<sup>181</sup> Here the gnostics designate the Perfect Men, the manifestations of the Muḥammadan essence, same as the saints and prophets. The protagonist thus seems to indicate to us that we will only understand his narrative if we are gnostics ourselves, if we are capable of tapping into the esoteric dimension of our being which is our face of perfection.

---

<sup>177</sup> p. 265.

<sup>178</sup> p. 268.

<sup>179</sup> See pp. 276-7.

<sup>180</sup> See p. 248.

<sup>181</sup> p. 284.

Ḳayğusuz plays with us in his typically humorous fashion throughout the text. We are thus not surprised when he tells us that the whole universe is in a bottle hung inside the shop of Naşreddīn Ḳoca.<sup>182</sup> In Ḳayğusuz's era, Naşreddīn Ḳoca was famous for expressing spiritual truths in the most seemingly blasphemous, explicitly sexual language.<sup>183</sup> Similarly, Ḳayğusuz Abdāl also shocks us, makes us lose our sense of meaning, before he brings us back to ourselves - to our transformed selves which are no longer limited by our preconceived notions and judgements. Much of this transformation occurs via a reinterpretation of the identity of the dervish: Are we face to face with an impostor, a man of Satanic ruse, much like the masters and ascetics in the text? Are we face to face with a man of ignorance, who nonetheless has glimpses of truth, but cannot escape the frequent traps Satan sets for him? Or are we in the presence of the Perfect Man, one who is capable not only of seeing, but also of representing the world as a whole, in all its duality, with the beautiful and the ugly, the pure and the sinful? Only by letting go of our socially and culturally obtained bias can we begin to find the answer. Traditionally accepted rules in dream interpretation lead us astray, thus leaving us all alone, by ourselves, in the face of our great dilemma. How do we learn to recognize perfection where it hides itself the most?

In many ways, our experience of reading the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* is similar to the dervish's spiritual journey. As the dervish learns to turn to himself for the interpretation of his dream visions, so do we. In creating a parallel experience for its reader, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* ensures that these visions have become our own. Let us remember the meaning of the word *mağlaṭa*: "any matter that leads one into error. An argument devised to lead one into error, a trap or fallacy."<sup>184</sup> It is this aspect of the work which allows us to categorize it as a prose *şatḥiyye* in the same vein with the *şatḥiyye* analyzed in the third chapter.<sup>185</sup> Both types of work use the immediate, exoteric level of the text as a veil to hide its esoteric meaning. In both cases, an understanding of the text can only be achieved when we break the boundaries of the intellect. Once this is attained, another type of intellect emerges, one which opens in front of us an endless imagination embodying a vision of truth no longer hiding itself.

---

<sup>182</sup> See p. 278.

<sup>183</sup> See Pertev Naili Boratav, *Nasreddin Hoca* (Ankara: Edebiyatçılar Derneği, n.d.), 91-92.

<sup>184</sup> Sir James W. Redhouse, *A Turkish and English Lexicon* (Constantinople: A. H. Boyajian, 1890), 1923.

<sup>185</sup> Indeed, classical authors such as Rūzbihān Baqlī point to the similarity between dream visions and the *şatḥ*. See Lory, *Le Rêve*, 221.

This vision of truth, expressed openly in the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa*'s couplets, creates the work's affinity with the classical *shāḥ*. Once again, opposites complement each other in Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl's text: meaning is hidden under the most symbolic of narratives and meaning is revealed in the most direct and straightforward of verses.

## **Audience**

As mentioned before, the *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* is Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl's only work which is not "multi-perspectival" in the sense of a frequent shift of perspectives, doctrines, and terminology to accommodate for various spiritual levels. The semantic multiplicity witnessed in his other works is remodeled into multiple levels of duality, all of which become embodiments of the seeming duality between the hidden God and His self-manifestation. While this duality is fully developed through the structure and imagery of the text, it is also transcended, as the poetry and prose narrative begin to converge towards the end of the work. In fact, transcending this duality can be considered as the main spiritual aim of the work, the aim which breaks the intellectual boundaries of the *nafs* and allows the reader to become one of the gnostics capable of grasping the meaning of the text.

On the other hand, the fact that Ḳayḡusuz designates the gnostics as the only people able to understand his text also hints at his audience. He is talking either 1) to those people ready to take the final step towards perfection by breaking the veil of truth with his help, or 2) to people at the highest spiritual level, to Perfect Men like himself. Considering that the spiritual education of people at various spiritual levels is a fundamental goal of his corpus, what could be his purpose in putting down his dream narrative, for people who would already know its spiritual content by heart? That is, why write at all?

What renders this line of questioning even more interesting is the very personal voice with which the text is suffused. Although this is never explicitly told to us, we have the feeling that the given episodes are indeed Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl's own personal visions. If this is so, it would mean that he is the primary audience of his own text. This would make sense from a doctrinal standpoint, as Ḳayḡusuz does not distinguish between strata of Perfect Men. In fact, in his eyes, all Perfect Men are nothing but the self-manifestation of Muḡammad-ʿAlī.

On the other hand, we also need to underline the possibility of the text being dictated to a third party, as was the case for the Berlin manuscript. I have previously stressed the likelihood that *Meşnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz* was dictated, as evidenced by the use of the ‘*arūz*’ meter in the text. Moreover, a previously mentioned example from the *Dil-güşā* narrates Kaygusuz’s interaction with a scribe to whom he was dictating his work. All of this implies the possibility of there being a second person in Kaygusuz’s presence, who served as his immediate audience. As such, this person would also have to be either on the last step towards perfection (which would be completed during the listening of the work), or already a Perfect Man. Such a relationship, on which we cannot go beyond speculating, would remind us of the famous dictation of Rūmī’s *Maşnavī*. As such, it would have the potential of being a main dynamic in the production of the work itself.

The *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* is a unique text in its relationship to the classical literature on dreams, with which it shows a great level of engagement.<sup>186</sup> The work vehemently negates some aspects of this literature, while faithfully following some of the others. This duality serves to create an ambiguity of meaning, used as a tool which is both literary and doctrinal. Kaygusuz prevents his reader from relying on established social norms in deciding on his protagonist’s spiritual level. As such, the formation of judgement is continuously postponed. In its place, certainty slowly emerges, as the reader slowly abandons questioning the narrative and opens herself up to the experience of the truth which it conveys.

Kaygusuz depicts perfection as an endless battle with one’s base self wherein one’s true self is revealed as ontologically identical to the essence of Muḥammad. He portrays this revelation as a return to the preeternal moment of oneness with God, which is the same as unity in afterlife. The return to God is a spiritual voyage made possible by the unveiling of the memory of union. In this unveiling, God discloses Himself to be identical to ‘Alī.

---

<sup>186</sup> Our discussion in this chapter shows that Kaygusuz’s treatment of dreams is unrelated to the dream motifs found in the folktales on the lives of Anatolian minstrels, documenting traditions considered to have pre-Islamic origins. For discussions of these motifs, see İlhan Başgöz, “Dream Motif in Turkish Folk Stories and Shamanistic Initiation,” *Asian Folklore Studies* 26/1 (1967): 1-18; Umay Günay, *Áşık Tarzı Şiir Geleneği ve Rüya Motifi* (Ankara: Akçağ, 1999).

The duality between dream and wakefulness, multiplicity and unity, ignorance and experiential knowledge is mirrored in the form of the text which oscillates between often confusing dream visions narrated in prose and declarations of the oneness of being expressed through poetry. As the text progresses, the two opposing realities begin to merge as we lead towards the perfect expression of their unity: a poor dervish lying in the corner of a bath furnace.

## Conclusion

The main objectives of this study can be summarized under three complementary trajectories: 1) Understanding the unique religious doctrine and literary output of aygusuz Abdāl. 2) Situating aygusuz Abdāl’s thought within the broader scope of *abdāl* and dervish thought as manifested in the geographical area in which aygusuz Abdāl was active, namely Anatolia and the Balkans. 3) Situating *abdāl* thought of 14<sup>th</sup>-17<sup>th</sup> centuries within the broader scope of Bektashi thought.

aygusuz Abdāl’s work is characterized by its “multi-perspectival” quality, wherein he frequently shifts his terminology, doctrine, and imagery according to the spiritual levels of his multiple audiences. These shifts can be categorized by using as a conceptual tool the Doctrine of the Four Gates, which is the doctrine expounded by aygusuz to signify his understanding of spiritual hierarchy. Such a categorization allows us to systematize aygusuz’s largely disorganized corpus of teachings and meaningfully interpret the discrepancies between some of them. On the other hand, his *Kitāb-ı Mağlaṭa* diverges from the rest of his corpus in its highly symbolic, seemingly obscure language as well as the fact of being directed only towards those in the highest spiritual levels. As such, it is the work which is the most faithful to aygusuz’s personal teachings. In fact, the work can be interpreted as aygusuz’s dialogue with himself, though by extension he also speaks to other Perfect Men as well as ‘Alī b. Abī Ṭālib with whom he has achieved perfect identity.

Yūnus Emre’s literary influence on aygusuz Abdāl is treated in the third chapter, which aims to investigate the relationship between the antinomian social tendencies of dervish groups and the practice of writing in the Turkish vernacular. Such a practice signifies not a simple language shift, but rather a comprehensive act of translation from one literary domain to another. The dynamic relationship between genres of classical Sufi literature and folk genres can serve as a basis for further investigation into the development of vernacular literature in the pre-Ottoman and Ottoman realms. In this respect, our theoretical understanding of generic conventions developed in the Ottoman realm, in particular those belonging to the corpus known as “Alevi-Bektashi literature” is still in a state of infancy.

The two tables below compare aygusuz Abdāl’s teachings with the works of the four *abdāl* authors studied in Chapter 4: Şādı Abdāl’s *Dīvān*, Yemīnī’s *Fazīlet-nāme*, Şemsī’s *Deh*



*Murğ*, and Vīrānī's *Risāle* and *Dīvān*. The first table contains a list of doctrinal elements visible in the works of the five authors. A close look at the table reveals that many of these aspects are also prevalent in Bektashism, to which all authors except for Yemīnī express their affiliation.<sup>187</sup> It is important to note that such tables often contain a simplification of doctrine, due to their very nature. Thus, although “the doctrine of Muḥammad-‘Alī” is present in all authors, its interpretations can differ widely. For instance, while Yemīnī frequently underlines Muḥammad’s superiority over ‘Alī in his *Fazīlet-nāme*, in Vīrānī’s *Dīvān* we come across a deification of ‘Alī. Moreover, the lack of a certain element in one author’s work does not necessarily reflect the absence of the doctrine in the author’s milieu. A major objective of this study has been to show that authors’ individual temperaments and intended audiences play a major part in the establishment of the content and style of their work. This may seem obvious to some, and yet, most of the current research on Bektashi and Alevi thought tends to disregard the necessary balance between communal and individual thought, which are always in an intricate interplay.

