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Preface

This is a translation and edition of the ground-breaking, monograph-length article "Anadolu'da İslamiyet: Türk istilasından sonra Anadolu tarih-i dinisine bir nazar ve bu tarihin menbalarî" [Islam in Anatolia: A review of the religious history of Anatolia after the Turkish invasion and the sources for this history] by Mehmed Fuad Köprülü (1890-1966), which appeared in Darülfünün Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuası 2 (1922), 281-311, 385-420, 457-86. Written as a critique of a work by the German Orientalist Franz Babinger (1891-1967), it was the first modern attempt to describe broadly the religious and political context of the evolution of Islam in Anatolia, modern Turkey, from the appearance of the Turks in that region in the late eleventh century until the early expansion of the Ottoman Empire in the fifteenth century. Dealing with Anatolia as an integral part of the Middle East and not as a unique, isolated territory, Köprülü was the first to consider the major religious trends and political developments there as intimately related to those in the Middle East as a whole. In the process, he established a modern approach to research on the history of Islam in Anatolia and presented many of the major sources. Published in "Ottoman" Turkish a few years before the language reform movement and the adoption of the Latin alphabet in Turkey, Köprülü's seminal article has been essentially inaccessible to the scholarly world since its appearance. It is hoped that this English translation will finally make it available to a fairly wide audience.

I have attempted to translate Köprülü's work into colloquial English, but vestiges of his sometimes convoluted and rambling style may remain.

-xi-
His extensive footnotes have been clarified and recast according to modern usage, and I have added notes to reflect recent scholarship on many of the issues that he raised. The author divided his work into seven untitled sections. For the sake of convenience, I have given titles to these sections. Apart from these titles, all significant changes or additions to the text and footnotes are enclosed in braces. A glossary, bibliography, index, and map are also provided. For the transliteration of Turkish, Arabic, and Persian words, I generally followed the system used in the *Cambridge History of Iran*. Certain inconsistencies were inevitable, because many words common to all three languages are pronounced differently. This should not, however, pose any problem for the reader. As for modern Turkish orthography, ö and ü are the same as in German, c = j, ç = ch, ğ is not pronounced, i = schwa(Ə), and ş = sh.

Finally, it is my pleasure to thank several friends whose singular expertise helped make this translation possible. Professor Michel Mazzaoui of the University of Utah read the entire manuscript and saved me from a number of errors. He also kindly translated the Persian passages. Necmettin Hilâv of Istanbul and Esref Özand of Ankara were of critical assistance in unraveling several especially complicated footnotes. I should mention that, as a child, Mr. Özand once saw Sultan Abülhamit II (1876-1909) in Constantinople.

Gary Leiser

Vacaville, California
Translator's Introduction

In 1922, at the age of thirty-one, a precocious and enthusiastic Franz Babinger, who was soon to gain fame for his work on early Ottoman history, published an article in Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft entitled "Der Islam in Kleinasiien: Neue Wege der Islamforschung." Originally delivered as the inaugural lecture at Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität in Berlin on 7 May 1921, this article was the first modern attempt to describe, in broad strokes, the nature of the evolution of Islam in Asia Minor, or Anatolia, a rather different subject from the Islamization of that region. As we shall see, it provoked a remarkable response, the present monograph, from an equally young, precocious, and enthusiastic Fuad Köprülü.

Born in Bavaria in 1891 to a family of high-level civil servants, Babinger acquired a taste for history as a young man and eventually decided to pursue an academic career. He specialized in Indology at the University of Munich, but World War I changed his scholarly interests forever. He was first assigned to the field artillery and then was transferred to the German Military Mission to the Ottoman Empire. Babinger received numerous decorations in the war zone, including a rarely granted Ottoman order of merit, and quickly advanced in rank. For some time, he was a liaison officer with Mustafa Kemal, later Atatürk, and wrote several articles from the Gallipoli Front for the Frankfurter Zeitung. After the war, he joined the Bavarian Freikorps in the fighting around Munich, but left to devote himself to scholarship, above all Turkish studies, as a result of his wartime experience. This required some courage, for at that time Orientalism in Germany and Austria
was generally equated with Semitic studies. His attempt to include Turkish studies in that field was not viewed sympathetically by established scholars. The great German Orientalist C. H. Becker cautioned him about his views, saying that from the standpoint of academic advancement they were a "sheer catastrophe." There was no future in Turkish studies.

