A STUDY ON PRE-ISLAMIC SURVIVALS IN A TURKISH-ISLAMIC TEXT: THE VİLÂYET-NÂME

BY

© AHMET T. KARAMUSTAFA

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH OF McGILL UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

IN ISLAMIC STUDIES

INSTITUTE OF ISLAMIC STUDIES

McGILL UNIVERSITY

MONTREAL

1981

PRE-ISLAMIC SURVIVALS IN THE VİLÂYET-NÂME

ABSTRACT

The religious history of the Turkish peoples of Anatolia in the first few centuries after their entry into the peninsula remains obscure. This obscurity can be partially dispersed only through detailed analyses of the few religious works of early Muslim-Turkish literature. One such work, namely the legendary biography of the pīr of the Bektaşi order known as the Manâkıb-ı Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli, or simply the Vilâyet-nâme, is here subjected to a critical analysis with the purpose of identifying the survivals of pre-Islamic Turkish beliefs within it.

After an initial effort to place the Vilâyet-nâme into its proper historical context, an overall view of the religious life of Turkish nomads prior to their Islamization is given. This is followed by a comparative analysis of the text in the light of the information already presented, and it is demonstrated that this central work of the heterodox-antinomian Bektaşi tradition of Turkish Anatolia is clearly imbedded in the pre-Islamic culture of nomadic Turkish peoples.

RESUME

L'histoire religieuse des Turcs pendant les premiers siècles de leur existence en Anatolie nous est encore assez obscure. Toutefois, nous pensons que cette obscurité peut etre dissipée dans une large mesure à travers l'étude détaillée des premiers écrits de la littérature religieuse turque-musulmane. Dans cet ordre d'idées, la présente étude consiste en une analyse critique de l'une de ces oeuvres, le Manâkıb-ı Hacı Bektaş-ı Velî, connu aussi sous le titre de Vilâyet-nâme, avec le but de relever des survivances de croyances préislamiques dans cette biographie légendaire du pîr de l'ordre des Bektaşi.

Après un premier effort de placer le Vilâyet-nâme dans son propre contexte historique, sera tracé un aperçu général de la vie religieuse des nomades turcs avant leur conversion à l'Islam. Finalement, à la lumière des matériaux ainsi éxposés, une analyse comparative de notre document sera élaborée afin de démontrer que cette oeuvre capitale de la tradition quasiment antinomique de l'hétérodoxie Bektaşi d'Anatolie s'incruste dans la culture préislamique des nomades turcs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Despite its significance for Islamic history in general and Ottoman history in particular, the religious history of Anatolia between the eleventh century, Turkish entry into the area, and the fifteenth century, the political unification of the peninsula under the Ottomans, remains largely unstudied. It is true that very selective aspects of religious life have received attention, and here one thinks especially of the fairly extensive literature on the Mevlevis. Such studies, however, are few and isolated. Undoubtedly, the scarcity of relevant historical data and the rather obscure nature of the available documents have significantly hindered historical research. Nevertheless, perhaps equally obstructive has been the immense variety and complexity of the religious phenomena in question, which almost defy empirical study.

Especially the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries seem to have witnessed an increased religious fervor and activity, which laid the groundwork for a number of religious developments, among them the establishment of some well-organized Sufi brotherhoods with centralized administrative systems. Particularly remarkable in this period is the spread of what could be called heterodox beliefs with a certain Sufi-shīʿī coloring, such as Babâilik, Kalenderilik, Hurûfilik and Bektaşilik. It has been shown, largely through the efforts of the Turkish scholar M. F. Köprülü, that such beliefs were found primarily among the nomadic or semi-nomadic Türkmen tribes, whose members did not abandon their

strongly heretic tendencies even after they settled on soil as agriculturalists or found their way into cities as mercenaries, low-level laborers and apprentices.

The purpose of this study is to assess and further explore the accuracy of this connection established between heretic movements and nomadic peoples through a critical analysis of the central text of this heterodox tradition, namely the Manâkıb-ı Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli, commonly known as the Vilâyet-nâme, with the purpose of searching for and identifying the traces of pre-Islamic Turkish beliefs and practices within it.

The study will consist of three parts. Chapter I will introduce and attempt to provide a historical background to the Vilâyet-nâme. This work is a legendary biography which contains the accounts of the miraculous deeds of Hacı Bektaş Veli, the pīr of the Bektaşi tarīqa, who is known to have lived during the thirteenth century. Accordingly, it will be the purpose of this section to compile and recapitulate the results of research already carried out on the holy men of the Turkish tribes in Anatolia during the early period of its Turkification, with an eye towards situating the accounts contained in the Vilâyet-nâme in their historical context. An attempt will be made to bring together the available information on some of the key religious figures of the Türkmens in Anatolia in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries including Baba İlyas, Baba İshak, Barak Baba, Sarı Saltuk, Geyikli Baba, and Hacı Bektaş.

Chapter II will deal broadly with the religious history of the Turkish-speaking peoples of Central Asia prior to their Islamization,

with separate sections on the belief in life-giving forces, the principle of unity of being, the veneration of various objects of nature, the different religious rites, and other central features. Here, the main concern will be to bring out the general characteristics of the religious life of these steppe-dwelling pastoralist nomads.

In the third and final chapter, the Vilâyet-nâme will be subjected to a critical analysis in the light of the information presented in the first two sections. The terms "belief" and "practice" will be taken in their broadest meanings, and numerous phenomena ranging from the veneration given to specific sites to different ways of expressing respect and submission will come under consideration.

All throughout, the purpose will to determine to what degree it is possible to talk of a continuity in religious belief and behavior between the pre-Islamic and Islamic periods of Turkish nomads. It is hoped that this study will not only enable us to trace certain religious phenomena through different religious systems, but also facilitate a better understanding of a major Islamic document which has not yet been adequately studied, namely the Vilâyet-nâme itself.

Note on Transliteration

Throughout this study, modern Turkish orthography for Turkish and the transliteration rules of the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, for Arabic and Persian will be followed. The only exception will be the citations from the Orkhon Inscriptions in particular and pre-thirteenth-century Turkish in general; in such cases, the example of

Talât Tekin, A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic (The Hague: Mouton and Co., Indiana University Publications, 1968) will be followed. Titles of all books will be transliterated according to the language of the work in question, not according to the linguistic origin of the words that make up the title. Names of persons and places related to Anatolian Selçuks and Ottomans will be treated as Turkish, though there will be some exceptions such as the names of Selçuk sultans--thus ʿAlāʾ ad-Dīn Kayqubād, not Alâeddin Keykubâd--and of some well-known religious figures--thus Jalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī, not Celâleddin Rûmi. In all other instances, the guiding principle for transliteration will be contextual clarity.

Acknowledgements

The assistance of my thesis supervisor Dr. A. Üner Turgay, and the opportunity to pursue this study provided to me by the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, are here gratefully acknowledged.

CHAPTER I

THE BABAS: HOLY MEN OF THE TURKISH TRIBES IN ANATOLIA

From the earliest times that it can be traced in the sources, the religious life of the nomadic Turkish tribes in Anatolia appears to have been dominated by holy men generally known as either atas (Turkish 'ancestor, father'), or, and later more commonly, babas (Turkish 'father'). In general, it is clear that among non-Muslim Turkish nomads Islam was propagated chiefly through the agency of Turkish-speaking 'wise-men' of the tribes, who rendered some basic tenets of Islam available and intelligible to their common folk in their own language. Alternatively expressed, and this is perhaps closer to the truth, it was these babas who gave a successful Islamic coloring to the ancestral religious practices of the nomads.

Mostly lacking any formal education and without a working knowledge of either Arabic or Persian, these itinerant preachers often had at best a deficient understanding of the several different currents of Islamic thought and practice as these had developed in the heartlands of Islam during the first three hundred years of its history before the onset of massive conversions of nomadic Turks in the late 4th/10th century. It is hardly suprising, therefore, that faced with the difficult task of transmitting a whole array of exogenous beliefs into a nomadic

Turkish milieu which was determined by the inescapable necessity to locate ever new pastures for the flocks, as well as by the not less significant prospect of looting the richer sedentary populations, the Türkmen babas could succeed only by selecting just those elements of Islam which were congenial to their own religious practices and transforming these elements into new acceptable moulds through a lengthy process of adaptation. It was the accomplishment of this demanding task which assured to the babas a central place of authority in the life of the nomads, and until the formation of religious congregations during the late 7th/13th and 8th/14th centuries, the religious life of the common masses was determined by and shaped around the person of these holy men.[1] Furthermore, owing to this tremendous influence they exerted on the common people, many would-be and accomplished rulers alike sought to secure the active support of the babas. One can argue convincingly that the establishment of certain dynasties was accomplished at least in part through active alliances between certain political rulers and certain religious movements which were organized around the person or name of powerful religious figures. One such alliance was the relationship between the Ottomans and the Bektaşis. Also, there is reason to believe that a similar alliance existed between the Karamanoğlu dynasty and a certain İlyasi trend originating from Baba İlyas, a movement which seems to have shared the faith of the dynasty with which it had collaborated and went out of existence with the downfall of the Karamanoğlu principality.[2]

In spite of their undeniable historical significance, there is no clear information on the place and function of the babas within the tribal community. Were they, for instance, chiefly poet-singers who captivated the imaginations of their fellow tribesmen with their poems and songs so indispensable to a tribal life of wandering, or basically soothsayers and diviners who exercised a considerable power in the community because of their magical talents ? Or still yet, were they also medicine men who were highly respected on account of their generally recognized capacity to heal the sick and the wounded ? Alternatively, did such holy men bring together in their person the powers and attributes of poet-singer, soothsayer, and healer alike, without a recognizable differentation between these functions ? If a clear answer to these questions is not forthcoming, it is due in large measure to the scarcity of information on the early Türkmen babas. Mainly because of the silence of the available sources, we are in almost total darkness regarding the Turkish Muslim holy men of the tribes for the first two centuries of the Islamization of the Turks. It is not until the late 6th/12th century that things begin to gain clarity with the figure of Ahmet Yesevî (d.562/1166).

Our knowledge of the life and thought of this first great Turkish Sufi, however, sheds only indirect and partial light on the babas, since Yesevi himself cannot be considered a tribal baba by any stretch of the imagination. Born and raised in considerably large towns, Sayram and Yesi respectively, and educated under the guidance of the scholar and

and Sufi Yūsuf Hamadhānī (440-535/1048-1140) in the center of Islamic culture in Transoxiana, namely Bukhārā, Yesevi was primarily an urban personage. Although he grew popular especially among the Turkish peasantry and nomads around Yesi towards the end of his life, he obviously never had intimate daily contact with the common folk. The later spread of Yesevilik in Turkistan is due chiefly to the labors of his disciples whom Yesevi dispatched to various regions inhabited by Turkish-speaking peoples. The lives of these disciples, however, cannot be reconstructed except in legendary form and as such are not amenable to historical analysis.[3]

It is, therefore, not until we come to 7th/13th century Anatolia that more substantial information on the Türkmen babas can be obtained. Indeed, nothing positive can be asserted concerning the religious development of the Turkish invaders of Anatolia for the time period stretching from the onset of the first invasions in the late 5th/11th century to the middle of the 7th/13th century when Anatolia, like so many other Islamic regions, also came under Mongol domination. When the veil of obscurity is finally lifted at around that time, a considerably large body of material on the Türkmen babas becomes available for study. It is to this material that we now will turn and present in a concise form the information available on a number of these holy men. A more general picture of their religious thought and orientation will be drawn towards the end of the chapter.[4]

Baba İlyas-Baba İshak-Baba Resul

Baba İlyas

The most informative source on the life of Baba İlyas is the Menâkıb el-kudsîye fi menâsıb el-ünsîye (760/1358-59) of Elvan Çelebi in Turkish.[5] This author claims descendance from Baba Ilyas in the following manner: Elvan Çelebi himself was the son of the more famous Aşık Ali Paşa (d.733/1332), the author of the celebrated Turkish Garib-nâme, who was the son of a certain Muhlis Paşa (?). This Muhlis Paşa in turn was one of the five sons of Şücâeddin Ebu'l-Bekâ Baba İlyas-ı Horasani (d.638/1240). According to Elvan Çelebi, who devotes the second chapter of his six-chapter work to Baba İlyas, this latter came to Anatolia from Khorasan during the time of the Anatolian Selçuk Sultan ʿAlā ad-Dīn Kayqubād I (618-634/1220-37) and settled in the village of Çat near Amasya. Although he was on good terms with Kayqubād I, he fell out of favor during the reign of his son Giyāth ad-Dīn Kaykhusrav II (634-643/1237-45) and had to take refuge in the castle of Amasya in order to escape from persecution. It was at this juncture that one of his prominent disciples, namely Baba İshak, revolted against the Selçuks in Syria and travelled to Amasya to join his shaykh against the wishes of the latter, who had asked İshak to stay clear of Amasya. When İlyas refused to see him, İshak moved with his mostly nomadic supporters, who had by then increased significantly in number, to the vicinity of Kırşehir where he engaged in a pitched battle with a Selçuk army containing Georgian, Kurdish, and 'Frankish' contingents. It is said that after this battle, which saw the total destruction of İshak's army, Baba İlyas mounted his white horse and ascended to

the sky; no trace of him could be found after this point.

In other sources Baba İlyas is mentioned only in passing. In the Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman (889/1484-85) of Aşıkpaşazâde in Turkish, he appears under the name Baba İlyas-ı Divane as one of the holy men at the time of Ertuğrul (d.687/1288). Aşıkpaşazâde confirms the lineage of Baba İlyas as given by Elvan Çelebi and gives the additional information that he was the khalīfa of a Seyyid Ebu'l-Vefâ[6] and was himself the shaykh of Geyikli Baba. Aşıkpaşazâde also states that Hacı Bektaş and his brother Menteş paid homage to Baba İlyas when they travelled to Rum from Khorasan.[7]

In the Arabic ash-Shaqā'iq an-nuᶜmānīya fī ᶜulamā' ad-dawlat al-ᶜuthmānīya (965/1558) of Ahmet Taşköprüzâde, Baba İlyas is only mentioned once more as the shaykh of Geyikli Baba.[8] The Turkish translation of this work by Edirneli Mecdi (995/1586), however, has a separate entry under the title "Baba İlyas-ı Acemi," where it is related that he came from Khorasan during the time of Chıngız Khān, settled in Amasya and gathered many supporters around himself. Most of his followers, however, were destroyed by Sultan Giyāth ad-Dīn who got suspicious of their aims, and soon Baba İlyas himself was killed in the hands of his followers. Mecdi also adds that İlyas had a son called Muhlis Baba.[9]

Two later sources, the Bahjat at-tavārīkh (861-63/1455-58) of Şükrullah in Persian and the Şahā'if al-akhbār fī waqāyiᶜ al-aᶜsār (1083/1673) of Müneccimbaşı Ahmet Dede in Arabic, which recapitulate the information already given above, contain the additional report that Baba İlyas was involved in the uprising led by Baba İshak, but was granted

a pardon by the Sultan after the supression of the rebellion.[10]

Baba İshak

The main sources on Baba İshak may be enumerated as follows:

1. The Menâkıb el-kudsîye of Elvan Çelebi. The account contained in this work was given in the above section on Baba İlyas.

2. Al-Avamîr al-ᶜAlā'îya fî'l-umūr al-ᶜAlā'îya (680/1281) of Ibn Bîbî in Persian. According to this reliable work, Baba İshak was from the Kafarsud region in Syria. He was gifted in jugglery as well as magic and preached among ignorant Turkish tribes. Eventually growing afraid that he would start to be perceived as an impostor, he disappeared into the common folk and re-emerged in Amasya as a righteous and pious holy man engulfed in devotion and praying. It is said that he acted as an arbiter of conflicts and disagreements among his followers by preparing talismans for them. For a while, he travelled around southeast Anatolia and preached against Sultan Giyāth ad-Dîn. The latter reacted by dispatching troops against him under the command of a certain Muzaffereddin, who was defeated twice by İshak and his followers; the rebels thus gained control over Tokat and Sivas. Soon afterward, Baba İshak was captured and executed by the Selçuk commander Hacı Armağanşah, who was later killed by İshak's followers. The forces of İshak, which were apparently not shaken by their leader's death, could only be suppressed by a special army called from the eastern borders of the Anatolian Selçuk Empire which contained a sizeable 'Frankish' contingent. The Selçuk victory was followed by an extensive massacre, in which all the Babâis, or Babalıs, as the supporters of İshak were called,

were killed, women and children included.[11]

3. The history of Gregory Bar Hebraeus (Ibn al-ʿIbrī, d.685/1286) in Syriac. Bar Hebraeus writes that İshak was a disciple of an old ascetic Türkmen in Amasya known as "Papa" who claimed to be the messenger, rasūl, of God. It was Papa who dispatched Baba İshak to the eastern borders of the land of Rum, where İshak gathered many supporters among the Türkmens and defeated the forces of the amīr of Malatya sent upon him. In the meantime, however, Papa died in Amasya, whereupon İshak and his immediate entourage began to spread the rumor that their spiritual leader ascended to the sky in order to recruit the angels to his cause. Türkmen rebels numbering around six thousand then moved westward towards Amasya, inflicting serious blows to Selçuk forces on their way. Such was their devotion and strength that an army of six thousand could not attack them; they could be beaten only when around one thousand Frank horsemen, who were placed in the front ranks of the Selçuk army, charged upon them without fear and the rebels were massacred without any exceptions.[12]

Besides these three sources, the only other early work which refers to İshak by name is the Manāqib al-ʿārifīn (718-754/1318-19—1353-54) of Şemseddin Ahmet Eflāki in Persian, where he is mentioned as the chief disciple, naqīb, of Hacı Bektaş.[13]

Baba Resul

Several sources mention a certain Baba Resul without giving the proper name of this figure. The history of Bar Hebraeus is one of these where Baba Resul is depicted as an old ascetic Türkmen who claimed to be

rasūlallāh. The Dominican missionary Simon of Saint-Quentin, who crossed through Anatolia shortly after the Babâi revolt, refers to a certain "Paperoissole" as the leader of the uprising, who presented himself as the messenger of God.[14] Ṣibt b. al-Jawzī, writing shortly before 653/1255, also mentions a Baba Rasūl in his Mir'āt az-zamān.[15] Finally, Baba Resul appears in the Vilâyet-nâme as one of the prominent disciples of Hacı Bektaş,[16] and conversely, as the shaykh of this latter in the Manāqib al-ᶜārifīn.[17]

On the basis of this scanty information, it is not possible to identify Baba Resul with either Baba İlyas or Baba İshak. If Bar Hebraeus' account is to be believed, then it is tempting to think that the old ascetic Türkmen mentioned by him who claimed to be rasūlallāh was in reality no other than Baba İlyas.[18] If so, it is suprising that by far the most important source on Baba İlyas, namely the Menâkıb el-kudsîye, fails to report that Baba İlyas was also known by the name 'Baba Resul', or that he had ever claimed to be the messenger of God. On the other hand, if it is kept in mind that the active leader of the Babâi uprising was not İlyas but İshak, and more significantly that Ibn Bībī specifically mentions the reputation of Baba İshak among his followers as the messenger of God, then it might seem more plausible that it was İshak who was also known as Baba Resul.[19] Neither of the alternatives, however, can be verified at the present stage of our knowledge of the Babâi uprising. What can be asserted with some degree of certainty is that there were at least two different, if not three or more, babas who were involved in the uprising, namely İlyas and İshak,

each probably with their own separate groups of followers.[20]

Geyikli Baba

Information on Geyikli Baba is found in several sources, earliest among them the history of Aşıkpaşazâde and the anonymous Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman. As ash-Shaqa'iq an-nuᶜmanîya of Taşköprüzâde contains the most comprehensive account of this baba and is in agreement with the reports of the earlier sources, it is this account which is presented below.

Taşköprüzâde mentions Geyikli Baba among the shaykhs of the time of Ottoman Orhan Gâzî (726-761/1326-59). He was Geyikli Baba (Turkish, literally 'baba with deer'), because he used to ride deers, which in general were very fond of him. His real name was not known to Taşköprüzâde. Originally from the town of Khoy in Iran, he was a disciple of Baba İlyas and Ebu'l-Vefâ el-Bağdâdi as his pîr. Geyikli Baba participated in the conquest of Bursa by Orhan (726/1326), then settled in a village in the vicinity of that city where he spent the rest of his life. He was highly cherished by Turgut Alp, Orhan's close friend and a military commander under him. Hence the deep reverence of Orhan for Geyikli Baba, which is revealed in the following anectodes. After the conquest of Bursa, Orhan wanted to donate the town of İnegöl along with its surroundings to Geyikli Baba. The holy man first refused the offer, saying that property was the due of rulers only, but later conceded to the persistent demands of Orhan and accepted a piece of land for his dervishes. On another occasion, Geyikli Baba uprooted a tree and, carrying it all

the way to Bursa, planted it right beside Orhan's residence, an act to which Orhan reacted with the greatest joy. When Geyikli Baba died, the Sultan had a mausoleum, and according to Mecdi also a mosque and a zāwiya, built over his grave.

Taşköprüzâde reports that Geyikli Baba was a man of ecstacy, jadhba, possessing miraculous powers, karāma; he was cut off from worldly interests, always facing the divine presence. One of his miraculous deeds is recorded in another entry in ash-Shaqā'iq which gives information on a different famous dervish of the times, Abdal Musa. The latter, who also resided in Bursa, sent a piece of burning coal wrapped in cotton to Geyikli Baba as a sign of his karāma; yet , he had to acknowledge the greatness of Geyikli Baba when he received a bowl of deer's milk from him in return. Abdal Musa explained that it was more difficult to enchant living beings, hayawān, than plants.[21]

A somewhat different version of this account in ash-Shaqā'iq is found in an undated document of the Ottoman Imperial Council, Divân-ı Hümâyûn. There, it is reported that Geyikli Baba had all by himself conquered a church with three hundred and sixty doors called Kızıl Kilise (Turkish, 'crimson church'). When this fact was reported to Orhan Gâzi, he sent Geyikli Baba two loads of wine and two loads of rakı (Turkish, 'an alcoholic drink distilled from grape juice'), thinking that the latter was a wine-drinker. However, when these were taken to him, Geyikli turned to a friend who happened to be with him and said, "The Sultan has sent me two loads of honey and two loads of butter." These words were confirmed when the loads were opened in the presence

of Orhan's envoy. Thereupon, Geyikli Baba cooked a sweet dish, zerde, with the honey and butter and sent some of it to Orhan along with an ember from the fire wrapped in cotton. In response, Orhan ordered Kızıl Kilise to be bestowed upon Geyikli Baba as a pious endowment.[22]

Sarı Saltuk

The earliest reference to Sarı Saltuk in the sources appears in the second quarter of the 8th/14th century. Ibn Baṭṭūṭa (the dates of his travels are 726-755/1325-54), who twice visited the town of Baba Saltuk in Dobruja, depicts Saltuk as "an ecstatic devotee, although things are told of him which are reproved by the Divine Law."[23] At around the same time, the history of Birzālī (up to 738/1338) and the Aʿyan al-ʿaṣr wa aʿwān an-naṣr of aṣ-Ṣafadī refer to a certain "Sartuk", which must certainly read as Saltuk, as the shaykh of Barak Baba.[24] These reports do not give any positive information on the life or personality of Sarı Saltuk; they do establish, however, that he was well known as a historical personage by mid-8th/14th century.

