

ATATÜRK SUPREME COUNCIL FOR CULTURE, LANGUAGE AND HISTORY
PUBLICATIONS OF THE TURKISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
XXX. Serial - No. 3^a

sufism and sufis
in ottoman society

sources-doctrine-rituals-turuq-architecture
literature and fine arts-modernism

Edited by
Ahmet Yaşar Ocak

ANKARA - 2005

ORIGINS OF ANATOLIAN SUFISM

AHMET T. KARAMUSTAFA

The history of Sufism in Anatolia is truly a vast subject. If Anatolian Sufism is defined broadly to encompass nothing less than the Sufi thinking and behavior of all urban, peasant and nomadic populations of Anatolia, then the temporal and spatial dimensions of this subject are indeed limitless. If, on the other hand, the focus is narrowed considerably to include only those elites who can be characterized as Sufis, in this case too Anatolian Sufism presents an unusually expansive vista when it is borne in mind that thousands of manuscripts that could reveal to us something of the life stories and mental worlds of these social groups still await researchers in manuscript libraries. It is, therefore, crucial to clarify at the outset how we understand the phrase "Anatolian Sufism" for the purposes of this essay.

Anatolian Sufism can mean different things depending on how one approaches this subject. If one adopts an *institutional* perspective, the first thing that comes to mind will be Sufi orders (*tariqats*) and the social groups that form around them. However, since the reach of Sufism was obviously not limited to the institution of the Sufi order, we should extend our gaze to include, at the very least, another institutional formation related to yet distinct from Sufi orders, namely *the cult of saints*. One can argue, therefore, that from the perspective of social institutions the phrase "Anatolian Sufism" picks out Sufi orders and the cult of saints. However, when one approaches this same subject from the perspective of *cultural differentiation*, another distinction, that between Sufism of literate elites and that of the illiterate masses, comes into view. Here, the important point is that the distinction between the Sufi order and the cult of saints does not coincide with the distinction between Sufism of the literate and Sufism of the illiterate. Just as there were always some -albeit relatively few- illiterate members of Sufi orders, the cult of saints has been widespread equally among the literati as among the illiterate masses. To the distinctions already made, one can add several others that become visible when the subject is viewed from the perspective of *social, economic, political differentiation and stratification*, such as those between town and countryside, settled and

nomadic, peasant and artisan, ruler and ruled, male and female. Although they at times overlap with one another, it needs to be stressed that these distinctions never completely coincide. Having thus touched upon the significance of the perspective adopted, I should observe that, avoiding any detailed classification here, I will approach the subject with an *institutional* focus and use the phrase "Anatolian Sufism" to mean Sufi orders and the cult of saints.

It needs to be stated at the outset that it is extremely difficult to tackle such an expansive subject even from the somewhat narrow perspective of the origins of Sufi orders and cults of saints. The scope of the question "What are the origins of Anatolian Sufism?" is broader than it first appears. Clearly, the search for an answer to this question cannot be limited to the few centuries after the battle of Mentzikert or to Anatolia alone. For instance, it is not possible to ignore the fact that the rich Sufi heritage of many Arab lands such as Syria, Egypt and Hedjaz was added to the melting pot of Anatolian Sufism when these territories came under Ottoman suzerainty during the tenth/sixteenth century. Similarly, it needs to be asked how Anatolian Sufi traditions merged with the indigenous cultures of the Balkans when, starting much earlier during the eighth/fourteenth century, the Ottomans expanded their nascent empire to include Southeast Europe. We should, thus, try to answer the question of origins in such a way as to do justice to the constantly shifting composition of Anatolian populations.

I do not intend to undertake such an enormous project here. Instead, turning my gaze to eastern and southern Anatolia only, I will examine the impact of Sufi movements of Central Asian, Iranian and Iraqi origins such as the Yasawī, Malāmatī, Qalandarī and Wafā'ī paths on the genesis and development of Anatolian Sufism. The influence of these movements on Anatolia has been debated for many years, and much ink has been spilled on the subject. In this essay, I will attempt to survey the relevant scholarship and to reevaluate it in the light of some new findings.

At this stage, it behooves us to ask why it is necessary to raise the question of origins in the first place. In the attempt to understand any given cultural phenomenon, what could be the utility of unearthing its roots? Cultural historians and scholars of cultural studies have given widely different answers to this question. If cultural phenomena are likened to fruits and their origins to fruit seeds, then some have contended that the

seed explains the fruit (these can be, somewhat facetiously, named *reductionist origin seekers*) while others have adopted the principle that fruits cannot be reduced to their seeds, and that it is imperative instead to look for the function fruits serve (and these can be called *functionalists*). Making a broad generalization, it can be said that in the second half of the twentieth century functionalism gained ground while the reductionist search for origins, which was prevalent during the first half of the century, lost its lustre. The ascendancy of functionalism has tended to deflate the value of the search after origins so that in certain fields the question of origins has been almost totally abandoned. In the light of this development, it would be justified to ask "Do we really need to dig for the roots of Anatolian Sufism?" There are, however, compelling reasons to give a positive answer this question.

Even those who think that searching for functions is more important than searching for origins accept that it is not possible to grasp the function of a cultural phenomenon without breaking this phenomenon into its component elements and identifying the roots of each element. For instance, in probing a complex process such as Islamization of the Turks, it is imperative to examine pre-Islamic Turkish beliefs and rituals. According to functionalists, this is so not because the beliefs and rituals in question have survived without change among Muslim Turks (this indefensible view is nevertheless very widespread!) but because it is, functionalists think, impossible to understand Turkish Islam without having a clear sense of how Turkish beliefs and practices changed and assumed new meanings and functions during the process of Islamization. In short, even if one gives priority to function over origin, the two remain inseparable.

On the other hand, it should be pointed out that origin seekers have not completely surrendered to functionalists. On the contrary, it may even be said that shorn of their original reductionism, those who search for origins came to occupy the center stage among cultural historians. This is because concern for origins naturally tends to highlight the historical dimension of cultural phenomena, while functionalism, in its insistence on focusing on the dynamic nature of phenomena on the synchronic plane, runs the risk of obscuring their diachronic dimension. Under these circumstances, it is obvious that cultural historians cannot possibly abandon the search after origins.

Current Views on the Central Asian, Iranian and Iraqi Origins of Anatolian Sufism

In studying the history of Sufism in Anatolia, the first name that comes to mind is Mehmet Fuat Köprülü. All researchers who directly tackle this subject or indirectly touch upon it rely on his scholarship. His major works have preserved their status as the main reference on the question of the origins of both Turkish literature and Turkish Sufism ever since they were first published and have even assumed a kind of immunity from criticism. The views that Köprülü developed in his ground-breaking works have survived intact up until the present, having been revised, with the rare exception of one or two scholars such as Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı and Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, only by Köprülü himself. Clearly, we need to survey his views here.

It is well known that Köprülü devoted the first half of his *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar* to Aḥmad Yasawī and its second half to Yūnus Emre, with the ultimate goal of proving beyond doubt the fundamental similarity, indeed the interconnectedness, of the literary output of these two Sufis. Beneath the surface of this extensive study that at first sight appears to be an essay in literary history lie grand theses about Turkish history in general and the Islamization of Turks in particular. In outline, Köprülü is convinced that the history of eastern and western Turks should be studied as a whole, and, more specifically, that in the Islamization process the experiences of those Turks who entered Islam in Khorasan and Transoxania between the fifth/eleventh and seventh/thirteenth centuries proved to be formative for all later Turks, but especially for western Turks. Seen in this light, it appears as though the Islamization of Anatolia followed a course determined in advance in Central Asia, more particularly in Khorasan. Let us examine this course in greater detail.

Starting with the fact that the great majority of Turks were nomads, Köprülü, who never neglected to bring out the significance of social differentiation in his studies, argued that the Islamization process of Turkish tribes and clans had some special characteristics. Chief among these, according to him, was the fact that Turkish popular Islam took shape under the influence of Sufism. He contended that Turks entered Islam mostly through the activities of Sufi *babas/atas* who closely resembled pre-Islamic Turkish shamans. These erstwhile shamans, whose familiarity with Islam was

only superficial, later appeared in front of the nomadic masses in an Islamic garb and managed to Islamize them by proffering a simple, Sufi Islam that was readily comprehensible to them. Naturally, Köprülü conceded that among these *babas* who had not yet abandoned their old shamanic beliefs and practices there were some genuine Sufis who had imbibed from the ever fresh springs of Sufism. Paramount among these were Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre who had pioneered Turkish popular literature by sifting Sufi beliefs through the sieve of the Turkish language. The significance of Aḥmad Yasawī for Turkish history could then be traced back to the formative role he played in the Islamization of Turks. Köprülü was aware that the mystical views of Aḥmad Yasawī and Yūnus Emre were not exactly identical. Nevertheless, he took more interest in what he considered to be the way they expressed Sufi views in “a simple and national style,” that is to say in a language easily comprehensible by the common people.¹

This relation Köprülü established between Yasawī and Yūnus Emre, when coupled by his views on the holistic nature of all Turkish history, must have led him to detect ever closer ties between eastern and western Turks, since in his draft-like essay *Anadolu'da İslâmiyet* that he published four years after *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar* he placed great significance on the special role played by migrant dervishes from Khorasan and Khwarazm in the spread of Islam in Anatolia. The movement that immediately came to mind in this context was, of course, that of the Malāmātīs. Commenting on the phrase *the saints of Khorasan* that occurs frequently in historical sources, Köprülü observed that this expression should be understood “not as dervishes from Khorasan but as Sufis of Malāmātī disposition” and added that even though all kinds of Sufis migrated to Anatolia since the earliest days of the Seldjuqs, most noteworthy among these were the Qalandarīs and the Ḥaydarīs who had their origins in the Malāmātī movement. Naturally, he also appended the Yesevī dervishes to this category.²

Here, we need to pay attention to the way Köprülü established a link between the Malāmātī and Qalandarī movements. In his view, the former

¹ Mehmed Fuat Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar* (İstanbul: Matba'a-i 'Âmire, 1918).