Undeterred, Babinger continued his research in Berlin and in 1927 published his monumental Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke (Leipzig). His career as a founding father of modern Ottoman studies had begun. As a list of his publications attests, by the end of his life he had contributed more to this field than anyone since the Austrian Orientalist Joseph von Hammer-Purgstall (1774-1856). In 1934, after the National Socialists came to power in Germany, he emigrated to Romania where he held several university positions. Not until the end of World War II did he return to Germany. In 1948 he was given a newly established chair in the history and culture of the Near East and Turcology at the University of Munich. Babinger had a great interest in the history of the Balkans under Ottoman rule and frequently traveled to that area. In 1967 he was the guest of the University of Tirana in Albania and died while swimming at the beach of Durazzo. 1

Before the appearance of "Der Islam in Kleinasien," Babinger's most significant contributions to the history of Muslim Anatolia had been his work on Hans Dernschwam's sixteenth-century travel report from that region and a major study of the Ottoman jurist and rebel Badr al-Dīn b. Qādī Samāwīnā (d. 1416). Admitting that virtually no modern scholarship had been done on Seljuk or Ottoman Anatolia, he boldly set out to sketch the main developments in the evolution of Islam there from the eleventh century to the present. He first briefly described how the Turks emigrated from Central Asia and established the Seljuk sultanate of Rûm or Anatolia. Then he asked what we knew about the religious beliefs of the Seljuks. Specifically, were they orthodox Muslims, that is, Sunnīs? "Not at all," Babinger answered. The Seljuks professed a heretical sect. They were cAlawīs, and for him cAlawīs were identical with Shi‘īs. Their original homeland in Transoxiana had been subjected to strong cAlawī influence and had never embraced orthodox Islam. Furthermore, the heterodox beliefs of the Seljuks were reinforced as they passed through Iran, where the Muslim population was unquestionably hostile to Sunnism. After citing Niām al-Mulk's Ši‘īgyatnamē to show that the Turks were Iranianized and imbued with Shi‘ī beliefs, and referring to the geographer Yāqūt to reveal that the Sunnīs were contemptuous of the anti-Islamic

Turks, Babinger stated that the many so-called chūr cAlīs (four c Alīs) on the buildings in Konya, the capital of the Seljuks of Anatolia, were clear proof of the Shi‘ī mentality of their builders.

Despite the lack of information on the history of the Seljuks of Anatolia, one thing was certain, asserted Babinger: their entire political, religious, and literary life was under Iranian influence. This could clearly be seen in Ibn Bībī’s history. The religion of the Turks before they adopted Islam in Central Asia was obscure. They had certainly been exposed to Christianity in that region, as evidenced by the presence of Nestorians among them and by their use of biblical names. Later, as a result of the Crusades, there was intermarriage between the Turks and Frankish women. Isabella, the sister of Raymond IV of St. Gilles, Count of Toulouse, for instance, became the wife of Qılıch-Arslan I and thus the mother of the Seljuks of Anatolia. Moreover, it was probable, said Babinger, that Christians in the areas of Anatolia conquered by the Turks did not immediately adopt Islam. Instead, they resisted it for generations, and this contributed to a certain syncretism. The Mongol conquest of Anatolia had little effect on the religion of the Seljuks, for the religious beliefs of the Mongols and Turks were virtually the same. According to Ibn al-Tiqāqā, Hūlegū was an enthusiastic cAlawī, and he was friendly to the Christians. As for the Turkish principalities (or beyliks), that emerged in Anatolia after the dissolution of the Mongol Empire, it had been proven that they were c Alawī.

Around the turn of the thirteenth century, continued Babinger, a new people suddenly appeared in Anatolia out of the darkness of history, the Ottomans. Their origin was a mystery and the conditions under which they adopted Islam were almost as vague. They inherited the religious traditions of the Seljuks and beyliks, and Muslim religious fanatics -- that is, Sūfīs -- streamed into Anatolia and the Ottoman Empire from the East. Spreading everywhere, they shaped the spiritual life of the young Ottoman state. The two most important Sūfī brotherhoods, the Mawlawīyya and Bektāshiyya, both of which had the support of the Ottomans, were defenders of cAlawism. It was by means of such groups that Shi‘īsm was diffused throughout the Ottoman Empire. Tamerlane's invasion of Anatolia was by no means unfavorable to this, for he showed great respect to the Sūfīs. When the Ottomans reasserted their power as orthodox Muslims, the Iranian Sūfīs did their best to undermine and destroy their authority.

At the end of the fifteenth century, declared Babinger, a religious movement from Iran that of the Şafavids, began to threaten the Ottomans
directly. Its leader, the Şüfi shaikh Şaфи 'I-Dîn, who traced his descent from cAlî, acquired great influence even at the Ottoman court at Bursa. Later, Shâh Ismâcil, who founded the Safavid dynasty in Iran, won the hearts of thousands. Little was known of the actual beliefs of the Şafavids, but they must have derived from the traditions of ancient Iran and certain Christian principles. Especially striking was the way the Christians stood with Shâh Ismâcil. Within a short time, Şafavid teachings spread throughout Anatolia. According to a Venetian report, the people in the Southwest belonged without exception to the Şafavid movement. This was evidence of strong and continuous Şafavid propaganda in that region. The uprising of Şaihk Badr al-Dîn b. Qâdî Samâwna occurred in the context of this religious and political turmoil.