Nonetheless, Table 1 does contain some indications as to the historical trajectory of *bektāšī* and *abdāl* thought. It shows us that the doctrine of Muḥammad-‘Alī, as well as the veneration of the Twelve Imams and the *ahl al-bayt* were already established in these circles in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. It is thus time for us to discard the still common theory that these doctrines entered Bektashi and Alevi milieus with Safavid propaganda. The table demonstrates that antinomian tendencies, expressed via an open criticism of exoteric notions of Islam, were a major marker of *abdāl* and *bektāšī* temperament from the earliest days of these groups and continued to be so up to the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The table further underlines that the doctrine of the oneness of being (*wahdat al-wujūd*), generally considered to be a major aspect of Bektashi thought, is a doctrinal marker which can differ widely or be entirely absent according to the personal temperament of the author. Among the five authors, Ḳaygusuz Abdāl is the only author to treat this doctrine extensively. In fact, his entire corpus can be read as a unique contribution to the development of this doctrine in the pre-Ottoman and Ottoman milieu. The table also shows us that the doctrines of *tevellā-teberrā* as well as Ḥurūfī thought became part of *bektāšī* and *abdāl* doctrine from the fifteenth century onwards, while the veneration of the Fourteen Pure Innocents (*çārdeh ma ‘şūm-ı pāk*) probably became widespread in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

---

<sup>187</sup> Şemsī’s affiliation to the *bektāšī* path can be inferred from his portrayal of *bektāšīs* and *abdāls* as a single category.

Table 2 contains a list of *abdāl* and *bektāṣī* practices. While some of these practices may have been followed only by *abdāls* and some only by *bektāṣīs*, I purposefully refrained from separating the two categories, due to their lack of separation in the works of the authors. As this study as shown, an understanding of ‘*bektāṣī*’ and ‘*abdāl*’ as distinct affiliations was not always meaningful. Yet for instance, the fact that Yemīnī does not mention Hacı Bektāṣ anywhere in his text, in addition to multiple textual evidence from the period (such as the aforementioned portrayal of rivalries between *abdāls* and *bektāṣīs* in Otman Baba’s hagiography), indicates to us that we should at the same time refrain from conflating the two categories.

This study has aimed to limit its focus to the examination of doctrine. Nonetheless, the given table merits a few preliminary observations. We see that the four blows continued to be a widespread practice among *abdāls* up until the 17<sup>th</sup> century. While the institution of companionship (*muṣāhiblik*) already existed in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the ceremony of the ‘*ayn-ı cem*’, together with the prayers which constituted part of its content, was crystallized in the 16<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>188</sup> We observe that several antinomian practices, such as the consumption of alcohol and begging, continued to be markers of *abdāl* and *bektāṣī* piety throughout pre-modern Bektashi history. *Bektāṣī* and *abdāl* clerical costumes were probably not fully developed during the time of Şādık Abdāl, who only mentions the Bektashi cap. However, they appear fully crystallized at the time when Vīrānī composed his work.

While this conclusion is mostly devoted to preliminary remarks on the evolution of *bektāṣī* and *abdāl* thought and practice, it should be underlined that such an approach is not the main focus of this study. In my perspective, understanding *abdāls* and *bektāṣīs* first of all as individuals is a necessary primary step in examining larger questions pertaining to Bektashi history as well as the larger field of Anatolian religious history. We can say that in the still modest corpus of modern research on Bektashism and Alevism, individuals have largely fallen through the cracks. This preference for the collective over the individual goes hand in hand with a denial of intellectual creativity and philosophical thought to Bektashism and Alevism, rooted in the Köprülü paradigm’s stress on syncretism (a concept which intrinsically denotes a lack of

---

<sup>188</sup> We know this also from research on *Buyruk* manuscripts; see Rıza Yıldırım, “Inventing a Sufi Tradition: The use of the Futuwwa ritual gathering as a model for the Qizilbash *djem*,” in John J. Curry and Erik S. Ohlander (eds.), *Sufism and Society: Arrangements of the mystical in the Muslim world, 1200-1800* (London and New York: Routledge, 2012), 166.

individuality), remnants, and insufficient Islamization. Despite all the accumulated scholarly bias to the contrary, the main protagonist of this study, Kaygusuz Abdāl, shines through the cracks with all his unique creativity. It is our duty to give voice to his rich and powerful heritage.

**Table 1: Aspects of *bektāšī* and *abdāl* doctrine**

|  | Ḳayğusuz<br>Abdāl<br>14 <sup>th</sup> -15 <sup>th</sup> c. | Şādīḳ Abdāl<br>late 14 <sup>th</sup> -15 <sup>th</sup><br>c. | Şemsī<br>15 <sup>th</sup> - early<br>16 <sup>th</sup> c. | Yemīnī<br>15 <sup>th</sup> - early<br>16 <sup>th</sup> c. | Vīrānī<br>late 16 <sup>th</sup> -<br>early 17 <sup>th</sup> |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| The doctrine of Muḥammad-<br>‘Alī                                  | X  | X  | X  | X   | X   |
| The veneration of the Twelve<br>Imams                              | X  | X  | X  | X   | X   |
| The veneration of the <i>ahl al-<br/>bayt</i>                      | X  | X  | X  | X   | X   |
| Criticism of ascetics and<br>religious scholars<br>(antinomianism) | X  | X  | X  | X   | X   |
| The concept of the pole  | X  | X  |  | X   |   |
| The oneness of being   | X  |  |  |   |   |
| The four gates   | X  |  |  |   | X   |
| The veneration of Ḥacı<br>Bektaş <sup>189</sup>                    |  | X  | X  |   | X   |
| The veneration of Bektashi<br>saints                               |  | X  |  | X   | X   |
| References to miracles by<br>Bektashi saints                       |  | X  |  |   | X   |
| Holy war   |  | X  | X  | X   |   |
| The veneration of the Fourteen<br>Pure Innocents                   |  |  |  |   | X   |
| <i>Tevellā-teberrā</i>   |  |  | X  | X   | X   |
| Ḥurūfī thought   |  |  |  | X   | X   |
| Expectation of the Mahdi   |  |  | X  | X   | X   |
| Relative unimportance of ritual<br>obligations                     | X  | X  | X  |   |   |
| Negating the existence of<br>afterlife                             | X  |  | X  |   |   |
| Incurring blame  | X  |  |  |   | X   |

<sup>189</sup> Ḳayğusuz Abdāl’s single reference to his affiliation with Ḥacı Bektaş is not extensive enough to be classified as an expression of veneration. Similarly, his veneration of Abdāl Mūsā, which takes up only little space in his work, is different from the central role of saint veneration in the works of Şādīḳ Abdāl and others.

**Table 2*****Bektāšī and abdāl practices***

|  | Ḳayğusuz<br>Abdāl<br>14 <sup>th</sup> -15 <sup>th</sup> c. | Şādīḳ Abdāl<br>late 14 <sup>th</sup> -15 <sup>th</sup><br>c. | Şemsī<br>15 <sup>th</sup> - early<br>16 <sup>th</sup> c. | Yemīnī<br>15 <sup>th</sup> - early<br>16 <sup>th</sup> c. | Vīrānī<br>late 16 <sup>th</sup> -<br>early 17 <sup>th</sup> |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|
| The four blows                                 | X  |  | X  | X   | X   |
| ' <i>Ayn-i cem</i> '                           |  |  |  |   | X   |
| <i>Tercemān / gülbeng</i>                      |  |  |  |   | X   |
| Companionship ( <i>muşāhiblik</i> )            |  |  |  | X   |   |
| Mourning and/or blood-shedding during Muḥarram | X  |  | X  |   | X   |
| Not wearing special dress                      | X  | X  |  |   |   |
| Wearing the Bektashi cap                       |  | X  |  |   | X   |
| Carrying paraphernalia such as axes and horns  |  |  |  |   | X   |
| Smoking hashish                                | X  |  | X  |   | X   |
| Consuming alcohol                              | X  |  | X  | X   | X   |
| Walking bare feet                              |  |  | X  | X   | X   |
| Tattoo of the Dhu'l-fiḳār                      |  |  | X  |   |   |
| Nakedness except for an animal hide            |  |  | X  |   |   |
| Begging  | X  |  | X  | X   |   |
| Refusal to accumulate wealth                   | X  |  |  | X   | X   |
| Pilgrimage to holy Shi'ite sites               |  |  |  | X   |   |

## Bibliography

‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Qāshāni. *A Glossary of Sufi Technical Terms*, tr. Nabil Safwat. London: The Octagon Press, 1991.

*Abdal Musa Velâyetnâmesi*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1999.

Abu Nasr ‘Abdallah b. ‘Ali al-Sarrāj al-Ṭusī. *The Kitāb al-luma’ fi’l-taşawwuf*, ed. Reynold Alleyne Nicholson. Leiden: Brill, 1914.

Ağirdemir, Erdoğan. “Bektaşilikte Taç Şekilleri ve Anlamları.” *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi* 60 (2011): 365-378.

Ahmed Refik. “Fatih Zamanında Teke-ili.” *Türk Tarih Encümeni Mecmuası* 2/79 (1340): 65-76.

Ahmed Rif‘at Efendi. *Mir ‘ātu’l-Makāsîd fî def‘i’l-mefāsîd*. Istanbul, İbrahim Efendi Matbaası, 1293/1876.

Ahmed Sırrı Baba. *al-Risālah al-Ahmediyyah fî târîkh al-tarîqat al-‘Aliyyah al-Baktāshiyah*. Egypt: Maṭbū‘āt al-Sharq al-Sharîk, 1353/1934.

Akalın, Mehmet. “Kaygusuz Abdal’ın Gevher-nâme’si.” *Atatürk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Araştırma Dergisi* 10 (1979): 189-197.

Akçay, İlhan. “Abdal Mûsâ Tekkesi.” In *VII. Türk Tarih Kongresi: Kongreye Sunulan Bildiriler I*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1972, 360-373.

Aksoy, Hasan. “Derviş Şemseddin.” *TDVİA*, Vol 9. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1994, 198-199.

Aktan, Bilâl. “Kemal Ümmî’nin Vefât Risâlesi ve Dil Özellikleri.” *Selçuk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 19 (2006): 95-107.

Algar, Hamid. “Bektāšiya.” *Encyclopedia Iranica*, Vol. IV, Fasc. 2, 118-122.