² Mehmed Fuat Köprülü, “Anadolu'da İslâmîyet: Türk istilâsından sonra Anadolu târîh-i dînîsine bir nazar ve bu târîhin menba'ları,” *Dârü'l-fünûn Edebiyât Fakültesi Mecmû'ası* 2 (1922-23): 291-309; English translation: *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion (Prolegomena)*, trans. Gary Leiser (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1993).

was an elite Sufi trend widespread in Iran with Abū Sa'īd Abū al-Khayr as its chief representative, while the Qalandarīs and Ḥaydarīs were popular versions of the Malāmatī movement diluted and simplified by Turkoman *babas*. During this process of simplification somehow excessive Shī'ism and Bāṭinism had also crept into the mixture, thus resulting in Turkish popular Islam, which was to resurface later in Anatolia. To be fair, in his studies of the Islamization of Asia Minor Köprülü did not narrow his focus only on the emergence of 'popular' Islam but paid due attention to the formation of Islam among the literate urbanites as well. Nevertheless, it would not be mistaken to say that Köprülü took a special interest in the relation between Islam and Turkish identity and as a result attributed great significance to popular Islam. This was how he had formed the leading thesis on the origins and development of Sufism in Anatolia.

I do not have the space here to document this thesis that is more complex than it first appears. Köprülü touched on this subject in practically all his later works and did not hesitate to subject his views to major or minor revisions. The most conspicuous of such revisions concerned the image of Aḥmad Yasawī. While he viewed Yasawī first as a Sunni Sufi, later he almost demoted him to the level of a Turkoman *baba*.³ This radical revision should no doubt be understood as the victory of the theoretical framework Köprülü had developed to account for the Islamization of Turks over the data preserved in the relevant sources.

Until recently, later scholars had left Köprülü's theoretical framework intact. Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı, a student of Köprülü who made fresh contributions to scholarship on almost every subject his teacher had researched, departed from Köprülü's views on occasion yet did not initiate a new perspective on the Islamization of Turks and the role of Sufism in this process. We should note here that even though he himself did not emphasize this point, Gölpınarlı was the first to establish the significance of the Wafā'ī chain of initiation, which reaches back to the Iraqī sufi Abū al-Wafā Tādij al-'Ārifin, for Anatolian Sufism.⁴ It is well-known that Irène Mélikoff, who emerged as the premier specialist on the subject outside

³ Köprülü expressed his latest views on Yasawī in the article "Ahmed Yesevī" that he wrote for *İA*.

⁴ The following two of the author's numerous works are particularly important in this context: *Yunus Emre: Hayatı* (Istanbul: İkbāl Kitabevi, 1936) and *Melāmīlik ve Melāmīler* (Istanbul: Devlet Matba'ası, 1931).

Turkey, wholeheartedly accepted Köprülü's views and devoted her studies to their refinement.⁵ The only researcher to introduce noteworthy revisions to these views has been Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, although he has approached the subject from the same angle.

Ocak has both broadened Köprülü's thesis and revised it considerably. Accepting Köprülü's views on Aḥmad Yasawī and the Yesevī order, this energetic and prolific scholar has bolstered Köprülü's explanations concerning the Malāmatī, Qalandarī, and Ḥaydarī movements by producing much fresh evidence. However, he has parted company with Köprülü on the issue of the Shī'ī and Bātīnī tendencies of Turkoman *babas*, arguing that such tendencies were relatively recent developments that surfaced only after the mid-ninth/fifteenth century, particularly as a consequence of Safavī propagandā. Furthermore, when compared to Köprülü, Ocak has paid much more attention to the influence, on the formation of Turkish popular religion, of non-Islamic religions and religious movements such as Buddhism, Manichaeism, Paulicianism, and Bogomilism.⁶

Like Ocak, I too depart from the course charted by Köprülü and his followers. In so doing, I also part company with Ocak on certain issues, though it will be seen that we share the same views on many other occasions. It is time to clear new paths in the attempt to understand the development of Sufism in Anatolia.

The Yasawī Tradition

Let us start by reviewing some new findings on Aḥmad Yasawī, based on a forthcoming book by Devin DeWeese.⁷

⁵ The author's major articles on the topic have been collected in Irène Mélikoff, *Sur les traces du soufisme turc: Recherches sur l'Islam populaire en Anatolie*, Analecta Isisiana (Istanbul: Editions Isis, 1992); Turkish translation: *Uyur İdik Uyardılar: Alevilik-Bektaşılık Araştırmaları*, trans. Turan Alptekin (Istanbul: Cem Yayınevi, 1994).

⁶ Articles of Ocak in which he summarizes the results of his previous research on the topic are collected in his *Türkiye'de Tarihin Saptırılması Sürecinde Türk Sûfiliğine Bakışlar* (Istanbul: İletişim, 1996). In addition, one should read the article "Tarihsel süreç içinde Türklerin İslâm yorumu" that appeared in his later collection of articles titled *Türkler, Türkiye ve İslâm* (Istanbul: İletişim, 1999), 23-69. Ocak examines the impact of extra-Islamic influences in the formation of Turkish popular Islam in his book *Bektaşî Menâkıbnâmelerinde İslam Öncesi İnanç Motifleri* (Istanbul: Enderun Kitabevi, 1983); this work was later republished under the title *Alevî ve Bektaşî İnançlarının İslam Öncesi Temelleri* (Istanbul: İletişim, 2000).

⁷ I owe thanks to Devin DeWeese, who kindly allowed me to consult his unpublished monograph *The Yasavī Sufī Tradition* and to summarize his findings here ahead of the publication of his own work.

Sources

In his *İlk Mutasavvıflar*, which is still the main reference used in most studies on Aḥmad Yasawī, Köprülü largely bases himself on the *Djawāhir al-Abrār min Amwādj al-Bihār* of Aḥmad b. Maḥmūd Ḥazīnī, composed in Anatolia in the tenth/sixteenth century and dedicated to Sulṭān Murād III.⁸ Today, however, we have access to many more sources, especially in Central Asian Sufi literary traditions, than were available to Köprülü. Here are some examples:

* Some sayings of Aḥmad Yasawī, transmitted by one of his disciples named Şūfi Muḥammad Dānīshmend. These are not in Turkish but in Persian.⁹

* Another work attributed to Şūfi Muḥammad Dānīshmend, this time in Chagatay Turkish, under the title *Mir'āt al-Qulūb*.¹⁰

* A short treatise attributed to Ḥusām al-dīn Ḥusayn b. 'Alī Sighnāqī (probably died after 711/1311), a prominent Hanefi jurist of the seventh and eighth/thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.¹¹

* A long work in Chagatay in two different redactions, one of which carries the title *Ḥadiqat al-'Ārifīn*, composed by İshāq Khwādja, the son of the Yasawī master İsmā'il Ata. Written in mid-eighth/fourteenth century, this treatise is the oldest extant Yasawī history.¹²

* In addition to the major Naqshbandī sources of the ninth/fifteenth century (*Anīs al-Ṭālibīn*, *Risāla-i Bahā'īya*, *Nafaḥāt al-Uns*, *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, *Amīr Kulāl Manāqıbi/Maqāmāti*), the *Manāqıbi* of Nūr al-dīn Başır, a

⁸ The only known extant copy of this work is in the Istanbul University Library, TY 3893.

⁹ Yesevī's sayings were collected by Şūfi Muḥammad Dānīshmend and sections from this no longer extant collection were reproduced in the eleventh/seventeenth century by a Yesevī known as 'Alim Sheikh in his work titled *Lamaḥāt min Nafaḥāt al-Quds*. This latter work will be documented below.

¹⁰ Known copies: Uppsala MS Nov. 380, 158b-177a; Tashkent MS 2851, 0b-21a and MS 3004, 1b-17a as well as Kazakstan National Library, no. 1622-386.

¹¹ Tashkent, MS IVANUz 3386, 1b-3a and MS IVANUz 11084, 11b-14a (Persian); also MS VANUz 11759, 1b-3a (Arabic).

¹² Copies of the first redaction: Tashkent MS 252 in 94 folios; MS 2851, 21a-276a; and 3004, 17b-205a. Copies of the second redaction titled *Ḥadiqat al-'Ārifīn*: Kabul, Afghanistan National Archives MS 63/19, 183a-259a; Tashent, MS IVANUz 3637 in 267 folios; 11838 in 139 folios; 11941 in 144 folios (incomplete); and 12387 in 164 folios (also incomplete).