The first source to relate the story on Sarı Saltuk and Barak Baba, which was later repeated with some variations by Seyyid Lokman in his Oğuz-nâme and by Müneccimbaşı in the Ṣaḥāʾif al-akhbār, is the Selçuk-nâme, alternatively called the Oğuz-nâme, of Yazıcıoğlu Ali, written in Turkish early in the reign of the Ottoman Sultan Murat II (824-855/1421-51).[25] Yazıcıoğlu Ali reports that Sarı Saltuk crossed to Dobruja from Anatolia shortly after 660/1261 with the nomad families of the army of the Selçuk Sultan ʿIzz ad-Dīn Kaykāʾūs II, who had received permission for this migration from the Byzantine basileus.

Later, the Tatar Berke Khān of the Crimea transferred the Turks of Dobruja, and with them Sarı Saltuk as well, into the steppes. These nomadic people soon gained permission to return to their abode in Dobruja and were sent back there under the leadership of Sarı Saltuk. Meanwhile, one of the sons of ʿIzz ad-Dīn Kaykāʾūs II, who was captive in the hands of the Byzantine emperor, tried to escape and was imprisoned. The patriarch asked for this prince from the basileus, baptized him and made him a monk. After serving in the Hagia Sophia for some time, the prince was then sent to Sarı Saltuk upon the latter's request; the patriarch knew Sarı Saltuk to be a holy man, whose demands he was thus ready to meet. Sarı Saltuk converted the prince back to Islam and, bestowing upon him the name 'Barak' as well as his own supernatural powers which he himself has received from Mahmud-i Hayrâni[26] of Akşehir when he was still a shepherd, sent him to the village of Sultaniye, presumably in Azerbaijan. Sarı Saltuk himself died in Dobrúja shortly after 700/1300.

Other than this early account by Yazıcıoğlu Ali, there also exists a legendary biography of Sarı Saltuk entitled Saltuk-nâme, which was written by Ebu'l-Hayr Rûmi between the dates of 878-885/1473-80 for Mehmet the Conqueror's son Cem Sultan.[27] In this work Sarı Saltuk, whose real name is said to be Şerif Hızır, is depicted as a devout Sunni who fought against rāfiḍīs and gave a fatwā to the effect that Ḥanafīya was the strongest of the Sunni madhhabs. At the same time, however, he is said to have stayed in mourning for three days in the month of Muḥarram, to have conversed with ʿAlī in the well in which ʿAlī was

buried, and finally, to have made brothers with the famous qalandar Jamāl ad-Dīn as-Sāwī (died c.630/1232), in whose zāwiya he stayed for seventy days. In addition, he was a disciple of Mahmud-i Hayrânî and was on very good terms with all the heterodox Türkmen babas of his time. He travelled all over the Islamic world waging holy war against infidels while he remained particularly attached to Adrianople, which he adopted as his land, and also to the Crimea, where he spent much of his time. Saltuk-nâme gives the date of Sarı Saltuk's death as 696/1296 and the location of his tomb as Babadağı, where he was supposed to have spent his last days.[28]

In the Vilâyet-nâme, Sarı Saltuk appears as a disciple of Hacı Bektaş. Originally only a shepherd, Sarı Saltuk was transformed into a holy person by Hacı Bektaş who granted him a sword, a bow with seven arrows, and a prayer-rug, and sent him off to the land of Rum. Accompanied by two other dervishes and working miracles of all sorts, Sarı Saltuk wandered from place to place, fighting infidels and converting them to Islam. It is not possible to extract any historical information from this legendary account.[29]

Among the later reports on Sarı Saltuk, the most extensive one is that of Evliyâ Çelebi, who gives Sarı Saltuk's name as Mehmet Buhârî, and claims, as the name implies, that he was a Yesevî dervish from Turkistan. Evliyâ Çelebi's account includes many stories on Sarı Saltuk not attested in any earlier source. These, however, are all legendary in nature and do not add much to our knowledge of Sarı Saltuk as a historical figure.[30]

Barak Baba

There are two conflicting traditions on the origins of Barak Baba. The first tradition , the best account of which was summarized in the above section on Sarı Saltuk as it is given by Yazıcıoğlu Ali, claims Barak Baba as one of the sons of the Selçuk Sultan ᶜIzz-ad-Dīn Kaykā'ūs II. According to the second tradition contained in Mamluk sources of the 8th/14th and 9th/15th centuries,[31] however, Barak Baba is a native of a village of Tokat in central Anatolia; his father is one of the umarā' and his uncle a famous clerk.[32]

Nevertheless, all sources agree that Barak Baba was a disciple of Sarı Saltuk. The history of Birzālī, and quoting from it, Aᶜyān al-ᶜasr, note that Barak Baba was a dervish of a shaykh named Sartuk from the Crimea,[33] who almost certainly was identical with Sarı Saltuk. The Arab authors report that Barak Baba has eaten of Sarı Saltuk's vomit, who then gave him the name Barak.[34] The account in Yazıcıoğlu's Oğuz-nâme is closely reminiscent. There, it is written that when Sarı Saltuk was still a shepherd, Mahmud-i Hayrâni had placed a morsel of food mixed with yoghurt into his mouth, which stayed stuck unto his palate. When Sarı Saltuk finally one day spat it out, his young disciple ate it in an attack of ecstacy. Apparently pleased with this act, Sarı Saltuk stroked his disciple and called him "my barak."[35] That Barak Baba was a disciple of Sarı Saltuk is further confirmed by an extant shathīya of Barak Baba himself, in which Sarı Saltuk, other than Barak himself, is the only person ever mentioned by name.[36]

Almost all of what is known about the life and character of

Barak Baba is derived from the Arabic sources mentioned above. The story of his life, as it is told in these works, can be summarized as follows. He came to Syria in 705/1305-6 or 706/1306 as an envoy of the Ilkhān Ghazan Khān (an anachronism, since Ghazan Khān is known to have died in 703/1304), visited Jerusalem and also possibly Aleppo at least once, but was refused entry to Egypt, possibly because he was the envoy of the Ilkhāns. At this time, he was about forty years old. In 707/1307-8, he was sent by Sultan Muhammad Khudā-Banda to Gīlān, where he was killed within the same year--"boiled to death," "torn to pieces," or "impaled," according to different accounts--presumably because he was perceived to be a non-believer. This information is complemented by Eflâki who, in his Manāqib al-ᶜārifīn, cites Barak Baba as one of the shaykhs in the immediate entourage of Sultan Ghazan Khān.[37]

More important for our purposes is the description of Barak Baba contained in these sources. It is said that he was naked from his waist up, with a red cloth wrapped around his middle. On his head he wore a reddish turban with two buffalo horns attached at each side. His hair, beard, and moustache were all very long, though some accounts assert that he shaved his beard or even both his beard and moustache. He always carried with him a very large and long pipe or horn, nafīr, and a big black bowl made of gourd, kashkūl. He went around with a large number of disciples who resembled him in outlook, carrying long staffs with bells on their shoulders, and with painted anklebones and molar teeth hanging on strings from their necks, tambourines and large

drums in their hands. Wherever they went, the disciples played and Barak Baba danced like a bear and sang like a monkey, and especially enjoyed entertaining children. He never accumulated any wealth. When, on one occasion, Ghazan Khān gave him a large sum of money--ten or thirty thousand dirhams according to different accounts--because Barak Baba was not afraid of a wild tiger sent upon him but instead approached and mounted him, the dervish distributed the money to the poor within the same day. On another occasion in the presence of Afram, the amīr of Damascus, he rode a wild ostrich, rising from the ground on the animal's back and while still in the air cried down to Afram, asking him if he should fly more. He made it mandatory for his disciples to perform the daily prayers; if any of them failed in this task, he was given a certain number of blows with the long staffs. Despite this show of pietism, Barak Baba and his disciples were well-known for their antinomian ways, such as not fasting in the month of Ramadān, eating of what was forbidden to eat (presumably hashish), and gazing at what is beautiful, that is to say, women. Moreover, they reportedly believed in metempsychosis and denied the existence of the next world. Barak Baba supposedly once said that the only real religious obligation was the love of ᶜAlī. For all these reasons, Barak and his disciples were generally perceived to be ibāhīs.[38]

To this account on Barak Baba, it only remains to be added that in the Vilâyet-nâme he appears among the disciples of Hacı Bektaş.[39]

Hacı Bektaş

The earliest work in which Hacı Bektaş is mentioned is the Manāqib al-ᶜārifīn. There, Eflâki refers to him in two different stories. In the first, Haci Bektaş appears as one of the disciples of Baba Resul, who himself had a naqīb by the name of İshak. He had an enlightened heart, but did not abide by the Sharīᶜa. His antinomian tendencies are also emphasized in another story, where it is specifically mentioned that Hacı Bektaş neglected the Sharīᶜa and did not perform the daily prayers.[40]

More extensive information is provided by Aşıkpaşazâde. This author relates that Hacı Bektaş came to Sivas from Khorasan with a brother named Menteş. The two brothers then went to visit Baba İlyas and continued to travel first to Kırşehir, then to Kayseri, where they parted. Menteş returned to Sivas and was soon killed there under unknown circumstances. Hacı Bektaş, on the other hand, ended up in the small village of Karaöyük, where he settled down and adopted a woman called Hatun Ana as his daughter. Aşıkpaşazâde categorically rules out the possibility that Hacı Bektaş might have ever conversed with anyone from the house of Osman Gâzi; he asserts that Hacı Bektaş was an ecstatic holy man, far from being a shaykh or a disciple. Further down, however, he writes that Hacı Bektaş had a disciple through Hatun Ana, whose name was Abdal Musa.[41]

Taşköprüzâde mentions Hacı Bektaş among the shaykhs of the time of Sultan Murat I (762-792/1362-89), yet does not give any information on him. His translator Mecdi, though he enlarges the entry on Hacı

Bektaş, fails to add anything of value.[42]

One additional piece of information which we can adduce is that Hacı Bektaş most probably died before 691/1291, and possibly in the year 669/1270-71. A waqfīya seen by John K. Birge demonstrates that Hacı Bektaş was certainly dead before the year 697/1297. Another waqf deed reported by Ali Emiri takes this date back to 695/1295. A third deed consulted by Hüseyin Hüsameddin Yasar places the date still further back to 691/1291-92.[43] To this information, however, Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı adds that in a collection of manuscripts bound in Sivas in 691/1291, and less significantly, in a late copy of the Vilâyet-nâme (1179/1765) as well as in the Silsile-nâme (1291/1874-75) of Mehmet Şükrü, the date of Hacı Bektaş's death is given as 669/1270-71.[44] It is, therefore, safe to conclude that Hacı Bektaş probably died at around the same time as Jalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī in 673/1273, or soon thereafter.

A significant document on Hacı Bektaş is the Turkish translation, in both verse and prose, of an Arabic work attributed to him. The Arabic original, presumably entitled Maqālāt, has not so far been located. The Turkish translation in verse by a certain Hatiboğlu bears the date 812/1409, whereas the translation in prose by someone called Saideddin cannot be dated. The chief merit of this work, which is a learned exposition of the four stages of the mystic way (sharīᶜa, ṭarīqa, maᶜrifa, and ḥaqīqa), as well as of the different categories of people belonging to these four stages (ᶜābid, zāhid, ᶜārif, and muḥibb respectively), is that it proves, contrary to Aşıkpaşazâde's assertion,

that Hacı Bektaş was a fairly learned Sufi, worthy to be both a disciple and a shaykh. Any further appraisal of the Maqālāt, however, has to await the publication of a scholarly edition, a task which has not yet been attempted.[45]

Finally, there is the legendary biography of Hacı Bektaş, generally known as the Vilâyet-nâme. The oldest copy of this work in prose, apparently copied from an earlier version by a certain Ali Çelebi, dates back to 1034/1624. The oldest extant copy in verse, however, was written at an earlier date in the late 9th/15th or very early 10th/16th century, most probably between 886/1481 and 906-7/1501. A definite date cannot be given, since five pages from the beginning and three from the end of the manuscript are missing. Judging from a number of references in some later copies, in both prose and verse, this early version of the Vilâyet-nâme in verse was written by a certain Firdevsi, mentioned in the biographical dictionaries as Firdevsi-i Rûmi or as Uzun Firdevsi. His proper name was İlyas b. Hızır, and other known works by him include a Süleyman-nâme, written in honor of the Ottoman Sultan Bayezit II (886-918/1481-1512), and a Şerh-i kelimât-i Şeyh Barak, a Turkish translation of a Persian sharh by Quṭb al-ᶜAlavī of the shaṭḥīya of Barak Baba (see note 35 above). According to Gölpınarlı, a comparative study of these two works with the earliest verse copy of the Vilâyet-nâme demonstrates that all three works were composed by the same author. We possess, however, no indication concerning the identity of the original author of the prose Vilâyet-nâme. There is a good chance that Firdevsi was responsible

for this work as well. Short of conclusive proof, however, this remains but a conjecture.[46]

Was İlyas b. Hızır the original author of the Vilâyet-nâme, or did he have an earlier version to work with ? There is probably no definite answer to this question. Nevertheless, it is clear that even if there was an earlier version, it could not have been written any earlier than the beginning of the 9th/15th century, since the stories told in the Vilâyet-nâme definitely presuppose the formation of a well-developed Bektaşi tradition, which must have certainly taken a considerably long time in the making after the death of Hacı Bektaş in the late 7th/13th century. It is plausible to conclude, therefore, that the legendary biography of Hacı Bektaş was written after the full-scale development of Bektaşi legend and lore during the 8th/14th century, but before the definitive establishment of the order by Pir Balım Sultan, who is considered to be the second pīr of the Bektaşis, in the first two decades of the 9th/15th century.

Can we extract any reliable historical information on Hacı Bektaş from the Vilâyet-nâme ? Although the work is replete with stories of supernatural deeds and achievements of several holy men which do not yield any hard historical facts, it proves to have a suprisingly sound historical basis when compared with contemporary historical sources. Most of the characters mentioned in the narrative can be identified with historical personages of the 7th/13th century so that it remains within the realm of possibility that Hacı Bektaş might in reality have met many of the characters whom he is said to have met in his biography.

Thus, for instance, he may well have met and conversed with Taptuk Emre, Sarı Saltuk, Seyyid Mahmud-i Hayrânî, Ahi Evran, and Emir Cem Sultan, or may have sent one of his disciples to Jalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī.[47] On a similar note, the few identifiable historical events, like the Mongol invasion of Anatolia and the capture of Baghdad in 656/1258, that find an echo in the work also serve to establish the time period of the "historical life" of Hacı Bektaş firmly within the 7th/13th century. A number of other facts about Hacı Bektaş which can be deduced from the Vilâyet-nâme with the help of other sources do not add much of significance to the already available body of material on him, but merely serve to strengthen and support the more reliable information contained in different works. Such, for instance, are the facts that Hacı Bektaş was originally from Khorasan, that he settled in the village of Sulucakaraöyük in Kırşehir when he came to Anatolia, and that he was not obedient to the Sharīᶜa. Perhaps a more detailed analysis of the text in the light of all the relevant historical information available might reveal additional material of some significance.

The above survey of the historical data on a number of Türkmen babas of the 7th/13th century facilitates the formation of some general observations concerning especially the religious orientation of these holy men. To begin with, one can hardly fail to notice the presence of strikingly close ties of either disciplehood or friendship between different babas who are all distinctly famous in their own ways. Baba İshak and Geyikli Baba are disciples of Baba İlyas, while Hacı Bektaş is a disciple of either İlyas or İshak, depending on one's interpreta-

tion as to which one of these two babas Baba Resul is to be identified with. The celebrated Yunus Emre is connected through Taptuk Emre to Barak Baba, who we have seen to be a disciple of Sarı Saltuk, while Sarı Saltuk himself has been initiated by Mahmud-i Hayrânî, who was probably dear to both Hacı Bektaş and Jalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī. These last two great Sufis themselves are supposed to have communicated with each other.

The existence of such close connections, exaggerated beyond proportion in legendary accounts, is testimony to a high degree of similarity, and indeed often unity, between the religious ideas and practices of the different babas in question. Such unity was hardly coincidental, for another striking characteristic of most babas during this period was that they had a common origin in the province of Khorasan. The large number of nomadic tribes migrating into Anatolia in flight of the Mongol invasions brought with them many dervishes, who have imprinted a definitive Khurasānī stamp on the later development of folk religion in the peninsula.

The legacy of Khorasan was in the first instance the influence of Yesevilik. However deficient and inaccurate our knowledge of Ahmet Yesevi and Yesevilik in general may be, it is sufficient to demonstrate that from the very beginning the Islam of the common masses of Turkish origin was a variety of Sufism, which was transformed and adopted to meet the needs and expectations of peoples leading a nomadic-pastoralist life. Yesevilik determined the outer bounds, so to speak, of the whole subsequent religious development of the Turkish masses both in

Anatolia and elsewhere by implanting it firmly in the Sufi tradition. In this sense, it can be said that the religious synthesis which later came to full bloom in Anatolia during the 7th-9th/13th-15th centuries under the names of Bektaşilik-Alevilik-Kızılbaşlık had been initiated into its main stream by the earlier Yesevilik.

At the same time, the full growth of Yesevilik had concurred with the beginnings of the development of religious congregations within Sufism, an innovation whose influences the babas could have hardly escaped. The legacy of Khorasan was, therefore, in the second instance the influence of some newly developing ṭarīqas. The most widespread of these and also the most significant for our purposes was the Rifāᶜīya. The influence of other less tightly organized movements best represented by Qalandarīya was also part of this legacy. It is known that many of the dervishes who migrated west into Anatolia in flight of the Mongols were Rifāᶜīs, Qalandarīs, or of an offshoot of either of these two larger groupings like Haydarīya.[48] There is, however, no strong evidence for the presence of Rifāᶜīya in Anatolia until the 8th/14th century, when Ibn Baṭṭūṭa reports the existence of many Rifāᶜī zāwiyas in the peninsula. The only exception is the reports of Eflâki in the Manāqib al-ᶜārifīn which state that the son of Aḥmad ar-Rifāᶜī, whose name was Tāj ad-Dīn, visited Konya, and there was in the same city a Haydarī shaykh called Mubārak.[49] On the other hand, it is more certain that Qalandarīya and, more specifically an offshoot of it known as Jawlaqīya, spread westward into Anatolia during the 7th/13th century, mostly through the activities of the Qalandar Jamāl ad-Dīn as-Sāwī.[50] A Persian

work entitled Fustat al-ᶜadāla fī qavāᵓid as-saltana, which dates from 683/1284-85, demonstrates the presence of a large number of heterodox dervishes in Syria and Anatolia at that time.[51] Eflâki explicitly states that at the time of Jalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī's death there was a Qalandarī convent in Konya directed by a certain Abu Bakr-i Jawlaqī.[52] In addition, there are clear signs that there were close contacts between the early Bektaşis and the Qalandar-Jawlaqīs. It appears, for instance, that the earlier Bektaşis, like the Qalandars, shaved the moustache, the beard, the eyebrows, and the head and were equally negligent of the Sharīᶜa. Moreover, Hacı Bektaş is addressed as kalender şahı, 'the shah of Qalandars', in the inscriptions of the tekke of Hacı Bektaş.[53]

Is it plausible to see a strong shīᶜī influence on the Türkmen babas besides those of the Rifāᶜīs and Qalandars ? Judging by the fact that the love of ᶜAlī had an undeniably central place in the religious thought of the heterodox babas, it has been previously thought that such a shīᶜī influence existed among the Turkish masses in Anatolia, and that this came about during the period between the downfall of Selçuk power and the consolidation of Ottoman authority in the peninsula.[54] More recent scholarship has demonstrated, however, that even though the Mongol invasions, at least initially, certainly contributed to a strengthening of shīᶜī currents in general, there is no clear evidence that shīᶜī movements benefited from Mongol rule in Anatolia, or that a propagation of shīᶜī beliefs occurred there during that time. Indeed, the situation was not that different for the preceeding century. Even

the heated propaganda of the Assassins of Alamūt and Maṣyāf hardly penetrated west of Aleppo.[55] More significantly, it has been remarked that the love of ᶜAlī, especially among the Turkish common folk, for whom the shīᶜī-ᶜAbbāsī conflict was not of prime religious importance, was not a distinguishing mark of shīᶜī conviction any more than that of Sunnism during the 7th/13th century. It did not, therefore, necessarily reflect a shīᶜī influence.[56] Instead, it is more plausible to posit a growing "shīᶜīzation" within Sunnism through the agency of Sufi movements.[57] There is, therefore, no reason to completely rule out certain shīᶜī influences, be they ithnā ᶜasharī, ismāᶜīlī, or other, on the Turkish masses.

Thus, the religious orientation of the Türkmen babas could perhaps be best described as a heterodox-antinomian Sufism that is open to shīᶜī penetration. It is the purpose of the next chapter to present a comprehensive view of the pre-Islamic Turkish religious beliefs which constituted the basis for this specific heterodox-antinomian synthesis.

NOTES

[1]The best overall account of the religious life of Anatolia after the Turkish invasions is still M. F. Köprülü's "Anadolu'da İslamiyet. Türk istilasından sonra Anadolu tarih-i dinisine bir nazar ve bu tarihin menbaları," Darülfünun Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası 2(1922-23):281-311; 385-420; 457-486 (hereafter cited as Köprülü, "Anadolu'da İslamiyet").