Algar, Hamid. “The Ḥurūfî Influence on Bektashism.” In Alexandre Popovic and Gilles Veinstein (eds). *Bektachiyya: Études sur l’ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant de Hadji Bektach*. Istanbul: Éditions Isis, 1995, 39-53.

Ali Ulvi Baba. *Bektaşilik Makâlâtı*. İzmir: Marifet Matbaası, 1341 (1922-23).

Amir-Moezzi, Mohammad Ali. “Dissimulation.” *Encyclopaedia of the Qur’ân*. General Editor: Jane Dammen McAuliffe, Georgetown University, Washington DC. Brill Online, 2015. Reference. University of St Andrews. 27 May 2015

<[http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-the-quran/dissimulation-EQSIM\\_00122](http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-the-quran/dissimulation-EQSIM_00122)>

Amir-Moezzi, Mohammad Ali. "Introduction." In Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi (ed). *L'Ésotérisme shi'ite: Ses racines et ses prolongements*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2016, 1-11.

Amir-Moezzi, Mohammad Ali. *La Religion discrète: Croyances et pratiques spirituelles dans l'Islam shi'ite*. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 2006.

Amir-Moezzi, Mohammad Ali. *Le Guide divin dans le shi'isme originel*. Paris: Verdier, 1992.

‘Āshīk Çelebi. *Meşā’irü’ş-şu’arā*, ed. Meredith Owens. Cambridge: E. J. W. Gibb Memorial, 1971.

‘Āshīkpaşazāde. *Tevārīh-i Āl-i ‘Osmān*, ed. ‘Alī Bey. Istanbul: Maṭba‘a-i Āmire, 1332/1913-14; reprinted as *Ashiqpashazādeh ta’rikhī: A History of the Ottoman Empire to A.H. 893 (A.D.1478)*. Farnborough: Gregg, 1970.

Altschul, Nadia R. and Bradley J. Nelson. "Transatlantic Discordances: The Problem of Philology." *Hispanic Issues* 2 (2007): 55-63.

Awn, Peter J. *Satan's Tragedy and Redemption: Iblīs in Sufi Psychology*. Leiden: Brill, 1983.

Ay, Resul. "Sufi Shaykhs and Society in Thirteenth and Fifteenth Century Anatolia: Spiritual Influence and Rivalry." *Journal of Islamic Studies* 24:1 (2013): 1-24.

Azamat, Nihat. "Kaygusuz Abdal." *TDVİA*, vol. 25. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2002, 74-76.

‘Azīz al-Dīn Nasafī. *Kitāb al-insān al-kāmil*, Edited by Marijan Molé. Tahrān-Paris: Institut Franco-Iranien, 1962.

Babinger, Frantz. "Nesīmī." *Encyclopaedia of Islam (Second Edition)*, Vol. VIII. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995, 8.

Badawi, A. R. *Shatahāt al-şūfiyya, I, Abū Yazīd al-Bistāmī*. Cairo: Dar al-Nahdah al-Misriyah, 1949.

Ballanfat, Paul. *Messianisme et sainteté: Les poèmes du mystique ottoman Niyazi Misri (1618-1694)*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2012.

Paul Ballanfat, "Réflexions sur la nature du paradoxe," *Kâr Nâme* 12-3 (1995): 25-40.

Barkan, Ömer Lütfi. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda bir İskân ve Kolonizasyon Metodu Olarak Vakıflar ve Temlikler I: İstîlâ Devirlerinin Kolonizatör Türk Dervişleri ve Zâviyeler," *Vakıflar Dergisi*, 2 (1942): 279-386.

Barth, Fredrik. "Introduction." In Fredrik Barth (ed). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1969, 9-38.

Bashir, Shahzad. *Fazlallah Astarabadi and the Hurufis*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2005.

Bashir, Shahzad. "Narrating Sight: Dreaming as Visual Training in Persianate Sufi Hagiography." In Özgen Felek and Alexander D. Knysh (eds). *Dreams and Visions in Islamic Societies*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012, 233-247.

Başgöz, İlhan. "Dream Motif in Turkish Folk Stories and Shamanistic Initiation." *Asian Folklore Studies* 26/1 (1967): 1-18.

Başgöz, İlhan. "The Human Dimension of Yunus Emre's Transformation." In Talat Halman (ed). *Yunus Emre and His Mystical Poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, 1981, 23-40.

*Baṭṭāl-nāme*. In Yorgos Dedes (ed). *Battalname*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 1996, 335-610.

Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Irène. "Abdal, l'étrange destin d'un mot: Le problème abdal vu à travers les registres ottomans." *Turcica* 36 (2004): 37-90.

Bilgin, A. Azmi. "Nesîmî." *TDVİA*, Vol. 33. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2007, 3-5.

Binbaşı Mehmed Tevfik. *Manastır Vilayetinin Tarihçesi*. Bitola: Beynelmillel Ticaret Matbaası, 1327.

Birge, John Kingsley. *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*. London: Luzac, 1937.

Boratav, Pertev Naili. *Nasreddin Hoca*. Ankara: Edebiyatçılar Derneği, n.d.

Boratav, Pertev Naili. *Zaman Zaman İçinde*. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1958 (Ankara: İmge Kitabevi, 2007).

Bölükbaşı, Rıza Tefvik. *Tekke ve Halk Edebiyatı Makaleleri*, ed. Abdullah Uçman. Istanbul : Dergah Yayınları, 2015. [First edition: Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1982]

Brack, Jonathan. "Was Ede Bali a Wafā'ī Shaykh? Sufis, Sayyids and Genealogical Creativity in the Early Ottoman World," In A.C.S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds). *Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-century Anatolia*. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, forthcoming, 333-360.

Bursalı Mehmed Tâhir. *‘Osmānlı Mü’ellifleri* Vol. I. Istanbul: Maṭba‘a-i Āmire, 1333, 144-145.



Cahen, Claude. "Le Problème du shī'isme dans l'Asie mineure turque préottomane." In *Le Shī'isme imâmite: Colloque de Strasbourg (6-9 mai 1968)*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1970, 115-129.

Chartier, Roger and Maurice Elton. "Crossing Borders in Early Modern Europe: Sociology of Texts and Literature." *Book History* 8 (2005): 37-50.

Chittick, William C. *The Sufi Path of Knowledge : Ibn al- 'Arabi's Metaphysics of Imagination*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.

Chodkiewicz, Michel. "La Réception de la doctrine d'Ibn 'Arabī dans le monde Ottoman." In Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed). *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society*. Ankara: Atatürk Supreme Council for Culture Language and History, 2005, 97-120.

Chodkiewicz, Michel. *Le Sceau des saints: Prophétie et sainteté dans la doctrine d'Ibn Arabī*. Paris: Gallimard, 1986.

Clayer, Nathalie. "Autorité locale et autorité supra-locale chez les Bektashis d'Albanie dans l'entre-deux-guerres." In Nathalie Clayer, Alexandre Papas, Benoît Fliche (eds). *L'Autorité religieuse et ses limites en terres d'Islam*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2013, 159-193.

Clayer, Nathalie. *Aux Origines du nationalisme albanais: La Naissance d'une nation majoritairement musulmane en Europe*. Paris: Éditions Karthala, 2007.

Clayer, Nathalie. "Bektachisme et nationalisme albanais." In Alexandre Popovic and Gilles Veinstein (eds). *Bektachiyya: Études sur l'ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant de Hadji Bektach*. Istanbul: Éditions Isis, 1995, 277-308.

Clayer, Nathalie and Alexandre Popovic. "Sur les traces des derviches de Macédoine Yougoslave." In Jacques Thobie (ed). *Anatolia Moderna Yeni Anadolu IV: Derviches des Balkans, disparitions et renaissances*. Paris: Jean Maisonneuve, 1992, 13-63.

Cler, Jerome. "Neden bu ikilik? 'Pourquoi cette dualité?' Ethnographie de la division dans un village Bektashi du Taurus." In Nathalie Clayer, Alexandre Papas, Benoît Fliche (eds). *L'Autorité religieuse et ses limites en terres d'Islam*. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2013, 209-230.

Corbin, Henry. *L'Imagination créatrice dans le soufisme d'Ibn Arabi*. Paris: Flammarion, 1958 (Paris: Editions Médicis-Entrelacs, 2006).

Corbin, Henry. Introduction. *Sharḥ-i shaḥīyāt*. By Ruzbihān al-Baqlī. Edited by Henry Corbin. Tehran and Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1966, 1-31.

Coşan, M. Es'ad. *Hacı Bektâş-ı Velî ve Bektâşîlik*. Istanbul: Server İletişim, 2013.

Coşan, M. Es'ad. "Hâcî Bektaş-ı Velî: Maḳâlât." Associate Professorship (Doçentlik) Thesis, Ankara Üniversitesi, 1971.

Cunbur, Müjgan. “Gülşehri ile Kaygusuz Abdal’ın Şiirlerini Kapsayan XV. Yüzyıldan Kalan Bir Mecmua.” In *X. Türk Dil Kurultayında Okunan Bilimsel Bildiriler* 1963. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1964. 23-30.

Çal, Halit. “1192 Numaralı 1696-1716 Tarihli Hurufat Defterine Göre Yunanistan’daki Türk Mimarisi.” *Erdem: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Dergisi* 58 (2010): 93-242.

Çalışkan, Sermin. “Alevilik’te Dört Kapı Kırk Makam.” Master’s Thesis, Marmara Üniversitesi, 2010.

Çift, Salih. “Bektâşî Geleneğinde Vahdet-i Vücûd ve İbnü’l-‘Arabî.” *Tasavvuf: İlmî ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi* 23 (2009): 257-279.

Dağlı, Muhtar Yahya. *Bektâşî Tomarı Bektâşî Nefesleri*. İstanbul: Sebat Matbaası, 1935.

Dağlı, Muhtar Yahya. *Kaygusuz Abdal*. İstanbul: Maarif Kitaphanesi, 1939.

De Jong, Frederick. “The Iconography of Bektashiism: A survey of themes and symbolism in clerical costume, liturgical objects and pictorial art.” *Manuscripts of the Middle East* 4 (1989): 7-29.

De Jong, F. “The Takīya of ‘Abd Allāh al-Maghāwirī (Qayghusuz Sulṭān) in Cairo.” *Turcica* 13 (1981): 232-260.

Dedes, Yorgos. *Battalname*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 1996.

*Demir Baba Velâyetnâmesi: İnceleme -Tenkitli Metin*, Edited by Filiz Kılıç and Tuncay Bülbül. Ankara: Grafiker Yayınları, 2011; also *Demir Baba Vilayetnamesi*, ed. Bedri Noyan. Ankara: Can Yayınları, 1996.