Just as Konya was the center of Iranian spiritual and literary life in Anatolia, the Ottoman capitals of Bursa, Edirne, and Constantinople were gathering places of Iranian shaikhs and poets. Indeed, Iranian influence on the Ottomans became overpowering. The common people, however, were more receptive to wandering Turkish minstrels and their own folk traditions from Central Asia. Their understanding of Islam was superficial. Yet this too played into the hands of the Şafavids. The danger from the East was finally recognized by Sultan Bâyezîd II, who, having survived an assassination attempt by a Şîfî dervish, set out to crush the Şîchîs in the empire. Henceforth there was a continuous struggle between the Sunnî Ottomans and Şîchî Şafavids. Prominent among the Şîchî supporters of the Şafavids in Anatolia were the Kızılbash and the enigmatic Tahtajîs. The former included the Turkish Chepnî tribe that was found around Trebizond. The struggle against Şîchism and the Şafavids did not mean, however, that Iranian cultural influence declined at the Ottoman court. In fact, orthodox Iranian scholars, poets, and artisans flocked to Constantinople and Şîfasm remained a potent religious force. The common people were greatly attracted to the Şîfî shaikhs, especially heterodox Şüfi shaikhs, and this proved, claimed Babinger, how little Sunnî Islam was accepted by the masses until recent times.

Babinger believed that it was the popular religion of Anatolia that should be the object of research. Islam was the product of the assimilation of certain original basic concepts with other age-old religious traditions found in the lands conquered by the Arabs. In Anatolia, more than anywhere else in the Muslim world, the religion of MuHammad was subjected to strong local influences. As Ignaz Goldziher had shown, in no other region had the original teachings of Islam been made to conform so well to local beliefs, above all by the widespread practice of the worship of local saints. By this means local traditions were Islamized. The legend of cAlîn particular was the driving force behind saint worship, because it provided the framework for the perpetuation of earlier beliefs in the guise of Islam. This was obvious to any reader of the Perso-Turkish āsytname or menâqîbnâmes, the epic deeds of saints. The cult of cAlî formed a direct link with the Şîfîs, and the striking connection of the dervishes with the Şîchîs was no coincidence. The Şîfîs, or dervishes, helped Buddhist, Manichaean, Christian, and other beliefs enter Anatolian Islam. All of this provided enormous possibilities for historical research. Babinger pointed out, however, that the immediate future did not bode well for such endeavors, for Anatolia was a battlefield -- Turkey was in the midst of its War of Independence against a Greek invasion. Nevertheless, he hoped that German scholarly diligence would eventually shed light on the dark age of medieval Anatolian religious history. There were rich treasures to be revealed.

Two major themes run through Babinger's article: first, that virtually all of the Turks in Anatolia, especially the Seljuks, have been cAlawîs; second, that the culture of Turkish or Muslim Anatolia was overwhelmingly Iranian. Among his other significant points were the notions that folk traditions rather than formal Islam were at the heart of the religious life of the Turkish masses, that Şîfism played a key role in Islamizing these traditions, and that Şîfism was tantamount to Şîchism. Babinger's article was almost immediately translated into Turkish and appeared in Darülfünün Edebiyat Fakültesi Mecmuasi in 1922. But even before that, it came to the attention of Fuad Köprülü.

An almost exact contemporary of Babinger, Köprülü at the age of twenty-eight had published a masterpiece of its time and place on the development of Turkish culture in the Middle East with special reference to Anatolia. This was his famous Türk edebiyatında ilk mutasavvîflar [Early mystics in Turkish literature] (Istanbul, 1918), which described at length Şîfism, Turkish literature, and folk traditions. In 1922 he was professor of the history of Turkish literature at Darülfünün, later Istanbul University. A year later he became dean of the Faculty of Literature at that institution and published a small but incisive work called Türkiye tarihi [The history of Turkey], which embraced the entire Turkish world. This book won the admiration of Mustafa Kemal, who personally wrote to him about it. Ziya Gökâl, the Turkish nationalist ideologist of the Ottoman Empire and exponent of the Turkism movement, in whose circle Köprülü had grown up, was equally effusive in his praise. Clearly, Köprülü was a rising star in the Turkish academic and intellectual world.
Köprülü took Babinger's "Der Islam in Kleinasien" as a challenge. He felt Babinger was quite right in emphasizing the enormous research possibilities in Anatolia, but had no firm grasp of the historical context in which Islam evolved in that region: nor was he fully versed in the primary sources for research on the religious history of Anatolia. In this respect, he saw Babinger as a symbol of Western Orientalism. Köprülü therefore set out to define -- sometimes in polemical, albeit brilliantly polemical, fashion -- the parameters of this subject in the present work. He also believed that many of Babinger's assertions were either erroneous (such as his identification of the Turks with cAlawism) or needed to be qualified (such as his statements concerning Iranian influence on the Turks) and thus wished to provide the needed correctives. It was no coincidence that Köprülü's study was published in the fasicle of DEFM that followed the one in which the translation of Babinger article appeared. This study was meant first to describe the historical background of the evolution of Islam in Anatolia by focusing on religious and political developments in the rest of the Muslim world to see how they affected events in Anatolia and second to describe the actual history of Islam in that region. At the same time, Köprülü set out to discuss the primary sources for such a study -- showing that more was known than Babinger realized. He only completed the first part of this work, which dealt with the historical background. Hence my description of this translation as a "prolegomena."