[2]On the close relations between political rulers and popular religious figures, see Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, "Le règne de Selim Ier: Tournant dans la vie politique et religieuse de l'Empire Ottoman," Turcica 6(1975):36; Claude Cahen, "Baba Ishaq, Baba Ilyas, Hadjdji Bektash et quelques autres," Turcica 1(1969):61 (hereafter cited as Cahen, "Baba Ishaq"); and Köprülü, "Anadolu'da İslamiyet," p.293. The relationship between the Ottoman Orhan Gâzi and Geyikli Baba (see pp.14-16 of the present chapter) provides an excellent example. On the alliance between the Karamanoğlu dynasty and an İlyasi trend, see Cahen, "Baba Ishaq," p.61; and Hilmi Ziya Ülken, "Anadolu tarihinde dini ruhiyat müşahedeleri. Medhal. I.Burak Baba. II. Geyikli Baba. III. Hacı Bektaş Veli," Mihrab 1(1923):444-445.

[3]The best accounts of Ahmet Yesevi and his disciples are given in M. F. Köprülü, Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar, 2nd ed., (Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1966), Part I, pp.21-153 (hereafter cited as Köprülü, İlk Mutasavvıflar). This should be read in conjunction with the article on Yesevi by the same author in İslam Ansiklopedisi (İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi, 1950-), 1:210-215, which contains some important revisions of the earlier work. On Yūsuf Hamadhānī, see İlk Mutasavvıflar, pp.51-58.

[4]The choice to present only some of these babas to the exclusion of others was governed chiefly by the availability of data. Much more is known on the ones discussed in this paper than those who are omitted. The obvious exception to this is Yunus Emre, who is not considered here precisely for the opposite reason that any account of his life and thought would necessitate long and detailed literary analyses, which falls outside the scope of this study.

[5]The information on this source, as well as the summary of the account it contains on Baba İlyas, is taken from Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "Les Menākib'ul-Kudsīya fī Menāsib'il-Unsīya: une source importante pour l'histoire religieuse de l'Anatolie au XIIIe siècle," Journal Asiatique 267(1979):345-356. Earlier information on this source was given by Mehmet Önder, "Eine neuentdeckte Quelle zur Geschichte der Seltschuken in Anatolien," Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 55 (1959):83-88. Cahen also refers to it in his "Baba Ishaq," p.58.

[6]Presumably Shaykh Abu'l-Wafā' Sayyid Muhammad-i Baghdādī, commonly known as Tāj al-ʿĀrifīn. See Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre.

Hayatı (İstanbul: Bozkurt Basımevi, 1936), pp.56-58, and Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf (İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1961), pp.46-49. Also J. S. Trimingham, The Sufi Orders in Islam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), pp.49-50, note 6. Since this Tāj al-ᶜArifīn died in 501/1107, he could hardly have been the shaykh of Baba İlyas, who died in 638/1240, but probably was merely his pīr; see Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre. Hayatı, p.58, and Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, p.47. Geyikli Baba and Yunus Emre as well claim Ebu'l Vefâ as their pīr; see Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre. Hayatı, pp.58-59.

[7]The edition of Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman that is used here is that of Nihal Atsız Çiftçioğlu in Osmanlı Tarihleri (İstanbul: Türkiye Yayınevi, 1949), pp.77-319. References to Baba İlyas are found on pp.91, 122, 234, and 237.

[8]Ahmet Taşköprüzâde, ash-Shaqā'iq an-nuᶜmānīya fī ᶜulamā' ad-dawlat al-ᶜuthmānīya (Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ᶜArabī, 1390/1970), p.11.

[9]Mecdi Efendi, Şakâyık Tercümesi (İstanbul: n.p., 1269/1853), pp.32-33.

[10]These references are cited in Köprülü, İlk Mutasavvıflar, pp.177-178, note 35.

[11]Ibn Bībī, Die Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bībī, trans. Herbert W. Duda (Kopenhagen: Munksgaard, 1959), pp.216-220.

[12]Abu'l-Farac Tarihi, trans. Ömer Rıza Doğrul (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1950), pp.539-540.

[13]Şemseddin Ahmet Eflâki, Âriflerin Menkibeleri, 2 vols., trans. Tahsin Yazıcı (İstanbul: Hürriyet Yayınları, 1973), 1:370, anecdote number 3/315.

[14]Simon de Saint-Quentin, Histoire des Tartares (Historia Tartarum), ed. Jean Richard (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1965), pp.62-63.

[15]Reference cited in Cahen, "Baba Ishak," p.55.

[16]Vilâyet-nâme: Manâkıb-ı Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli, ed. A. Gölpınarlı (İstanbul: İnkilap Kitabevi, 1958), pp.58-59 (hereafter cited as Vilâyet-nâme).

[17]Âriflerin Menkibeleri, 1:370, anecdote number 3/315.

[18]This is the position of Ocak, pp.353-356. He claims that Baba İlyas was identical with Baba Resul and that Baba İshak was his disciple.

[19]Köprülü is the most consistent exponent of this view. He believes that İshak, who was the real initiator of the rebellion, exploited the reputation of İlyas for his own political purposes. See his "Anadolu'da İslamiyet," pp.305-306, and İlk Mutasavvıflar, pp.177-178. Cahen also seems to think that Resul is to be identified with İshak: "Baba Ishaq," p.55, and "À propos d'un article récent et des Babâ'is," Journal Asiatique 268(1980):69-70.

[20]See Cahen, "À propos d'un article récent et des Babâ'is."

[21]Ash-Shaqā'iq, pp.11-12; the additional information taken from Mecdî is on p.32 of the translation.

[22]The document from the Dîvân-ı Hümâyûn is reproduced in Ahmet Refik Altınay, Türkiye Tarihi (İstanbul: Kütübhane-i Hilmi, 1923), p. 349; also partially in Ülken, p.447. Neither Altınay nor Ülken identify or date the document. Ülken reports further that two stanzas in Turkish, which he thinks could be ascribed to Geyikli Baba, are found on the back of the document. These verses, reproduced by Ülken on p. 448, are simple in style and language and reveal an ascetic tendency. The second stanza in particular calls for renunciation of this world in favor of the "world of truth."

On the other hand, Gölpınarlı (Yunus Emre. Hayatı, pp.59-60; Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, p.11; and "Aşık Paşa'nın şiirleri," Türkiyat Mecmuası 5(1935):99-100), noting that Geyikli is mentioned in a poem of Yunus Emre, reads the relevant line from this poem to imply that Geyikli Baba's proper name was Hasan. If his ascription of this name to Geyikli Baba is justified, Gölpınarlı argues, then it is possible that a poem preserved in the Câmiünnazâir is to be attributed not to Aşık Paşa, as it is so attributed in this collection, but to Geyikli Baba instead.

In this connection, it may be observed that a contrary reading of Yunus Emre in this case is just as possible, if not more so, and further that the mentioned poem in the Câmiünnazâir (cited in "Aşık Paşa'nın şiirleri," pp.98-99), replete with Persian words and betraying a definite literary and religious learning, could hardly have been composed by the same person who was responsible for the verses in Turkish cited by Ülken. Whether Geyikli Baba was the composer of any of this poetry remains, however, an open question.

[23]The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa, A.D. 1325-1354, 4 vols., trans. H. A. R. Gibb (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958-), 2:499-500.

[24]Cited in Gölpınarli, Yunus Emre. Hayatı, p.39, and Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, p.27.

[25]The following summary of the information on Sarı Saltuk contained in the Oğuzname of Yazıcıoğlu Ali is taken from Paul Wittek, "Yazıjıoghlu ʿAlī on the Christian Turks of the Dobruja," Bulletin of

the School of Oriental Studies 14(1952):639-668, especially pp.648-651, and from Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre. Hayatı, pp.37-39.

[26]Mahmud-i Hayrâni is mentioned in the Manāqib al-ᶜārifīn as a contemporary of Jalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī much favored by the patron-saint of the Mevlevis, Âriflerin Menkibeleri, 2:70, anecdote number 3/596, and also in the Vilâyet-nâme, where he comes to meet Hacı Bektaş riding a lion and using a snake as a whip, but acknowledges the latter's greatness when he sees Hacı Bektaş riding a "lifeless rock" and becomes his disciple, Vilâyet-nâme, pp.49-50. The inscription on his wooden coffin preserved in Türk ve İslam Eserleri Müzesi in Ankara gives the date of his death as 667/1268-69. See Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre. Hayatı, p.38, note 1, and Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, pp.45-46; and Wittek, p.658, note 1. Also Köprülü, İlk Mutasavvıflar, p.219, note 1, where the date of Hayrâni's death is given as 655/1257-58, yet the source, said to be a waqf-deed, is not specified.

[27]Gölpınarlı's Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf contains a good summary of the Saltuk-nâme, pp.33-38 which is the source of the brief account of this work given below.

[28]This last piece of information on Sarı Saltuk's death and the place of his tomb is cited from the Saltuk-nâme by Yusuf Ziya Yörükan in "Bir fetva münasebetiyle. Fetva Müessesesi, Ebussuud Efendi ve Sarı Saltuk," Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi 1/2-3(1952): 152-153. It should be added that the history of Birzālī reports the date of Sarı Saltuk's death as c.690/1291, which confirms the view that Sarı Saltuk was certainly dead before the turn of the century; see Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, pp.42-43.

[29]Vilâyet-nâme, pp.45-48.

[30]Once again, a good summary of Evliyâ Çelebi's account of Sarı Saltuk is supplied by Gölpınarlı in his Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, pp.39-40.

[31]These sources are (1) the history of Birzālī (up till 736/1335-36), (2) Aᶜyān al-ᶜaṣr wa aᶜwān an-naṣr of as-Ṣafadī (the author died in 764/1363), (3) al-Durar al-kāmina of Ibn Ḥajar (up till c.832/1428-29), (4) ᶜIqd al-jumān fī tā'rīkh ahl al-zamān of al-ᶜAynī (the author died in 855/1451), and (5) al-Manhal of Abu'l-Maḥāsin Yūsuf b. Taghrībirdī (up till 862/1458). The relevant passages from these works are given by Gölpınarlı in his Yunus Emre. Hayatı, pp.39-47, both in Arabic and in Turkish translation.

[32]All Arabic sources agree on these points, except for al-Manhal, which seems to combine the reports on Barak Baba's father and uncle by writing merely that his father was a clerk; it omits the uncle altogether. See Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre. Hayatı, p.40.

[33]Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, p.27.

[34]Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre. Hayatı, p.39.

[35]Wittek, p.659, and Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, pp. 18-19. It should be added that the word barak signified 'hairy' and "was a favorite descriptive word for Turkic shamans and shamanic animals," especially for dogs. See Robert Dankoff, "Baraq and Burāq," Central Asiatic Journal 15(1971):111.

[36]This shaṯḥīya survives in a sharḥ written on it in Persian by a certain Quṭb al-ᶜAlavī in the year 756/1355. The Turkish translation of the sharḥ is given by Gölpınarlı in Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, pp.252-275. The reference to Sarı Saltuk is on p.265. At another place in the same work, p.17, Gölpınarlı quotes a couplet from Yunus Emre which also demonstrates the close relation between Barak Baba and Sarı Saltuk. See also Yunus Emre. Hayatı, p.54. Later Bektaşi tradition also has it that Barak Baba is a disciple of Sarı Saltuk. See Köprülü, "Anadolu'da İslamiyet," p.308.

Barak Baba's shaṯḥīya itself deserves some attention. Arguing that most of Barak Baba's words can be grouped to form rhyming couplets of seven-syllable lines, Gölpınarlı (Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, pp.275-278) suggests that Barak Baba must have uttered these words in a moment of ecstacy. He compares them to similar utterances of shamans and soothsayers in general and finds it only natural that most of Barak Baba's words should be non-sensical. Such indeed is the character of the shaṯḥīya which consists of a set of cryptic sentences held together by repetition and a certain musicality. The commentator Quṭb al-ᶜAlavī, who as Gölpınarlı rightly observes (Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, pp.253-254), apparently had a very sound knowledge of both religious and literary writings, shows exceptional skill and insight in his interpretation, which has an unmistakable bāṭinī character. Whether Barak Baba's words really had deeper meanings is, however, a question that cannot be considered here.

[37]Âriflerin Menkibeleri, 2:242, anecdote number 8/20.

[38]This description is based on the translations of the relevant passages in the above-mentioned (note 31) Arabic works contained in the following works in Turkish: Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre. Hayatı, pp.39-47, and Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, pp.20-26; Köprülü, "Anadolu'da İslamiyet," p.393; and Hüseyin Hüsameddin Yasar, Amasya Tarihi, 4 vols. (İstanbul: Aydınlık Basımevi, 1912-1935), 3:460-464.

Ibāḥa, literally 'permission' in Arabic, was a term generally applied to antinomian teachings. See Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed., s.v. "Ibāḥa."

[39]Vilâyet-nâme, pp.81 and 90. A. Bodrogligeti, in his "Ahmad's Baraq-Nāma: A Central Asian Islamic Work in Eastern Middle Turkic," Central Asiatic Journal 18(1974):83-128, publishes in transcription

and English translation a Baraq-nāma in Eastern Middle Turkic, possibly dating from the first half of the 8th/14th century. If Bodrogligeti is justified in identifying Baraq in this work with Barak Baba--he states, "Indeed, Baraq in our story was to all indications a certain Barak Baba, a distinguished personality in early Turkic Sufism," p.86 --this would be sufficient proof that the fame and popularity of Barak Baba had very early spread into Central Asiatic Turkish folk culture as well.

[40]Ariflerin Menkibeleri, 1:370-371, anecdote number 3/315 and 1:450-451, anecdote number 3/479.

[41]Osmanlı Tarihleri, pp.237-238. There is no positive connection between Menteş, the brother of Hacı Bektaş, and the principality of Menteşe which came to flourish in the late 7th/13th and early 8th/14th century. See Wittek, Das Fürstentum Mentesche. Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.-15. Jh. (İstanbul: Istanbuler Mitteilungen--herausgegeben von der Abteilung Istanbul des Archäologischen Institutes des Deutschen Reiches, 1934), pp.24-57.

[42]Ash-Shaqā'iq, p.16; Mecdi's translation, pp.44-45.

[43]The first two deeds are reported in John K. Birge's The Bektashi Order of Dervishes (Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Seminary Press, 1937), p.41; the third deed by Köprülü in his İlk Mutasavvıflar, p.95.

[44]Vilâyet-nâme, Introduction, pp.xix-xx.

[45]On the Maqālāt, see Birge, pp.44-45; Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre. Hayatı, pp.17-19, especially note 1 on p.18; Köprülü, "Anadolu'da İslamiyet," p.406, note 1; and Ülken, p.442. There exists a popular edition of the Maqālāt by Sefer Aytekin, Makalât-ı Hacı Bektaş Veli (Ankara: Emek Basım-Yayımevi, 1954).

[46]Vilâyet-nâme, Introduction, pp.xix-xxv. Cahen ("Baba Ishaq," p.56) thinks that the Vilâyet-nâme is anonymous and that it was written around 1400.

[47]Taptuk Emre is the shaykh of the more famous Yunus Emre and himself the disciple of Barak Baba, according to several poems of Yunus. The most thorough account on him is in Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, pp.41-43.

We possess almost no information on the life and character of Ahi Evran. Two waqfiyas, dated 706/1306 and 676/1277 respectively, which were previously thought to belong to Ahi Evran, were proven to be forgeries and are thus of no value. See Gölpınarlı, Vilâyet-nâme, p.120, and Franz Taeschner, "Akhi Ewrān," Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed., vol.1, p.324. On the other hand, sources for the early Ottoman times permit us to establish only that he lived during the time of Orhan Gâzi and that probably did not survive to that of Murat I (760-791/1359-1389). See ash-Shaqā'iq, p.12; Mecdi, p.33; and Aşıkpaşazâde's

Tevârih-i Âl-i Osman in Osmanlı Tarihleri, p.235. It is not certain when he came to be recognized as the pīr of the tanners, for which he is best known. Taşköprüzâde, Aşıkpaşazâde, and Gülşehri, who wrote shortly after 717/1317 a Turkish mathnawī on Ahi Evran, published in Taeschner's Gülschehrī's Mesnevī auf Achi Evran, den Heiligen von Kırschehir und Patron der türkischen Zünfte (Wiesbaden: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Kommissionsverlag Franz Steiner, 1955), do not refer to Ahi Evran in this capacity; but already in the Vilâyetnâme (p.52) and Mecdi's translation of ash-Shaqā'iq, he is mentioned as pīr-i tarīqa of the tanners. Other than these sources, there also exists a manuscript titled hazâ fütüvvet-i Ahi Evran, bearing the date 876/1471, which reports that Ahi Evran was contemporaries with Geyikli Baba, Hacı Bektaş, and Abdal Musa and died at the age of 93 during the reign of Orhan Gâzi. See Refik Soykut, Ahi Evran (Ankara: San Matbaası, 1976), p.7. For the present, there is no reason to reject this information.

The correct form of the name of Emir Cem Sultan was probably Emirci Sultan. He was a Yesevi shaykh who resided in the province of Bozok in central Anatolia and died during the Babâi uprising. For more information, see Ocak, "Emirci Sultan ve zâviyesi. XIII. yüzyılın ilk yarısında Anadolu (Bozok)'da bir Babâi şeyhi: Şeref'üd-Din İsmail b. Muhammad," Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi 9(1978):129-208.

[48]Köprülü, "Anadolu'da İslamiyet," p.298, and "Les origines du Bektachisme," in Actes du Congrès International d'Histoire des Religions tenu à Paris en 1923, 2 vols. (Paris, 1926), 2:402; and Cahen, "Baba Ishaq," p.54. Köprülü, unlike Trimingham, pp.38-39, thinks that Haydarīya should be considered a Kalandarī and not a Rifāᶜī branch; see his "Anadolu'da İslamiyet," p.301, note 1.

[49]Âriflerin Menkibeleri, 2:149-151 and 1:252, anecdote numbers 5/16 and 3/123 respectively. Eflâki is also quoted in Trimingham, p. 39, note 5 and p.40, note 5. Here Trimingham shows Tāj ad-Dīn as the great grandson of ar-Rifāᶜī and not as his son, as Eflâki describes him.

[50]T. Yazıcı, "Ḳalandariyya," Encyclopedia of Islam, 2nd ed., vol.4, p.473.

[51]Osman Turan, "Selçuk Türkiyesi din tarihine dair bir kaynak," in 60. Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Fuad Köprülü Armağanı (İstanbul: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları, 1953), pp.531-565, especially, 537-542.

[52]Âriflerin Menkibeleri, 2:63, anecdote number 3/584.

[53]Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre. Hayatı, pp.6-8.

[54]Köprülü, "Anadolu'da İslamiyet," pp.301-303.

[55]Cahen, "Le problème du shiᶜisme dans l'Asie Mineure turque préottomane," in Le Shiᶜisme imâmite, Colloque de Strasbourg, 6-9 mai, 1968 (Paris: Bibliothèque des Centres d'études supérieurs spécialisé, Travaux du Centre d'Etudes Supérieurs Spécialisé d'Histoire des Religions de Strasbourg, 1970), pp.115-129; Irène Mélikoff, "Yunus Emre ile Hacı Bektaş," İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi 20(1972):27-36, and "Les babas turcomans contemporaines de Mevlânâ," in Uluslararası Mevlânâ Semineri. Bildiriler, ed. Mehmet Önder (Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1973), pp.268-274.

[56]Cahen, "Le problème du shiᶜisme dans l'Asie Mineure turque préottomane," pp.119-120, and "Baba Ishaq," p.63; Mélikoff, "Yunus Emre ile Hacı Bektaş," p.34.

[57]Cahen, "Le problème du shiᶜisme dans l'Asie Mineure turque préottomane," pp.118-119.

CHAPTER II

PRE-ISLAMIC PERIOD: RELIGIOUS LIFE OF TURKISH PEOPLES PRIOR TO THEIR ISLAMIZATION

Any attempt to give an account of the religious life of Turkish peoples prior to their Islamization runs at the outset into at least two problems. The first has to do with the nature of the available sources for a general history of Turkish peoples. There is very little in the way of direct evidence; what we possess consists of on the one hand archeological and paleontological remains, themselves very difficult to uncover and exploit, and on the other hand written documents, which are, as a rule, very scarce and date no earlier than the seventh and eighth centuries. Consequently, for the history of Turkish-speaking tribes prior to this date we are dependent solely on the records of the neighboring peoples, primarily the Chinese, and to a lesser extent, the Byzantine. The use of such indirect evidence is beset with insurmountable problems. The references in these sources to what can be assumed to be Turkish peoples are scattered through a large number of documents from different periods. They frequently contradict each other and remain enigmatic even to the specialist. Beginning with the definitive conquest of Transoxiana by the Arabs in the eighth century, Islamic sources in Arabic and Persian also gain importance, yet their use is not less

difficult than their Chinese or Byzantine counterparts.[1]

A second problem that stems from this peculiar nature of the relevant sources is the identification and delimitation of the peoples under study. The evidence coming from various sources does not allow a detailed historical description of the different nomadic peoples occupying Central Eurasia, and as a result, it very often becomes impossible to draw ethnic and linguistic distinctions among the different peoples in question. What is Turkish merges into what is Mongolian, what is Mongolian merges into what is Tungus, so that it is not possible to isolate a certain group of people as Turkish and trace their history throughout long periods of time and widely removed geographical regions.

It should be stressed at the outset, therefore, that the present attempt to describe the religious life of Turkish nomads prior to their Islamization will reveal only tentative results which are subject to change in the light of further research. This should not, however, be taken to imply that no conclusive statements will be made. On the contrary, it is believed that the general outlines of the religion of Altaic peoples has already been established; it is the details that still escape us.

In what follows we are concerned with data pertaining to ancient and medieval Altaic peoples in general without attempting to make hazardous distinctions between Turkish, Mongol, and Tungus, except where these are both possible and necessary. Nevertheless, it should be added that special care has been taken to make sure that the evidence

cited within the text of this paper definitely--but not exclusively--pertains to the religious life of Turkish peoples. Data belonging solely to Mongol and Tungus peoples will not be supplied, as such a project exceeds the limits of the present study.

All the beliefs and practices of Altaic peoples which are to be considered in this chapter will remain impenetrable to the understanding if two basic principles of these peoples' thought are not well understood from the beginning. These principles are not really distinct from each other but merely two different aspects of the same phenomenon. They may be expressed as the absence of a distinction between what is human and what is non-human and, as a corollary, the fundamental unity of all beings and objects existing in nature on the one hand, and the consistent treatment of the non-human, material reality of nature as a world of people on the other hand. Put differently, not only is there no differentiation between man and nature, or intentional human reality and unintentional natural (that is, material and objective) reality, but the world of things is humanized or personified so that each object of nature is invested with attributes of man such as consciousness, will, and understanding. It is believed that everything in nature is alive in the same sense that a human being is alive; even such apparently inertial objects as stones, mountains, and metals partake of a life-cycle essentially similar to man's, if only it is of different dimensions. In this completely humanized world, all things share the same origin and the same destiny; there is a fundamental unity of origins, means, and ends.