Dervîş Aḥmed. *Menâkıb-ı Kemâl Ümmî*. İstanbul, Millet Kütüphanesi Ali Emiri Efendi Kol. 1323/1 (undated), fol. 1a-31a.

DeWeese, Devin. *Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition*. University Park, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1994.

DeWeese, Devin. “Foreword.” In Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. *Early mystics in Turkish literature*. Edited and translated by Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff. London-New York: Routledge, 2006.

Doğanbaş, Muzaffer. “Pîri Baba Velâyetnâmesi.” *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi* 41 (2007): 161-182.

Dressler, Markus. "How to Conceptualize Inner-Islamic Plurality/Difference: 'Heterodoxy' and 'Syncretism' in the Writings of Mehmet F. Köprülü (1890-1966)." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 37/3 (2010): 241-260.

Dressler, Markus. *Writing Religion: The Making of Turkish Alevi Islam*. Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Durbilmez, Bayram. "Muhyiddin Abdal Divanı (inceleme-tenkitli metin)." PhD Dissertation, Elazığ, Fırat University, 1998.

Dürüst, Kamil. "Varna'da Akyazılı Sultan Tekkesi." *Vakıflar Dergisi* 20 (1988): 443-452.

Düzdağ, Mehmet Ertuğrul. *Şeyhülislâm Ebussuud Efendi Fetvaları Işığında 16. Asır Türk Hayatı*. İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1972.

Elvân Çelebi. *Menâkıbu'l-Kudsiyye Fî Menâsibi'l-Ünsiyye: Baba İlyas-ı Horasânî ve Sülâlesinin Menkabevî Tarihi*, ed. İsmail F. Erünsal and Ahmet Yaşar Ocak. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1995.

Emecen, Feridun. "Devriyye." *TDVİA*, Vol 9. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1994, 251-253.

Erarslan, Kemal. *Yesevî'nin Fakr-nâmesi*. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi, 1977.

Ernst, Carl W. "Shaḥ." *The Encyclopedia of Islam: Second Edition*. Vol IX. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 361-362.

Ernst, Carl W. *Words of Ecstasy in Sufism*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985.

Erzi, Adnan. "Türkiye Kütüphanelerinden Notlar ve Vesikalar I." *TTK Belleten* XIV/53 (1950): 85-105.

Evlîyâ Çelebi. *Evlîyâ Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi*, ed. Yücel Dağlı, Seyit Ali Kahraman, Robert Dankoff. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2005.

Eyice, Semavi. "Akyazılı Sultan Âsitânesi." *TDVİA*, Vol. 2. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1989, 302-303.

Eyice, Semavi. "Hamza Baba Türbesi." *TDVİA*, Vol 15. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1997, 502-503.

Eyice, Semavi. "Varna ile Balçık Arasında Akyazılı Sultan Tekkesi." *TTK Belleten* 31/124 (1967): 551-600.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Conflict, Accommodation and Long-Term Survival: The Bektashi Order and the Ottoman State." In Alexandre Popovic and Gilles Veinstein (eds). *Bektachiyya: Études sur*

*l'ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relevant de Hadji Bektach.* Istanbul: Éditions Isis, 1995, 171-185.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. *Der Bektaschi-Orden in Anatolien (vom späten fünfzehnten Jahrhundert bis 1826)*. Vienna: Verlag des Institutes für Orientalistik der Universität Wien, 1981; also Suraiya Faroqhi. *Anadolu'da Bektaşilik*. Istanbul, Simurg, 2003.

Flemming, Barbara. *Türkische Handschriften, Teil I*. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1968-1981.

Foley, John Miles. "Orality, Textuality, and Interpretation." In A. N. Doane and Carol Braun Pasternack (eds). *Vox Intexta: Orality and Textuality in the Middle Ages*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991, 34-45.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Geoffroy, Éric. *Introduction to Sufism: The Inner Path of Islam*. Translated by Roger Gaetani. Bloomington, Indiana: World Wisdom, 2010.

Gezik, Erdal. "How Angel Gabriel Became Our Brother of the Hereafter (On the Question of Ismaili Influence on Alevism)." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 43/1 (2016): 56-70.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre, 1956.

Gökyay, Orhan Şaik. "Kaygusuz Abdal ve Sımâtiyeleri." *Türk Folkloru* 1/13 (1980): 3-5, 2/14 (1980): 3-6.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. *Alevî-Bektâşî Nefesleri*. Istanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1992.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. *Huruflî Metinleri Kataloğu*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1973.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. *Kaygusuz Abdal, Hatayi, Kul Himmət*. Istanbul: Varlık Yayınevi, 1962. (1962; Istanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2013)

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. "Halk Edebiyatımızda Zümre Edebiyatları." *Türk Dili* 19/ 207: Türk Halk Edebiyatı Özel Sayısı (1968): 357-375.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf*. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1961.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbaki. "Devriyeler." In Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı (ed). *Alevî-Bektâşî Nefesleri*. Istanbul: İnkılap Kitabevi, 1992, 70-82.

Graham, William A. *Divine Word and Prophetic Word in Early Islam*. The Hague: Mouton, 1977.

Güzel, Abdurrahman. *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alâaddîn Gaybî)*. Ankara: Akçağ, 2004.

Hacı Bektâş. *Makâlât*. Manisa Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi 3536 (dated 827/1423), fol. 58a-87a; also Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli. *Makâlât*, ed. Esad Coşan. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1996; Hünkâr Hacı Bektaş-ı Velî. *Makâlât*, ed. Ali Yılmaz, Mehmet Akkuş and Ali Öztürk. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2007; Hacı Bektaş Veli. “Makâlât.” Ed. Ömer Özkan and Malik Bankır. In Gıyasettin Aytaş (ed). *Hacı Bektaş Velî Külliyyatı*. Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Merkezi, 2010, 473-767.

[Hacı Bektâş] Hünkâr Hacı Bektaş-ı Velî. *Besmele Tefsiri (Şerh-i Besmele)*, ed. Hamiye Duran. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2009; also *Besmele Tefsiri*. Manisa Yazma Eser Kütüphanesi 3536 (dated 827/1423), fol. 1b-29b.

Günay, Umay. *Âşık Tarzı Şiir Geleneği ve Rüya Motifi*. Ankara: Akçağ, 1999.

*Hacım Sultan Menâkıbnâmesi*. In Salih Gürerer (ed). *Hacım Sultan ve Menâkıbnâmesi*. Uşak: Uşak Akademi Kitap Dağıtım Pazarlama Yayınevi, 2014, 414-644; also *Das Vilâjet-nâme des Hadschim Sultan: Eine türkische Heiligenlegende*, trans. and ed. Rudolf Tschudi. Türkische Bibliothek, 17. Berlin: Mayer & Müller, 1914.

Hatiboğlu Muhammed. *Bahru'l-Hakâ'ik*. In Abdurrahman Güzel. *Hacı Bektaş Velî ve Makâlât*. Ankara: Akçağ, 2002, 287-341.

Hayretî. *Dîvân*, ed. Mehmed Çavuşoğlu and M. Ali Tanyeri. Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1981.

Heß, Michael R. “Abdalan-ı Rum, literature.” *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*. Kate Fleet, et al. (eds). Consulted online on 26 February 2017 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912\\_ei3\\_COM\\_25751](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_25751) First published online: 2015.

Hickman, William. “On Editing Ottoman Turkish Tekke Poetry.” *The Journal of the American Oriental Society*, forthcoming.

Hickman, William. “Two 15th Century Ottoman Sufi Mysteries; An Historiographical Essay. Part II: The Case of Ümmi Kemal.” *Osmanlı Araştırmaları*, forthcoming.

Hickman, William. “Ümmi Kemâl in Anatolian Tradition” *Turcica* 24 (1982): 155-167.

Hickman, William. “Who was Ümmi Kemal?” *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi* 4-5 (1976-1977): 57-82.

Ibn ‘Arabî. *Ibn al-‘Arabî’s Fuşûş al-Hikam*, tr. Binyamin Abrahamov. London and New York: Routledge, 2015.

Ibn Sîrîn. *L’Interprétation des rêves*, tr. Dominique Penot. Lyon: Alif éditions, 1998.

Izutsu, Toshihiko. "An Analysis of Waḥdat al-Wujūd." In *The Concept and Reality of Existence*. Tokyo: The Keio Institute of Cultural and Linguistic Studies, 1971, 35-55.

İnalçık, Halil. "Dervish and Sultan: An Analysis of the Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi." In Grace Martin Smith and Carl W. Ernst (eds). *Manifestations of Sainthood in Islam*. Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1993, 209-223.

Kafadar, Cemal. *Between Two Worlds: The Construction of the Ottoman State*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995.

Kaplan, Doğan. *Yazılı Kaynaklarına Göre Alevilik*. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2009.

Karadavut, Zekeriya and Ünsal Yılmaz Yeşildal. "Anadolu-Türk Folklorunda Geyik." *Milli Folklor* 19/76 (2007): 102-112.

Karakaya-Stump, Ayfer. "Documents and Buyruk Manuscripts in the Private Archives of Alevi Dede Families: An Overview." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 37/3 (2010): 273-286.

Karakaya-Stump, Ayfer. "Kızılbaş, Bektaşî, Safevî İlişkilerine Dair 17. Yüzyıldan Yeni Bir Belge (Yazı Çevirimli Metin-Günümüz Türkçesi'ne Çeviri-Tıpkıbasım)." *Journal of Turkish Studies/Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* Volume 30/II (2006): 117-130.

Karakaya-Stump, Ayfer. "Subjects of the Sultan, Disciples of the Shah: Formation and Transformation of the Kızılbaş/Alevi Communities in Ottoman Anatolia." Dissertation, Harvard University, 2008.

Karakaya-Stump, Ayfer. "The Forgotten Dervishes: The Bektashi Convents in Iraq and Their Kızılbaş Clients," *International Journal of Turkish Studies* 16/ 1-2 (2010): 1-24.

Karakaya-Stump, Ayfer. "The Vefâ'iyye, the Bektashiyye and Genealogies of 'Heterodox' Islam in Anatolia: Rethinking the Köprülü Paradigm," *Turcica* 44 (2012): 279-300.