Suhrawardī master of Samarqand. This source is particularly significant since it is independent of both Naqshbandī and Yasawī circles.¹³

* Still from the fifteenth century, a Persian treatise on saintly lineages by the well-known Sūfi Seyyid Muḥammad Nūrbakhsh (d. 869/1464).¹⁴

* In addition to the Naqshbandī source *Rashaḥātu 'Ayn al-Ḥayāt* - one of the major sources used by Köprülü on the Yasawī tradition - 'Alī Shīr Nawā'ī (d. 906/1501) Chagatay translation of *Nafaḥāt* under the title *Nasāyim al-Maḥabba min Shamāyim al-Futuwwa*.¹⁵

* *Ta'lim al-Dhākirin* of Ayyūb b. Maḥmūd Shādmānī written in 947/1541 in defense of the vocal *zīkr* of Yasawīs.¹⁶

* A Persian biographical dictionary of poets under the title *Mudhakkir-i Aḥbāb* completed by Khwādja Ḥasan Nithārī in 974/1566.¹⁷

* A hagiographical work titled *Adhkār al-Azkiyā* by Mīr Seyyid Muḥammad completed in 992/1584.¹⁸

* A Chaghatay work in verse called *Hudjdjat al-Abrār* written in Istanbul by the Yasawī author Ḥazīnī - who also wrote the *Djawāhir al-Abrār* - about his master Seyyid Mansur.¹⁹

* *Manāqib al-Akhyār*, a Persian work that Seyyid Muḥammad Qāsım Rıdwan wrote in 1036/1607 about his father Djāmāl al-dīn Khwādja Dīwāna Seyyid 'Atā'ī Khwārazmī (d. 1016/1607).²⁰

¹³ Copies: Tashkent, MS IVANUz 3061/II, 50b-76b and St. Petersburg, LOIV B4464/II, 155a-205a.

¹⁴ Published under the title "Silsilat al-Awliyā-i Nūrbakhsh-i Quhistānī" by Muḥammad Taqī Dānīshpajūd in *Mélanges offerts à Henry Corbin*, ed. Seyyed Hossein Nasr (Tehran: McGill University Institute of Islamic Studies Tehran Branch, 1977), 1-61 (Persian section).

¹⁵ Ed. Kemal Eraslan (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1979).

¹⁶ St. Petersburg, MS LOIV C1563, 45b-120a.

¹⁷ *Mudhakkir-i Aḥbāb* ("Remembrancer of Friends") of Khwādja Bahā al-Dīn Ḥasan Nithārī Bukhārī, ed. Syed Muḥammad Fazlullah (Hyderabad: Osmania University, Da'iratu'l-Ma'arif Press, 1969).

¹⁸ Tashkent, MS 7582/III, 84b-244b.

¹⁹ Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Pers. A.F.263, 103v-173.

²⁰ Devin DeWeese, "A Neglected Source on Central Asian History: The 17th-Century Yasawī Hagiography *Manāqibu'l-akhyār*," *Essays on Uzbek History, Culture, and Language*, ed. Denis Sinor and Bakhtiyar A. Nazarov (Bloomington: RIFIAS, 1993), 38-50. DeWeese uses London, MS India Office Ethé 644.

* Finally, perhaps the most significant Yasawī hagiography of all: *Lamaḥāt min Nafaḥāt al-Quds* in Persian written in 1035/1626 by the renowned Yasawī master Muḥammad al-‘Ālim al-Siddiqī al-‘Alawī, who was better known in Central Asia as ‘Ālim Sheikh ‘Azizān.²¹

Although it is possible to add to these sources others used by DeWeese in his study, I will not extend this list here since my purpose in producing it is only to demonstrate that it is necessary to revisit Köprülü’s views in the light of the information contained in these new sources. Now, let us review the conclusions DeWeese reaches on the basis of his close examination of these previously unknown or under-utilized sources.

The Life and Personality of Aḥmad Yasawī

Hitherto it has generally been thought that Yasawī was born in Sayram/Isfīdjāb, spent the majority of his life in Yesi, and died in this latter town in the year 562/1166-67. However, in the light of the new information available to us, it emerges the place of his birth or the date of his death cannot be ascertained, even though it seems clear that he spent his life in the middle-Jaxartes region. Leaving out the fine details, DeWeese asserts with confidence that the year 562/1166-67, which begins to be cited as the year of his death at the earliest around the mid-tenth/sixteenth century, is in fact about a quarter century too early and that Yasawī most probably died in the first quarter of the seventh/thirteenth century.²² Closely related to this point is another one that emerges on the basis of an entirely separate body of evidence: namely, the tradition that presents Yasawī as the third disciple of the renowned scholar and sufi Yūsuf Hamadānī (d. 535/1140) right before this latter’s fourth disciple ‘Abd al-Khāliq Gudjduwānī, a figure who has a special place in the Naqshbandī spiritual chain, cannot possibly be true. Curiously, we do not have to abandon the report that Yasawī had a mentor named Abū Ya‘qūb Yūsuf Hamadānī in order to reach this conclusion, since there is strong evidence indicating that Yasawī’s mentor

²¹ This work exists in at least thirteen copies and was also lithographed in Tashkent in 1327/1909.

²² As DeWeese himself points out, Abdūlbaki Gölpinarlı had reached this same conclusion before DeWeese, on the grounds that Ḥādji Bektāsh must have definitely had direct contact with Aḥmad Yasawī, see his *Yunus Emre: Hayatı* (Istanbul: İktbal Kitabevi, 1936), 97-98, note 1. Curiously, in some of his later publications Gölpinarlı falls back on the year 532 as Yasawī’s death date.

was in all likelihood not the well-known Shāfi‘ī scholar and sufi Yūsuf Hamadānī, but possibly a certain Yūsuf Sekkāki who was a Hanefī jurist also known as Abū Ya‘qūb, or even yet another scholar with a similar name.²³ Furthermore, it emerges that Yasawī had close relations with the major sufi masters of his time in Central Asia and Khorasan, including the famous Abū al-Nadjīb Suhrawardī (d. 563/1168) and his nephew Shihāb al-dīn Suhrawardī (d.632/1234).

In the light of this new information, DeWeese develops the following likely scenario: having traveled, from his homeland in Turkistan, to Transoxania and Khorasan, perhaps also to Baghdad, Aḥmad Yasawī established ties with a certain Yūsuf Hamadānī (though this was not the famous scholar with the same name who died in 535/1140) as well as with the two Suhrawardīs and even with Nadjm al-dīn Kubrā’ (d. 618/1221) in Baghdad and returned home to build his own lodge. It is important to stress that in this portrait of him drawn by DeWeese Yasawī possesses no characteristics strikingly different than those of the other Sunnī Sufi masters mentioned. Nor is it possible to view vocal *dhikr*, which was the one unchanging feature of the Sufi path Yasawī charted, as a practice that was outside the pale of the respectable Sufism of literate Sunnī circles. Moreover, there is no clear evidence to indicate that Yasawī directed his Sufi preaching especially towards illiterate Turkish speakers or that he composed many Turkish *ḥikmats* for this purpose. It is possible, even probable, that on account of his Turkish ethnicity Yasawī attracted a Turkish following, but there is no indication that he adopted the goal of converting Turks to Islam. Furthermore, the well-known collection *Diwān-i Ḥikmat* was not the work of Yasawī. Nor is it possible to assume that the *ḥikmats* contained in this collection directly reflect the views of Yasawī himself.²⁴

²³ This Sekkāki, who was the author of a work titled *Miftāḥ al-‘Ulūm*, was martyred in the year 626/1228-29 in Almalık by the Mongols, see Carl Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 1:294 and suppl.1:515. It was Wilferd Madelung who first pointed out that the information contained in the sources about the life of Yūsuf Hamadānī was full of contradictions, see his “Yūsuf al-Hamadānī and the Naqshbandiyya,” *QSA*, 5-6 (1987-88): 499-509, and also, though briefly, *Religious Trends in Early Islamic Iran* (Albany: Bibliotheca Persica, 1988), 49-51. Yūsuf Sekkāki, however, was brought into the picture by DeWeese.

²⁴ Kōprülü, who observes in his *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar* that the *Diwān-i ḥikmat* cannot be the work of Aḥmad Yasawī, nevertheless proceeds to draw the literary and Sufi portrait of Yasawī on the basis of the extant *ḥikmats*. According to DeWeese, it was the Soviet Turkologist Borovkov who first demonstrated with detailed arguments that the *Diwān* could not

Although this new information on the life of Aḥmad Yasawī clears the way for some significant revisions about the place of the Yasawī path in Turkish history, this task will have to be postponed until after the publication of DeWeese's study. Here, I will be content with making some observations about Yasawīs and Anatolian history.