The most striking instance of this unity is the conviction that everything in nature is permeated by life-giving or animating forces which are eternal and separable from the material bodies they occupy (though there is a problem concerning the meaning of such separability, as will be seen shortly). It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to determine the exact nature of these forces. For the purposes of the present study we will address them as souls or spirits, though it should be emphasized that since the Altaic peoples did not distinguish between "material" and "spiritual,"[2] the souls or spirits in question do not correspond to the concepts of soul or spirit as these were developed in monotheistic cultures. This point will become increasingly obvious as our discussion proceeds. It will be seen that souls peculiar to humans, animals, and natural objects differ in form and character. Nevertheless, these divergences are not of such a degree to conceal the fundamental unity of conception behind different representations, and it could be argued that the concept of life-giving forces is at the very center of the religious beliefs and practices of the peoples in question. In what follows, this line of argument will be extended and elaborated through separate discussions on humans, animals, and objects of nature.

Since our sources do not permit a clear exposition of the souls associated with human beings, it is necessary to bring together evidence from different quarters in order to reach some understanding of these forces which make human life possible. The most informative evidence consists of a number of Turkish words enumerated below, all of which has to do with the "essence," "substance," or "soul" of human beings.

qut: the usual meaning is 'good fortune'.[3] However, on some occasions it also seems to mean 'soul'.[4] Gérard Clauson reports that in one passage of a Manichean text (eighth-eleventh centuries) "kut seems to mean 'a personification of divine favour, a benevolent spirit'."[5] This second meaning of the word is further analysed by Jean-Paul Roux, who concludes, after an analysis of the different uses of the word in various texts, that "[l]e qut est très exactement la force vitale, un viatique de longue vie."[6] It is not clear if qut is always present within human beings; however, it is perhaps more significant, as will be noted below, that it is thought to descend from the sky.[7]

tïn: the basic meaning is 'breath', but sometimes by extension also 'spirit' or 'life'.[8]

öz: "basically the intangible part of human 'spirit' as opposed to the tangible body...; from this it came usually to mean no more than 'self'...but sometimes 'the interior part of an organism, pith, marrow', and the like."[9]

It is apparent from these words that first a distinction is made between the tangible and intangible aspects of the human personality, and second, and more importantly, that life is associated not with the former but with the latter. It should be emphasized that this distinction does not amount to a body-soul dichotomy; that the Turkish word for 'body' is a compound noun made up of the words et, meaning 'flesh', and öz, meaning 'spirit' (et+öz=etöz; that is, flesh+spirit=live-body), should be enough evidence to substantiate this claim. The exact nature of the distinction in question, however, remains problematic, especially since there is a

problem as to whether there is merely a single spirit or a multiplicity of spirits simultaneously occupying different parts of the same body. Nevertheless, there is some evidence that the spirit(s) has (have) special relations with specific elements or parts of the body. It is known, for instance, that blood, and not only human blood but blood in general, is invariably linked with life-giving spirits so that its loss entails the loss of one's soul as well. It is this general principle which is thought to lie behind the well-attested custom among the Turks of killing sacrificial animals without spilling their blood, as it is the soul and not the body of the animal which is being sacrificed.[10] Similarly, the special care taken to preserve intact the skeleton of the dead during burial, when interpreted within the general context of funerary rites, suggests that one's bones function as the seat of one's spirits.[11] The presence of numerous evidences for the practice of scapulamantia, the use of an animal's shoulder blade to divine the future, as well as for the preservation of skulls which were thought to possess a special force strengthens this connection between bones and vital forces.[12] Other reports concerning the custom of either cutting or unbraiding the hair when in mourning, the preservation of the scalps of enemies, and the burial of locks of hair along with the dead implies that the hair might have been conceived as another seat of life-giving spirits.[13]

From this information regarding special links between specific parts of the body and vital forces, it is not clear if the latter are inseparable from and dependent upon the former. It is true that there is no confirmation for the idea that in ancient and medieval times the

human soul was conceived to be capable of detaching itself from the body and wander around freely. The comprehension of sleep, and sometimes also of disease, as a transitory state engendered by a temporary departure of the soul from the body dates only from more recent times.[14] Similarly, the belief that each person possesses an "additional" personal soul existing outside his body (mostly in animal form) other than the one (or ones) dwelling within his body[15] is also not attested in the sources for ancient and medieval periods. If, however, we are ill-informed about the belief of these peoples on the separability of life-giving forces from the body during this life on earth, there is considerable evidence on the acceptance among them of at least some degree of such separability after the destruction of the body. It is beyond doubt that the Altaic peoples believed in life after death.

The evidence which bears witness to the presence of a belief in afterlife can be classified into three types, depending on whether they concern the act or moment of dying, the rites and practices of burial, or the cult of forefathers.

First, it is significant to note that more often than not the act of dying was expressed in Turkish by the verb meaning 'to fly' (the root uç-) rather than the verb meaning 'to die' (the root öl-), especially if the person referred to was a close relative or one with whom the speaker was bound with ties of respect and admiration.[16] Moreover, there is reason to think that at least at some point in time the human soul was believed to leave the dead body in the shape of a bird.[17] These facts suggest that the cessation of those corporeal functions associated with being alive,

such as breathing, heartbeat, and preservation of normal bodily temperature, and the decay and decomposition of the flesh (but not, as we have already noted, of the bones) did not signal the end of human life; one continued to live even after the "death" of the body.

Second, the various practices of burial cannot be explained without assuming a belief in afterlife. Indeed, the whole of the funerary rite becomes intelligible only if it is interpreted as a preparation for another life in the beyond. In most cases, the "dead" person is buried as if he was going to go on living exactly as he lived on this earth, so that his grave is filled with all the necessities of an earthly life: clothes, food and drink, valuables, weapons, human and animal servants, and companions. The sacrifice of the dead person's horse as well as of other animals, and in earlier periods (until around the end of the second century A.D.) of his close relatives and servants no longer appears as enigmatic when seen in this light; they are to serve him in the next world.[18] Related to this is the belief that the enemies killed by a person in this world are to serve him in the next; these are represented by stone or wooden statues named balbals erected over the grave.[19]

Third, starting as early as the third century and continuing much later with the reports of William of Rubruck and Abū'l Ghāzī Bahadur Khān, there is evidence for the existence of ancestor worship. The deceased ancestors were thought to dwell in representations or images made of felt or fur, called tör or töz in Turkish and ongon in Mongolian. Preserved at a prestigious place in the tent, these images were accorded special treatment with periodic offerings of food and valuable items.

It has been pointed out that not all of these representations, differing in shape and material, stood for ancestors; however, it is clear that most were conceived to be the receptacle of the souls of the deceased.[20] Moreover, other than the tŏz/ongon, the banner or standard, tuğ in Turkish, of the clan or tribe was also perceived as symbols or seats of the ancestral souls.[21]

The establishment of the presence of a belief in afterlife supports our initial claim that life is associated with the intangible aspects of the human personality, that is, the vital and animating forces, the soul. It is these sources which impart life upon the body. Accordingly, they do not perish with the annihilation of the latter, but simply return to and continue to exist in the source from which they originated (this source, as will be discussed later, is believed to be the sky). In other words, the souls are "eternal;" this is a premise that stands at the basis of the conception of an afterlife and thus at that of the cult of ancestors.

It is true that no clear picture of the relation between what we have called the tangible and intangible aspects of personality has emerged from the above discussion. It could not be ascertained if the body functioned solely as the material seat of the immaterial souls, as the belief in afterlife would indicate, or if the two were inseparably linked, as the preservation of the skeleton, etc. would imply. The only conclusion which can be drawn is that the relation appears contradictory and inconsistent only to the eyes of a modern observer. However, to the ancient or medieval Turkish nomad who did not distinguish between "material" and "immaterial," or between "corporeal" and "incorporeal," at least not in

the same way these distinctions have been drawn in monotheistic cultures, there could hardly have been an inconsistency in the manner he perceived life. The same must have been true with the problem concerning the number and unity of animating powers. Were there more than one, individually distinct souls (and evidence suggests at least some distinction was certainly made), or was it simply a question of a single entity which permeated all beings and objects to varying degrees ? Here too, the question will probably remain unanswered if posed in this manner, for there is no evidence to justify the assumption on which it is based, namely that the souls in question must have been perceived in a manner which is consistent with the logic of the modern observer. In the particular case of the identity and number of the animating forces, for instance, it is assumed that there must have been either one single soul or else more than one separate souls, whereas there is hardly any reason to think that the Turkish nomads under study were in the least bothered to view the vital soul(s) as one and many at different times and occasions. Indeed, the conception of the fundamental unity of life and the world noted earlier does not admit strict and insurmountable distinctions either between different species, especially between human and animal, or within a single species. More specifically, when it is a question not of outward shape and appearance but of secret, indwelling capacities and powers, there is significant "cross-mobility" even between separate species so that certain humans are thought to be able to transform themselves into animals, and conversely, certain animals are considered to assume human characteristics.

The relationship between humans and animals is a specially close one.

To begin with, in accordance with the absence of a distinction between intentional human reality and unintentional natural reality, animals are consistently humanized and seen to be essentially similar to human beings. Perhaps the most striking instance of this humanization is the belief that animals partake of the same animating forces as humans; they too possess souls which survive their bodies. This is best evidenced by the killing of a large number of animals during funerary rites in compliance with the belief that they will serve the deceased in the next world, and also by the extreme care taken not to spill the blood of sacrificial animals and not to break any of their bones so that their souls could depart unimpaired from their bodies.[22] Further evidence confirming the humanization of animals comes from reports picturing animals in the position of praying[23] as well as from numerous folk legends and stories where animals are portrayed as special "guides" of a particular human community.[24]

It should be noted, however, that humans and animals are similar not only in the sense that each single animal is perceived as an "individual" possessing all the faculties, such as thought, will, intention, and judgement, as well as the capacity to experience all the affective and emotional states like fear, anger, love, and pity that a human being would possess, but also in the sense that different animal species are seen as distinct social units in themselves, organized and regulated in the same manner as human societies are.[25] There is evidence which leads us to believe, for example, that hunting, which is the manifestation of a conflict between humans and particular animal species, was regarded to be no different than war, which, in turn, is the manifestation of a

conflict between different human communities. Among others, one can single out the well-known custom among the Turks of not giving a name to a child until he grows old enough to engage in battle with either other humans, i.e., war, or animals, i.e., hunting, as well as the general rule, equally applicable to humans and animals, that those that are killed are to enter the service, in the next world, of those that kill them or those in whose name they are killed.[26] These phenomena are indicative of the essential unity of hunting and war, and thus of human and animal life.

It should be noted here, however, that the conception of the unity of life does not in any way imply that all living beings were equal; it is quite possible that there was a hierarchy between different species in terms of strength and capacity.[27] Indeed, it is clear that in the eyes of Altaic peoples animals were in general far superior to human beings and that the world of animals was used as an exemplary tool to regulate and organize human life. The evidence indicating the central significance of animals can be summarized as follows:

1. The world of animals functioned as a tool of classification. It is likely that images and names of animals were at times utilized as symbols of specific social units as clans, tribes, and families;[28] but more importantly, names of animals were used to divide and calculate time in the "twelve-animal calender."[29]

2. Almost all magical practices contained at least an allusion or reference to, or an imitation of, some animal, if not animals themselves or parts of their bodies. Scapulamantia was the most widespread form of

divination.[30] The stone that was used to bring rain or to cause a storm was more often than not the bezoar, an accretion found in the alimentary organs of some ruminants.[31] In addition, parts of animals were used to cast spells and to prepare magical potions, remedies, and talismans.[32]

3. In the sources, there are numerous metaphors establishing analogies between humans and animals, depicting human qualities in terms of characteristics of particular animals. A tendency and a desire to liken humans to animals also supported with evidence from many folk tales and legends containing accounts of humans assuming animal forms, suggest that it was thought possible for a human to transform himself into an animal in "soul," if not always in outward appearance. Such ability to transform may be the explanation for the well-attested custom of wearing horns, wings, or feathers and posts of various animals.[33]

4. Finally, in the various different myths of origin, not of mankind but of a particular clan or tribe, that have come down to us, animals play a prominent role. They appear as the sustainer or progenitor of the clan or tribe in question.[34]

This list could be extended, yet its meaning is clear: the ancient and medieval Altaic peoples recognized the superiority of animals and tried to partake in and use the latter's special powers through various means. It should be emphasized that this superiority was never to such a degree as to violate the principle of the fundamental unity of life. More precisely, there was no deification of animals, no belief in animal-gods.[35] Animals were thought to possess essentially the same sort of

souls as humans. Their powers, however, proved to be far superior to those of humans in everyday existence, especially in terms of better suitability to natural conditions. Consequently, they were highly valued and venerated, though never deified or worshipped.

It has been stated earlier that in the humanized world of the Altaic peoples all things shared the same origin and the same destiny (p.41). Having shown that humans and animals were believed to be animated by life-giving forces, which, as the belief in afterlife indicates, were separable from the body at death and thus eternal, the meaning of such a unity of origins and ends can now be expressed more explicitly. It has already been observed that the soul was believed to "fly" from the body upon the destruction of the latter, and conversely, that qut, "le viatique de longue vie," was thought to descend from the sky. It can be concluded that the original source and final abode of vital forces were thought to be the same; they originated from and returned to the sky.

The Turkish word for the sky is tängri. It appears in various two of three syllable forms throughout Central Asian history and its etymological origins remain obscure to this day.[36] The oldest appearance of the word is in the Chinese documents relating to the Hsiung-nu (presumably the Huns) in 174 and 121 B.C., where it seems to have the meaning of 'sky' only, without any connotation of divinity.[37] There are, however, indications that from very early on the word tängri also possessed the meaning of 'deity' or 'divinity' along with the meaning of 'sky'.[38] Apparently, the early Turks made no distinction between a material sky and one or many immaterial gods which may have resided up in the heavens; it was the sky

itself which was divine and which was venerated like a deity.[39] The divine character of tängri is not emphasized in the sources until the rise to power of the Türük tribe in the sixth and seventh centuries. In the Orkhon Inscriptions, the word is clearly used to denote a divine power which interferes in men's lives, and after the eighth century it is mostly the religious meaning of the word which comes to the forefront.[40] The distinction between a material, visible sky and a spiritual, invisible god which inhabits it appears only in the tenth century with the Islamization of a growing number of Turkish peoples. At around this time, the word tängri gradually loses the meaning of 'sky' and begins to be used interchangeably with Allah , thus assuming the meaning of a single god, while people start to refer to the sky by another word, which has so far functioned only as an adjective of the word tängri, namely kök (the later gök in Southwest Turkish), meaning 'blue'.

Going beyond a historical description of the uses of the word tängri, it is possible to develop a more detailed picture of the "sky-god" itself through a careful examination of the sources. The Orkhon Inscriptions of the eighth century is undoubtedly the richest among these sources. There, the three adjectives most frequently used to qualify tängri are üzä, meaning'elevated' or 'high', kök, meaning 'blue' or 'celestial', and küč, meaning 'strong, powerful'.[41] There is nothing to suggest that tängri was perceived in either solely material or spiritual terms.[42] Nor can one detect any signs of anthropomorphism in the way tängri was represented or in the way it interfered in human affairs.[43] On the other hand, despite the presence of some signs indicating that the Türük believed themselves

to be its favorite people, tängri does not appear as a power whose domain of influence is restricted only to a certain human community. It is viewed more like a universal presence whose sovereignty extends beyond the Türük to other peoples, friendly or hostile.[44] Curiously, there is no reference to tängri as the "creator," and on the basis of the available evidence it is not possible to determine if it was viewed as the ultimate creator of the universe or not.[45] In this connection, here it could be added that among ancient and medieval Altaic peoples, a myth of creation is conspicuously absent. The only reference to the creation of this world is a sentence in the Orkhon Inscriptions from which nothing can be deduced about a creator or the process of creation.[46]

The most that one can conclude from this short discussion is that tängri is an impersonal power which is the foundation of all life. It appears as the combination of the sky visible to the eye and the sky which is the source, permanent residence, and perhaps beyond all this, also the collective unity of life-giving forces as a whole. Furthermore, tängri also appears as the organizer and supervisor of human society as a political community. In the Orkhon Inscriptions, the name tängri is mentioned almost always only in connection with a political issue, whether this be the election or investiture of a new ruler, or the disorganized state of the Turkish people in the face of danger from its enemies.[47] It is often repeated that the ruler, as well as other high state officials, derive their authority from tängri and that tängri issues special orders or decrees, yarlïq in Turkish, which have to be carried out in full.[48] It appears, therefore, that tängri stands behind only a certain political

order, namely monarchy, and that any rebellion against political rulers who are charged with the execution of tängri's orders is an infraction of its authority. In such cases of transgression tängri strikes quite severely; death, defeat, disease, and natural disasters such as drought and violent storms are tängri's most frequent means of punishment. However, such acts of punishment take place only on this earth; there is no vision of damnation or retribution in another world.[49]

We possess little information on other aspects of tängri's relations with humans, owing, no doubt, to the peculiar nature of our sources. The Orkhon Inscriptions, which recount the lives of rulers and princes only, naturally focus chiefly on political issues. The situation is not much different with the reports included in Chinese annals; the neighbors to the south, who suffered seriously from nomadic raids, were interested more in questions of political organization than in popular beliefs of the common people. As a result, it is not known if tängri was so highly venerated outside the immediate circles of ruling groups. Indeed, it appears likely that "tängrism", if that term is appropriate, was and remained a "state" religion, which flourished only when a large nomadic empire managed, if only precariously, to unite the steppes, as this happened in an ever increasing scale under the Hsiung-nu, the Türük, and much later, the Mongols. This view is supported by what little knowledge we possess of the cult rendered to tängri. The few and isolated reports, mostly by the Chinese, which mention occasions of praying and sacrificing to the sky, pertain exclusively to the ruler or to his entourage. There is no sign that praying or offering sacrifices to tängri, unlike the cult of ancestors,

were practiced on a large scale by the masses themselves.[50] It could be argued, therefore, that the Orkhon Inscriptions give us a rather warped view of the religious life of the Altaic nomads, in whose daily lives tängri did not actually play that significant a role as a source of political and ethical authority. It is likely that for most people tängri remained the highest divine power mainly because it was viewed as the source and permanent abode of life-giving forces, and because it was the source and thus the legitimizing power behind particular political rulers, as put forth by the ruling circles themselves.

Here it is essential to point out that tängri was not conceived to be the only divine power that existed. It was only the most significant of several different entities which were sacred owing to their functions as seats or receptacles of life-giving forces. It is very likely that Altaic nomads thought neither in terms of a single divine being, nor of discrete divine entities organized in the form of a hierarchical ladder of primary, secondary, and tertiary divinities, but rather in terms of attributes or states of sacredness induced in entities by the presence of vital forces within them. Strictly speaking, therefore, it is not possible to talk of "gods" or "deities," let alone a "pantheon of gods," among ancient and medieval Turkish peoples. Moreover, it would not be a particularly enlightening question to ask if these peoples were monotheists or polytheists.[51] It is true that there are a limited number of reports contained in non-Turkish sources which may be interpreted as signs for the presence of a degree of monotheism among pre-Islamic Turks.[52] These pertain, however, only to the tenth century and after, when Islam had already

spread among Turkish nomads to a considerable extent, and they should not be taken as representative of earlier beliefs more remote from Islamic influence.

It is clear that numerous objects of nature other than the sky were believed to be infused, either permanently or temporarily, by life-giving spirits and, therefore, considered sacred and venerable. The most important of these, indeed second only to the sky as far as one can deduce from the Orkhon Inscriptions, is yer sub, which literally translates as 'earth-water'. The exact meaning of this expression has been the subject of some discussion. In the Inscriptions, the term yer sub almost always appears qualified by the adjective ïduq, a word which came to mean 'sacred, holy' from its original meaning of 'left free' or 'let loose'.[53] It has been maintained that the expression ïduq yer sub, literally 'earth-water left free', stands for a single indivisible divinity,[54] or for a specific geographical locality, such as the Ötükän forests or the Tamir plateau, held in special esteem by nomads,[55] or that ïduq yer sub is really a general name for a cult of nature, which consists of separate cults of mountains, trees, fire, and water.[56] More plausibly, it has been suggested that ïduq yer sub is the totality of all places and waterways that have been left free, that is to say, that are considered sacred and inviolable.[57] Whatever its exact meaning, it is noteworthy that we possess no information about yer sub outside the Orkhon Inscriptions where it almost equals tängri in terms of its sacred character and importance. Any further elaboration on the expression would, therefore, be no more than conjecture.

More conclusive evidence exists on the veneration of other objects of nature. It is known, for instance, that from a very early period onwards (at least Hsiung-nu times), mountains in particular and high places in general generated "religious" feelings in the steppe-dwelling nomads due to their overbearing altitudes. Being "closer" to the sky, they were perceived as points of contact and communication between this world and the beyond. Therefore, it is not inconceivable that there was a special connection between the veneration of tängri and the cult of forefathers on the one hand and the reverence of mountains on the other. The presence of such a connection is confirmed by reports that sacrificial feasts and ceremonies took place only at specially chosen sites, among which mountain-tops always remained a prominent choice.[58]

Another favorite site for ceremonies was the immediate vicinity of springs, rivers, lakes, or any other bodies of water, which suggests that for some unknown reason water was also held in high esteem. Ibn Faḍlān writes that the Oğuz Turks abstained from washing in water, possibly for fear that they would contaminate this sacred substance.[59] A method to fight against demonic possession, which is trasmitted by Kaşgarlı Mahmud, required that water be sprinkled over the face of the possessed person simultaneously with the utterance of special words.[60]

There are signs that at least some sacrificial ceremonies were held beside certain trees or woods that were commonly considered as means of communication; each tree was viewed as an axis mundi which connected the earth with the sky. The well-known custom among the Turks of stringing rags on branches of certain trees as offerings for the realization of

personal wishes might well be traced back to this belief that trees function as centers of communication between this world and the permanent residence of life-giving forces.[61]

On a slightly different note, it is unlikely that Turkish peoples worshipped fire as did the peoples of Indo-European stock inhabiting the Iranian plateau, though the issue has been debated at some length.[62] Most significantly, there is no mention of fire in any of the Turkish inscriptions of the seventh and eighth centuries. Nonetheless, it is clear that fire was believed to possess certain characteristics which rendered it sacred or at least magical. It was a widespread conviction that fire came from the sky and returned there; anything consumed in it also ascended to the heavens. It was for this reason that some sacrificial offerings, and at times also the dead, were burned in fire. This belief perhaps lies also at the basis of a certain kind of scapulamantia, which was practiced by throwing the shoulder bone of an animal in the fire and interpreting the cracks it thus received. Fire was also believed to possess purificatory powers and was used frequently to cleanse both inanimate and animate objects of disease and evil.[63]

In an entry in the Divânü Lûgat-it Türk, Kaşgarlı Mahmud reports that the Turks swore over iron swords and states that iron was thus considered sacred among them. It is, however, difficult to accept this assertion at face value since there is no other evidence on consecration of metals among Turkish peoples. It is equally possible, and perhaps more plausible, that what was considered sacred was not iron as such but the sword itself as weapon, meaning that only weapons, and not the

metals they were made of, were consecrated. This, however, cannot be confirmed , as there is scarcely any information on the subject.