Although the second part of Köprülü's work remained unfinished, the prolegomena can stand on its own as a critical introduction to the study of Islam in Anatolia. It was, in fact, a major breakthrough, for it attempted to set the stage for research on that subject. As a result of it, Köprülü was regarded in Turkey as the founder of the study of the religious history of the Turks in the entire Middle East. Unfortunately, Köprülü's article was never translated into a Western language nor even transliterated from the original Arabic alphabet to the Latin alphabet, revised, and republished in modern Turkish. Consequently, it has been virtually lost to the scholarly world, including, to some degree, Turkey. Only a handful of Western scholars, such as H. A. R. Gibb, Harold Bowen, Bernard Lewis, and Speros Vryonis, have known of this work and used it. It has never been fully exploited or criticized, while, for obvious reasons, Babinger's article continues to be cited, as in the sixth volume of The Cambridge History of Iran (1986). A translation of Köprülü "Islam in Anatolia" is clearly overdue.

Author's Introduction

Franz Babinger has published a new short study on a very noteworthy subject {"Der Islam in Kleinasien: Neue Wege der Islamforschung"}, in the Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft that serves as a kind of introduction to the article that he published two years ago {1921} in Der Islam on Badr al-Dīn {b. Qāḍī} Samāwnā. One cannot but appreciate Babinger's work, for he has grasped very well the significance of the religious history of Anatolia after the Turkish invasion, which has remained unknown to the scholarly world up to now, and has devoted an important part of his research to this fruitful area of study. I have worked for years on the same obscure and difficult field -- but one that is nevertheless very attractive with respect to its potential results -- so it goes without saying that I have followed with great interest the efforts of my esteemed colleague. In an article entitled "Bemerkungen zur Religionsgeschichte Kleinasiens" that appeared in Mitteilungen zur Osmanischen Geschichte {1 (1921-22)}, published in Vienna, I wrote a criticism of his article on the aforesaid Badr al-Dīn and also described how the religious history of Anatolia should be studied. Consequently, I see no need to repeat here the general remarks that were made in that article. I shall simply be satisfied with considering briefly the points in Babinger's new article that I believe need to be criticized and clarified. Let me add in this respect that I think it would also be useful, for future research, to present, in a concise manner, some of the results that I have obtained up to now from my work on the religious history of Anatolia, but unfortunately have not yet found the time or opportunity to publish in detail. I have reached rather clear and positive results, for example, in my research on many
problems that Babinger rightly believes have not yet been studied scientifically, but I have not yet published them. They are therefore unknown to everyone. By succinctly presenting these results in this short sketch, I shall show those aspects of the subject in question that are more or less clear and those that remain completely obscure. If this saves future researchers from much unnecessary effort, it will be an important step toward shedding light on this subject.

The Ethnology of the Turks Who Went to Anatolia, Their Religious Beliefs, and Contemporary Muslim Doctrinal Currents

The Turkish principalities that were created on the frontier of Byzantium after the Turkish invasion of Anatolia and the decisive victory of Alp Arslan at Malāzgird -- indeed, even the political history of the Seljuks of Anatolia -- have not yet been properly studied. Some valuable texts in this regard have been edited by Th. Houtsma, but there are a number of other important texts that still need to be published. Furthermore, some of the important studies that have been done are quite limited and for the most part deficient and erroneous. The sources for the Seljuks of Anatolia are basically very few because of a great many destructive events, such as the Crusades, wars with Byzantium and with the rulers of Egypt, Syria, Aleppo, and Khwārazm, civil wars, and the invasion of the Mongols and then of Tīmūr. Consequently, a great many written documents on the history of Anatolia, inscriptions, works of art, and intellectual achievements were lost. Nevertheless, the few sources that have survived have not yet been studied. The limitations of these sources, on the one hand, and the elementary nature of the current studies, on the other, have therefore caused European scholars to maintain a number of false ideas about the Seljuks of Anatolia. It is obvious how detrimental this will be to future research. In a field in which even the work on political history is of such an elementary nature, serious research on problems of cultural history, which are doubtless more complex, will of course encounter great difficulties. Moreover, if one takes into consideration, in particular, how little one should trust the old historians in this matter, for they were never impartial -- being under the influence of religious zeal in opposition to currents of religious beliefs that were contrary to Sunni doctrine -- and
saw history as the heroic deeds of rulers, then the road to be followed will clearly be seen as twice as difficult. Furthermore, there is another point, and one that Babinger ignores, {that must be understood} with respect to the religious history {of Anatolia}: namely, it is not possible to study that region as if it were a simple and independent "unit." The regions of Syria, Iraq, Āzarbājān, and Khurāsān must be added to it. In other words, one must study at the same time the religious history of the Oghuz Turkmen {who lived in these areas} in general.