Aḥmad Yasawī and Anatolia

The new data proffered above casts doubt on the thesis of Köprülü summarized earlier. It emerges that Aḥmad Yasawī was not a Turkoman *baba* alien to "official" Sunnī Sufism, as Köprülü imagined him to have been when he wrote the article "Aḥmad Yasawī" for the Turkish *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, nor was he a "heterodox" figure, to use a term favored by Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, who follows Köprülü on this issue. Quite the contrary, Köprülü's original views about Yasawī that he had developed in his *İlk Mutasavvıflar* were closer to the truth. Perhaps more significantly, it is now clear that we can no longer accept Köprülü's facile assumption that Yasawī had appointed for himself the mission of spreading Islam among illiterate, uneducated Turks. Köprülü's thesis has some other dimensions that are difficult to endorse. For instance, contrary to his assertions -but quite in keeping with Ocak's views, who is right on the mark on this issue- there is no trace of Shi'ism or Bāṭinism in Yasawī, nor is there any indication that he had adopted any Malāmātī views.²⁵ Before we discuss the Malāmātī movement, however, let us review yet another part of Köprülü's thesis that is of vital significance for our topic, namely the claim that many Yasawī dervishes migrated to Anatolia during the Mongol conquests.

have been the work of Yasawī himself (A. K. Borovkov, "Ocherki po istorii uzbekskogo iazyka (opredelenie iazyka khikmatov Akhmada İasevi," *Sovetskoe vostokovedenie* 5 (1948): 229-250). DeWeese declares his support for Borovkov on this issue. While the *Dīvān* may conceivably contain some *ḥikmats* of Aḥmad Yasawī, it would clearly be a misguided effort to approach the corpus of poems contained in the *Dīvān* as a repository of Aḥmad Yasawī's personal beliefs and practices. On this point, see also Meserret Dirioz, "Dīvān-ı Hikmet'e yeni bir bakış," *Milletlerarası Hoca Ahmet Yesevî Sempozyumu Bildirileri (26-29 Mayıs 1993)*, ed. Abdülkadir Yuvalı, Mustafa Argunşah, and Ali Aktan (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1993), 93-9.

²⁵ It would be mistaken to see the widespread belief in Aḥmad Yasawī's descent from Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafī as an indication of Shi'i orientation on his part. 'Alī and figures like Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafī who were descended from Muḥammad through 'Alī as well as "heroes" such as Abū Muslim who were believed to represent the Prophet's family played a crucial role in the Islamization of the common masses in Iran and Central Asia. Veneration of such figures persisted unabated in both Shi'i and Sunnī communities and formed the nucleus of the *ghulāt* movements.

Is it really true that numerous Yasawî dervishes found their way to Anatolia during the seventh/thirteenth century? Contrary to Köprülü and those who follow his views, I would like to state clearly that with one possible exception (and that is Hādji Bektāsh) I can find no firm evidence that even a small number of Yasawî dervishes came to Anatolia from Central Asia. However, in order to examine this subject closely, it will be necessary to explore the nature of the relationship of Aḥmad Yasawî with Hādji Bektāsh and Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar, who had disciples in Anatolia. Were Hādji Bektāsh and Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar disciples of Yasawî? Was the Ḥaydarī path an offshoot of the Yasawî path?

As is well known, the clearest connection between Aḥmad Yasawî and Anatolia is the person of Hādji Bektāsh. Indeed, the information on Yasawî contained in the *Wilāyatnāma* -hagiographical in nature- is among the earliest data available on him in any source. Parts of this information that are in accordance with the historical record on Yasawî preserved in Central Asian sources and that would thus appear to be more reliable are the following: Aḥmad Yasawî settled in Yesi; there was a belief that he had 99,000 disciples; he had a special relationship with Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar; he was believed to have been descended from Muḥammad b. al-Ḥanafīya; it was thought that he had inherited several signs from 'Alī (green banner, crown, robe, lamp, food mat & prayer rug); he had some enemies; and there was a story about these enemies that involved the killing of an ox.²⁶ These components of the biographical legacy of Yasawî should be interpreted in the light of the following observations:

ī It is quite possible, even probable, that Hādji Bektāsh (d. 669/1270-71), who came to Anatolia in the seventh/thirteenth century, had direct contact with Aḥmad Yasawî, especially since this latter died at around the beginning of the same century and not in 562/1166-67.

Similarly, it is quite possible, even probable, that Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar (d. 617/1220), the master of Ḥaydarī dervishes who spread to many regions of Islamdom starting the early seventh/thirteenth century, had contact with both Hādji Bektāsh and Aḥmad Yasawî.

²⁶ *Vilāyet-Nāme: Manâkıb-ı Hacı Bektâş-ı Velî*, ed. Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı (Istanbul: İnkılâp Kitabevi, 1990 [1958]), 9-16.

It is fair to say, therefore, that the *Wilāyatnāma* preserves information about Yasawī that is corroborated by evidence contained in Central Asian sources. Moreover, both Hādījī Bektāsh and Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar could quite possibly have been disciples of Aḥmad Yasawī. Should we conclude, then, that both were Yasawī dervishes?

In my view, we lack sufficient information to view the relationship between any two of these three figures as a master-disciple bond. Even though the information we possess on the life of Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar is more substantial and reliable than what we know about Yasawī, the earliest sources on Quṭb al-dīn are silent on his spiritual genealogy.²⁷ While he is portrayed as a disciple of Luqmān-i Paranda in a work written in the mid-eighth/fourteenth century, all of the three sources that depict him as a disciple of Yasawī are much later and date from the end of the ninth/fifteenth century. The *Wilāyatnāma* presents Luqmān-i Paranda as a disciple of Aḥmad Yasawī but it is the only work that does so, and data contained in other sources on Luqmān render this claim of the *Wilāyatnāma* baseless.²⁸ Furthermore, nothing in what we know about the life of this extremely ascetic spiritual master suggests that he was following the example of Aḥmad Yasawī. Quite the contrary, his independence is evidenced by the formation of a group of followers around him that outlasted him for several centuries and also by the naming of a town after him (present-day Turbat-i Ḥaydarīya). On the other hand, it is certainly not possible to claim that Quṭb al-dīn was not at all influenced by Yasawī.

As for Hādījī Bektāsh, the only source that could possibly be interpreted as portraying him as a disciple of Yasawī is the *Wilāyatnāma*.²⁹ However, the

²⁷ These sources are discussed in my *God's Unruly Friends: Dervish Groups in the Islamic Later Middle Period, 1200-1550* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1994), 44-46. A Turkish translation of this work by Ruşen Sezer is soon to appear under the title *Tanrının Kural Tanımayan Kulları* among Yapı-Kredi publications.

²⁸ The only Luqmān to have had the appellation "Perende" was Luqmān-i Sarakhsī, the contemporary of the famous sūfī Abū Sa'id-i Abī al-Khayr (d. 440/1049). The most detailed information on him appears in the late sixth/twelfth century work *Asrār al-Tawhīd fī Maqāmāt al-Sheikh Abī Sa'id* written by a descendant of Abū Sa'id named Muḥammad b. Munawwar, see the edition by Muḥammad Riḍā Shafī'i Kadkanī ([Tehran]: Mū'essese-i Intişārāt-i Āgah, 1987), index. Also see Gölpinarlı, *Vilāyet-Nāme*, 100-03.

²⁹ Even though it is noted in 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. 'Abd al-Muḥsin al-Wāsiṭī (d. 744/1343)'s, *Tiryāq al-Muḥibbīn fī Ṭabaqātī Khirqat al-Mashāyikh al-'Ārifīn* ([Cairo]: al-Maṭbū'at al-Bahīyat al-Miṣriya, 1305/1888), 47 that Hādījī Bektāsh was initiated by Aḥmad Yasawī, DeWeese points

relationship between Aḥmad Yasawī and Ḥādji Bektāsh in the *Wilāyetnāma* is complex, and on occasion it is possible to view it as a relationship of competition instead of a relationship of initiation. Nevertheless, it is extremely difficult to imagine, especially in the light of the new information on Aḥmad Yasawī now available to us, that Ḥādji Bektāsh and Aḥmad Yasawī had not come into direct contact with one another, whatever was the true nature of this contact. Without assuming such a contact, it is impossible to explain the fact that Yasawī is extended a degree of praise and reverence in the *Wilāyatnāma* not given to any other figure. Moreover, there is significant overlap between the *Faqrnāma* attributed to Aḥmad Yasawī and the *Maqālāt* attributed to Ḥādji Bektāsh, even though we cannot be certain about the attribution of either work.³⁰ In this context, Ocak claims that Ḥādji Bektāsh was a Ḥaydarī dervish and that the Yasawī material found its way into the *Wilāyatnāma* on account of this Ḥaydarī connection.³¹ In the light of our knowledge of the relation between Aḥmad Yasawī and Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar as summarized above, it is difficult to accept this claim. Also militating against this view is the fact that Aḥmad Yasawī is depicted as a much more significant figure in the *Wilāyatnāma* than is Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar and that nowhere in the *Wilāyatnāma* is it stated explicitly that Ḥādji Bektāsh was a disciple of Quṭb al-dīn. Furthermore, we simply do not have any evidence that this latter was a devoted follower of Aḥmad Yasawī.

Also relevant here is the view that Ḥādji Bektāsh was a disciple of Baba İlyās, whose name is bound up with the Baba'ī uprising. According to this view, Ḥādji Bektāsh was not a Yasawī but a Wafā'ī, or had become a Wafā'ī

out that the only extant manuscript of this work (MS Cambridge Qq 93) does not contain this note and demonstrates, on the basis of other examples, that the printed edition is not reliable.

³⁰ For these texts, see Kemal Eraslan, "Yesevî'nin Fakr-nâmesi," *TDED*, 22 (1974-1976): 45-120 and *Makālāt*, ed. Esat Coşan (Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı, 1990). On the similarity between these two texts, see Abdurrahman Güzel, "Ahmed Yesevî'nin Fakr-name'si ile Hacı Bektaş'ın Makalâtı arasındaki benzerlikler," *Milletlerarası Ahmed Yesevî' Sempozyumu Bildirileri* 26-27 Eylül, 1991 (Ankara: Feryal Matbaası, 1992), 33-43.