Among other objects of nature that were considered sacred or magical, one can mention certain stones. One such stone, called yat or yada, possibly meaning 'bezoar', was used to bring rain and wind, or alternatively as an antidote for poison. Another called kaş, meaning 'jade', was worn on a ring or some such object as a protection against thunderbolt, lightening, and thirst.[64] Celestial bodies, especially the sun and the moon, carried special significance, and certain directions and time periods were considered particularly propitious in connection with their movements. It is recorded in Chinese sources, for instance, that the tent of the ruler always opened to the east, and that certain Turkish tribes awaited the full moon in order to attack the enemy.[65]

Undoubtedly, Turkish nomads sanctified and gave differential treatment to other objects and phenomena of nature as well. It is difficult, however, to reach valid generalizations on the subject since pertinent evidence is missing. Notwithstanding such lacunae in our knowledge of the religious thought of the ancient and medieval Altaic nomads, it is possible on the basis of the preceding discussion to state with confidence that the belief in life-giving forces forms the core of their thought around which all their other beliefs gravitate and on which rest all their efforts to understand and change the world they live in. It was seen earlier that it is almost impossible to elaborate further upon the exact nature of these animating powers which do not lend themselves to a critical analysis in "logical" terms. Consequently, it is now more

appropriate to direct our attention to the practical aspects of the religious life of the peoples in question and consider very briefly their rites and ceremonies.

We do not possess accurate information on the time, duration, content, and structure of the various ceremonies conducted on different occasions. It is sufficiently clear that at least some of these ceremonies were periodic in nature. Among these one can mention the so-called "spring and new year's" festivals, held in the fifth and seventh months of the year, and certain other festive occasions, held at the time of the equinoxes and the solstices, whose exact nature remain unknown.[66] Most other ceremonies were occasional in character, performed at the time of a wedding, childbirth, funeral, and inauguration of a ruler. Whatever the occasion, it is obvious that the central aim of any ceremony was to honor either tängri and yer sub or the ancestors. Less frequently, sacred objects like certain rivers or trees were also honored. The focal point of any ceremony was the offering of sacrifices to these sacred powers.[67]

The sacrificial offering ranged from human beings to precious goods made of gold or silver. The sacrifice of humans was peculiar only to the time when the close relatives and servants of the dead person were buried with him. This is not attested for later periods.[68] Animals, however, remained the ideal choice for any sacrificial occasion. Of these, horses, and especially white stallions, were the most highly prized.[69] As noted earlier, extreme care was taken not to spill the blood or to break any

bones of the sacrificial animal while it was being killed.[70] Once the animal died, the flesh was carefully stripped from the bones, and the bones were later either burned or buried.[71] Anything considered precious other than animals could also be used as oblations. In a nomadic community, these were often such things as milk, butter, and kımız, an intoxicating drink made from fermented mare's milk.

In most ceremonies, the offering of sacrifices was accompanied by communal eating, music making, and perhaps some dancing. No detailed information exists, however, on any of these practices.[72] It appears that circumambulation around a sacred object, such as the dead person in a funerary rite, a certain tree, or a specially built fire, was an integral part of many ceremonies. Circumambulation was perhaps carried out with the purpose of establishing harmony with cosmic movements, though the meaning of such harmony is not immediately clear.[73]

One final consideration has to do with "holy men" who were charged with the performance of certain magical practices. According to non-Turkish sources, the Turks called their magicians kam, a word which does not exist in the Turkish sources of the seventh and eighth centuries. The earliest recording of it is in the Chinese annals of the T'ang dynasty (618-906 A.D.). It occurs more frequently in several medieval sources, such as Divânü Lûgat-it Türk, Kutadgu Bilik, Codex Cumanicus, and the works of Rubruck and Juwaynī, as well as the anonymous Hudūd al-ʿĀlam.[74] To these medieval observers, kam appears to be above all a 'seer' or 'soothsayer', a diviner of the future. He is viewed also as a magician who prepares spells for magical cures and who has the power to change

the weather by use of the yat/yada stones.[74] Apparently, he was not primarily a medicine man and did not have the ability to heal, which, according to the Dîvânü Lûgat-it Türk belonged to the otacı, the 'physician'.[76] Judging by these medieval works, the kam was not a shaman either. He did not travel to the celestial regions and the underworld, and such a journey would be the defining characteristic of any shaman.[77] Indeed, there is no sign that shamanism as a kind of magical practice was widespread among Turkish nomads prior to the Mongol expansion in the thirteenth century.[78] Nothing more than what has been stated above can be asserted about holy men of the tribes, be they kams, otacıs, or yadacıs; the absence of specific information in the sources on this subject does not allow a systematic exposition of the place and significance which these religious figures occupied in the religious practices of the pre-Islamic Turkish nomads.

NOTES

[1]For a comprehensive list of sources for early Turkish history, see Karl H. Menges, The Turkic Languages and Peoples: An Introduction to Turkic Studies (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1968), pp.190-196; and Jean-Paul Roux, La Mort chez les peuples altaïques anciens et médiévaux d'après les documents écrits (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1963), Introduction (hereafter cited as Roux, La Mort).

[2]Roux, Faune et Flore sacrées dans les sociétés altaïques (Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve, 1966), p.2 (hereafter cited as Roux, Faune), and La Mort, p.71.

[3]Kaşgarlı Mahmud, Divânü Lûgat-it Türk, 3 vols. and separate index, trans. Besim Atalay (Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 1940-43), 1:320; Gerard Clauson, An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), p.594.

[4]For example in the following sentence from the Orkhon Inscriptions, Bilgä Kagan, East 35: "üzä tängri, ïduq yer sub, [äčim qa]γan qutı taplāmadï ärinč," i.e., "Heaven above, the Holy Earth and Water (spirits below) and the soul (of my uncle, the kagan) certainly did not like it." Talat Tekin, A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic (The Hague: Mouton and Co., Indiana University Publications, 1968), pp.244 and 277, respectively.

[5]Clauson, p.594.

[6]Roux, La Mort, p.28.

[7]Clauson, p.594.

[8]Kaşgarlı Mahmud, 1:339; Clauson, p.512.

[9]Clauson, p.278. Roux lists a number of other words like sür, yula, tus, oyun which he thinks to be associated with human spirits. See his La Mort, pp.28-30. There is no support for his interpretation in Clauson's dictionary, which appeared much later than Roux's study.

[10]Roux, La Mort, pp.76-79, and Faune, p.219.

[11]Roux, La Mort, p.81.

[12]Ibid., pp.82-85. Abdülkadir İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1945), pp.151-156.

[13]Roux, "Türk göçebe sanatının dini bakımdan anlamı," in Türk Kültürü El-Kitabı, Vol.2, Part Ia, ed. Emel Esin (İstanbul: Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Devlet Kitapları, 1972), p.86, and La Mort, p.151; İnan, Tarihte

ve Bugün Şamanizm, p.195; and Şerefeddin Yaltkaya, "Eski Türk ananelerinin bazı dini müesseselere tesirleri," in II. Türk Tarih Kongresi, İstanbul, 20-25 September, 1937 (İstanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1943), p.696.

[14]Roux, La Mort, p.90, and Faune, p.165.

[15]Ahmet Caferoğlu, "Türk onomastiğinde 'köpek' kültü," Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı Belleten (1961):6; İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.81-83, and "Yakut şamanizmindeki ija kııl," Türkiyat Mecmuası 10(1951-53):215; reprinted in A. İnan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968), p.460.

[16]Roux, La Mort, pp.92-99. Several examples of the use of the verb uç- are given on p.99.

[17]Ibid., p.100. At another place (Faune, p.26), talking about the shape of human souls, Roux states, "...les documents sont assez nombreux qui nous permettent de croire à la dominance de l'âme ornithomorphe."

[18]V. V. Barthold, "The Burial Rites of the Turks and the Mongols," trans. J. M. Rogers, Central Asiatic Journal 14(1970):207; İbrahim Kafesoğlu, "Eski Türk Dini," Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi 3(1973):23; Roux, La Mort, pp.106-108; 175-176, and Faune, pp.98 and 196.

[19]Barthold, p.207; Inán, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.177-178; Roux, La Mort, pp.103, 186, and "La religion des Turcs de l'Orkhon des VII[e] et VIII[e] siècles," Revue de l'histoire des religions 168(1965):223-224; also "Türk göçebe sanatının dini bakımdan anlamı," p.81.

[20]Roux reports that U. Harva objected to the idea that the töz or ongon represented only the forefathers and observed that they could be the images of "mythical beings, different animals, even celestial bodies." La Mort, 126. Regarding töz/ongon, see İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.42-45, and "Ongon ve tös kelimeleri hakkında," Türk Tarih, Arkeologya ve Etnoğrafya Dergisi no.2(1934):277-285; reprinted in Makaleler ve İncelemeler, pp.268-273; Kafesoğlu, p.23; Roux, La Mort, pp.105, 126, and 131.

[21]Roux, "Les êtres intermédiaires chez les peuples altaïques," in Sources Orientales. VIII. Génies, anges et démons (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1971), pp.240-242.

[22]İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, p.101; Roux, Faune, pp.38-40.

[23]Roux, Faune, pp.40-42.

[24]Ibid., p.131: "Des l'epoque la plus ancienne, la protection que l'animal accorde à l'homme se spécialise dans le guidance."

[25]Ibid., p.91.

[26]Ibid., pp.93 and 98.

[27]Ibid., p.51: "Le sentiment que les Altaïques ont de l'unité de la vie n'a pas comme corollaire que tout ce qui vit est égal."

[28]Ibid., p.76.

[29]Louis Bazin, Les Calendriers Turcs anciens et médievaux, thèse de Doctorat d'Etat (Service de reproduction des Thèses, Université de Lille III, 1974);and Osman Turan, Oniki Hayvanlı Türk Takvimi (İstanbul: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları, 1941).

[30]İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.151-156; Roux, Faune, p.150.

[31]Robert Dankoff, "Kāšgarī on the beliefs and supersitions of the Turks," Journal of the American Oriental Society 95(1975):77 (hereafter cited as Dankoff, "Kāšgarī"); Hikmet Tanyu, Türklerde Taşla İlgili İnançlar (Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1968), p.71.

[32]As examples, see entries kekûk and çatuk in Kaşgarlı Mahmud, 2:287 and 3:218, respectively. On the word çatuk, see Dankoff, "A Note on khutū and chatuq," Journal of the American Oriental Society 93(1973): 542-543, where Dankoff maintains that the word chatuq is a misspelling of the correct khutū.

[33]On metaphors, see Roux, Faune, first chapter of the second part, entitled "Métaphores, symboles, participations, mutations et identités."

[34]On myths, see Roux, Faune, Part II, chapters three through seven.

[35]Roux, Faune, pp.83-84: "Originellement et d'une manière stricte, in n'y a aucun dieu animal et aucun zoolâtrie dans la region des peuples altaïques....L'animal n'est pas dieu; il surpasse l'homme mais et de même sang, de même os et de même âme qui lui."

[36]Roux, "Tängri. Essai sur le Ciel-Dieu des peuples altaïques," Revue de l'histoire des religions 149(1956):54-70 (hereafter cited as Roux, "Tängri").

[37]Ibid., pp.54, 70, and 198.

[38]Ibid., p.71: "Nous avons avec les preuves de leur existence ancienne, la cértitude qu'à coté du sens 'Ciel', le mot Tängri avait le sens 'Dieu' (dieux)..." Also see Wilhelm Schmidt, "Eski Türklerin dini," trans. Sadeddin Buluç, İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi 13-14(1965-66):83-84.

[39]İnan, "Eski Türk dini tarihi," in A.İnan, Eski Türk Dini Tarihi (İstanbul: Devlet Kitapları, 1976), p.17.

[40]Ibid., p.17; Roux, "Tängri," 149(1956):198-199.

[41]İnan, "Eski Türk dini tarihi," p.19, and Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, p.28; Roux, "La religion des Turcs de l'Orkhon des VII[e] et VII[e] siècles," pp.19-20, and "Tängri," 149(1956):200-209.

[42]Roux, "Tängri," 149(1956):211, "C'est [Tängri] un Etre et la distinction entre spirituel et materiel ne vient pas à l'esprit de ses adorateurs."

[43]Ibid., 150(1956):32.

[44]Ibid., 149(1956):214; Kafesoğlu, p.28.

[45]Roux, "Tängri," 149(1956):221-225.

[46]The sentence reads, "üza kök tängri asra yaγïz yer qïlïntuqda ekïn ara kisï oγlï qïlïnmis," i.e., "When the blue sky above and the reddish brown earth below were created, between the two human beings were created," Tekin, Kül Tigin Inscription, East 1, pp.232 and 263, respectively.

[47]Roux, "Tängri," 150(1956):40, "[en des grandes inscriptions paléoturques] le nom de Tängri revient à tous les moments quand il s'agit de l'investiture qu'un kaghan ou de la réorganisation du peuple Türük."

[48]Ibid., p.27.

[49]Ibid., pp.48-49, and "La religion des Turcs de l'Orkhon des VII[e] et VIII[e] siècles," p.214.

[50]Roux, "Tangri," 150(1956):173-190.

[51]Caferoğlu, İnan, Kafesoğlu, and Roux all talk indiscriminately of "gods" and "deities." It is Inan who uses the expression "pantheon of gods" ("Eski Türk dini tarihi," p.15). The question concerning mono-/polytheism is expressed most explicitly by Roux ("Tängri," 149(1956):211-221), who is careful to remark that "nous ne nous trouvons pas en face d'autre dieux [i.e., other than tängri] mais seulement en face de notions sacrées et supre-humaines." It is not clear why Roux thinks that only tängri is a god and that, for instance, yer sub is not (see below for yer sub).

[52]The most often cited report is that of Ibn Fadlān, who records that the Oğuz raise their arms to the sky and say bir tängri, i.e., 'one sky'; see Ibn Fadlān's Reisebericht, ed. and trans. A. Z. V. Togan (Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1939; reprint ed., Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1966), p.10 in the Arabic text, 20 in the translation (paragraph 20 in Togan's division). Another is in the chronicle of Michael the Syrian (1126-1199) who reports that the Oğuz worshipped the sky-god tängri and that they have accepted Islam

easily since they had always believed in one god; see Rauf Husseinov, "Les sources syriaques sur les croyances et les moeurs des Oghuz du VII^e au XII^e siècle," Turcica 8/1(1976):22-23. This view of Michael the Syrian is shared by Kafesoğlu (p.27), along with other Turkish scholars.

[53]It is known that originally the term Iduq was used primarily when referring to animals that were left free to wander around as a kind of sacrifice; it was forbidden to touch or kill such animals.

[54]Reported by Roux, Faune, p.173, also "La religion des Turcs de l'Orkhon des VII^e et VIII^e siècles," pp.203-204.

[55]This was the opinion of R. Giraud, as reported by Roux at the same places as note 54.

[56]İnan, "Eski Türk dini tarihi," pp.30-31; Kafesoğlu, pp.20-21.

[57]Roux, Faune, pp.173-174, and "La religion des Turcs de l'Orkhon des VII^e et VIII^e siècles," pp.203-204.

[58]On mountains as holy places, see İnan, "Eski Türk dini tarihi," pp.32-38, and Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.9, 49; Bahaeddin Ögel, İslâmiyetten Önce Türk Kültür Tarihi (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1962), pp.131 and 134; Roux, La Mort, pp.97, 120, 153-154, 179, and "Tängri," 149(1956):71-76; 150(1956):180.

[59]Ibn Fadlān's Reisebericht, p.10 in the text, 20-21 in the translation (paragraph 20 in Togan's division).

[60]Dankoff, "Kāšgarī," p.75. On water as a sacred substance, see Inan, "Eski Türk dini tarihi," p.6; Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.8-9, and "Türklerde su kültü ile ilgili gelenekler," in 60. Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Fuad Köprülü Armağanı (İstanbul: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları, 1953), pp.249-253; reprinted in Makaleler ve İncelemeler, pp.491-495; Roux, Faune, p.201; La Mort, p.153, and "La religion des Turcs de l'Orkhon des VII^e et VIII^e siècles," p.207.

[61]Regarding trees as holy objects, see İnan, "Eski Türk dini tarihi," pp.37-38; "Türk boylarında dağ, ağaç ve pınar kültü," in R. Rahmeti Arat İçin (Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1966), pp.272-277; "Türk destanlarına genel bir bakış," Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten (1954):196-197 (pp.227-228 of the reprint ed. in Makaleler ve İncelemeler), and Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, p.8; Roux, Faune, pp.52-57.

[62]See Roux, "Fonctions chamaniques et valeurs du feu chez les peuples altaïques," Revue de l'histoire des religions 189(1976):67-69.

[63]On the place of fire among the Turks, see John A. Boyle, "Turkish and Mongol Shamanism in the Middle Ages," Folklore 83(1972): 181-183; İnan, "Al ruhu hakkında," Türk Tarih, Arkeologya ve Etnoğrafya Dergisi no.1(1933):160-167 (reprinted on pp.259-267 of Makaleler ve İncelemeler); "Eski Türk dini tarihi," pp.42-43, 46, also Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.9, 67-68; K. Inostrantsev, "Eski Türklerin inançları hakkında bir kaç söz," trans. A. İnan, Belleten 14 (1950):45-47; and Roux, "Fonctions chamaniques et valeurs du feu chez les peuples altaïques."

[64]On magical stones, see Dankoff, "Kāšgarī," p.77; Inan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.160-161; and Tanyu

[65]On celestial bodies, see Wilhelm Koppers, "Cihan tarihinin ışığında ilk Türklük, ilk İndo-Germenlik," Belleten 5(1941):457; Ögel, p.134; and Roux, "La religion des Turcs de l'Orkhon des VII^{e} et VIII^{e} siècles," pp.207-208.

[66]İnan, "Eski Türk dini tarihi," pp.47-52, and Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.6 and 97; Roux, La Mort, p.123, and Faune, pp.201-202.

[67]On sacrifices to tàngri, see İnan, "Eski Türk dini tarihi," p.6; Roux, Faune, p.198, and "La religion des Turcs de l'Orkhon des VII^{e} et VIII^{e} siècles," p.185. On sacrifices to yer sub, see Roux, Faune, p.198, and "La religion des Turcs de l'Orkhon des VII^{e} et VIII^{e} siècles," p.185. On sacrifices to forefathers, see İnan, "Eski Türk dini tarihi," p.6, and Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, p.5; Kafesoğlu, p.23; Roux, the same places cited above in this note. Finally on sacrifices to waters and trees, see İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, p.8; and Roux, Faune, pp.204-205.

[68]See note 18 for references.

[69]On horses as sacrificial animals, see İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.100-101; Kafesoğlu, p.25; Roux, Faune, 190, 207-213; Schmidt, p.84.

[70]On the practice of killing without spilling the blood, see Roux, La Mort, pp.76-79, and Faune, 190 and 219.

[71]İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, p.101; Roux, La Mort, p.81.

[72]On music making, see İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.93-95: Roux, La Mort, pp.152 and 168, and "Türk göçebe sanatının dini bakımdan anlamı," p.76; and Yaltkaya, 691. On dancing and circumambulation, see Roux, Faune, pp.60-61, 218, and "Türk göçebe sanatının dini bakımdan anlamı," p.76; H. Z. Ülken, "Anadolu örf ve adetlerinde eski kültürlerin izleri," Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi 14 (1966):15; and Yaltkaya, p.691.

[73]Roux, Faune, pp.60-61, 218.

[74]Boyle, pp.178-180; Clauson, p.625; Roux, "Le nom du chaman dans les textes turco-mongols," Anthropos 53(1958):135-136.

[75]Boyle, pp.178 and 184; Dankoff, "Kāšgarī," pp.76-77; İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp.72-73; and Kafesoğlu, p.19.

[76]Dankoff, "Kāšgarī," p.76; İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, pp. 72-73. Kutadgu Bilik, however, implies that a kam or an otacı could serve the same purpose; see Clauson, p.625.

[77]Boyle, p.181; Dankoff, "Kāšgarī," p.77; Roux, "Eléments chamaniques dans les textes pré-mongols," Anthropos 53(1958):441-446; and Ülken, "Anadolu örf ve adetlerinde eski kültürlerin izleri," pp.5, 24-25.

CHAPTER III

THE VİLÂYET-NÂME AND PRE-ISLAMIC TURKISH BELIEFS AND PRACTICES: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE TEXT

The present chapter will attempt to uncover survivals of pre-Islamic Turkish beliefs in the Vilâyet-nâme. For purposes of convenience and clarity, the discussion will follow as closely as possible the framework already established in the preceding chapter, which dealt with the beliefs in question at some length. A consideration of the conception of human life in the Vilâyet-nâme will be followed by an attempt to locate elements in that text which reflect the principles of the unity of life and humanization of unintentional natural reality, first those concerning animals, then those which have to do with objects and phenomena of nature. The chapter will also include a discussion on practical aspects of religious life, followed by miscellaneous observations and concluding remarks.

It should be pointed out at the outset that in the Vilâyet-nâme there is no explicit reference to life-giving forces, or for that matter, any conclusive evidence which would serve to establish a continuation of the belief in such forces from pre-Islamic times. Although traces of pre-Islamic Turkish beliefs can be found, most of these are not very telling on this subject and do not suffice to prove that a belief in animating spirits continued to prevail as well after the Islamization

of Turkish nomads.[1] It is not suprising, therefore, that the Vilâyet-nâme is highly reticent on "spirits of humans," as these were considered in the second chapter. There is, for example, hardly any sign in the text that any part or element of the human body is thought to be more crucial for the maintainance of human life than any other; blood, hair, and bones, which were previously believed to have special links with life-giving forces, do not here carry any particular significance.