Karakaya-Stump, Ayfer. *Vefailik, Bektaşîlik, Kızılbaşlık: Alevi Kaynaklarını, Tarihini ve Tarihyazımını Yeniden Düşünmek*. Istanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2015.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. "Anadolu'nun İslâmlaşması Bağlamında Aleviliğin Oluşumu." In Yalçın Çamak and İmran Gürtaş (eds). *Kızılbaşlık, Alevilik, Bektaşîlik*. Istanbul: İletişim Yayınları, 2015, 43-54.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. "Antinomian Sufis." In Lloyd Ridgeon (ed). *The Cambridge Companion to Sufism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014, 101-124.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. "Early Sufism in Eastern Anatolia." In Leonard Lewisohn (ed). *Classical Persian Sufism: from its Origins to Rumi*. London : Khaniqahi-Nimetullahi Publications, 1993, 175-198.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period 1200-1550*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. "İslam Tasavvuf Düşüncesinde Yunus Emre'nin Yeri." In Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed). *Yunus Emre*. Ankara : T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012, 287-304.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T.. "Islamisation through the Lens of the Saltuk-name." In A. C. S Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds). *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2015, 349-364.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. "Kalenders, Abdâls, Hayderîs: The Formation of the Bektâşîye in the 16th Century." In Halil İnalçık and Cemal Kafadar (eds). *Süleymân the Second and His Time*. Istanbul: The Isis Press, 1993, 121-129.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. "Kaygusuz Abdal: A Medieval Turkish Saint and the Formation of Vernacular Islam in Anatolia." In Orkhan Mir Kasimov (ed). *Unity in Diversity: Mysticism, Messianism and Construction of Religious Authority in Islam*. Leiden: Brill, 2014, 329-342.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. "Speaker, Voice and Audition in the Koran and the Mathnawî." *Sufi* 79 (2010): 36-45.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. "The Antinomian Dervish as Model Saint." In Hassan Elboudrari (ed). *Modes de Transmission de la Culture Religieuse en Islam*. Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 1993, 241-260.

Karamustafa, Ahmet T. "Yesevîlik, Melâmetîlik, Kalenderîlik, Vefâîlik ve Anadolu Tasavvufunun Kökenleri Sorunu." In Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed). *Osmanlı Toplumunda Tasavvuf ve Sufiler*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2005, 61-88.

Katz, Jonathan G. "Dreams and Their Interpretation in Sufi Thought and Practice." In Felek and Knysh (eds). *Dreams and Visions in Islamic Societies*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2012, 181-197.

Katz, Jonathan G. "Dreams in the Manâqib of a Moroccan Sufi Shaykh: 'Abd al-'Azîz al-Dabbâgh (d, 1131/1719)." In Louise Marlow (ed). *Dreaming Across Boundaries: The Interpretation of Dreams in Islamic Lands*. Boston: Ilex Foundation, 2008, 270-282.

Kaya, İdris Güven. *Derviş Şemsi and his Mesnevi Deh Murg*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 1997.

Çaygusuz Abdâl. *Delîl-i Budalâ or Budalâ-nâme*. In Abdurrahman Güzel (ed). *Kaygusuz Abdal'ın Mensur Eserleri*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1983, 49-74; also Tahir Galip Seratlı (ed). *Vahdet-i Vücut ve Tevhid Risaleleri*. Istanbul: Furkan Kitaplığı, 2006, 11-128; Bilâl Yücel. "Kaygusuz Abdal'ın Budalanâme'si." *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Makaleleri* 2 (2002): 50-80.

Çaygusuz Abdâl. *Dil-güşâ*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2009.

Çaygusuz Abdâl. *Dîvân*. Ankara, Milli Kütüphane Mil Yz A 7621/2 (dated 920/1514), fol. 114b-235a, 312a-325b; also Çaygusuz Abdâl, *Dîvân*, Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044 (dated 907/1501-2), fol. 70b-71a, 120a-121b, 134a-139b, 211a-211b, 261a-262b, 288b-341b, 345a; *Kaygusuz Abdal Divânı*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel. Ankara: MEB, 2010.

Çaygusuz Abdâl. *Gevher-nâme*. In *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alâaddin Gaybî) Menâkıbnâmesi*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999, 119-123; also Mehmet Akalın. "Çaygusuz Abdal'ın Gevher-nâmesi." *Atatürk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Araştırma Dergisi* 10 (1979): 189-197; Müjgan Cunbur. "Gülşehri ile Kaygusuz Abdal'ın Şiirlerini Kapsayan XV.Yüzyıldan Kalan Bir Mecmua." In *X. Türk Dil Kurultayında Okunan Bilimsel Bildiriler 1963*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi, 1964, 23-30.

Çaygusuz Abdâl. *Gülistân*. *Gülistân*, Ankara, Milli Kütüphane Mil Yz A 7621 (dated 920 /1514), fol. 235a-286a; also Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, (dated 907/1501/1502), fol. 140a-210b.

Çaygusuz Abdâl. *İkinci Meşnevî*. Ankara Milli Kütüphane Mil Yz A 7621/2 (dated 920/1514), fol. 1a-11a.

Çaygusuz Abdâl. *Kitâb-ı Mağlaça*. Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044 (dated 907/1501-2), fol. 263b-288b; also Manisa Provincial Public Library 45 Hk 7793/2 (dated 956/1549), fol. 164b-221a; Ankara, National Library Collection of Ankara Adnan Ötüken Provincial Public Library, 06 Hk 824/2 (undated), fol. 75b-104b; Ankara, National Library National Library Manuscript Collection 06 Mil Yz A 1107/5 (dated 1140 /1727-8), fol. 91b-108a; Ankara, National Library Collection of Eskişehir Provincial Public Library 26 Hk 273/2 (dated 1201/1786-7), fol. 109b-131b; Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library Düğümlü Baba Collection 00411 (dated 1208/1793-1794), fol. 109b-131b; Istanbul, Millet Library Collection of Ali Emiri AEmnz797 (dated 1229/1814), fol. 143b-168b; Istanbul, Atatürk Kitaplığı Collection of Osman Ergin O.E. 663 (undated), fol. 70b-105b; Vatican Library Turkish Manuscripts Vat.Turco 185 (undated), fol. 51b-78b; Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library Collection of Hacı Mahmud Efendi 03040 (dated 1268/1852), fol. 29b-46b; Istanbul, Süleymaniye Library Collection of Uşşaki Tekkesi 00261/11 (dated 1240/1824-5), fol. 134b-153b; Istanbul, Hacı Selim Ağa Library Kemankeş Collection 248 (undated), fol. 56b-113a; Abdurrahman Güzel (ed). *Kaygusuz Abdal'ın Mensur Eserleri*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1983, 82-130; Bilâl Yücel. "Çaygusuz Abdal'ın Kitâbu Maglata'sı." *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Makaleleri 2* (2002): 83-117.

Çaygusuz Abdâl. *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*, ed. Zeynep Oktay. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 2013, 79-173.

Çaygusuz Abdâl. *Minber-nâme*. In *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alâaddin Gaybî) Menâkıbnâmesi*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999, 136-140.

Çaygusuz Abdâl. *Serây-nâme*. Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.Oct. 4044, (dated 907/1501-2), fol. 1b-70a; also Abdurrahman Güzel (ed). *Sarây-nâme*. Ankara: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2010.

Çaygusuz Abdâl. *Üçüncü Meşnevî*. Ankara Milli Kütüphane Mil Yz A 7621/2 (dated 920/1514), fol. 11b-21a.



Kaygusuz Abdâl. *Vücûd-nâme*. In Abdurrahman Güzel (ed). *Kaygusuz Abdal'ın Mensur Eserleri*. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 1983, 135-152.

*Kaygusuz Abdal (Alâaddin Gaybî) Menâkıbnâmesi*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1999.

Kaya, Doğan. *Anonim Halk Şiiri*. Ankara: Akçağ, 1999.

Kaya, Doğan. "Cönklerden Gün Işığına: Abdal Mahlaslı Halk Şairleri." *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Makaleleri 2* (2003): 121-144.

Kelâmî. *Dîvân*. Istanbul, Yapı Kredi Sermet Çifter Araştırma Kütüphanesi Yazmaları 611 (undated), 138 ff.

Kemâl Ümmî. *Dîvân*. In Hayati Yavuzer (ed). *Kemâl Ümmî Dîvânı (İnceleme-Metin)*. Bolu: Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Bolu Halk Kültürünü Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi, 2008, 417-759.

Kırman, Aydın. "Yemini'nin Fazîlet-nâme'si: Şekil ve Muhteva Tahlili." Dissertation, Izmir, Ege University, 2004.

Kinberg, Leah. "Dreams." In *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*. Kate Fleet, et al. (eds). Consulted online on 24 December 2016 <[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912\\_ei3\\_COM\\_26091](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_26091)> First published online: 201297

Kinberg, Leah. "Dreams as a Means to Evaluate Ḥadīth." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 23 (1999): 79-99.

Kinberg, Leah. "Interaction Between This World and the Afterworld in Early Islamic Tradition." *Oriens* 29/30 (1986): 285-308.

Kinberg, Leah. "The Legitimization of the Madhāhib through Dreams." *Arabica* 32/1 (Mar. 1985): 47-79.

Kinberg, Leah. "Literal Dreams and Prophetic Ḥadīth in Classical Islam: A Comparison of Two Ways of Legitimation." *Der Islam* 70/2 (1993): 279-300.

Kinberg, Leah. "Qur'ān and Ḥadīth: A Struggle for Supremacy as Reflected in Dream Narratives." In Louise Marlow (ed). *Dreaming Across Boundaries: The Interpretation of Dreams in Islamic Lands*. Boston: Ilex Foundation, 2008, 25-49.

Kocatürk, Vasfi Mahir (ed). *Tekke Şiiri Antolojisi*. Ankara: Edebiyat Yayınevi, 1968.

Koçak, Aynur. "Akyazılı Sultan ve Tekkesine Folklorik Bir Yaklaşım." *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi* 26 (2003): 223-234.