The Oghuz Turkmen, who arrived at the Byzantine frontier after passing through the Ṣyr Darya {Jaxartes} region and wandering about Transoxiana and Iran for a while, and who Turkified Anatolia under the resolute command of the Seljuk rulers and their military commanders {s. amīr}, undoubtedly played the largest role in the Muslim history of Asia Minor. Although no historical study has yet been done on the ethnology of the Anatolian Turks, the documents in our possession clearly show that the present-day Turks of Anatolia came into existence from a mixture of some very different ethnic elements. Not only did the Oghuz, who went to the Byzantine frontier at the time of the Seljuk sultans, encounter on the eastern borders of Anatolia, in Iraq, and in Syria blocks of different kinds of Turks who had gone there centuries before them,  but they also found in Anatolia groups of certain Christian Turks who had been transported there from Rumelia by the Byzantines.  Furthermore, the Qipchaqs and, after the Mongol invasion, the Khwārazmians, Ak-Koyunlu and KaraKoyunlu Turkmen, and then some Mongol-Tatar groups in the Il-Khānīd period went to Anatolia, and, by mixing with the Oghuz conquerors who formed the primary mass of people, had an effect, differing more or less from place to place, on the ethnic formation of the Turks in eastern and western Anatolia.  In addition, the invasion of Tîmūr brought some new ethnic elements from the East to the West; and by siphoning off certain Mongol-Tatar groups from Anatolia and taking them back to the East, it further influenced the ethnology of Anatolia.  Of less importance ethnologically were events like the Šafavīd movement, the transfer of some Kızılbash groups to Rumelia from Anatolia, and the return to the East from the West of some Turkmen tribes that followed Shāh Ismāʿīl, although they had other noteworthy consequences, mainly for later religious history.  In order to complete this brief summary, which mentions only the mixture of various branches of the Turks, I should add that, in this region, which for centuries had been a preferred place of habitation for different races and nations and had an advantageous geographical position, the Turks mixed with a number of local and foreign elements. It would be a very lengthy task to enumerate, one by one, these Aryan and Semitic peoples who were Muslims or belonged to different forms of Christianity. But compared to this, there is a need for even longer ethnographical and historical studies in order to establish and analyze the extent to which these peoples mixed and intermarried with the Turks, and the extent to which religious and other kinds of traditions were transmitted from them to the Turks.  

In order to understand properly the religious life of these ethnic elements, which formed the present-day population of Anatolia, and the majority of which were composed of the conquering Turkmen, it is necessary to know how they came to Anatolia, the nature of the beliefs they brought with them, and what they found when they arrived. It is possible to learn this, albeit approximately, from the documents in our possession. It is certain that Christianity in particular had spread, for a while, among the Oghuz Turkmen long before they entered the milieu of Islamic civilization or went to the regions of Transoxiana and Iran.  Furthermore, we know that different branches of Turks adopted Mandaeanism, Buddhism,  and Manichaeanism at various times.  And when we take into account that the Oghuz were in geographical contact with the Khazars, who had adopted the Judaism of the Qipchaqs, who in turn had a very close ethnic relationship with the Oghuz, it is rather easy to understand the problem of the origin of the influence of the Pentateuch, the religious obligations of which were found among the Seljuks.  However, no matter how auspicious and perfect were these alien belief systems that came from abroad, there is no doubt that the old primitive religion and old traditions of the nomadic Oghuz Turkmen, who gradually adopted Islam as they advanced south from the Ṣyr Darya region, continued to have an effect on them even after they had adopted other religions. Therefore, while doing research on how Islam was received among these Turkmen and on what forms it took, it is necessary for the historian of religion to search for the traces of the old ethnic traditions under the new forms of Islam, to see the Turkmen bāhās {bāhā, or "father," was an honorific title especially used in dervish circles}, for example, who were popular saints, as Islamized versions of the old Turkish kām/ozān {shaman/wandering minstrel}.  It surely seems more correct to search for the influence of old ethnic religious beliefs than for the external and superficial factors in the religious life of the Oghuz masses, who demonstrated their attachment to tradition by giving the {geographical} names in the country that they

[6-13]
had left to the mountains and rivers they encountered on their emigration routes. 18

Thus, after this critical role of the Turkmen in the sultanate of the Great Seljuks, as well as in the state of the Anatolian Seljuks, is understood, 19 it rather diminishes the significance of the problem advanced by Babinger, according to whom religious doctrines {s. madhhāb} dominated the courts of the Anatolian Seljuks and the great cities of Anatolia. Beginning with Toghril Beg, who crushed the {Ismā‘īlī, pro-Fātimid} Shī‘ī revolt led by al-Basāsīrī, the Seljuk rulers adopted a position whereby they acted in unison with the caliphs in Baghdad as a pillar of their Islamic policy. 20 Although they were officially Sunnīs and some of them, like Sanjar, certainly behaved as if they had a serious interest in questions concerning religious doctrine, 21 we could rightly claim that this was not in fact of great significance, for the Shī‘ī currents, which had begun well before the appearance of the Seljuks and thoroughly dominated the Islamic world, so vigorously spread the spirit of Shī‘ism, indeed, even under the name of Sunnism, among the common folk and upper classes that we clearly find it in the religious history of Anatolia as well. 22