³¹ See, for instance, *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Marjinal Süfilik: Kalenderiler (XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1992), 64-65, 92-93. Ocak conveniently summarizes his views on Ḥādji Bektāsh in his "Anadolu heterodoks Türk Süfliğinin temel taşı: Hacı Bektaş-ı Veli el-Horasānî," *Türkiye'de Tarihin Saptırılması Sürecinde Türk Süfliğine Bakışlar* (İstanbul: İletişim, 1996), 148-68.

while he had earlier been a Yasawī or a Ḥaydarī.³² The Wafā'ī initiatory lineage will claim our attention in a while, but let me first point out that the Wafā'ī affiliation of Ḥādji Bektāsh is not at all certain. Perhaps the strongest evidence for such an affiliation is that Aflākī (d.761/1360), the author of *Manāqib al-Ārifin*, once refers to Ḥādji Bektāsh as "the favorite disciple" of Baba Resūl.³³ However, Aflākī, who never again mentions Baba Resūl in his work, was not at all sympathetic towards Turkomans and had a positively inimical attitude toward Ḥādji Bektāsh. There is, therefore, little reason to trust Aflākī on Ḥādji Bektāsh, even if we were to accept the claim that Baba Resūl and Baba İlyās were one and the same person (as maintained by Ocak in his *Babailer İsyası*).³⁴ Significantly, 'Āshiqpashazāda and Alwān Tchelebī, the authors of two other early sources on the subject, do not depict Ḥādji Bektāsh as a disciple of Baba İlyās, even though they themselves were descendants of this latter figure.³⁵

³² For detailed documentation of this view, see Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *La Révolte de Baba Resul, ou La formation de l'hétérodoxie musulmane en Anatolie au XIIIe siècle* (Ankara: Impr. de la Société turque d'histoire, 1989), 90-91.

³³ Shams al-Dīn Aḥmad Aflākī, *Manāqib al-Ārifin* ed. Tahsin Yazıcı (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1976), 2d. ed, 1:381-83 and 497-98; Baba Resūl is mentioned on page 381.

³⁴ Indeed, as Claude Cahen argued before Ocak's study, there are no compelling reasons to think that Baba İlyas and Baba Resūl were one and the same person, see Claude Cahen, *La Turquie Pré-Ottomane*, Varia Turcica (Istanbul and Paris: L'Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes d'Istanbul Éditions d'Amérique et d'Orient, 1988) Turkish translation: *Osmanlılardan önce Anadolu*, trans. Erol Üyepazarcı (Istanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları, 2000). Cahen's first essay on this issue was "Baba İshak, Baba İlyas, Hadjdi Bektash et quelques autres," *Turcica*, 1 (1969):53-64. For a recent reinterpretation of the uprising, see Irène Beldiceanu-Steinherr, "La 'révolte' des Baba'i en 1240, visait-elle vraiment le renversement du pouvoir seldjoukide?" *Turcica*, 30 (1998): 99-118.

³⁵ 'Āshiqpashazāda states simply that Ḥādji Bektāsh came to Anatolia from Khorasan desiring to see Baba İlyās ("hevesine") and does not even record a meeting between the two, let alone mention that the former became a disciple of the latter. Judging by his remarks, one can conclude at most that Ḥādji Bektāsh perhaps really left Khorasan after he heard of Baba İlyās, but since 'Āshiqpashazāde was descended from Baba İlyās, even this conclusion is suspect. See 'Āshiqpashazāda, *Tawārikh-i 'Āl-i 'Utmāndan 'Āshiqpashazāda Tārikhī*, ed. 'Āli Bey (Istanbul: Matba'a-yi 'Āmire, 1914), 204-05. For his part, Alwān Tchelebī mentions Ḥādji Bektāsh by name, not among the disciples of Baba İlyās whom he discusses, but while he is reporting on a certain Sheikh Bālī, who was a disciple of 'Āshık Paşa, the grandson of Baba İlyās and the father of Alwān Tchelebī. His reference to Ḥādji Bektāsh is vague indeed, and there is no mention of any relationship between him and Baba İlyās. See *Menākibu'l-Kudsīyye fi Menāsibi'l-Ūnsiyye (Baba İlyas-ı Horasāni ve sūlalesinin menkabevi tarihi)*, (Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1984), verses 168-70, 1984-2012 (I could not consult the second edition of this work, Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1995). If Ḥādji Bektāsh really were a prominent disciple of Baba İlyās, one would have expected this latter's biographer and great

In the light of all this information, it is not possible to reach the conclusion that Ḥādji Bektāsh was a disciple of Baba İlyās who had, however, mysteriously refrained from participating in the revolt that "his master" had directed. Instead, it is best to view Ḥādji Bektāsh as a sufi who came to Anatolia from Turkistan with a strong Yasawī connection but who, once there, chose to chart an independent course -much like Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar had done in Khorasan- and left an indelible mark in his adopted country.

In summary, it emerges that neither Ḥādji Bektāsh nor Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar can be portrayed as Yasawī dervishes who were committed to propagating the spiritual path of Yasawī. After all, the Yasawī order, just like the Bektāshī order, took shape long after the death of its eponymous figurehead, and it is not possible to talk about a Yasawī order during the seventh/thirteenth, eighth/fourteenth and ninth/fifteenth centuries in the same sense that one can talk about an institutionalized Yasawī presence during the following three centuries. What outlasted Aḥmad Yasawī during the first two or three centuries after his death was his Sufi legacy (vocal *dhikr*, various reports of his *charismata*, perhaps also his teachings that may be reflected in the *Faqrnāma* and some *ḥikmats* in Turkish) as well as his reputation among Turkish speakers as a major Islamic figure who was descended from the Prophet. It is entirely natural for us to assume that Ḥādji Bektāsh and Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar, who developed their Sufi identities in the same circles as Aḥmad Yasawī, were probably influenced by him. Nonetheless, there is no reason for us to draw the Sufi profiles of these two powerful figures in the shape of a Yasawī identity that at the time existed at best in a nebulous form.

Leaving aside Ḥādji Bektāsh, Quṭb al-dīn Ḥaydar and their followers, is it possible to talk of a Yasawī influence on Anatolian Sufism? Had no Yasawī dervishes come to Anatolia through Iran during the thirteenth century? On the basis of the available evidence, the answer to both of these questions has to be negative. Simply put, the claim that great numbers of Yasawī dervishes migrated to Anatolia in the thirteenth century is baseless, and it is high time to dispense with this myth that was originated by Köprülü. It is possible, even probable, that some shaykhs who, like Ḥādji Bektāsh, had direct contact with Aḥmad Yasawī ended up in Anatolia, but this hardly means that the Yasawī

grandson Alwān Tchelebī to mention this fact and also to give considerable attention to Ḥādji Bektāsh in his work.

path was thereby imported to Anatolia or that Sufism in Anatolia developed under the influence of this path.³⁶

Malāmātī and Qalandarī Movements

In summarizing Köprülü's thesis, we have had occasion to describe his views on the Malāmātī movement and the significance he ascribed to it and have also mentioned that recently Ahmet Yaşar Ocak elaborated on these views. This latter claims that the history of Sufism was characterized by the coexistence of two major trends, namely the İraqī trend based on asceticism and the Khorasani trend with divine love and ecstasy at its center, and that Anatolian Sufism developed as a mixture of both of these two trends.³⁷ While it is difficult to accept this twofold developmental scheme for the history of Sufism, there is no doubt that Ocak's approach to the history of Anatolian Sufism is balanced and measured. Since the topic is broad, I will here limit myself to a discussion of Malāmātī and Qalandarī trends.

³⁶ In his "Emirci Sultan ve Zaviyesi: XIII. yüzyılın ilk yarısında Anadolu (Bozok)'da bir Babāi Şeyhi Şeref'ud-Din İsmail b. Muhammed," *TED*, 9 (1978): 129-208, Ocak discusses a figure by the name Emirci Sultan whom he considers a Yasawī, but on closer scrutiny, I can find no indication that this figure was a Yasawī. Two later historical sources that record the arrival of Yasawī dervishes into Anatolia during the seventh/thirteenth century are *Kunh al-Akhhbār* of the tenth/sixteenth century historian Muştafa 'Āli and the *Seyāhatnāma* of Awliyā Tchelebī, the celebrated traveler of the eleventh/seventeenth century. 'Āli thinks Hādji Bektāsh (through Luqmān-i Parranda) and another figure called Amīr-i Tchīn to be disciples of Aḥmad Yasawī and says that these two came to Anatolia during the seventh/thirteenth century; see Ali Aktan, "Kūnhū'l-akhhbār'a göre Hoca Aḥmad Yasawī ve Anadolu'daki halifeleri," *Milletlerarası Hoca Ahmet Yesevī Sempozyumu bildirileri (26-29 Mayıs 1993)* (Kayseri: Erciyes Üniversitesi Basımevi, 1993), 13-22. Awliyā claims descent from Aḥmad Yasawī and lists ten Yasawī dervishes in Anatolia, including Abdal Musa and Geyikli Baba; see Köprülü, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*, 46-48; also Mustafa Ekincikli, "Evliya Çelebi Seyahatnâmesi'nde Yesevîlik," *Milletlerarası Hoca Ahmet Yesevī Sempozyumu bildirileri (26-29 Mayıs 1993)*, 115-18. However, the fact that Awliyā had a special interest in the Yasawī path render his claims suspect. Furthermore, not much information is found in any other sources on most of these dervishes, and what little information there is on them contradicts Awliyā's claim that they were Yasawīs. For instance, his claim that Abdal Musā and Geyikli Baba, whom we know through other sources, both were Yasawī can only hold water only if these two were somehow directly affiliated with Baba İlyās and, moreover, if Baba İlyās were to be seen as a Yasawī dervish. Such a chain of affiliation, however, is most unlikely. In his later publications, Ocak too has tended to deemphasize the significance of the Yasawī path in the formation of Anatolian Sufism, or, more precisely, he shifted his attention to the Qalandarī phenomenon, of which, according to him, the Yasawī path is but one manifestation; see his *Türkiye'de Tarihî Sapırlması Sürecinde Türk Süfiliğine Bakışlar*, 51-98.