There are, however, a few details which might reveal the survival of some of the ancient beliefs about the human body. One such detail concerns the hair. In the Vilâyet-nâme, an almost invariable element of the ceremony of initiation into disciplehood is the "tonsure;" the head of each new disciple is shaved by Hacı Bektaş himself.[2] There is no doubt that in these cases the loss of the hair is simultaneously the loss of the self and the personality, for a hair-cut implies the casting away of all personal concerns and complete submission to Hacı Bektaş. Here one is reminded of the custom prevalent among pre-Islamic Turks of either cutting or unbraiding the hair when in mourning for a dead relative or a friend. Is it not then possible to see a denial of the self, a deliberate attempt to destroy one's status in society in this act as well ? Indeed, in view of the special significance accorded to it among ancient and medieval Turks, it is conceivable that the hair was viewed as an essential constituent of one's status in the community, and that it is this belief which lies behind the inclusion of tonsure in the initiation ceremony as a deliberate measure to insure the destruction of the personal interests of the disciple and his complete devotion

to the "path" of God only.[3]

A second detail is contained in the following episode. Kadıncık,[4] a woman whose house Hacı Bektaş chooses as his dwelling in the village of Sulucakaraöyük, habitually drinks any water that Hacı Bektaş uses for his ablutions or for other cleaning purposes. One day the saint's[5] nose bleeds while taking his ablutions, and some of his blood is mixed into the water. When Kadıncık drinks this water as well, instead of pouring it somewhere far away as Hacı Bektaş tells her to do, she gets pregnant and bears three children (pp.64-65). If it is possible to deduce from this episode the conclusion that the vital, reproductive powers of Hacı Bektaş dwell in his blood, then it could be claimed that the connection between blood and life-giving forces as discussed in the preceding chapter is also preserved in the Vilâyet-nâme. There is, however, no other piece of evidence to support this claim, and we are bound to rest content with this single observation.

It could be said that there is in the Vilâyet-nâme comparatively more information on the belief in afterlife. Curiously, since all reports of life after death pertain to holy men only, it is impossible to tell if ordinary people continue to live after the annihilation of the body as well. The explanation might be that by the time the legendary biography of Hacı Bektaş was written down, the cult of ancestors had been transformed into a cult of saints, whereby it was believed that only holy men achieved eternity and that they were, therefore, revered even after they ceased to live on this earth. Such a view is best expressed by Hacı Bektaş himself, who says to a favorite disciple, Saru İsmail,[7]

"We do not die, but only change form," or again, "The saint is he who dies before death and washes his own corpse himself"(pp.90-91).[8] Whatever the exact nature of popular beliefs in afterlife during Islamic times, it is not to be doubted that the presence of the cult of forefathers among ancient and medieval Turkish peoples greatly facilitated the formation and expansion of the cult of saints after their Islamization.

The relationship between humans and animals is a particularly revealing sphere on the continuation of pre-Islamic beliefs among Muslim Turks. The principle of the unity of life is clearly at work here, for there is considerable evidence for both the humanization of animals and the likening and transformation of humans into animals. The evidence for the former is found in the following instances on pages indicated:

1. Ahmet Yesevi has on ox, which goes to the market by itself, carrying goods to be sold there. It is known that this is Yesevi's ox, and whoever takes anything from its back places enough money in exchange into a bag also attached to the animal. If anyone attempts to steal anything, the ox follows him until the people of the city realize that that person is a thief and force him to pay for what he took. The ox then returns to Yesevi with the money (p.14).

2. On his way from Turkistan to the land of Rum, Hacı Bektaş passes through a desert, where he is attacked by lions. When two of the animals get sufficiently close, he transforms them into stone by stroking them from head to tail. The other lions then submit to his superiority by rubbing their faces on the ground, an act of submission executed only by humans on other occasions in the Vilâyet-nâme (p.17).[9]

3. On his way to Anatolia, Hacı Bektaş passes by a river in Kurdistan, whereupon the fish in the river stick their heads out of the water in order to greet him. Hacı Bektaş accepts their greetings and tells them to return to praying (p.17).

4. Hacı Bektaş enters the land of Rum from the region of Bozok in the province of Zülkadirli, where he sees a shepherd driving his sheep. Unlike the shepherd, the sheep immediately sense the wilāya of Hacı Bektaş and run toward him (p.21).

5. Once, while Hacı Bektaş is conversing with a company of friends in Kırşehir, the frogs in a nearby river begin to croak so loudly that they disturb the conversation. Thereupon, Hacı Bektaş says to the frogs, "either let us converse and you listen, or we listen while you converse." The frogs stop croaking as soon as Hacı Bektaş finishes his sentence (p.55).

6. An aged ox speaks to Saru İsmail, disciple of Hacı Bektaş, and begs him to save it from death (p.83).

More important for our purposes are the instances of likening humans to animals and especially the transformation of humans into animal form, since these attest to the continued superiority of animals to humans. They can be enumerated as follows:

1. Hacı Bektaş likens himself to a hawk, şahin. When a certain Nureddin Hoca asks Bektaş why he has long fingernails and a long moustache, he replies, "no hawk is without claws or without a wreath" (p.29).

2. On another occasion, Hacı Bektaş likens a fellow saint, Emir Cem Sultan, to a hawk. A person once takes an ox to Emir Cem Sultan as

an offering, but the latter refuses it. The same person then brings it to Hacı Bektaş, who accepts the animal. When the owner of the ox informs Hacı Bektaş that Emir Cem Sultan had refused the offering, Hacı Bektaş answers, "Emir Cem Sultan is a hawk that does not alight on any common object" (pp.77-78).[10]

3. Ahmet Yesevi is in narrow straits soon after the unbelieving people of Badakhshān defeat an army he sends upon them and imprison his son Kutbeddin Haydar.[11] As the enemy continue their attacks on the people of Turkistan, Yesevi prays to God for help, who sends Hacı Bektaş to his aid. Upon learning the situation, Hacı Bektaş pledges to convert all the unbelievers to Islam and, changing into a hawk, flies to Badakhshān (p.10).

4. The saints of Khorasan once decide to invite Ahmet Yesevi for a gathering and send seven messengers to him, who assume the form of seven cranes and begin to fly towards Turkistan. This state of affairs is sensed by Yesevi; he gathers his disciples, and also changing into cranes, they all fly to Samarqand in order to meet the messengers (p.15).

5. When the saints of Rum find out that a very powerful saint, that is Hacı Bektaş, is coming to Rum, they unsuccessfully try to prevent his entrance into their land. Hacı Bektaş jumps to the heavens and, assuming the form of a pigeon there, flies down to his destination, the village of Sulucakaraöyük. Upon finding this out, the saints of Rum ask a certain Hacı Doğrul[12] among them to change into a falcon and hunt down Hacı Bektaş. Hacı Doğrul flies to Sulucakaraöyük, but just when he is about to catch Hacı Bektaş, the latter, who has remained a pigeon till

then, changes back into human form, grasps the falcon and squeezes it so hard that Hacı Doğrul temporarily loses his mind (pp.18-19).

6. Two further reports of transformation into animal form relate to two disciples of Hacı Bektaş: Saru İsmail changes into a falcon to fly to a distant place (p.82), and Resul Baba assumes the forms of first a golden deer, then a pigeon (p.88).

It is clear from the above that in all instances except in one transformation into animal form in the Vilâyet-nâme is specifically into the form of a bird. Are we faced with a mere coincidence here, or is it possible to explain this preference given to birds ? It has been suggested that there could here be a link with shamanistic practices, since the shaman, who travels to the heavens and the underground, often pretends that he accomplishes his journey in animal form, and since the preferred animal is more often than not a bird, especially if the shaman is ascending to the sky.[13] However, when it is remembered (1) that the favorite birds of the shamans are not pigeons, cranes, falcons, or hawks, but eagles and owls, (2) that transformation into bird-form in the Vilâyet-nâme does not have the purpose of travelling to the sky but appears as a mere expediency (for example, covering great distances in short periods of time) or an effective form of working miracles, and (3) that shamanism is not attested for the Turks in ancient and medieval times, at least not until the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the argument from shamanistic practices loses much of its credibility. Nevertheless, an influence from the Mongols, who were definitely practicing shamanism in the thirteenth century, cannot be totally ruled out.

Another suggestion was that the roots of the motif of changing into a pigeon in particular should be searched in the epic traditions of the peoples of Southeast Europe and Anatolia in ancient Greek and Byzantine times.[14] Such a continuation as this is, of course, possible, yet remains to be proven. The fact that transformation into pigeon-form may be attested among the former inhabitants of the areas newly conquered by nomadic Turks in itself would not suffice to demonstrate that the Turks borrowed this motif from these peoples. Such a claim could be confirmed only after a comparative study of the origin of the motif and its meaning and significance for the peoples in question is made. In this connection, it could be observed here that the meaning of transformation into pigeon-form in the Vilâyet-nâme is expressed quite explicitly and adequately by Hacı Bektaş himself, who, after catching Hacı Doğrul in his hands, comments to him, "A saint does not come upon another saint in this fashion. You have come to us in the guise of a tyrant; we have come to you in that of a tyrannized. If we had found a more tyrannized creature than a pigeon, we would have come in that guise" (p.19). It remains to be seen if transformation into pigeon-form carried a similar meaning among the inhabitants of Southeast Europe and Anatolia prior to the Turkish conquest of these areas.

In addition, it should not be forgotten that pigeons are only one of the four kinds of birds in question. Even if it is granted that the nomadic Turks have adopted the motif of changing into a pigeon from the former inhabitants of the regions they have newly conquered, this still leaves open the question as to what feature of their cultural formation

made such a transplantation possible. Obviously not all the foreign cultural motifs the Turks have encountered in their new habitats could have been assimilated into their culture. The influence of the traditions which existed in pre-Turkish Anatolia upon the culture of the incoming Turkish tribes might be properly viewed as a process of implantation of only those foreign elements which could be easily integrated into the culture of these nomads. If so, it would then be more plausible to look for the roots of the motif of ornithographical transformation in particular and transformation into animal-form in general in the pre-Islamic beliefs of the Turkish nomads. Such a view would also be corroborated by reports mentioned earlier in this paper (p.45, references in note 17) that among pre-Islamic Altaic peoples the human soul was believed to leave the dead body in the shape of a bird. At this point, however, the only legitimate conclusion is that the motif ornithographical transformation probably came about as a synthesis of possible influences from shamanistic Mongols on the one hand and from indigenous peoples of Anatolia and the Balkans on the other hand, upon an already existing base of pre-Islamic beliefs about the unity of all living beings and the superiority of animals to humans. If this conclusion is justified, then it would be possible to think that the pre-Islamic principle of the unity of life is still at work in the Vilâyet-nâme.

Besides the ones enumerated in the above examples, other animals as well are mentioned in the Vilâyet-nâme. Yet, these do not carry any special significance and are not useful for an attempt to trace the pre-Islamic beliefs in that text. The only exception to this is a fabulous

beast mentioned on two occasions, namely the seven-headed dragon. One such dragon is sent by God himself to the aid of Hacı Bektaş in Badakhshān upon the latter's request (p.12); a second one is killed by Sarı Saltuk in the castle of an unbeliever (p.46). Dragons are mentioned in other places as well (the dragons of Ahi Evran, pp.52-53; the dragon killed by Hacım Sultan,[15] p.87); however, these are not said to be seven-headed. The link with pre-Islamic times is provided by Kaşgarlı Mahmud, who talks of a belief in large, seven-headed dragons.[16] To this it could be added that the belief in dragons came to Central Asia in ancient times from neighboring lands, especially from China, and has been maintained ever since.[17]

Proceeding now to beliefs concerning objects and phenomena of nature, what first strikes the attention is the absence of a reverence for the sky. Indeed, in the whole of the Vilâyet-nâme, there are only three references to the sky which carry some significance at all. The first of these relates to the dragon sent by God to Hacı Bektaş in Badakhshān. Once Hacı Bektaş' mission in this land is accomplished, he prays to God and the dragon ascends to the sky (p.13). On another occasion, when his entrance to the land of Rum is blocked by the saints who dwell there, Hacı Bektaş jumps to the limits of the sky, where he is met and greeted by angels (p.18). Finally, the saints of Rum ask for proof of his descendance from the Prophet, Hacı Bektaş attempts to take out an authorization, ijāzat-nāma, given to him by Ahmet Yesevi; however, before he can do so, a smoke descends from the sky, which turns out to be a green decree, firmān, upon which the ijāzat-nāma of Hacı Bektaş is written.

These details do not reveal much; nevertheless, they suggest that

the veneration of tăngri had given way to a belief in the one God of Islam, and that the only possible link with the previous conceptions about tăngri is that the sky, earlier perceived to be the eternal abode of life-giving forces and ancestral spirits, gradually came to be seen as the seat of God and his angels. It is granted, however, that the belief in the celestial residence of God need not be linked to pre-Islamic Turkish beliefs and may perhaps be satisfactorily explained as a borrowing from Islamic traditions.

It could here be added that it is also difficult to exact any information on the conception of God from the Vilâyet-nâme. The supreme being is mentioned only on those instances when he accepts the prayers of certains saints and enables them to perform miraculous deeds. Nothing else is known about him, and he certainly does not appear as a significant figure in the text.

There is considerably more material on how other objects of nature are perceived. The most revealing in this context are those parts of the narrative which describe the meetings of Hacı Bektaş with other holy men. It appears that the sites of these meetings are important in themselves, and are not chosen arbitrarily. It should not come as a suprise that the sites most frequently selected are mountains, hills, and immediate vicinity of springs, streams, and rivers, all of which were shown earlier in this paper to be preferred places for ceremonial occasions in pre-Islamic times. The places where meetings between holy men take place may be divided as follows:

1. Elevated Places:

On at least four occasions Hacı Bektaş meets with other saints over a hill, a ridge, or a mountain: with Seyyid Mahmud-i Hayrâni on the Aliler ridge (p.50); twice with Ahi Evran on a hill close to Kırşehir (p.52); and with holy men of the beyond on the Hırkadağı mountain (p.66).

2. Courses of Water:

a) The seven messengers of the saints of Khorasan to Ahmet Yesevi, flying towards Turkistan in the form of cranes, are welcomed by Yesevi and his disciples, who have also changed into cranes, right over a "wild river," namely the Oxus (p.15).

b) Hacı Bektaş first runs into Sarı Saltuk beside a spring called Zemzem (p.45).

c) Ahi Evran and Hacı Bektaş sit together and converse on three different occasions beside Gölpınarı, literally 'lake-spring', in Kırşehir (pp.53, 54, and 59).

d) The spirit of Seyyid Sultan Gazi meets Hacı Bektaş, who is coming over to visit him, beside a certain Akpınar, i.e., the 'white spring' (p.72).

It is very plausible that this insistence on mountains and courses of water is a survival of the pre-Islamic veneration of these places. This view is further confirmed by other instances in the Vilâyet-nâme, which are enumerated below:

1. Elevated Places:

a) It is reported that Lokman-ı Perende,[18] the mentor of Hacı Bektaş, was once caught in ecstacy and kept wandering around on mountains.

Supposedly, Imam Jaᶜfar aṣ-Ṣādiq had sent his own robe to Lokman-ı Perende with Bāyazīd-i Bisṭāmī. This latter found Lokman on a mountain and handed him the robe (p.5).

b) The name of the village which Ahmet Yesevi designates to Hacı Bektaş as his point of destination in Rum is Sulucakaraöyük, meaning 'watery-black-mound'. It is significant that both water and hills appear in the name of the village where Hacı Bektaş spends most of his life on this earth.

c) There is a mountain near Sulucakaraöyük called Arafat; Hacı Bektaş goes into a forty day-long seclusion on this mountain in a hut specially built for this purpose (p.28).

d) Close to Sulucakaraöyük is another mountain called Hırkadağı; Hacı Bektaş and his disciples one day build a fire and hold a samāᶜ around it on this mountain (p.36).

2. Water:

The evidence relating to the significance of water in the Vilâyetnâme could be considered in three parts.

a) Causing a spring to come out of the ground is one of the most favorite forms of performing miracles. For instance:

i) While Hacı Bektaş is still a child, his teacher Lokman-ı Perende one day asks Bektaş to bring him some water so he can perform his ablutions. Bektaş then inquires if Lokman-ı Perende could not cause a stream of water to flow through the school instead of him having to fetch water from outside. Lokman answers that such a deed is beyond his powers. Thereupon Bektaş begins to pray to God; immediately a stream springs out

from the middle of the school and flows towards the door (p.6).

ii) When Hacı Bektaş arrives to Sulucakaraöyük, he climbs to the Arafat mountain and causes water to flow out of the ground by a slight touch of his finger (p.28).

iii) During one of their meetings, Ahi Evran expresses to Hacı Bektaş his need of water for both performing his ablutions and quenching his thirst. Upon hearing this, Bektaş digs the ground with his hand and a clear spring of water begins to flow out (p.52).

iv) Other instances of miraculous springs relate to two disciples of Hacı Bektaş, Sarı Saltuk (p.47), and Hacım Sultan (p.52).

b) Hacı Bektaş has a special relation with water in the following instances:

i) Two miracles that Hacı Bektaş works in Badakhshān in order to convert its people to Islam are to bring about a drought by stopping the rains and to hide away all the waters in the land so that all springs, rivers, and wells dry up and no new water could be found (pp.12-13).

ii) On a certain day, Hacı Bektaş is with his disciple Saru Ismail, who is shaving him. When only half of his head is shaved, Hacı Bektaş stands up, walks to a certain place and digs the ground with his hand, saying three times, "ak pınarım, ak pınarım, ak pınarım," meaning 'flow my spring'. A clear spring begins to flow out from that place. Hacı Bektaş then asks the stream why it came only after he cried three times and not after the first call. The stream answers that after the first call, it flowed from Khorasan through Nishapūr to Erciyeş

(a mountain in Anatolia); after the second, it circumambulated Erciyeş seven times; and after the last call it came out of the place Hacı Bektaş has dug. When the stream stops talking, Hacı Bektaş turns to Saru İsmail and tells him that this stream was with him in Khorasan and used to come to his aid whenever and wherever he needed it--a clear reference to the occasion when Hacı Bektaş caused a stream to flow through his school when still in Khorasan (see pp.83-84 above). He continues to say that it came to his aid now as well and expresses his wish that no one who washes in this stream should burn in the fires of hell (p.41).

iii) On another occasion, Saru İsmail comes to Hacı Bektaş and tells him that he has heated some water for him to wash with. Bektaş informs him that it is not the time for washing and that he should travel to Konya and there ask for a book from Molla Celâleddin, presumably Jalāl ad-Dīn Rūmī. Saru goes to Konya and upon meeting Celâleddin informs him of what happened. Celâleddin remarks that Hacı Bektaş has no need to wash since everyday seven seas and eight rivers come to his presence. He asks Saru why he even attempted to wash the saint. Saru listens, then asks for the book the Hacı Bektaş had demanded. Celâleddin replies that there is no book, and that the purpose of Saru's visit was only to receive this piece of advice that Celâleddin has given him (p.49).

iv) When Hacı Bektaş visits the tomb of Sultan Seyyid Gâzi, all of a sudden he becomes a sea so extensive that it has no shores, in which the grave of Seyyid Gâzi begins to swim like a gourd. Then the exact reverse takes place; the tomb of Seyyid Gâzi changes into an endless sea, in which Hacı Bektaş swims in the form of a ship. Afterwards,

they both return to their normal forms (pp.72-73).

v) Finally, on two different occasions Hacı Bektaş comes to the rescue of ships caught in storms in the Black Sea (pp.69 and 71); it is understood that he has also rescued a third ship in the "Indian Sea" (p.79). In one of these instances, he is depicted dwelling in a huge castle built at the bottom of the Black Sea.

c) Other episodes of lesser significance, in which streams of water appear as sites where happy coincidences and meetings occur (pp.2, 3, 27, and 29), will not be related in detail here. They contribute, however, to the overall significance of water in the text.

The common purpose of all these episodes is to demonstrate the definitive command of Hacı Bektaş over water in general, but springs, streams, and seas in particular. The fact that it should have been thought important to establish such a close link between a highly esteemed saint and water reveals the value accorded to water, which can easily be traced back to the veneration of water among pre-Islamic Turkish peoples. It seems very plausible that elevated places and courses of water, which earlier functioned as points of contact with life-giving forces and the souls of ancestors, should continue to be revered in Islamic times as well, if only for different purposes and under different guises. Viewed as such, it could hardly be an insignificant detail or an inexplicable coincidence that meetings between holy men in the Vilâyet-nâme take place on elevated places or beside springs and rivers, or that the command of Hacı Bektaş over water is emphasized so persistently throughout the text.

Similar arguments could be made for trees and fire, though it should be granted that here there is hardly sufficient material to reach firm conclusions; one should rest content with the mere possibility of connections which cannot be proven at this stage. Here are the episodes in which trees have some significance:

1. When Hacı Bektaş begins his journey to Anatolia, a saint from the circle of Ahmet Yesevi picks up a piece of wood from a fire there and throws it to Anatolia, saying that one of the saints there should catch this wood and understand that the holy men of Turkistan are sending a saint to their land. This piece of wood is caught by Hak Ahmet Sultan in Konya and is planted in front of the tekke of Hacı Bektaş there (pp.16-17).

2. At one time Hacı Bektas wants to hide away from a crowd of peasants and asks a maple tree on the Hırkadağı to hide him. The tree bends and turns into a closed tent, where Hacı Bektaş goes into seclusion (p.25).

3. In an effort to convince a certain person of his sainthood, Hacı Bektaş once causes an apple tree to bear fruit in the middle of winter (pp.32-33).

4. On another occasion, when Ahi Evran expresses his desire for some shade, Hacı Bektaş takes the stick of Ahi Evran and drives it into the ground; the stick immediately turns green and grows into a tree (p.52).

5. Finally, on two occasions Hacı Bektaş is said to be sitting below a certain maple tree, presumably the same as the one on Hırkadağı

which had previously hidden him from peasants (pp.57 and 74).

The significance of these episodes, especially of the first one is not totally clear. Nevertheless, it could be pointed out that here as well it is a question of the command of Hacı Bektaş over a revered object, this time trees instead of water. Admittedly, however, this connection is bound to remain a conjecture, even if a well-taken one.