As for the Turkmen clans, which constitute the most important object of study in the religious history of Anatolia, they were completely indifferent to the philosophical perspectives of the scholars of kalām {philosophical theology}. They were content with simply adopting the doctrines that conformed to their own ethnic traditions and, as I shall explain below, that were inspired by the Turkmen bābās. Therefore, Babinger's assertion -- based on the works of Russian scholars -- that Transoxiana and Iran were not Sunnī but under strong cAlawī influence 23 and that the Anatolian Seljuks who came from there had unquestionably adopted the Shī‘ī creed cannot be considered to be very accurate {i.e., such creeds meant little to the Turkmen}. 24 Although we possess certain documents that support Babinger's claim, it would be more appropriate, and undoubtedly more acceptable to historical reality, to correct it in the manner that I have described without fear of contradiction. 25 It has become axiomatic to say that, compelled by a great many factors, the Shī‘ī movement's introduction of the spirit of Shī‘ism, even into the most fanatical forms of Sunnism, proved to be a basic element of the history of Islamic doctrine. Consequently, I see no need to give a long and detailed account of this subject here. Let me just add that the cAbbāsid caliph alNāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (575-622/1180-1225), whom the most trustworthy sources describe as a follower of the shī‘a-yi imāmiyya, imitated the arbāb-i futuwwa {leading members of the futuwwa, a semireligious brotherhood characterized by certain chivalrous precepts} who were his contemporaries 26 and maintained very cordial relations with the great Shī‘ī Shihāb al-Dīn al-Suhrawardī. 27 In the study of the history of religion, one must try to understand the true nature of real beliefs, their origin and significance, more than external labels and outward forms. These are always below the surface.
2

The Şûfî Movements in Anatolia in the Seventh/Thirteenth Century

After giving this brief description of the ethnology of the Turkish masses who went to Anatolia, the nature of the beliefs of various origins that prevailed among them, and the doctrinal currents present in Anatolia, I can go on to analyze the manifestations of the Şûfî movement in that region. Because I have previously made this important problem the subject of research, to some degree, in Türk edebiyatında ilk mutasavviflar, I shall not repeat the same things here. I only wish to present, in summary fashion, the results of my recent research, which was not published there, together with some general observations.

It is well known that the Seljuk rulers of Anatolia, like the Seljuks of Iran and other Muslim rulers in the Middle Ages, had great respect and affection for Şûfî shaikhs and, in the new countries that they conquered, they constructed a great many lodges (s. tekke) for them, to which they assigned rich endowments (s. waqf). The construction of the khanqâh-i masûdî\(^\text{28}\) Mescûdî Monastery in Amasya in 545/ 1150-51 was no doubt not an isolated event.\(^\text{28}\) As our information on Anatolian history increases, we shall find a great deal more evidence to support this assertion. In my view, contrary to the opinion of European Orientalists, it is necessary to trace the cultural and intellectual life in the Turkish cities of Anatolia back to periods prior to the reign of cAlâ\' al-Dîn Kai-Qubâd I. The inadequacy of the present studies, however, and, above all, the disappearance of the necessary documents -- for the reasons I cited above -only allow us to do research on the Şûfî trends in Anatolia starting from the seventh/thirteenth century. An important point to be taken into consideration in this matter is that the manifestations of the Şûfî movement
in the great cities, which were basically Turkish but composed of a mixture of various elements like Arabs, Persians, Kurds, and local converts, and which were under the strong influence of Arab and Persian culture, should be distinguished from those among the [nomadic] Turkish groups that were indifferent to foreign cultures and closely bound to ethnic traditions. The explanation that follows will show with greater clarity how justified I am in making this dichotomy.

I have come across a great many major Sufi figures in the history of Anatolia during the seventh/thirteenth century. Starting at the top with the great Mujah 'l-Din Ibn al-cArabi (560-638/1165-1240), who considered God to be absolute being {zāyi bāri-yi vaqīd-ī mutlaq} and who had extremist supporters as well as equally fanatical opponents, I can list Awḥad al-Din Kirmān in Konya; the author of the Lamacāt, Fakhr al-Din al-clārqī, for whom the famous Muṣīn al-Dīn Parvāna, his disciple and devotee, built a monastery in Tokat; Shalik Najm al-Dīn Dāya, the writer of Mirzād al-clbād, in Kayseri and Sivas; Shadr al-Dīn al-Qānawī, who extensively popularized the monistic {unity of being} philosophy of Ibn al-cArabī, in Konya; his disciples Mu'ayyad al-Dīn Jundī, who wrote commentaries on some of the works of Ibn al-cArabī; Sacd al-Dīn Farghānī, who wrote a commentary on Ibn al-Fārid's ode al-Tā'iyya; Āfīf al-Dīn al-Tīlīmsānī from the Maghreb; and especially Jalāl al-Dīn al-Rūmī (604-72/1207-73). Although research has been done on some of these great personalities, who had an important influence on the history of Sufism, it is elementary and inadequate. It can be claimed with complete confidence, however, that all of them, disregarding insignificant differences in their points of view, were defenders of a broad Šāfi philosophy that Ibn al-cArabī tried to spread with rather obscure and dry symbolism. And in this respect, we can consider them to be the successors of the old group of Sīs from Khurāsān, of whom the most successful was Abū Ṣaḡīd Ibn Abī 'l-Khāir. The scope of inspiration of these great individuals was essentially confined to a very limited and refined class. With regard to religious history, the problems of their legendary character among the popular masses, how their system of mystical theology changed, and what strange and simple forms of belief it took among the people are more worthy of study than their actual historical lives and their mystical system with its fundamental beliefs. Here the primary task of the historian of religion is to study the role of the Šāfi brotherhoods {s. ḥarqa}, which usually brought together groups having novel beliefs, and to search for those that especially flourished in Anatolia.