³⁷ For a summary of this thesis, see *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler (15-17. yüzyıllar)*, 121-23.

Both Köprülü and Ocak use the term *Malāmātī* as the name of the “Khorasani” trend. The former thinks that the *Malāmātī* phenomenon existed in both “high” and popular forms, and views the *Qalandarīs*, *Ḥaydarīs* and *Yasawīs* as popular *Malāmātīs*. For his part, Ocak treats the terms *Malāmātī* and *Qalandarī* practically as synonyms and operates with the distinction “elite” and “popular” *Qalandarīs*.³⁸ Is it justified to use the terms *Malāmātī* and *Qalandarī* as though they had such broad application?

After Köprülü, a number of highly significant publications have been published on the *Malāmātīs* that allow us to reach some new conclusions.³⁹ It now appears that the *Malāmātī* movement first emerged in Nishapur during the last quarter of the third/ninth century as a reaction to the extremely ascetic *Karrāmī* movement that had originated and spread in the same region. It assumed a distinct profile under the leadership of Abū ‘Uthmān al-Ḥirī (d. 298/910), but before long began to merge with Sufism that was slowly but surely gaining ground in Khorasan though it had entirely separate origins in Iraq. By the end of the fourth/tenth century, *Malāmātīs* had ceased to exist as a separate movement and had become a trend within Sufism. Seen in this light, the *Malāmātīs* clearly cannot be identified with Sufis of Khorasan or be viewed as the Khorasani trend of Sufism characterized by intoxicated love. If we wanted to use the phrase “Sufism of Khorasan,” we can only say that this was a composite phenomenon that emerged as a result of the spread of Sufism, which had originated in Iraq, into Khorasan and its subsequent merger with several different movements that had formed in this region around different understanding of the

³⁸ For a detailed exposition of these views, see the introduction of Ocak’s *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Marjinal Sûfîlik: Kalenderîler (XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)*.

³⁹ See, especially, the following articles of Jacqueline Chabbi: “Remarques sur le développement historique des mouvements ascétiques et mystiques au Khurasan,” *SI*, 46 (1977): 5-72; “Zuhd et soufisme au Khorasan au IVe/Xe siècle,” *La Signification du bas Moyen-Âge dans l’histoire et la culture du monde musulman (Actes du 8me Congrès de l’Union Européenne des Arabisants et Islamisants, [Aix-en-Provence, du 9 au 14 Septembre 1976])* ([Aix-en-Provence]: Édisud, 1978), 53-61; and “Réflexions sur le Soufisme iranien primitif,” *JA*, 266 (1978): 37-55. Also significant are Berndt Radtke, “Theologien und Mystiker in Hurāsān und Transoxanien,” *ZDMG*, 136 (1986): 536-69; Sarah Svirī, “Hakīm Tirmidhi and the *Malāmātī* movement in early sufism,” *Classical Persian Sufism from Its Origins to Rumi*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn (London, New York: Khaniqahi Nimatullahi Publications, 1993), 583-613; Margaret Malamud, “Sufi Organizations and Structures of Authority in Medieval Nishapur,” *IJMES*, 26 (1994): 427-42; and Christopher Melchert, “Sufis and Competing Movements in Nishapur,” *Iran*, 39 (2001): 237-47.

meaning of asceticism and faith, among them the powerful Malāmatis. It would, however, be misleading to call this composite phenomenon Malāmatis, since the dominant element in it was without a doubt Sufism. Moreover, it is equally misleading to maintain that there were two separate trends within Sufism following its spread into greater Iran during the fifth/eleventh and sixth/twelfth centuries once it absorbed the Malāmatis movement during the fourth/tenth: one based on asceticism prevalent in Iraq and the other that foregrounded divine love and ecstasy with its core in Khorasan/Iran. Such a characterization, built on loose geographical and typological distinctions, does not reflect historical reality.

It is clear, therefore, that the views of Köprülü and Ocak on the Malāmatis movement need to be revised. The same applies to their views on the Qalandaris and Haydaris.

As mentioned already, Köprülü considered the Qalandari and Haydari movements as superficial and corrupted versions of "high" Malāmatis philosophy popularized among illiterate Turkoman tribes by *babas* who preserved their erstwhile Shamanism. Ocak's perspective on the Qalandaris, however, is considerably different than Köprülü's. In his view, the Qalandaris had their roots in ancient Indian and Iranian mystical cultures and emerged as a broad mystical movement within Sufism. In this sense, Ocak thinks it possible to call this movement the "Khorasan Malāmatis school" of Sufism. Setting out with this assumption, Ocak has approached the Qalandari phenomenon with a higher degree of sensitivity than Köprülü and on the one hand documented the popularity of the Qalandari approach also among elite circles and on the other stretched the scope of popular Kalenderism to include all other movements that resembled it, the most prominent of these being the Haydaris, the Abdals of Rüm and the Djamis. In spite of these differences between Köprülü and Ocak, however, it may be not so far from the truth to say that what the former called Malāmatis, the latter prefers to call Qalandari. Operating with such a broad definition of the term Qalandari, Ocak published a monograph on the subject, where he, like Köprülü before him, argues that the Qalandari movement played a special role in the Islamization of Turks and of Anatolia. On this subject, he agrees with Irène Mélikoff that the most prominent characteristic of Turkish popular Islam was its syncretism. According to him, this Turkish popular Islam developed as a syncretistic synthesis of pre-Islamic Turkish beliefs with

the Qalandarī movement. In short, Ocak thinks that Islamization for Turkish common masses involved a decisive encounter with Qalandarism.⁴⁰

Having published a separate study on the Qalandars already, I will avoid detailed discussion of the subject here and limit myself to a summary of the findings of this previous study.⁴¹ In my view, Qalandars is the name of a much more narrow social phenomenon. The *qalandar* first appeared as a literary type in Iran during the fifth/eleventh and sixth/twelfth centuries. After the emergence of a group of followers around the spiritual example of the extremely ascetic master Djamāl al-dīn-i Sāwī who lived during the first half of the seventh/thirteenth century, the term *kalender* came to be used primarily in reference to his dervishes. However, the Qalandarī path was but one of several different renunciatory movements that appeared in Islamic Central and South Asia as well as in the Middle East after the sixth/twelfth century, such as the Ḥaydarīs, Djāmīs, Abdāls of Rūm, Madārīs and Djalālīs. Although these groups resembled one another in certain respects, they preserved their separate identities by perpetuating the memory of their eponymous founders for at least several centuries. Therefore, it would not be appropriate to use the name of only one of these groups to refer to all of them collectively, as does Ocak with the term Qalandarī. For this purpose, I use the phrases *new renunciation* and *dervish piety*. Furthermore, I argue that in the attempt to explain new renunciation as a historical phenomenon, it will not do to explain it away as a mere survival under Islamic garb of certain non-Islamic beliefs and practices such as Central Asian shamanism or ancient Indian and Iranian religious traditions.⁴² This is not to deny that originally extra-Islamic beliefs and practices must have entered into the formation of dervish piety. It is only to assert that the search for origins should be accompanied by a *functionalist* approach so that it would be possible to account for the emergence of new renunciation at this specific

⁴⁰ The most detailed and developed documentation of Ocak's views on the Qalandarīs is his monograph *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Marjinal Süfilik: Kalenderiler (XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)*. His thinking on Turkish popular Islam is conveniently displayed in the collection of his articles titled *Türkler, Türkiye ve İslam*.

⁴¹ See *God's Unruly Friends*.

⁴² The view that the new renouncers were but superficially Islamized shamans originated with Köprülü's *Influence du chamanisme turco-mongol sur les ordres mystiques musulmans* (Istanbul: Imp. Zellitch frères, 1929). For new and different views on the roles that shamans played in the Islamization process, see Reuven Amitai-Preis, "Sufis and Shamans: Some Remarks on the Islamization of the Mongols in the Ilkhanate," *JESHO*, 42 (1999): 27-46, especially 38-42.

stage in the history of Sufism. Viewed in this perspective, it becomes clear that everywhere dervish piety emerged at the heels of a crucial development in this history, namely the institutionalization of Sufi life and the mushrooming of *ṭā'ifas* and *tariqats*. It is my contention that new renunciation is best understood as a series of reactions from within Sufism directed against increasing institutionalization and its consequences. While many Sufis came to occupy the center stage in Muslim communities across Islamic societies, others felt such complete social conformity to be in conflict with the central precepts of Sufism as they understood them and moved to position themselves against the emerging *tariqats* by expressing a preference for extreme asceticism or, on occasion, for unbridled ecstasy. These latter were the new renouncers.