The situation is not much different in the case of fire. The latter appears in the Vilâyet-nâme as an integral feature of large-scale gatherings, meetings, and ceremonies and is frequently accompanied by samāᶜ:

1. When the ninety-nine thousand disciples of Ahmet Yesevi gather together in order to express a certain desire to their shaykh, there is a large fire in their midst (p.15).

2. Hacı Bektaş and his disciples build a fire on the Hırkadağı mountain and hold a samāᶜ there, circumambulating the fire forty times (p.36).

3. Fire and samāᶜ are juxtaposed on another occasion as well. A certain Kara İbrahim, who gets angry with a disciple of Hacı Bektaş by the name of Hacım Sultan, throws all the iron tools of Hacım Sultan's company into an oven in order to destroy them. Seeing this, a close companion of Hacım Sultan, Burhan Abdal, enters the oven and takes the tools out. In the meantime he starts a samāᶜ and dances so hard that he puts the fire out (p.86).[19]

In a different context, fire is used on two occasions as a tool with which to test sainthood: if the claimant does not burn in fire,

he is believed to be a holy person (Can Baba on p.40; Hdy Ata on p.45). Similarly, Hacı Bektaş as well demonstrates his command over fire: in the land of Badakhshān he prays to God, and the unbelieving people of that land can no longer start any fires, nor can they light their candles (p.12). At another place in the text, Hacı Bektaş puts out the candles of the fifty-seven thousand saints of Anatolia; they cannot start them for three, or according to another tradition, for forty days (p.19). These last incidents might reflect a Mongolian influence, since "mastery over fire," which is one of the marks of a shaman, is not attested for the Turks in the Middle Ages but is known to be wide spread among the Mongols.[20] However, the presence of fire in ceremonies of all sorts is common among Turkish peoples in all periods,[21] and it is possible, though not definitely proven, that the above instances related to fire reflect pre-Islamic Turkish beliefs.

Similarly, it remains to be demonstrated if the samāc as it exists in Bektaşi lore does not have its origins, if only partially, in the culture of the ancient and medieval Turkish nomads. It has been noted earlier that adequate information on music making and dancing among pre-Islamic Turks is not forthcoming (see Chapter II, note 72 for references). Nonetheless, there is a strong possibility that circumambulation in general and samāc, of which circumambulation is an integral part, in particular are among those aspects of the religious practice of the Alevi-Bektaşi Turks of Anatolia which could be traced back to the times when Turkish peoples were on the whole confined to Central Asia. Evidence for circumambulation in the Vilâyet-nâme has already been given (the Hırkadağı

episode, p.88 above); instances of samāᶜ, other than the ones listed in the brief discussion on fire, are the following:

1. When Hacı Bektaş meets with Mahmud-i Hayrâni of Akşehir, the two saints, accompanied by their disciples, talk, eat, drink, and make samāᶜ for one whole week (p.50).

2. A similar gathering occurs in Kayseri; Hacı Bektaş has a session of samāᶜ and conversation with other saints and their friends (p.69).

3. Hacım Sultan, disciple of Hacı Bektaş, visits the grave of Seyyid Gâzi and gathers the people of that province for communal eating and samāᶜ. The company marches to the tomb of Seyyid Gazi, where Hacım Sultan joins other dervishes for a samāᶜ. It is said that whoever he touches with his robes while he is dancing falls down and dies (pp.85-86).

A more definite link with pre-Islamic past is provided by another practice which is very common in the Vilâyet-nâme, that is, placing headgears on adherents' heads. This practice appears to be an essential feature of initiation into disciplehood. No person is accepted into the company of Hacı Bektaş's followers who is not first blessed through a ceremony where his head is covered with a headgear (called taç in the text) by Hacı Bektaş himself.[22] It is clear that the reception of the headgear by the follower symbolizes his submission and allegiance to Hacı Bektaş. Moreover, there can be no question that it is the covering of the head by the pīr and not the actual presentation of a headgear or the headgear itself which is important here. This is confirmed by the

fact that in the Vilâyet-nâme the headgear is standard neither in material nor in shape; in most cases these are not even specified. On this point, even more telling is the fact that in one episode the person to be accepted as a follower is already wearing a cap made of deerhide, yet Hacı Bektaş is clearly not concerned with the material or the make of the cap but rests content with taking it off and putting it back on with his own hands (p.21).

There is here a definite connection with pre-Islamic Turkish practices. It has been observed earlier in this paper that the hair was possibly considered to be a seat of life-giving forces (p.44). Perhaps connected to this belief are some reports to the effect that having one's head uncovered had a certain significance among the Turks. It is known, for instance, that the yatçı, a person who uses the rain-stone called yat/yada, had to have his head uncovered.[23] Among medieval Turks it was a widespread custom not to wear anything on one's head while in mourning.[24] Also related must have been the rule about removing one's headgear in the presence of the ruler.[25]

It has earlier been noted by scholars that among Turkish and Mongolian peoples the "headcover" and the "girdle" or the "belt" shared the same significance; having the head covered and the waist girded had one and the same meaning. Some have suggested that these two objects stood for "liberty" and their removal for "submission" or "humility." Thus the person who took off his cap and unwound his girdle showed with this act his submission to the person or object in whose presence he stood.[26] Such an interpretation is in accordance with the above-mentioned

reports on having one's head uncovered, and with others in Islamic sources that unwinding the belt and hanging or wrapping it around one's neck was a widespread symbol of submission among non-Muslim Turks.[27] This view has been complemented and strengthened by the suggestion that the headgear and the girdle are not symbols of "freedom" in the abstract, but of one's acceptance into and inclusion in human society; they signify that the person wearing them is a full member of his community and capable of assuming any social responsibility. This interpretation has the merit of accounting for a very common practice which involves headgears and belts, namely having one's head covered and waist girded by one's superior, whether this latter is a political ruler, a shaykh, or a saint. The person who places a headcover on another's head or wraps a girdle around his waist attaches the other to himself with bonds of vassalage, as if it were he who bestows upon the other this latter's place in society.[28]

This is exactly what happens in the Vilâyet-nâme; by placing a headcover on a new follower, Hacı Bektaş acknowledges the newcomer's acceptance into the community of disciples and dervishes and grants him a footing in the holy path. It could be pointed out that in the Vilâyet-nâme there is confirmation also for the view that the headgear and the belt or the girdle shared the same significance. On some occasions Hacı Bektaş "ties the waist" (pp.48 and 50), "gives a belt" (pp.72 and 76), or "winds a girdle" (pp.72 and 76) instead of placing a headcover. In this connection, it could be added that giving a sword, a bow, or an arrow, objects which were considered sacred or at least blessed among

Turks since ancient times, possibly also shared this same meaning of attaching someone to oneself with ties of submission and vassalage.[29] The occurance of such incidents in the Vilâyet-nâme (Ahmet Yesevi gives a sword to his son, p.9; Hacı Bektaş gives one sword, one bow, and seven arrows to Sarı Saltuk, p.45; and a sword to Hacım Sultan, p.83) clearly show the connection of these practices with pre-Islamic Turkish beliefs.

If a person affirms his superiority, sovereignty, or dominance over another by handing him objects which are symbols of inclusion in a human order, then this latter expresses his submission, vassalage, or humility most frequently through "genuflection" or "prostration." These acts are the most common gestures of submission in the Turkish inscriptions of the seventh and eighth centuries.[30] In the Vilâyet-nâme there is evidence only for prostration which appears under several different guises.[31]

This note concerning gestures of submission marks the end of our attempt to uncover survivals of pre-Islamic beliefs in the Vilâyet-nâme. The preceding discussion has demonstrated that many of the beliefs and practices which were observed earlier in this study to have been peculiar to ancient and medieval non-Muslim Turks could indeed be traced in the Vilâyet-nâme. As pointed out at the beginning of the present chapter, it is not possible to positively establish a continuation in the Vilâyet-nâme of the pre-Islamic belief in life-giving forces, which has been the core of the thought of Turkish nomads prior to their Islamization (Chapter II, p.21). Nor is it possible to discover a reference to tängri. On the other hand, it is equally impossible to argue that the

spirit of the Vilâyet-nâme rules out such a belief in animating forces altogether, and that the work as a whole is incompatible with the idea of life-giving spirits. Moreover, there is the fact that the fundamental principle underlying the religious thought of pre-Islamic Turkish peoples, namely the principle of the unity of being and its corollary, the consistent humanization of non-human beings, are demonstrably at work in the Vilâyet-nâme. We may conclude, therefore, that the legendary biography of Hacı Bektaş is clearly imbedded in a cultural tradition which remained firmly attached to its pre-Islamic foundations even after it came under the influence of Islamic cultures.

NOTES

[1]It is, of course, most likely that the Vilâyet-nâme, focusing as it does on the miraculous deeds of a walī, does not mirror popular beliefs in their totality and that it should not, therefore, be accepted as a definitive criterion in identifying the religious life of newly Islamized Turkish nomads of Anatolia. It should be obvious that a comparative study of all the available sources and not just a single manuscript is needed before one could reach conclusions on this issue.

[2]Examples are on pp.16, 23, 53, 56, 61, 71, 72, 78, and 88 of the Vilâyet-nâme. All references in this chapter are to the modern Turkish version of the text.

[3]The establishment of a connection between tonsure and pre-Islamic Turkish beliefs does not, of course, exclude other influences in the adaptation of shaving by Sufis in a Turkish milieu. The Qalandarī-Bektaşi relation in this regard has already been mentioned (Chapter I, p.29). Further information on the origins and significance of shaving among the Qalandars may be found in Fritz Meier, Abū Saᶜīd-i Abū L-Hayr (357-440/967-1049). Wirklichkeit und Legende. Acta Iranica, Troisième Série, vol.4 (Téhéran-Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi, 1976), pp.502-504.

[4]This Kadıncık is no doubt the same as Hatun Ana, the woman mentioned by Aşıkpaşazâde as the adopted daughter of Hacı Bektaş; see Chapter I, p.22.

[5]The word here translated as 'saint' is eren in the original, an irregular plural of er, meaning 'man, a human male'. In time, eren came to be treated as a singular. In the period under consideration, it might have meant (1) 'male' (not female), (2) 'real man, hero', and (3) 'man of experience'. On this see Clauson, pp.192 and 232. The usage in the Vilâyet-nâme seems to be a combination of the last two meanings, 'a man of experience who is a hero at the same time'.

[6]The following figures in the Vilâyet-nâme continue to live after death: Muhammad and ᶜAlī (p.5), the saints of the beyond (p.66), Sultan Seyyid Gâzi (presumably Seyyid Battal Gâzi of Turkish epic literature, pp.72 and 85), Saru İsmail (a disciple of Hacı Bektaş, p.83), and Hacı Bektaş himself (pp.90-91).

[7]There is no historical information on Saru İsmail, who is a very prominent figure in Bektaşi legend. See Köprülü, İlk Mutasavvıflar, p.221, note 4.

[8]All quotations from the Vilâyet-nâme are translated by the author.

[9]On rubbing the face on the ground, see note 31 below.

[10]Emir Cem Sultan in his turn explains Hacı Bektaş's acceptance of

the offering as follows: "Hacı Bektaş is a sea that is not muddled by any common object" (p.78).

[11]Köprülü ("Anadolu'da İslamiyet," p.300, note 2, and "Orta Asya Türk dervişliği hakkında bazı notlar," Türkiyat Mecmuası 14(1964):260) states that Kutbeddin Haydar was a favorite disciple of Ahmet Yesevi, who dispatched Kutbeddin to Khorasan. There Kutbeddin gained great popularity, especially among Turkish peoples, and came to be known as the pīr of the Haydarī order. On the other hand, Trimingham (p.39, note 2) reports that Kutbeddin Haydar was a disciple of the qalandarī Jamāl ad-Dīn as-Sāwī. Trimingham does not cite a source. Köprülü, however, is drawing upon a Turkish translation of Jāmiᶜ's Nafahāt al-uns.

[12]Doğrul is a variation of tuğrul/toğrıl, which in Turkish is "a bird of prey, exact identity unknown," Clauson, p.472.

[13]See, for example, Köprülü, Influence du chamanisme turco-mongol (İstanbul: Memoires de l'Institut de Turcologie de l'Université de Stanbul, 1929), p.18. Elsewhere (İlk Mutasavvıflar, pp.26-27, note 14) Köprülü reports that F. Grenard, Le Turquestan et le Tibet (E-Leroux, 1898), p.240, sees a possible Buddhist influence in the spread of the motif of ornithographical transformation among Muslim Turks. Köprülü himself disagrees with Grenard on this point.

[14]Şenay Yola, "Zur Ornithophanie im Vilâyet-nâme des Hâğğî Bektaş," in Islamkundliche Abhandlungen aus dem Institut für Geschichte und Kultur des Nahen Orients an der Universitat München. Hans Joachim Kissling gewidmet von seinen Schulern (Munich: Beitrage zur Kenntnis Südosteuropas und des Nahen Orients, 1974), p.189. On another attempt to trace residues of anterior Anatolian cultures in the Vilâyet-nâme, see H. J. Kissling, "Eine bektaşitische Version der Legende von den zwei Erzsündern," Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 99(1945-49):181-210. In this connection, one could note that the extraordinary powers attributed to "saliva" on two occasions in the Vilâyet-nâme (the grandmother of Hacı Bektaş, Zeyneb Hatun, becomes pregnant by drinking from a sweet drink which was mixed with the saliva of a saint, p.3; and Hacı Bektaş heals Yesevi's son Kutbeddin Haydar by rubbing some of his saliva on Kutbeddin's bald head, pp.10-11) might be still another trace of beliefs dating to ancient Anatolian cultures, since "in classical antiquity the saliva was considered as a means of conferring spiritual power," Wittek, "Yazıjıoghlu ᶜAlī on the Christian Turks of the Dobruja," p.659.

[15]There exists a vilâyet-nâme of this famous disciple of Hacı Bektaş. See Rudolf Tschudi, Das Vilâjet-nâme des Hadschim Sultan. Eine türkische Heiligenlegende (Berlin: Türkische Bibliothek, 1914).

[16]Kaşgarlı Mahmud, büke, 3:227; Dankoff, "Kāšġarī," p.79.

[17]Roux, Faune, pp.29-30.

[18]For an attempt to identify Lokman-ı Perende as a historical firgure, see Gölpınarlı's explanatory notes to his edition of the Vilâyet-nâme, pp.101-104. Also Köprülü, İlk Mutasavvıflar, p.42, note 56.

[19]Extinguishing fires by dancing on them was a well-known feat of the Rıfā'īs. See the quotation from Ibn Khallikān in Trimingham, pp.37-38.

[20]Boyle, p 181.

[21]İnan, "Eski Türk dini tarihi," p.46.

[22]Examples are on pages 8, 9, 20-23, 27, 46, 53, 56, 61, 72, 75, 76, and 78.

[23]Yaltkaya, p.696.

[24]İnan, Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, p.199.

[25]Roux, "Quelques objets numineux des Turcs et des Mongols. I. Le bonnet et la ceinture," Turcica 7(1975):54 (hereafter cited as "Le bonnet").

[26]Ibid., pp.50-51.

[27]İnan, "Eski Türklerde teslim ve itaat sembolleri," in 60. Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Z. V. Togan'a Armağan (İstanbul: Maarif Basımevi, 1950-55), pp.480-483; reprinted in Makaleler ve İncelemeler, pp.331-334; Roux, "Le bonnet," p.53, and "Türk göçebe sanatının dini bakımdan anlamı," p.76.

[28]Roux, "Le bonnet," pp.50-51, and 'Türk göçebe sanatının dini bakımdan anlamı," p.76.

[29]Roux, "Quelques objets numineux des Turcs et des Mongols. III. L'arc et les flèches," Turcica 9/1(1977):7-29. The motif of a holy person bestowing a wooden sword to his disciples is very widespread in Turkish legendary accounts of famous religious figures. For more information and examples, see Gölpınarlı, Yunus Emre. Hayatı, p.30, and Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf, p.39; İnan, "Eski Türklerde teslim ve itaat sembolleri," pp. 480-483; Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm, p.80, note 21; and "Eski Türklerde ve folklorda and," Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi 6/3(1948):279-290; reprinted in Makaleler ve İncelemeler, pp. 317-330; Köprülü, Ilk Mutasavvıflar, pp.44 and 216-217, notes 109 and 110; finally, Ocak, "Emirci Sultan ve zâviyesi. XIII. yüzyılın ilk yarısında bir Babâî şeyhi: Şeref'üd-Din İsmail b. Muhammad," p.143.

[30]İnan, "Eski Türklerde teslim ve itaat sembolleri," pp.480-483; Roux, "Le bonnet," p.52. On the Oğuz Turks Ibn Faḍlān states, in Togan's translation, "das ist ihre Sitte: wenn ein Mann anderen ehrt, so macht

er vor ihm die Prosternation." See Ibn Fadlān's Reisebericht, p.26 of the translation (paragraph 28 in Togan's division).

[31]These different guises are kissing the feet (p.53), kissing the ground (p.10), rubbing the face on the others feet (pp.69, 70, 80, 83, and 87), rubbing the face on the ground (pp.12, 17, and 21), placing one's head on the other's feet (p.32), and falling to the feet (pp.15, 40, 50, 53, and 68).

CONCLUSION

The discovery of a considerable number of pre-Islamic Turkish phenomena in the Vilâyet-nâme is significant in that it demonstrates the presence of a clear link between heterodox Islamic beliefs in Anatolia and pre-Islamic Turkish religious conceptions. Nevertheless, a more exhaustive analysis of the text is required if one wants to elaborate further on this connection and thus to reach meaningful conclusions concerning the nature of the specifically Turkish heterodox-antinomian synthesis which formed the basis of the later Bektaşilik-Alevilik-Kızılbaşlık. Such an analysis would necessitate further research on at least two fronts. First, it would be necessary to determine the relative weight of the different cultural influences that went into the formation of the Vilâyet-nâme. The present study has attempted to uncover the elements of pre-Islamic Turkish origin in that text; a similar study (or studies) which would bring out elements of primarily Islamic (Arab and Persian) but also Greco-Roman origin remains to be carried out. It is only when the results of such a study are available that the different cultural influences can be weighed against each other. Second, the Vilâyet-nâme would have to be subjected to a comparative literary and linguistic analysis in relation to the other major works of early Muslim-Turkish literature, such as Dede Korkut Kitabı, Seyyid Battal Gâzi Destanı, Danişmend-nâme, Hacım Sultan Vilâyet-nâmesi, Otman Baba Vilâyet-nâmesi, and Saltuk-nâme. Such an analysis would serve to complement and

substantiate the conclusions of previous research on the subject. There is no doubt that a better understanding of the early religious development of Turkish nomads in Anatolia could be obtained only after detailed analyses of the sort pictured above for the Vilâyet-nâme have been carried out for each major epico-religious work of early Muslim-Turkish literature.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahmed, Mahammad Tagi. "Who is a Qalandar?." Journal of Indian History 33(1955):155-170.

Altınay, Ahmet Refik. Turkıye Tarihı. İstanbul: Kütübhane-i Hilmi, 1923.

Aşıkpaşazâde. Tevârih-ı Âl-ı Osman. Edited by Nıhal Atsız Çıftçıoğlu in Osmanlı Tarihleri. İstanbul: Türkıye Yayınevı, 1949. Pp.77-319.

Bar Hebraeus, Gregory (Ibn al-ʿIbrī). Abu'l-Farac Tarihi. Turkısh translation by Ömer Rıza Doğrul. Ankara: Türk Tarıh Kurumu Yayınları, 1950.

Barthold, Vasılii Vladımirovıch. "The Burıal Rites of the Turks and the Mongols." Translated with a note on iconography by J.M. Rogers. Central Asıatıc Journal 14(1970):195-227.

Bazin, Louıs. Les Calendrıers Turcs anciens et médiévaux. Thèse de Doctorat d'Etat, Servıce de reproductıon des Thèses, Universıté de Lille III. 1974.

Beldiceanu-Steinherr, Irène. "Le règne de Selīm I^{er}: Tournant dans la vie politique et religieuse de l'Empire Ottoman." Turcica 6(1975): 34-48.

Bırge, John Kıngsley. The Bektashi Order of Dervishes. Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Seminary Press, 1937.

Bodrogligeti, A. "Ahmad's Baraq-Nāma: A Central Asiatic Work in Eastern Middle Turkic." Central Asiatic Journal 18(1974):83-128.

Boratav, Pertev Naılı. "Vestiges oguz dans la tradıtıon bektaşi." In Akten des XXIV. international Orientalisten-Kongress. Munich: Deutsche Morgenlandische Gesellschaft, 1957. Pp.382-385.

Boyle, John Anderson. "Turkish and Mongol Shamanism in the Middle Ages." Folklore 83(1972):177-193.

Caferoğlu, Ahmet. "Türk onomastığinde 'at' kültü." Türkiyat Mecmuası 10(1951):201-212.

_____. "Türk onomastığinde 'köpek' kültü." Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten (1961):1-11.

_____. "Türk onomastığinde ay ve güneş unsurları." İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi 13(1964):19-28.

Caferoğlu, Ahmet. "Şaman-Sayacı'nın bir duası." In R.Rahmeti Arat İçin. Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1966. Pp. 155-161.

Cahen, Claude. Pre-Ottoman Turkey. Translated by J.Jones-Williams. London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1968.

_____. "Baba Ishaq, Baba Ilyas, Hadjdji Bektash et quelques autres." Turcica 1(1969):53-64.

_____. "Le problème du shi^{c}isme dans l'Asie Mineure turque préottomane." In Le Shi^{c}isme imâmite. Colloque de Strasbourg (6-9 mai, 1968). Paris: Bibliothèque des Centres d'études supérieurs spécialisé, Travaux du Centre d'Etudes Supérieurs Spécialisé d'Histoire des Religions de Strasbourg, 1970. Pp. 115-129.

_____. "À Propos d'un article récent et des Babâ'is." Journal Asiatique 268(1980):69-70.

Clauson, Gerard. "Turks and Wolves." Studia Orientalia 38/2. Helsinki, 1964.

_____. An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Cremers, Wolfgang. "Schamanistische Uberbleibsel in der heutigen anatolischen Folklore." Turcica 3(1971):49-58.

Dankoff, Robert. "Baraq and Burāq." Central Asiatic Journal 15(1971): 102-117.