- Korkmaz, Esat. *Alevilik ve Bektaşilik Terimleri Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar, 2005.
- Korkmaz, Esat. *Dört Kapı Kırk Makam*. İstanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar, 2008.
- Korkmaz, Murat (ed), *Abdal Musa ve Erkânı*. İstanbul: Horasan Yayınları, 2006.
- Koz, M. Sabri. “Cönk ve Mecmûa Yapraklarında Âşık Aramak.” In Hatice Aynur, et al. *Mecmûa: Osmanlı Edebiyatının Kırkambarı*. İstanbul: Turkuaz Yayınları, 2012, 159-200.
- Köprülü, Mehmet Fuad. “Abdal.” In *Türk Halk Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi: Ortaçağ ve Yeniçağ Türklerinin Halk Kültürü Üzerine Coğrafya, Etnoğrafya, Etnoloji, Tarih ve Edebiyat Lûgati*. İstanbul: Burhaneddin Basımevi, 1935, 23-56.
- Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad. “Abdal Musa.” In *Türk Halk Edebiyatı Ansiklopedisi: Ortaçağ ve Yeniçağ Türklerinin Halk Kültürü Üzerine Coğrafya, Etnoğrafya, Etnoloji, Tarih ve Edebiyat Lûgati*. İstanbul: Burhaneddin Basımevi, 1935, 60-64; reprinted with notes and additions by Orhan F. Köprülü in Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. “Abdal Musa.” *Türk Kültürü* 124 (1973): 198-207.
- Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad. “Anadolu’da İslamiyet: Türk İstilasından Sonra Anadolu Tarih-i Dinisine Bir Nazar ve Bu Tarihin Menbaları.” *Darülfünun Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası* 2 (1922): 281-311, 385-420, 457-486; also Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion (Prolegomena)*, tr. Gary Leiser. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1993.
- Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad. “Bektaşiliğin Menşeleri.” *Türk Yurdu* 16-2 / 169-8 (May 1925), reprint, Ankara, 2001, 9:68-76.
- Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad. *Influence du Chamanisme Turco-Mongol sur les ordres mystiques Musulmans*. İstanbul: Zellitch frères, 1929.
- Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad. “Mısır’da Bektaşılık.” *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 6 (1939): 13-40.
- Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad. *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1966.; also Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. *Early mystics in Turkish Literature*, tr. Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff. London-New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Köprülü, Orhan F. “Abdal: Edebiyat.” *TDVİA*, vol. 1. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988, 61-62.
- Köprülü, Orhan F. “Abdal Murad.” *TDVİA*, vol. 1. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988, 63-64.
- Köprülü, Orhan F. “Abdal Musa.” *TDVİA*, vol. 1. İstanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988, 64-65.
- Krstić, Tijana. *Contested Conversions to Islam: Narratives of Religious Change and Communal Politics in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.
- Kurnaz, Cemal and Mustafa Tatçı. *Türk Edebiyatında Şathiye*. İstanbul: Akçağ, 2001.

Kutlar, Fatma Sabiha. “Seher Abdal’ın Helvâ vü Nân’ı.” *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Dergisi* 56 (2010): 261-294.

Lamoreaux, John C. *The Early Muslim Tradition of Dream Interpretation*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002.

Lamoreaux, John C. “An Early Muslim Autobiographical Dream Narrative: Abū Ja’far al-Qāyīnī and His Dream of the Prophet Muhammad.” In Louise Marlow (ed). *Dreaming Across Boundaries: The Interpretation of Dreams in Islamic Lands*. Boston: Ilex Foundation, 2008, 78-98.

Landolt, Hermann. “Azīz-i Nasafī and The Essence-Existence Debate.” In *Recherches en Spiritualité Iranienne: Recueil d’articles*. Tehran: Institut Français de Recherche en Iran Presses Universitaires d’Iran, 2005, 119-125.

Laṭīfī. *Tezkire-i Laṭīfī*. Istanbul: Kitāb-hāne-i İkdām, 1314.

Lory, Pierre. “Les Paradoxes mystiques (shatahât) dans la tradition soufie des premiers siècles.” In *École pratique des hautes études, Section des sciences religieuses, Annuaire, Tome 102, 1993-1994*. Paris: École Pratique des Hautes Études, 1993, 225-227.

Lory, Pierre. “Les Paradoxes mystiques (shatahât) dans la tradition soufie des premiers siècles.” In *École pratique des hautes études, Section des sciences religieuses, Annuaire, Tome 103, 1994-1995*. Paris: École Pratique des Hautes Études, 1994, 231-234.

Lory, Pierre. *Le Rêve et ses interprétations en Islam*. Paris: Éditions Albin Michel, 2003.

Massignon, Louis. “La légende de Hallacé Mansur en pays turcs.” *Revue des études islamiques* (1941-46): 67-115.

Mazıoğlu, Hasibe. “Yunus Emre’nin Şiirlerinin Şekil Özellikleri.” In *Uluslararası Yunus Emre Semineri: Bildiriler*. Istanbul: Baha Matbaası, 1971, 183-187.

*Mecmū’a-i eş’âr*. Ankara, Milli Kütüphane Yazmalar Koleksiyonu, 06 Mil Yz B 170 (undated), 178 ff.

Meier, Fritz. “Some Aspects of Inspiration by Demons in Islam.” In G. E. Von Grunebaum and Roger Caillois (eds). *The Dream and Human Societies*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966, 421-429.

Mélikoff, Irène. *Au Banquet des quarante: Exploration au cœur du Bektachisme-Alevisme*. Istanbul: Éditions Isis, 2001.

Mélikoff, Irene. *Hadji Bektach: Un Mythe et ses avatars*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Mélikoff, Irène. *Sur les traces du soufisme turc: Recherches sur l'Islam populaire en Anatolie*. Istanbul: Éditions Isis, 1992.

*Menâkıb-ı Koyun Baba*, ed. M. Şakir Çıplak. In *Osmancık'ta Erenler Durağı: Koyun Baba*. Istanbul: Horasan, 2001, 20-165; also *Koyun Baba Velâyetnâmesi*, ed. Muzaffer Doğanbaş. Istanbul: Dörtkapı, 2015.

Minorsky, V. "The Sect of the Ahl-i Hakk." *Iranica* 1964: 308-309.

Mir-Kasimov, Orkhan. *Words of Power, Hurûfî Teachings between Shi'ism and Sufism in Medieval Islam: The Original Doctrine of Faḍl Allāh Astarābādī*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2015.

Naimuddin, Sayyid "Evil and Freewill in Rūmī and Iqbāl." *Islamic Culture* 46/1 (1972): 227-234.

Nesīmī. *Dīvān*. In Hüseyin Ayan (ed). *Nesīmī: Hayatı, Edebî Kişiliği, Eserleri ve Türkçe Divanının Tenkitli Metni I-II*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 2014, 153-862 (First edition Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2002).

[Nesīmī] Sayyid 'Imād al-Dīn Nasīmī. *Dīvān*, ed. Hamid Mohammadzadeh. Baku: Nashrīyāt-i Dawlatī-i Āzarbāijān, 1972.

Nesīmī. *The Quatrains of Nesimī – Fourteenth-Century Turkic Hurufî (with Annotated Translations of the Turkic and Persian Quatrains from Hekimoğlu Ali Paşa MS)*, ed. Kathleen R.F. Burrill. Paris: Mouton, 1972.

Niyazioğlu, Aslı. "Dreams, Ottoman Biography Writing, and the *Halveti-Sünbüli Şeyhs* of 16th Century Istanbul." In Ralf Elger and Yavuz Köse (eds). *Many Ways of Speaking About the Self: Middle Eastern Ego-Documents in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish (14th-20th century)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2010, 171-184.

Niyazioğlu, Aslı. "How to Read an Ottoman Poet's Dream? Friends Patrons and the Execution of Figānī (d. 938/1532)." *Middle Eastern Literatures* 2013: 1-12.

Niyazioğlu, Aslı. "In the Dream Realm of a Sixteenth-Century Ottoman Biographer: Taşköprizade and the Sufi Shaykhs." In John J. Curry and Erik S. Ohlander (eds). *Sufism and Society: Arrangements of the mystical in the Muslim world, 1200-1800*. London and New York: Routledge, 2012, 243-257.

Nour, Rıza. "Kaygusuz Abdal Gaybî Bey." *Türk Bilik Revüsü / Revue de Turcologie* 2/5 (1935): 77-98.

Noyan, Bedri. *Bütün Yönleriyle Bektaşilik Alevilik* Vol. 1. Ankara: Ardiç Yayınları, 1998.

Noyan, Bedri. *Bütün Yönleriyle Bektâşilik ve Alevilik* Vol. 4. Ankara: Ardiç Yayınları, 2001.

Noyan, Bedri. *Bütün Yönleriyle Bektâşilik ve Alevilik* Vol. 8/1 (*Erkân*). Ankara: Ardıç Yayınları, 2010.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "Alevîliğin Tarihsel Sosyal Tabanı ile Teolojisi Arasındaki İlişki Problemine Dair," In İsmail Kurt and Seyid Ali Tüz (eds). *Tarihî ve Kültürel Boyutlarıyla Türkiyede Alevîler Bektaşiler Nusayriler*. Istanbul: Ensar Neşriyat, 1999, 385-398.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *Babaîler İsyanı: Alevîliğin Tarihsel Altyapısı Yahut Anadolu'da İslâm-Türk Heterodoksisinin Teşekkülü*. Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları, 1980; also Ahmet Yaşar Ocak. *La Révolte de Baba Resul ou la Formation de l'Hétérodoxie Musulmane*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1989.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "Geyikli Baba." *TDVİA*, vol. 14. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1996, 45-7.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "Hacı Bektâş-ı Velî." *TDVİA*, vol. 14. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1996, 455-458.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "Hacım Sultan." *TDVİA*, vol. 14. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1996, 505-506.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *Kalenderîler (XIV.-XII. Yüzyıllar)*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1992; also Istanbul: Timaş, 2016.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "Kitabiyat." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları: The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 2 (1981): 243-252.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler: 15.-17. Yüzyıllar*. Istanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 1998.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "Islam's Second Aspect in Turkey's History: Rethinking the Shî'a Element in Anatolia, or some comments on the Isma'îlî Influences." In Kaan Durukan, Robert W. Zens and Akile Zorlu-Durukan (eds). *Hoca, 'Allame, Puits de Science: Essays in Honor of Kemal H. Karpat*. Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2010, 11-26.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "The Wafâ'î Tarîqa (Wafâiyya) During and After the Period of the Seljuks of Turkey: A New Approach to the History of Popular Mysticism in Turkey." In *Perspectives and Reflections on Religious and Cultural Life in Medieval Anatolia*. Istanbul: The Isis Press, 2012, 149-80.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "Yunus Emre: 13-14. Yüzyıllar Arasında 'Bir Garip Dervîş-i Kalender-reviş' Yahut Önce Kendi Zaman ve Zemininin İnsanı." In Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed). *Yunus Emre*. Ankara: T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, 2012, 183-198.

Oktay, Zeynep. "Kaygusuz Abdal'ın Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz'u: Tenkitli Metin ve İnceleme." Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi Üniversitesi, 2010.

Oktay, Zeynep. *Mesnevî-i Baba Kaygusuz*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 2013.

Ormsby, Eric. "The Poor Man's Prophecy: Al-Ghazālī on Dreams." In Louise Marlow (ed). *Dreaming Across Boundaries: The Interpretation of Dreams in Islamic Lands*. Boston: Ilex Foundation, 2008, 142-152.

*Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi: Vilâyetname-i Şâhî Göçek Abdal*, ed. Şevki Koca. Istanbul: Bektaşî Kültür Derneği, 2002; also *Otman Baba Velayetnamesi*, ed. Filiz Kılıç, Mustafa Arslan, Tuncay Bülbül. Ankara: Grafiker Ofset, 2007.