Once Qalandarism is thus understood as only one particular manifestation of a larger trend that I am proposing to call new renunciation, it becomes obvious why it would be misguided to think that Qalandarīs played a prominent or even a central role in the Islamization of Anatolia, let alone in the Islamization of Turks. It is, of course, true that this dervish path that developed around the example of Djamāl al-dīn-i Sāwī spread to Anatolia and continued to exist as a separate movement there for a considerably long period of time, just as it did in practically all other regions of Islamdom with the exception of the Maghrib. Furthermore, other dervish paths such as the Ḥaydarī accompanied the Qalandarīs into Anatolia and over time completely new kinds of dervish piety emerged there, like the Abdāls of Rum, that were peculiar only to this new frontier region. Nevertheless, it would be a mistake to interpret the presence of new renouncers in Anatolia as evidence for the primacy of dervish piety in the formation of Anatolian Sufism. It might be best to express the situation prevailing in Anatolia as follows: the Turkicization and Islamization of Anatolia took place concomitantly with the institutionalization of Sufism, and as the new Sufi institutions of *tariqats* and saints' cults began to take root there, movements of new renunciation also followed suit. In other words, dervish piety contributed to the formation of Sufism in Anatolia only at a *secondary* level; at the *primary* level were the Sufi orders and the cults of saints. I will return to this topic at the end of the essay, but first we need to turn our gaze to the south of Anatolia and review the Wafā'ī Sufi lineage whose roots were in Iraq.

The Wafā'ī Lineage

The lifestory of Baba İlyās (d.638/1240), a Sufi master whose name is bound up with one of the most significant events of seventh/thirteenth century Anatolian history, namely the Baba'ī revolt, remains largely obscure. It is well-known that 'Āshiqpashazāda (d. 733/1332), the author of the *Gharīb-nāma* and Alwān Tchelebī (d. after 760/1358-59), who composed the *Manāqib al-Qudsīya*, as well as the famous chronicler of the end of the ninth/fifteenth century 'Āshiqhashazāda all claimed descent from a son of Baba İlyās named Mukhliş Pasha who is known to have played a role in the history of Karaman. It is reported that the spiritual lineage of Baba İlyās, who came to Anatolia from Khorasan, reached through a certain Dede _arkın to the Iraqī Kurdish sheikh Abū al-Wafā Tādj al-'Ārifīn (d. 501/1107).⁴³ Ocak has gathered new information on the Wafā'ī chain, and he rightly argues, on the basis of the high profile of Wafā'ī figures in the history of Anatolian Sufism, that this lineage had played a considerable role in the development of Sufism during the Seldjuq and Beylik periods.⁴⁴ However, it is difficult to accept Ocak's claim that Hādji Bektāsh was also a Wafā'ī and his characterization of the Wafā'ī path as a "heterodox" formation like the Qalandarīs and the Haydarīs. We have noted earlier that there is no compelling reason for us to portray Hādji Bektāsh as a Wafā'ī. Similarly, there is no evidence that would serve to link the Wafā'īs with the Qalandarīs and/or the Haydarīs. The real significance of the Wafā'ī lineage lies elsewhere. It is highly revealing that the Sufi genealogy of a major figure like Baba İlyās, who left an indelible mark on seventh/thirteenth century Anatolia and beyond, is traced back not to Khorasan but to Iraq. Contrary to received wisdom, then, the Sufi roots of all Turkoman *babas* who came to Anatolia from the East did not necessarily reach back to Khorasan even when these *babas* themselves hailed from that province; indeed, some, like

⁴³ The connection between Baba İlyās and Abū al-Wafā is asserted by 'Āshiqpashazāda, see *Tawārikh-i 'Āli 'Uthmāndan 'Āshiqpashazāda Tārikhī*, 1. On the other hand, Alwān Tchelebī, who wrote more than a century earlier than 'Āshiqpashazāda, makes no mention of an affiliation between his ancestor Baba İlyās and Abū al-Wafā and, instead, reports Baba İlyās to be a disciple of Dede Gharqīn, see *Menākibu'l-kudsīyye fi menāsibi'l-ūnsiyye*, text 13-16. Ocak combines these different reports to reach the conclusion that Dede Gharrqīn must have been a disciple of Abū al-Wafā

⁴⁴ The most detailed documentation of Ocak's findings on the Wafā'ī path is to be found in his *La Revolte de Baba Resul*.

Dede Gharqīn, entered the Sufi path in Syria or Iraq.⁴⁵ This is not surprising. It is perfectly natural that two contemporary Sufis like Aḥmad Yasawī and Dede Gharqīn, who lived about two centuries after large numbers of Turkish speakers began to accept Islam in Khorasan, Transoxania and Turkistan, should have entered Sufism under the guidance of masters who were active in the regions they lived. Just as Aḥmad Yasawī, who spent most of his life in Turkistan, seems to have come under the influence of the Suhrawardī path, which was one of the most prominent of the Sufi lineages in Iran, Central and South Asia during the second half of the sixth/twelfth and first half of the seventh/thirteenth century, it is to be expected that Dede Gharqīn, who lived in Southeastern Anatolia during this same time period, should have been initiated into a Sufi lineage that was widespread in this region. Indeed, Dede Gharqīn may have felt the influence of the Rifāʿī path, but he appears to have joined the Wafāʿī lineage that preserved the example of the Kurdish master Abū al-Wafā, who had disciples among Turkomans in Syria and Iraq.⁴⁶ Seen in this light, the Wafāʿī chain is clear evidence that the contribution of Turkish-speaking Sufi masters to the development of Sufism in Anatolia was nurtured not from a single source in Khorasan but from multiple sources.

The Institutional Features of Sufism in Anatolia during the Seventh/Thirteenth and Eight/Fourteenth Centuries

Anatolian Sufism of the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth centuries presents a highly *fluid* and *untidy* panorama when it is viewed from the vantage point of institutionalization. During this period the

⁴⁵ It needs to be repeated here that we do not have any independent evidence Dede Garkın was initiated by Abū al-Wafā. Since the first to mention a Wafāʿī affiliation for Baba İlyās is 'Ashiqpashazāda who lived two centuries after him, the suggestion of a Wafāʿī lineage for Dede Garkın on the basis of this claim has to remain conjectural. Nonetheless, at this stage there is no compelling reason to reject Ocak's claim that Dede Gharqīn was a disciple of Abū al-Wafā.

⁴⁶ Judging by the fact that Abū al-Wafā had Turkish disciples, Ocak, speculates that he may have been a nomadic Turk rather than being a Kurd, see *La Revolte de Baba Resul*, 55. In this regard, he follows Gölpınarlı, see *Yunus Emre: Hayatı*, 58. Since such a speculation is not in keeping with the information found in Abū al-Wafā's sacred biography, it seems best to suspend judgment on this issue until a rigorous study is conducted on Abū al-Wafā. However, Alya Krupp, *Studien zum Menāqybnāme des Abu l-Wafā' Tāğ al-'Arifin*, Beiträge zur Kenntnis Südosteuropas und des Nahen Orients (München: Trofenik, 1976), who does not tackle this issue head on, seems certain about Abū al-Wafā's Kurdish ethnicity.

formation of orders and cults of saints was in its initial phases, and Sufi networks were messy and discontinuous. Let me elaborate.

Historians of Sufism have long been preoccupied with the nature of the bonds that connect Sufis to one another and with the evolution of these bonds over time.⁴⁷ This subject is more complicated than it first appears, and skirting its many facets here, I will focus only on the concept of *silsila*, 'initiatic chain', *silsila* can be viewed as a tool that is used to perpetuate the example of a Sufi master and to chart a path around that example. Even though no independent study has been conducted on when and how this concept originated and evolved, it is clear that the earliest chains do not predate the sixth/twelfth century.⁴⁸ Consequently, the formation of the most prominent chains should not be dated earlier than the seventh/thirteenth century, while in frontier regions like Anatolia where Islamization started only in the late fifth/eleventh and sixth/twelfth centuries, the formative phase of initiatic chains might be better placed mostly to the eighth/fourteenth and ninth/fifteenth, and sometimes even the tenth/sixteenth centuries. For this reason, it is possible to characterize Anatolian Sufism of late Seldjuq and early Ottoman periods as being in a transitional phase in terms of *silsila* formation. During this time, *silsilas* that had already formed outside Anatolia, such as the Rifā'ī, Kāzarūnī, Suhrawardī, Wafā'ī, perhaps Qādirī (and Qalandarī and Ḥaydarī) chains, found their way into the peninsula, and simultaneously, new *silsilas* like the Mawlawī began to emerge. Nevertheless, it is also true that Sufi masters who cannot be so neatly placed into any given *silsila* also made inextricable traces on Anatolian communities that have survived until the present. Among these we can name Ḥādījī Bektāsh; Abdāl Mūsā and his disciple Qayghusuz Abdāl; Şārī Salıq and his disciple Baraq Baba; Tapduq Emre and his disciple Yūnus Emre as well as others whose Sufi mentors we cannot even identify, such as Geyikli Baba; Qumrāl Abdāl; Abdāl Murād, Abdāl Meḥmed, Postinpūsh Baba; Seyyid Hārūn; Sulṭān Shudjā' al-dīn; and Seyyid 'Alī Sulṭān. In my

⁴⁷ See the important article of Fritz Meier, "Hurāsān und das Ende der Klassischen Sūfik," *Atti del Convegno Internazionale sul Tema: La Persia nel Medioevo (Roma, 31 Marzo-5 Aprile 1970)* (Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1971), 545-70; reprinted in *Bausteine: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Islamwissenschaft*, eds. Erika Glassen and Gudrun Schubert, Beirut Texts und Studien (Istanbul Stuttgart: In Kommission bei F. Steiner, 1992), 1:131-156.