_____. "A Note on khutü and chatuq." Journal of the American Oriental Society 93(1973):532-543.

_____. "Kāšgarī on the Beliefs and Supersitions of the Turks." Journal of the American Oriental Society 95(1975):68-80.

Dede Korkut Kitabı. Editions used are:
1. Muharrem Ergin. Dede Korkut Kitabı. Giriş-Metin-Faksimile. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 1958.
2. Orhan Şaik Gökyay. Dedem Korkud'un Kitabı. İstanbul: Başbakanlık Kültür Yayınları, 1973.

Deér, Jozsef. "İstep Kültürü." Turkish translation by Şerif Baştav. Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi 12/1-2(1954):159-176.

Devereux, Robert. "Al-Kāshgarī and Early Turkish Islam." The Muslim World 49(1959):133-138.

Diyarbakırlı, Nejat. "Vestiges de croyance altaïque dans l'art seldjoukide." Turcica 3(1971):59-70.

Eberhard, Wolfram. Çin'in Şimal Komşuları. Bir Kaynak Kitabı. Turkish translation by Nimet Uluğluğ. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1942.

Eflâkı, Şemseddin Ahmed. Ârıflerin Menkıbeleri. 2vols. Turkish translation by Tahsin Yazıcı. İstanbul: Hürriyet Yayınları, 1973.

Eraslan, Kemal. "Yesevi'nın Fakr-Nâme'si." İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dılı ve Edebiyatı Dergisi 22(1974-76): 45-120.

Eröz, Mehmet. "Türk içtımai hayatında totemizm izleri." İslam Tetkikleri Enstitüsü Dergisi 5(1973):289-301.

_____. Türkiye'de Alevîlık-Bektâşîlık. İstanbul: Otağ Matbaacılık, 1977.

Eşin, Emel. İslâmıyetten Öncekı Türk Kültür Tarihi ve İslâma Giriş. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası, 1978.

Eyice, Semâvi. "Ilk Osmanlı devrının dinî-içtımaî bir mûessesesi: zâvıyeler ve zâvıyelı câmiler." Istanbul Üniversitesi İktisat Fakültesi Mecmuası 23/1-2(1962-63):3-80.

Faroqhi, Suraiya. "Bektaschiklöster in Anatolien vor 1826: Fragestellungen und Quellensprobleme." Der Islam 53(1976):28-69.

_____. The tekke of Hacı Bektaş: Social Position and Economic Activities." International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 7(1976):183-208.

Gölpınarlı, Abdülbâkî. "Aşık Paşa'nın şiirleri." Türkiyat Mecmuası 5(1935):87-100.

_____. Yunus Emre. Hayatı. İstanbul: Bozkurt Basımevi, 1936.

_____. Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi, 1961.

Hasluck, Frederick William. Christianity and Islam Under the Sultans. 2 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1929.

Husseinov, Rauf. "Le terme goš dans un texte syriaque." Studia et Acta Orientalia 5-6(1967):385-393.

_____. "Les sources syriaques sur les croyances et les moeurs des Oghuz du VII^{e} au XII^{e} siècle." Turcica 8/1(1976): 21-27.

Ibn Battūta. The Travels of Ibn Battūta, A.D.1325-1354. 4 vols Translated with revisions and notes by H.A.R.Gibb. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958-

Ibn Bībī. Die Seltschukengeschichte des Ibn Bībī. Translation by Herbert W.Duda. Kopenhagen: Munksgaard, 1959.

Ibn Fadlān. Ibn Fadlān's Reisebericht. Edited with a German translation by A.Z.V.Togan. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, 1939; reprint ed., Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint Ltd., 1966.

Inan, Abdülkadir. "Kıtab-ı Dede Korkut hakkında." Türkiyat Mecmuası 1(1925):213-219. Reprinted in A.Inan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler. Ankara. Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.165-172.

_____. "Türk rivayetlerinde bozkurt." Türkiyat Mecmuası 2(1926):131-137. Reprinted in A.İnan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968, Pp.69-75.

_____. "Al ruhu hakkında." Türk Tarih, Arkeologya ve Etnografya Dergisi no.1(1933):160-167. Reprinted in A.İnan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.259-267.

_____. "Ongon ve tös kelimeleri hakkında." Türk Tarih, Arkeologya ve Etnografya Dergisi no.2(1934):277-285. Reprinted in A.İnan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.268-273.

_____. "Dede Korkut kıtabındaki bazı motiflere ve kelimelere ait notlar." Ülkü 9(1937):139-140; 10(1937-38):78-80 and 545-547; 11(1938):549-551; and 13(1939):168-171. Reprinted in A.İnan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.173-190.

_____. "Altay'da Pazırık hafriyatından çıkarılan atların vaziyetini Türklerin defin merasimi bakımından izah." In II. Türk Tarih Kongresi (İstanbul, 20-25 September, 1937). İstanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1943. Pp.142-151.

Inan, Abdülkadir. "İslam Türklerinde şamanizm kalıntıları." Doğu no.4 (1943). Reprınted ın A.İnan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.454-455.

_____. Tarihte ve Bugün Şamanizm. Ankara: Türk Tarıh Kurumu Yayınları, 1945.

_____. "Eskı Türklerde ve folklorda and." Ankara Ünıversıtesi Dil ve Tarıh-Coğrafya Dergisi 6/4(1948).279-290. Reprinted in A. İnan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler. Ankara Türk Tarıh Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.317-330.

_____. "Göçebe Türk boylarında evlatlık müesseseleriyle ilgılı gelenekler." Ankara Üniversıtesi Dil ve Tarıh-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi 6/3(1948):127-137. Reprınted in A.İnan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.305-316.

_____. "1. It başlı ulus efsanesı. 2. Iskitlerın savaş belgesi ve XI. yüzyıl Türklerınde beçkem. 3. Barak efsanesı." Belleten 13(1949):149-151. Reprınted ın A.İnan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler. Türk Tarıh Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.217-219.

_____. "Muslüman Türklerde şamanızm kalıntıları." Ankara Üniversitesı İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergısı 1/4(1952):19-30.

_____. "Türklerde su kültu ıle ılgılı gelenekler." In 60. Doğum Yılı Münasebetıyle Fuad Koprülü Armağanı. Istanbul: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları, 1953. Pp.249-253. Reprinted in A.Inan, Makaleler ve Incelemeler. Ankara: Türk Tarıh Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.491-495.

_____. "Yakut şamanızmındekı ıja kııl." Türkıyat Mecmuası 10(1951-53):213-216. Reprınted ın A.İnan, Makaleler ve Incelemeler. Ankara: Türk Tarıh Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.458-461.

_____. "Türk destanlarına genel bır bakış." Türk Dılı Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten (1954):189-206. Reprınted ın A.İnan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler. Ankara. Türk Tarıh Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.220-237.

_____. "Eski Türklerde teslim ve ıtaat sembolleri." In 60. Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Z.V.Togan'a Armağan. Istanbul: Maarif Basımevi, 1950-55. Pp. 480-483. Reprinted in A.Inan, Makaleler ve Incelemeler. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp. 331-334.

İnan, Abdülkadir. "Türk destan ve masallarında 'kırklar' motifi." Türk Dili 7/77(1958):222-224. Reprinted in A.İnan, Makaleler ve İncelemeler. Ankara; Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.238-240.

_____. Hurâfeler ve Menşeleri. Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayını, 1962. Reprinted in A.İnan, Eski Türk Dini Tarihi. İstanbul: Devlet Kitapları (Kültür Bakanlığı Kültür Eserleri), 1976. Pp.174-235.

_____. "Türk boylarında dağ, ağaç ve pınar kültü." In R.Rahmeti Arat Için. Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1966. Pp.272-277.

_____. "Dede Korkut kitabı'nda eski inanç ve gelenekler." Türk Kültürü Araştırmaları 3-6(1966-69):145-157. Reprinted in A.İnan, Eski Türk Dini Tarihi. İstanbul: Devlet Kitapları (Kültür Bakanlığı Kültür Eserleri), 1976. Pp.136-160.

_____. "Dîvânü Lûgat-it Türk'de şamanizme ait kelimeler." Türk Kültürü 9(1971):293-297. Reprinted in A.İnan, Eski Türk Dini Tarihi. İstanbul: Devlet Kitapları (Kültür Bakanlığı Kültür Eserleri), 1976. Pp.129-136.

_____. "Eski Türk Dini Tarihi." In A.İnan, Eski Türk Dini Tarihi. İstanbul. Devlet Kitapları (Kültür Bakanlığı Kültür Eserleri), 1976. Pp.1-62.

Inostrantsev, K. "Eski Türklerin inançları hakkında bir kaç söz." Translated into Turkish by A.İnan. Belleten 14(1950):45-47.

Kafesoğlu, Ibrahim. "Eski Türk Dini." Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi 3(1972): 1-34.

_____. Türk Milli Kültürü. Ankara: Türk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1977.

Karamağaralı, Beyhan. "Anadolu'da XII-XIV. asırlardaki tarikat ve tekke sanatı hakkında." Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi 21(1976):247-277.

Kaşgarlı Mahmud. Dîvânü Lûgat-ıt Türk. 3vols. and separate index. Turkish translation by Besim Atalay. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, 1940-43.

Kissling, Hans Joachim. "Eine bektaşitische Version der Legende von den zwei Erzsündern." Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 99(1945-49):181-210.

Kocatürk, Saadettin. "İran'da Islamiyetten sonraki yüzyıllarda fikir akımlarına toplu bir bakış ve 'Kalenderiye tarikatı' ile ilgili bir risâle." Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi 28/3-4(1970):215-231.

Koppers, Wilhelm. "Cihan Tarihinin ışığında ilk Türklük, ilk Indo-Germenlik." Belleten 5(1941):439-480.

Köprülü, Mehmed Fuad. "Bemerkungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasiens." Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte 1(1921-22):203-222.

_____. "Anadolu'da Islamiyet. Türk istilasından sonra Anadolu-tarih-i dinisine bir nazar ve bu tarihin menbaları." Darülfunun Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası 2(1922-23):281-311; 385-420; 457-486.

_____. "Une institution magique chez les anciens Turcs: yat." In Actes du Congrès International d'Histoire des Religions tenu à Paris en 1923. 2 vols. Paris, 1926. 2:440-451.

_____. "Les origines du Bektashisme." In Actes du Congrès International d'Histoire des Religions tenu à Paris en 1923. 2 vols. Paris, 1926. 2:391-411.

_____. Influence du chamanisme turco-mongol. Istanbul: Memoires de l'Institut de Turcologie de l'Universite de Stanbul, 1929.

_____. "Abu Ishāq Kāzerūnī und die ishāqī Derwische in Anatolien." Der Islam 19(1930):18-26.

_____. "Anadolu Selçukluları tarihinin yerli kaynakları." Belleten 7(1943):379-523.

_____. "Orta Asya Türk dervişliği hakkında notlar." Türkiyat Mecmuası 14(1965):259-262.

_____. Türk Edebiyatında Ilk Mutasavvıflar. 2nd edition. Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlığı Yayınları, 1966.

Makalât-ı Hacı Bektaş Veli. Edited by Sefer Aytekin. Ankara: Emek Basım-Yayımevi, 1954.

Mecdi Efendi (Edirneli). Şakâyık Tercumesi. İstanbul : No publisher , 1269/1853.

Meier, Fritz. "Der Derwischtanz. Versuch eines Überblicks." Asiatische Studien 1-4(1954):107-136.

_____. Abū Sa^{c}īd-i Abū L-Hayr (357-440/967-1049). Wirklichkeit und Legende. Acta Iranica (Troisième Série, vol.4). Téhéran - Liège: Bibliothèque Pahlavi, 1976.

Mélikoff, Irène. "Nombres symboliques dans la litterature épico-religieuse des Turcs d'Anatolie." Journal Asiatique 250(1962):435-445.

_____. "Yunus Emre ile Hacı Bektaş." İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi 20(1972):27-36.

_____. "Les babas turcomans contemporaines de Mevlana." In Uluslararası Mevlana Semineri. Bildiriler. Edited by Mehmet Önder. Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 1973. Pp.268-274.

_____. "Le problème kızılbaş." Turcica 6(1975):49-67.

Menges, Karl Heinrich. The Turkic Languages and Peoples: An Introduction to Turkic Studies. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1968.

Mutafciev, Peter. Die Angebliche Einwanderung von Seldchuk-Türken in die Dobrudscha im XIII. Jahrhundert. Sofia: Bŭlgarska Akademiîa na Naukitîe i Izkustvata, 1943.

Ocak, Ahmet Yaşar. "Emircı Sultan ve zâviyesi. XIII. yüzyılın ilk yarısında Anadolu (Bozok)'da bir Babâî şeyhi: Şeref'üd-Dın Ismail b. Muhammad." Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi 9(1978):129-208.

_____. "Les Menākib'ul-Kudsîya fî Menāsib'il-Unsîya: une source importante pour l'histoire religieuse de l'Anatolie au XIII^{e} siècle." Journal Asiatique 267(1979):345-356.

Ögel, Bahaeddın. "Doğu Göktürkleri hakkında notlar." Belleten 21(1957): 81-137.

_____. Islamiyetten Önce Turk Kültür Tarihi. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1962.

Oguz Kağan Destanı. Edited by W.Bang-Kaup and R.Rahmeti Arat. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Yayınları, 1936.

Okiç, M.Tayyib. "Sarı Saltuk'a âit bir fetva." Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi 1/1(1952):48-58.

Önder, Mehmet. "Eine neuentdeckte Quelle zur Geschichte der Seltschuken in Anatolien." Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 55)1959):83-88.

Orkhon Inscriptions. Editions used are:
1. Muharrem Ergin. Orhun Abideleri. Istanbul: Boğaziçi Basım ve Yayın Evi, 1973.
2. Talat Tekin. A Grammar of Orkhon Turkic. The Hague: Mouton and Co. (Indiana University Publications), 1968. Texts of the inscriptions are on pp.229-259; English translations on pp. 259-295.

Rásonyi, László. Tarihte Türklük. Ankara: Turk Kültürünü Araştırma Enstitusu Yayınları, 1971.

_____. "The Psychology and Categories of Name Giving Among the Turkish Peoples." In Hungaro-Turcica. Studies in Honour of Julius Németh. Edited by Gy.Káldy-Nagy. Budapest: Loránd Eötvös University, 1976. Pp.207-223.

Roux, Jean-Paul. "Tängri. Essai sur le Ciel-Dieu des peuples altaiques." Revue de l'histoire des religions 149(1956):49-82; 197-230; 150(1956):27-54; 173-212.

_____. "Eléments chamaniques dans les textes pré-mongols." Anthropos 53(1958):441-456.

_____. "Le nom du chaman dans les textes turco-mongols." Anthropos 53(1958):133-142.

_____. "Notes additionelles à Tangri, le Ciel-Dieu des peuples altaiques." Revue de l'histoire des religions 154(1958):32-66.

_____. "La naissance du monde chez les Turco-mongols." In Sources Orientales. I. La Naissance du monde. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1959. Pp.281-297.

_____. "La religion des Turcs de l'Orkhon des VII^{e} et VIII^{e} siècles." Revue de l'histoire des religions 161(1962):1-24; 199-231.

_____. La Mort chez les peuples altaiques anciens et médiévaux d'après les documents écrits. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1963.

_____. "Les chiffres symboliques 7 et 9 chez les Turcs non musulman." Revue de l'histoire des religions 168(1965):29-53.

_____. Faune et Flore sacrées dans les sociétés altaïques. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1966.

_____. "Le chaman." In Sources Orientales. VII. Le Monde du sorcier. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1966. Pp.205-231.

Roux, Jean-Paul. "Recherche des survivance préislamiques dans les textes turcs musulmans, le Bābur-nāme." Journal Asiatique 256(1968):247-261.

_____. "Les êtres intermédiaires chez les peuples altaïques." In Sources Orientales. VIII. Génies, anges et démons. Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1971. Pp.217-256.

_____. "Le lièvre dans la tradition turque." Turcica 3 (1971):40-48.

_____. "Türk göçebe sanatının dini bakımdan anlamı." In Türk Kültürü El-Kitabı. Vol.2, Part Ia. Edited by Emel Esin. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Devlet Kitapları, 1972. Pp. 74-87.

_____. "Dieu dans le Kitāb-i Dede Qōrqut. Revue des études islamiques 43(1975):123-140.

_____. "Quelques objets numineux des Turcs et des Mongols. I. Le bonnet et la ceinture." Turcica 7(1975):50-64.

_____. "Fonctions chamaniques et valeurs du feu chez les peuples altaïques." Revue de l'histoire des religions 189(1976): 67-101.

Roux, Jean-Paul and Massé, Marie-Madeleine. "Quelques objets numineux des Turcs et des Mongols. II. Les plumes." Turcica 8/1(1976): 28-57.

Roux, Jean-Paul. "Recherche des survivances pré-islamiques dans les textes turcs musulmans. II. Le Kitāb-i Dede Qōrqūt." Journal Asiatique 264(1976):35-55.

_____. "Quelques objets numineux des Turcs et des Mongols. III. L'arc et les flèches." Turcica 9/1(1977):7-29.

Schaeder, Hans Heinrich. "Zur Stifterlegende des Bektaschis." Orientalistische Literaturzeitung 31(1928):1038-1057.

Schmidt, Wilhelm P. "Eski Türklerin dini." Turkish translation by Sadettin Buluç. İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi 13-14(1965-66):75-90.

Simon de Saint-Quentin. Histoire des Tartares (Historia Tartarorum). Edited by Jean Richard. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1965.

Soliman, Ahmad el-Said. "Quelques survivances paiennes dans la littérature populaire des Turcs musulmans." Abr Nahrain 13 (1972-73):1-15.

Soykut, Refik H. Ahi Evran. Ankara: San Matbaasi, 1976.

Sümer, Faruk. Oğuzlar (Türkmenler). Tarihleri - Boy Teşkilatı - Destanları. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1967.

Taeschner, Franz. Gülschehrī's Mesnevi auf Achi Evran, den Heiligen von Kirschehir und Patron der türkischen Zünfte. Wiesbaden: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft, Kommissionsverlag Franz Steiner, 1955.

_____. "Kırşehir, ein altes Kulturzentrum aus spat- und nachseldschukischer Zeit." In Necâti Lugâl Armağanı. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.557-592.

Tanyu, Hikmet. Türklerde Taşla İlgili İnançlar. Ankara: Ankara Universitesi İlahiyat Fakultesi Yayınları, 1968.

Tarım, Cevat Hakkı. Kırşehir Tarihi Üzerinde Araştırmalar. Kırşehir: Kırşehir Vilayet Matbaası, 1938.

_____. Tarihte Kırşehri-Gülşehri ve Babailer-Ahiler-Bektaşiler. İstanbul: Yeniçağ Matbaası, 1948.

Taşköpruzâde, Ahmed. Ash-Shaqā'iq an-nuᶜmānīya fī ᶜulamā' ad-dawlat al-ᶜuthmānīya. Beirut: Dār al-Kitāb al-ᶜArabī, 1390/1970.

Togan, A.Z.Velidi. "Oğuzların hıristiyanlığı meselesine ait." Türkiyat Mecmuası 2(1928):61-67.

_____. "Yeseviliğe dair bazı yeni malumat." In 60. Doğum Yılı Munasebetiyle Fuad Köprulu Armağanı. Istanbul: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları, 1953. Pp.523-529.

Trimingham, J.Spencer. The Sufi Orders in Islam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Tryjarski, Edward. "The Dog in the Turkic Area: An Ethnolinguistic Study." Central Asiatic Journal 23(1979):297-319.

Turan, Osman. Oniki Hayvanlı Türk Takvimi. Istanbul: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Yayınları, 1941.

Turan, Osman. "Selçuk Türkiyesi din tarihine dair bir kaynak." In 60. Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Fuad Köprülü Armağanı. İstanbul: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Yayınları, 1953. Pp.531-565.

Ülken, Hilmi Ziya. "Anadolu tarihinde dini ruhiyat müşahedeleri. Medhal. I.Burak Baba. II. Geyikli Baba. III. Hacı Bektaş Veli." Mihrab 1(1923):434-448; 515-530.

_____. "L'amour divin et la danse mystique." Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi 14(1966):13-25.

_____ "Anadolu örf ve adetlerinde eski kültürlerin izleri." Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi 17(1969): 1-28.

Vilâyet-nâme-i Hacı Bektaş Velî. Editions consulted are:
1. Erich Gross. Das Vilâjet-Nâme des Hâğğî Bektasch Ein Türkisches Derwischevangelium. Leipzig: Turkische Bibliothek, 1927.
2. Abdülbakı Gölpınarlı. Vilâyet-nâme: Manâkıb-ı Hacı Bektâş-ı Velî. Istanbul: İnkilap Kitabevi, 1958.

Vilâyet-nâme-i Hacım Sultan.
Rudolf Tschudi. Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hadschim Sultan. Eine türkische Heiligenlegende. Berlin: Türkische Bibliothek, 1914.

Vryonis, Speros. The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1971.

Wittek, Paul. Das Fürstentum Mentesche. Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.-15. Jh. İstanbul: Istanbuler Mitteilungen (herausgegeben von der Abteilung Istanbul des Archaologischen Institutes des Deutschen Reiches), 1934.

_____. "Yazıjıoghlu ʿAlī on the Christian Turks of the Dobruja." Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies 14(1952):639-668.

Yaltkaya, Şerefeddîn. "Eski Turk an'anelerinin bazı dini muesseselere tesirleri." In II. Türk Tarih Kongresi (İstanbul, 20-25 September, 1937). İstanbul: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1943. Pp.690-698.

Yasar, Hüseyin Husameddin. Amasya Tarihi. 4.vols. İstanbul: Aydınlık Basımevi, 1912-1935.

Yazıcı, Tahsin. "Mevlana devrinde semâ'." Şarkiyat Mecmuası 5(1964): 135-159.

Yazıcı, Tahsin. "Kalenderlere dair yeni bir eser." In Necâti Lûgal Armağanı. Ankara; Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1968. Pp.785-797.

Yola, Şenay. "Zur Ornithophanie im Vilâyet-nâme des Hâǧǧî Bektaş." In Islamkundliche Abhandlungen aus dem Institut für Geschichte und Kultur des Nahen Orients an der Universitat München. Hans Joachim Kissling gewidmet von seinen Schulern. Munich: Beitrage zur Kenntnis Südosteuropas und des Nahen Orients, 1974. Pp.178-189.

Yörükan, Yusuf Ziya. "Bir fetva münasebetiyle. Fetva müessesesi, Ebussuud Efendi ve Sarı Saltuk." Ankara Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi 1/2-3(1952):137-160.