Özcan, Hüseyin. "Bektaşilikte Dört Kapı Kırk Makam." *Journal of Turkish Studies / Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları: Kaf Dağının Ötesine Varmak, Festschrift in Honor of Günay Kut III* 28/1 (2004): 241-245.

Pala, İskender. *Ansiklopedik Divan Şiiri Sözlüğü*. Istanbul: Kapı Yayınları, 2004.

Papas, Alexandre. "Dervish." *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*. Kate Fleet, et al. (eds). Consulted online on 18 August 2017 <[http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912\\_ei3\\_COM\\_25986](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_25986)> First published online: 2011.

Papas, Alexandre. *Mystiques et Vagabonds en Islam: Portraits de Trois Soufis Qalandar*. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 2010.

Peacock, A.C.S. and Sara Nur Yıldız. "Introduction: Literature, Language and History in Late Medieval Anatolia." In A.C.S. Peacock and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds). *Literature and Intellectual Life in Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-century Anatolia*. Würzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2016, 19-35.

Pinguet, Catherine. *La Folle sagesse*. Paris: Patrimoines, 2005.

Pinguet, Catherine. "Remarques sur la poésie de Kaygusuz Abdal." *Turcica* 34 (2002): 13-38.

Redhouse, Sir James W. *A Turkish and English Lexicon*. Constantinople: A. H. Boyajian, 1890.

Reynolds, Dwight F. "Symbolic Narratives of Self: Dreams in Medieval Arabic Autobiographies." In Philip F. Kennedy (ed). *On Fiction and Adab in Medieval Arabic Literature*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005, 261-284.

*Risāle-i Şeyh Şafî*. Konya Mevlana Museum Ferid Uğur Collection 1172 (dated 1201/1786), fol. 1b-61a; also Bisâtî. *Şeyh Sâfî Buyruğu: Menâkıbu'l-Esrâr Behcetü'l-Ahrâr*, ed. Ahmet Taşğın. Ankara: Rheda-Wiedenbrück Çevresi Alevi Kültür Derneği Yayınları, 2003.

Rûzbihân al-Baqlî. *Sharḥ-i shaḥḥiyât*, ed. Henry Corbin. Tehran and Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1966.

Şadık Abdâl, *Sâdik Abdâl Dîvânı*, ed. Dursun Gümüsoğlu. Istanbul: Horasan Yayınları, 2009.

Sa‘îd Emre (Mollâ Sa‘deddîn). *Said Emre'nin Şiirleri*. In Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı (ed). *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf*. Istanbul: İnkılap, 1961, 280-294.

Schimmel, Annemarie. “Drei Türkische Mystiker: Yunus Emre, Kaygusuz Abdal, Pir Sultan Abdal.” In Norbert Reitz (ed). *60 Jahre Deutsch-Türkische Gesellschaft*. Norderstedt: Books on Demand, 2014, 17-185 (originally published in *Mitteilungen der Deutsch-Türkischen Gesellschaft* 48 (1962)).

Schimmel, Annemarie. *Mystical Dimensions of Islam*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1975.

Schimmel, Annemarie. “Yunus Emre,” In Talat Halman (ed). *Yunus Emre and His Mystical Poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, 1981, 59-85.

Seher Abdâl. *Sa‘âdet-nâme*. In Mustafa Özağaç (ed). “Seher Abdal’ın Saadet-nâme İsimli Mesnevîsi (Metin-Muhteva-Tahlil).” Master’s Thesis, Izmir, 9 Eylül Üniversitesi, 2009, 88-149.

Seyyid Seyfullâh. *Seyyid Seyfullah Külliyyâtı I: Manzum Eserler*, ed. Arzu Meral. Istanbul: Revak Kitabevi, 2014.

Soileau, Mark. “Conforming Haji Bektash: A Saint and His Followers between Orthopraxy and Heteropraxy.” *Die Welt des Islams* 54/3-4 (2014): 423-459.

Sviri, Sara. “Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the Malāmatī Movement in Early Sufism.” In Leonard Lewisohn (ed). *Classical Persian Sufism: from its Origins to Rumi*. London: Khaniqahi-Nimetullahi Publications, 1993, 583-613.

Şahin, Haşim. “Şücâüddin Velî,” *TDVİA*, vol. 39. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2010, 247-8.

Şemsî. *Deh Murg*. In İdris Güven Kaya (ed). *Derviş Şemsi and his Mesnevi Deh Murg*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 1997, 73-176.

Şucâ‘eddîn Velî *Velâyetnâmesi*. In Yağmur Say (ed). *Şucâ‘eddîn Velî (Sultan Varlığı) ve Velâyetnâmesi*. Eskişehir: Eskişehir Valiliği, 2010, 99-176; also Ayşe Yıldız. “Şücaaddin Baba Velâyetnâmesi.” *Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi* 37 (2006): 49-97.

Tanman, M. Baha. “Abdal Mûsâ Tekkesi.” *TDVİA*, vol 1. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988, 65-66.

Tanman, M. Baha. “Demir Baba Tekkesi.” *TDVİA*, Vol. 9. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1994, 150-151.

Tatçı, Mustafa. *Yûnus Emre Külliyyâtı 5: Yûnus Emre Şerhleri*. Istanbul: H Yayınları, 2008.

Tekindağ, Şehabettin. “Teke-eli ve Teke-Oğulları.” *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 7-8 (1977): 55-95.

“T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Türkiye Yazmaları,” accessed February 27, 2016,  
[https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay\\_goster.php?k=22566](https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay_goster.php?k=22566).

[https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay\\_goster.php?k=76960](https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay_goster.php?k=76960).

[https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay\\_goster.php?k=138694](https://www.yazmalar.gov.tr/detay_goster.php?k=138694).

Terzioğlu, Derin. “How to Conceptualize Ottoman Sunnitization: A Historiographical Discussion.” *Turcica* 44 (2012-2013): 301-338.

Tortel, Christiane. *L’Ascète et le bouffon: Qalandars, vrais ou faux renonçants en islam ou l’Orient indianisé*. Arles: Actes Sud, 2009.

Turan, Osman. “Selçuklular Türkiyesi Din Tarihine Ait Bir Kaynak.” In *60. Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Fuad Köprülü Armağanı*. Ankara: Dil ve Tarih Coğrafya Fakültesi, 1953, 544-546.

Uçar, Ramazan. *Alevîlik-Bektaşîlik: Abdal Mûsa Tekkesi Üzerine Sosyolojik Bir Araştırma*. Ankara: Berkan Yayınevi, 2012.

Uçman, Abdullah. “The Theory of the Dawr and the Dawriyas.” In Ahmet Yaşar Ocak (ed). *Sufism and Sufis in Ottoman Society*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür, Dil ve Tarih Yüksek Kurumu, 2005, 445-475.

Uludağ, Süleyman. “Abdal Mehmed.” *TDVİA*, vol. 1. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 1988, 63.

Usluer, Fatih (ed). *Hurufî Metinleri I*. Ankara: Birleşik Yayınları, 2014.

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya. “L’École Wudjüdite et son influence dans la pensée turque.” *WZKM* 62 (1969): 193-208.

Ünver, İsmail. “Kemâl Ümmî.” *TDVİA*, vol. 25. Istanbul: Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı, 2002, 229-230.

Üsküplü Asiye Hatun. *Rüya Mektupları*. Edited by Cemal Kafadar. Istanbul: Oğlak Yayıncılık, 1994.

Vāhidī. *Menākıb-ı H̄oca-i Cihān ve Netīce-i Cān*. In Ahmet T. Karamustafa (ed). *Vāhidī’s Menākıb-ı H̄oca-i Cihān ve Netīce-i Cān: Critical Edition and Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, 1993, 88-293.

*Velāyet-nāme-i Seyyid ‘Alī Sulṭān*. In Rıza Yıldırım (ed). *Seyyid Ali Sultan (Kızıldeli) ve Velāyetnāmesi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007, 161-184.

Vīrānī. *Risāle-i Vīrānī Abdāl*. In Fatih Usluer (ed). *Hurufî Metinleri I*. Ankara: Birleşik Yayınları, 2014, 143- 231.



Vīrānī. *Âşık Viranî Divanı*, ed. M. Hâlid Bayrı. İstanbul: Maarif Kitaphanesi, 1959.

Von Grunebaum, G. E. "Introduction: The Cultural Function of the Dream as Illustrated by Classical Islam." In G. E. Von Grunebaum and Roger Cailliois (eds). *The Dream and Human Societies*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1966, 3-21.

[Dervîş Muhammed] Yemînî. *Fazîlet-nâme*, ed. Yusuf Tepeli. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu, 2002.

Yıldırım, Dursun (ed). *Türk Edebiyatında Bektaşî Fıkraları*. Ankara: Akçağ, 1999.

Yıldırım, Rıza. "Abdallar, Akıncılar, Bektaşîlik ve Ehli-Beyt Sevgisi: Yemini'nin Muhiti ve Meşrebi Üzerine Notlar." *Bellekten* 75/272 (2011): 51-85.

Yıldırım, Rıza. "Anadolu'da İslamiyet: Gaziler Çağında (XII.-XIV. Asırlar) Türkmen İslam Yorumunun Sünni-Alevi Niteliği Üzerine Bazı Değerlendirmeler." *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 43 (2014): 93-124.

Yıldırım, Rıza. "Bektaşî Kime Derler?: 'Bektaşî' Kavramının Kapsamı ve Sınırları Üzerine Tarihsel Bir Analiz Denemesi." *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Dergisi* 55 (2010): 23-58.

Yıldırım, Rıza. "Beylikler Dünyasında Kerbela Kültürü ve Ehl-i Beyt Sevgisi: 1362 Yılında Kastamonu'da Yazılan Bir Maktelin Düşündürdükleri." In Halil Çetin (ed). *Kuzey Anadolu'da Beylikler Dönemi Sempozyumu Bildiriler, Çobanoğulları, Candaroğulları, Pervaneoğulları, 3-8 Ekim 2011 Kastamonu-Sinop-Çankırı*. Çankırı: Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi Yayınları, 2012, 344-72.

Yıldırım, Rıza. "Inventing a Sufi Tradition: The use of the Futuwwa ritual gathering as a model for the Qizilbash *djem*." In John J. Curry and Erik S. Ohlander (eds). *Sufism and Society: Arrangements of the mystical in the Muslim world, 1200-1800*. London and New York: Routledge, 2012, 164-182.

Yıldırım, Rıza. "Muhabbetten Tarikata: Bektaşî Tarikatı'nın Oluşum Sürecinde Kızıldeli'nin Rolü." *Türk Kültürü ve Hacı Bektaş Veli Araştırma Dergisi* 53 (2010): 153-190.