⁴⁸ J. Spencer Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 11-16.

view, it is neither possible to identify the *silsilas* of these figures nor even meaningful to undertake such an attempt.⁴⁹ Quite apart from the fact that the limited and patchy nature of the historical record on them does not allow such an exercise, we lack any evidence that the very concept of an initiatic chain played a significant role in the lives of these figures. This is not to suggest that these Sufis did not know who initiated them into the Sufi path or that they did not keep track of their own disciples. It is to deny, however, that the concept of initiatic chain and the phenomenon of *tariqat* can be reduced to a master-disciple relationship that lasted only one or two generations. It is crucial to resist the temptation to search for *tariqats* and *silsilas* in each and every region and era of Islamic history. Instead, one should attempt to reflect historical reality in all its untidiness and complexity. In brief, then, there were in Anatolia of the period under consideration both initiatic chains, themselves of recent origin and still in formative stages, that spread inward into the peninsula from the outside and new, homebred chains as well as many master-disciple affiliations that could perhaps be conceptualized as component parts of potential chains or of chains-in-the-making. All of these continued to evolve until the tenth/sixteenth century and beyond, and while some grew robust, others became emaciated and eventually disappeared. Master-disciple circles too evolved in different directions: while some took root and became local saints' cults, others grew into major new institutions like the Bayrāmī, Malāmī, and Bektashī *tariqats*. Still others were absorbed by old and new *tariqats*, both homeborn as well as foreign, which -the foreign- such as Khalwatīs, Safawīs, Zaynīs and Naqshbandīs continued to enter Anatolia throughout this period.

Thus, the main features of Sufism in Anatolia during the late Seldjuq and early Ottoman period were fluidity and untidiness. In this territory that

⁴⁹ There is, for instance, no real evidence to project a *silsila* that runs from Şārī Salṭuq through Baraq Baba and Tapduq Emre to Yunus Emre, as do Gölpinarlı and, following him, Ocak, even though we can establish master-disciple links between, on the one hand, Şārī Salṭuq and Barak Baba, and, on the other, Tapduq Emre and Yunus Emre. Gölpinarlı and Ocak are led to this "affiliation" between Baraq Baba and Tapduq Emre because of one verse of Yunus Emre that exists in two separate versions (these are: 1. *Yunus'a Tapduq'dan oldı hem Barak'dan Saluk'a*; 2. *Yunus'a Tapduq-u Saluk u Barak'dandır nasip*), see Ocak, *Sarı Saluk: Popüler İslam'ın Balkanlardaki Destanı Öncüsü* (Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 2002), 78. Since Yunus nowhere else mentions Şārī Salṭuq ve Baraq Baba, however, it is difficult to accept the inference that Tapduq Emre belonged to the lineage of Şārī Salṭuq through Baraq Baba.

was rapidly being simultaneously Turkicized and Islamized, Sufi movements of foreign origin mixed with one another, new movements emerged, and the Sufi landscape of the place, itself of very recent provenance, was continuously redrawn. In this new Sufi terrain, just as there were powerful rivers that ran across the peninsula in all directions, there were also large and small lakes and streams as well as springs that watered only very limited areas. Nevertheless, all these waterways and bodies of water were interconnected and the landscape remained fluid and messy.

The implications of this perspective on Anatolian Sufism can be spelled out as follows:

* During the seventh and eighth/thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Sufi institutions in Anatolia were in their formative stages. For this reason, it would be mistaken to retroject later *tariqat* patterns into this early period, even in cases with relatively high degrees of early institutionalization such as the Mawlawī path.

* This same period witnessed the formation of many saint's cults, some of which were later absorbed into *tariqats*. These cults always had the potential of growing into *tariqats*.

* A great number of these cults took shape around independent sheikhs who even today continue to defy all attempts to place them into known initiatic chains and who, moreover, were probably not even members of any large Sufi trends or movements.

* Not only is there no evidence to suggest that many of the Turkoman *babas* who migrated to Anatolia from the east had Yasawī affiliations, but, more to the point, even the very existence of a Yasawī chain in this period is highly suspect. It is quite possible to view Ḥādījī Bektāsh, the only Anatolian Sufi master who undoubtedly had contact with Aḥmad Yasawī, as a youthful contemporary or even a rival of this latter figure rather than as his disciple. Under these circumstances, it is high time to abandon the view of Köprülü that the Yasawī path played a crucial role in the development of Anatolian Sufism and, consequently, in the formation of Turkish popular Islam.

* The Malāmātī phenomenon should be seen not as a broad and long-lasting Sufi trend but as a mode of religiosity. It first emerged in and around Nishapur independently of Sufism but was absorbed into Sufism once this

latter spread into Khorasan from Iraq; after this point, Malāmātī became the name of a kind of Sufi temperament or disposition.

* Similarly, it is in better accord with historical reality to understand Qalandarism as a dervish path charted after the example of Djamāl al-din-i Sāwī instead of portraying it as a powerful and widespread, though curiously indeterminate, mystical trend of long duration whose roots reach back into pre-Islamic eras. This dervish path was only one ring of a widespread chain of reactions that emerged as a response to the increasing institutionalization of Sufism. This series of reactions can be designated as the 'new renunciation'. Some other rings of this chain that were to be found in Anatolia were the Ḥaydarīs, Djāmīs, Bektashīs before their reorganization during the first quarter of the tenth/sixteenth century, and Abdāls of Rum who were very visible especially between the mid-ninth/fifteenth and mid-tenth/sixteenth century.

* Consequently, neither the Malāmātī nor the Qalandarī path can be said to have been a major, much less the primary, factor in the formation of Anatolian Sufism or in that of Turkish popular Islam.

* More broadly, it should be admitted that Köprülü's attempt to examine Islamization in Anatolia within a larger framework drawn earlier in Central Asia or Khorasan has not proven to be effective, though such an approach could certainly have been fruitful as an exercise in comparative history. In order to understand Anatolian history, it is time to turn our gaze to Anatolia itself, without neglecting to pay attention to external influences.

* In the light of the above, the contours of the emergence of Anatolian Sufism and the concomitant formation of Turkish popular Islam can be drawn as follows: Great numbers of Sufis migrated to Anatolia via Iran from the beginning of the sixth/twelfth century to about the mid-ninth/fifteenth century. Among these there were, naturally, many Persian and Arabic speakers, but the number of Turkish speakers must have grown along with the increasing pace of Turkicization. Irrespective of whether they spoke Turkish or some other language, some of these migrant Sufis brought along already-existing or nascent initiatic chains to Anatolia, while others, though clearly initiated into Sufism, did not yet see themselves as imbedded in large initiatic networks and, acting in their own name, formed nuclei of either new initiatic communities or saint's cults of a limited scope. On the other

hand, clearly not all of the Sufis active in Anatolia during such a long period of time were immigrants from elsewhere, and, indeed, over time indigenous Sufis born and initiated in Anatolia must have predominated over the migrants. These latter too, just like their immigrant counterparts, either contributed to the formation of various *silsilas* or were instrumental in the emergence of independent and disparate cults of saints.

* There is no evidence to suggest that, whether immigrant or native born, the Turkish speakers among the Sufis active in Anatolia, especially those who had roots, by birth or by acculturation, in nomadic communities, preferred only certain initiatic chains or deliberately refrained from joining certain others. It would be entirely baseless, for instance, to make a claim of the form "Turkoman *babas* stayed away from the Suhrawardī path but did not hesitate to join the Rifa'is."

* Moreover, since Sufism in Anatolia was only in the initial stages of institutionalization during the period in question, it would be pointless to try to determine the initiatic or orientational affiliation of each and every sheikh and *baba*.

* On the other hand, it is imperative to resist the temptation to think that Turkoman *babas* were too simple-minded to be able to comprehend the subtleties of Sufism or too attached to their ancestral belief traditions to be able to cross over into Islam. Köprülü, who was generally right in his insistence that Sufism lay at the core of Turkish popular Islam, was mistaken in viewing Turkoman *babas* as but superficially Islamized shamans. This is not to deny the significance of pre-Islamic Turkish beliefs and practices in the Islamization of Turks. Continuity between pre-Islamic and Islamic belief and practice among the masses of Turkish speakers, however, does not mean that no recruits could have been made to Sufism from amongst them or that any such recruits could only have come from among the necessarily small numbers of shamanic figures active in such communities. On the contrary, it seems much more reasonable to think that such shamanic figures would have been the group most resistant to Islamization. In any case, it is beyond doubt that, whatever their social origins -urban, peasant, or nomadic, a certain number of Turkish speakers "entered" Sufism, absorbed and digested at least a good portion of contemporary Sufi teachings and practices, and successfully adapted these to their own linguistic and social contexts. Turkoman *babas* should be seen in this light.