A great many Turkmen bābās, dervishes from Central Asia, Khwārazm, and Khurāsān belonging to the Yasawīyya brotherhood, shaikhs belonging to branches of the Malāmatiyya brotherhood, to whom we refer as the "Sūfis of Khurāsān," and people from Iran, Iraq, and Syria having all kinds of creeds, went with the Turkmen clans to Anatolia, which was the dār al-jihād {abode of war}, at the very beginning of the Seljuk period. It was natural for some of them to settle in the newly established Muslim cities or in the older cities that slowly began to be Islamized. From the point of view of religious history, those who played the most important role among them were not the Persian-acculturated Sūfis who lived under the patronage of the rulers and amīrs at the courts in the great cities that were seduced by Persian culture. Instead, they were the bābās, who were surrounded by an aura of holiness inherited from the old wandering minstrels {s. ozān}, among the Turkmen clans. These bābās controlled their simple, primitive souls. Although the first type of Sūfis, who were aware of all the subtleties of Persian and Arabic mystical literature and who wrote eloquent Persian poetry and Arabic books and commentaries, were able to address the people in the cities, who were racially mixed and very infatuated with Persian culture, the Turkmen bābās, who wore strange clothing, made prophecies, and lived as those obsessed with divine love {in a mystical sense, mecbēbāne} under a form of Islam reminiscent of the old bakhshu/kām terms used respectively by the Altay Turks and Kirghiz for shaman, see TEJM, 2nd rev. ed. (1966), p. 242, n. 88, inspired the Oghuz clans, in a language they could understand, with mystical but simple and popular versions of Islam that conformed to their old ethnic traditions. These nondemic Turkmen clans were the only vigorous element that could carry out a religious or political movement against the multi-factional armies of the Seljuk emperors, who followed a policy of pursuing the form of Sunnism that was the official creed of the state in Anatolia. We therefore constantly find these Turkmen clans at the center of all the religio-political uprisings that occurred in Anatolia from the first instance until the later periods of the Ottoman sultanate.

After the Mongol invasion in particular, the emigration of dervishes to Anatolia from places that had been invaded, or were exposed to the fear of invasion, increased dramatically. We know that a great many dervishes fled from Turkistan and Bukhārā, Khwārazm, Iran, and Iraq in order to take refuge under the protection of the Seljuk sultanate. Because the vast majority of these dervishes who went to Anatolia both before and after the Mongol invasion were members of the Qandarīyya
group or its major branches, like the \textit{Haidariyya}, it is necessary to present first of all the results of my research on their extraordinarily important manifestations in the history of Sufism, which up to now have been completely neglected. The vigorous religious coalescence that took place in Anatolia and western Iran up to the eleventh/seventeenth century and the various groups and \textit{tariqas} that came into existence there beginning in the seventh/thirteenth century are closely bound to the history of the Qalandariyya, the nature and significance of which are not presently understood by the scholarly world. 