Yıldırım, Rıza. *Seyyid Ali Sultan (Kızıldeli) ve Velâyetnâmesi*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 2007.

Yıldırım, Rıza. "Shī'itization of the Futuwwa Tradition in the Fifteenth Century." *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies* 40/1: 53-70.

Yıldırım, Rıza. "Sunni Orthodox vs Shi'ite Heterodox?: A Reappraisal of Islamic Piety in Medieval Anatolia." In A. C. S Peacock, Bruno De Nicola and Sara Nur Yıldız (eds). *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia*. Surrey: Ashgate, 2015, 287-307.

Yılmaz, H. "Bilinmeyen Bir Koyunbaba Menâkıbnâmesi Üzerine." *Hacı Bektaş Velî Araştırma Dergisi* 11 (1999): 21-52.

Yunus Emre. *Risâlat al-Nushiyya ve Dîvân*. ed. Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı. İstanbul: Eskişehir Turizm ve Tanıtma Derneği Yayınları, 1965; also İstanbul, Hacı Selim Ağa Yazma Eser Library, Kemankeş Koleksiyonu MS 316/1 (undated), fol. 2b-4b, 20b-33b; Yunus Emre. *Dîvân*. MS. Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms.or.oct. 2575 (undated), fol. 1a-89b; Yunus Emre. *Yunus Emre Divânı: Risâletü'n-Nushiyye, Tenkitli Metin*, ed. Mustafa Tatçı. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1991 (İstanbul: H Yayınları, 2008); Yunus Emre. *Yunus Emre Dîvânı: Tenkitli Metin*, ed. Mustafa Tatçı. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1990 (İstanbul: H Yayınları, 2008); Yunus Emre. "Selected Poems Translated by Talât S. Halman." In Talat Halman (ed), *Yunus Emre and His Mystical Poetry*. Bloomington: Indiana University Turkish Studies, 1981, 141-190.

Yürekli, Zeynep. *Architecture and Hagiography in the Ottoman Empire: The Politics of Bektashi Shrines in the Classical Age*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2012.

Zarcone, Thierry. "Bektaşîyye." *Encyclopaedia of Islam, THREE*. Kate Fleet, et al. (eds). Consulted online on 26 February 2017 [http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912\\_ei3\\_COM\\_24010](http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1573-3912_ei3_COM_24010)  
First published online: 2014

Zarcone, Thierry. *Le Croissant et le compas: Islam et franc-maçonnerie: De la Fascination à la détestation*. Paris: Éditions Dervy, 2015.

Zarcone, Thierry. *Mystiques, philosophes et francs-maçons en Islam: Rıza Tevfik, penseur ottoman (1868-1949), du soufisme à la confrérie*. Paris: Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes d'Istanbul, 1993.

Zarcone, Thierry. "Nouvelles perspectives dans les recherches sur les Kızılbaş-Alévis et les Bektachis de la Dobroudja, de Deli Orman et de la Thrace orientale." In Jacques Thobie (ed). *Anatolia Moderna Yeni Anadolu IV: Derviches des Balkans, disparitions et renaissances*. Paris: Jean Maisonneuve, 1992, 1-11.

Zarcone, Thierry. "The Sword of 'Alî (Zülfikar) in Alevism and Bektashism." *Journal of the History of Sufism* 6 (2015): 113-126.

Sample Facsimiles

Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Ms. or. Oct. 4044 (Manuscript B)

**بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ**


**کتاب معجزة من كلام فيغوس ابدال رحمة الله عليه**

دليل خبر کتابت به لاد فخری ساکت تر عارف خالی تا آند هر کتاب کتابی  
 اندوه لسانی طهر نظر عاشقان بر محو صلوات درونده زخوری  
 سبک کند و زین بر صحرای که نهایی بود که برین اجتناب کوشش کرد  
 به محراب او زین بر صحرای که نهایی بود که برین اجتناب کوشش کرد  
 به حال کس که درین دید و در زمین زین با قادی که در کس که درین  
 یلکوز او زین در میان که کتک کتک بود و درین کس که درین  
 کند و هر حال که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 بر نگری وقت اول کس که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 چون که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 امین اولدی دیر بر زمین کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 خود درین کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 وجود جان جان جان من اولدم صورتی که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 صورتی که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین

---

۲۶۴

فی تنها کوری او زین بر زمین دیر دیر کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 اولاد دیدی دیر کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 او دیر کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 کوری دیر کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 بول تنی تنها اهان او زین بر زمین دیر دیر کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 صفا تی ذاتی مطلق بحری کتک همان بنم دایه جونی چرا بوق  
 نه الخی نه تنصوری نه بغداد دیدی دیر کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 بهر کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 دیر کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 الوری کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 نولدی کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 در زمین کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 با فدی کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 یقوم دیدی دیر کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین  
 در زمین کتک کتک بود که درین کتک کتک بود که درین کس که درین



۱۰۵  
 ۱۶۴  
 بیانده که کلان بود آن سخن دهر دردی در ویش  
 بو اولو یوبی دوتدی کنده برینقل رکه بولده  
 کنده کور دیکه هیچ نهایی یوق بون کور ویش  
 ایدر چاهه یوبی باری وقت اولاکه کسنده وایش  
 ایشین بکلی خبر ویریددی بوردس ویش چاهه  
 کور دیکه هیچ کسنده یوق جان انیدر بوردس  
 بو کز ایدر چون کسنده کسری امین اولاین  
 ددی بوردس ویش کور دیکه نه بو چهل ک خلیج  
 واروند حد و بانی وار بوردس ویش ازل کت  
 جومنده کلای ددی که بیت عالم کلای وجود  
 اولیم  
 جان بن اولده وجوده جان جانده جانان بای

۱۰۵  
 164-  
 غلته با یاقینی سوز عید الراجز و الیغونان  
 جسم الله الرحمن الرحیم  
 دلایل خبر کتاب بد لا ذوقه و مطاله ستر غایب  
 خیال نایب انزل بو کتاب حکایت ان ووه ولسان  
 طهر دهر نوسه نظر عاشقان بر محمد صلیت  
 بر هره ویش کور مشی که کنی وزین بر جمل و کله  
 وحدای یوق کورین آهین باقش کور مشکه بر  
 صحرای ناولی بول اور تا سنده وار بر بوجرا  
 دهر ویشدن ان که هیچ کسنده یوق بو حال کدن  
 صور این دردی بوردس ویش دست بکا با قوی  
 کور دیکه هیچ کسنده یوق بالکن ازلده حالیا  
 بیانده

## Résumé

Cette étude porte sur *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*, le représentant le plus célèbre et le plus prolifique du mouvement appelé les *Abdālān-ı Rūm*, un groupe de derviches de tendances antinomiques affiliées de façon ténue, qui apparut lors du 13<sup>e</sup> siècle en Anatolie et devint un composant principal du Bektachisme à partir du 14<sup>e</sup> siècle. Les œuvres de *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl* ont joué un rôle clé dans la formation du corpus ultérieurement appelé « la littérature Alévi-Bektachi ». La première partie de ce travail se concentre sur sa doctrine religieuse, ses positions versatiles et opportunistes en fonction des milieux, et son choix du turc vernaculaire comme vecteur de son propos. Ce dernier aspect est comparé à l'apport de *Yūnus Emre*, fameux derviche des 13<sup>e</sup> - 14<sup>e</sup> siècles, qui a contribué grandement au style littéraire de *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*. Les *ṣaḡhiyye* (un type de poème) de *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl* et *Yūnus Emre* sont analysés pour leurs rôles de passerelles entre les genres folkloriques et la littérature soufie classique. Dans le dernier chapitre de la première partie, les ouvrages des successeurs de *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*, de *Şādīḡ Abdāl*, *Yemīnī*, *Şemsī* et *Vīrānī Abdāl* sont lus sous l'angle de leurs contenus doctrinaux. Ainsi, un panorama de l'évolution des pensées *abdāl* et *bektāṣī* est créé. La deuxième partie de l'étude constitue en l'édition critique, la traduction et le commentaire de l'ouvrage le plus fascinant de *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*, à savoir le *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaḡa*. Le commentaire commence par étudier comment l'ouvrage se met en résonance avec la tradition islamique sur les rêves, en montrant particulièrement la subversion de celle-ci. Suit une analyse structurale, doctrinale et littéraire de l'ouvrage, trois aspects qui se complètent et se renforcent les uns les autres dans la manière humoristique de *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*. En conclusion, le présent travail vise à comprendre la pensée religieuse et littéraire de *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*, personnage saint toujours vénéré de l'Alévisme. Sa vision de la sainteté a joué un rôle clé dans la formation du Bektachisme et de l'Alévisme et leur évolution jusqu'à nos jours.

## Mots Clés

*Abdālān-ı Rūm*, *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*, derviche, soufisme, *ṣaḡhiyye*, vernacularisation, Bektachisme, Alévisme

## Abstract

This study focuses on *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*, the most famous and prolific representative of the *abdāls* of *Rūm*, an antinomian movement of loosely-affiliated dervishes which emerged in Anatolia in the thirteenth century and became a main constituent of Bektashism from the fourteenth century onwards. *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*'s works played a major role in the formation of the corpus later called "Alevi Bektashi literature." The first part of the study focuses on *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*'s religious doctrine, multiple social positions, and choice of the Turkish vernacular as his literary medium. This last aspect is compared to famous 13th-14th century dervish *Yūnus Emre*, who was instrumental in shaping *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*'s literary style. *Yūnus Emre*'s and *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*'s *ṣaḡhiyye* (a type of poem) are analyzed for their role in creating a bridge between folk genres and classical Sufi poetry. In the last chapter of the first part, the works of *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*'s successors, *Şādīḡ Abdāl*, *Yemīnī*, *Şemsī*, and *Vīrānī Abdāl* are examined for their doctrinal content, thus creating a panorama of the evolution of *abdāl* and *bektāṣī* thought. The second part of the study contains the critical edition, translation, and commentary of *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*'s most intriguing work, the *Kitāb-ı Maḡlaḡa* (The Book of Prattle). The commentary begins with a focus on the work's engagement with and subversion of the Islamic tradition of dream literature. A structural, doctrinal, and literary analysis of the work is undertaken, wherein these three aspects are shown to complement and reinforce one another in *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*'s unique humorous way. As a whole, the study aims to understand the religious and literary thought of *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*, who has been to this day one of the most important saints of Alevism. His understanding of sainthood was instrumental in shaping Bektashism and Alevism up to our day.

## Keywords

*Abdālān-ı Rūm*, *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl*, dervish, Sufism, *ṣaḡhiyye*, vernacularization, Bektashism, Alevism