The Qalandariyya originated from the Malāmatiya of Khorāsān, which was represented by great Sufis like Ḥamdūn al-Qasṣār and Abū Sa‘īd Ibn Abī ‘l-Khair. After the death of Jamāl al-Dīn al-Sawī (382/463) \textit{according to EI²}, \textit{s.v. "Kalandariyya," p. 473, he died ca. 630/1232-33}, whose memory remained alive for centuries, it developed in Iran, Iraq, Syria, Egypt, India, and Central Asia. Because of the strangeness of its ceremonies and basic principles that were peculiar to itself, and the very obvious indifference of its followers to other religious issues, very grave accusations were made against it by classic Sufis like al-Suhrawardi, the author of the \textit{al-Awārīf al-macārif}. In the old sources, this \textit{tariqa} is referred to as the \textit{tā‘līf-yi abdālān or javālīga}. The early Ottoman historians used the words abdāl, eshik, torlak, shayyād, haḍarī, edhemī, jāmī, and shemsī synonymously to mean Qalandarī. The Qalandariyya, which was manifest in a refined and distinct form of Sufi philosophy among great mystics like Abū Sa‘īd Ibn Abī ‘l-Khair, Shaikh al-Islām Ahmad al-Nāmāqī Jāmī, Shaikh Baḥā’ al-Dīn Zakariyyā Multānī, Fakhr al-Dīn al-clāqī, and Sayyid Ḥusainī, the author of the Qalandarīnāme, took on a completely different form among its members who wandered from city to city in rather large groups with their own special banners and small drums. In fact, it was a fundamental principle of Qalandarism to be completely free of worldly bonds and relations and to give essentially no thought to the future. Wandering Qalandarīs therefore distinguished themselves by divestment from worldly concerns, poverty, asking for alms, and indifference to censure \textit{malāma}. Indeed, in order to become the object of reproach, they chose to make the "four cuttings" \textit{chār ḡarīb}, that is, to shave the hair, beard, and eyebrows, and to be indifferent to religious obligations. Most of them came from the lower classes. If we take into consideration their incapacity for even a few subtle Sufi ideas and experiences, it becomes obvious that they were attracted to a number of concepts that they were not able to assimilate, like the pantheistic beliefs of \textit{dawr-i sayarān} \textit{metempsychosis} and \textit{ḥulūl wa tanāsukh} \textit{transmigration of souls}, and eventually were attracted to antinomianism \textit{iba‘āyiyya}. As for the Haidariyya, this group, which was supposedly associated with Shaikh Qutb al-Dīn Ḥaidar, who was famous in Yasawī and Bektāshī tradition, it can be regarded in every respect as a very important branch of Qalandarism. Beginning in the fifth/eleventh century, the influence of the Qalandarī \textit{tariqa}, which, in the full sense, had extremist Ṣī‘ism tendencies, was so strong throughout the Islamic world and had such great influence on the large Turkmen masses, especially in the regions of Aleppo and Syria, where extremist Shī‘ī or, more correctly, bātīnī \textit{or Isma‘īlī beliefs were very dominant, that we would certainly have to consider a \textit{tariqa} that developed in the same regions, like the Harfiriyya for example -- later regarded as a branch of the Rifā‘īyya \textit{in view of the well-known personality of its famous founder Shaikh c Alī b. Abī ‘l-Ḥasan al-Ḥarīrī (548-645/1153-1247)}, to be a branch of the Qalandariyya. As I shall show below with abundant evidence, the close ties and similarities between Shī‘ism and the principles of the \textit{futūwwa}, between the latter and Rifā‘īsm, and also between Shī‘ism and the Qalandariyya and Haidariyya, and between the latter two and Yasawīsm and Bektāshīsm are not coincidences but are based on a number of factors that I shall very clearly establish and explain historically. Furthermore, the rapid spread among the Turkmen masses of a number of such creeds that were contrary to Sunnī doctrine and even the creation among them of a number of groups having new creeds are important events that also cannot simply be ascribed to chance. But, to date, they have not attracted the attention of simple ordinary philologists who consider \textit{even before doing any research -- every religious and Śūfi movement to be of Iranian origin. The role of the Turks in this matter, however, is very much greater than has generally been believed. As a small example of this, I can mention that although Śūfism had great influence in Syria and al-Jazīra in the sixth/twelfth century, Shaikh Arslan, on whom unfortunately no research has been done, was a "Jacbar" Turkmen \textit{cf. EI², s.v. "Dacbar" (D. Sourdel)} and the ideas that he spread were apparently no different from the principles of Qalandarism. \textit{Under the apparent guise of Śūfism, and in the name of such orders as the Qalandariyya and Haidariyya, the bābās spread extremist Shī‘ī doctrines and bātīnī ideas among the Turkmen clans. The first religiopolitical movement that they initiated in Anatolia was known as the Bābāt rebellion (638/1240). Bābā Ḩishāq, who grew up in the environs of}
Samosata in the district of Kafarsūd, acquired a great many supporters among the Turkmen in various parts of Anatolia, spent a saintly life in retreat in a cave near Amasya, and incited the people against the Seljuk sultan, Ghiyāth al-Dīn {Kai-Khusraw II}. Finally, when he judged that his forces were strong enough to shake the great Seljuk sultanate, which had not yet suffered the blow from the Mongols, he gave the signal for the rebellion to begin by sending word to his disciples in the environs of Kafarsūd and Marcash. Because the large Turkmen masses in these regions knew that their "holy guide," to whom they gave the name Bābā Raṣūl Allāh {Bābā, the Prophet of God}, would definitely announce a holy war {jihād} one day, they were ready from the start. Consequently, they repeatedly defeated the city people and the Seljuk forces under the command of Amīr Muṣaffar al-Dīn b. cAlīshīr, who had set out against them, and took possession of the territory around Malatya, Tokat, and Amasya. As a result of previously conducted propaganda, the other Turkmen who lived in those territories immediately gave them support. The sultan withdrew in fear and confusion to Qubādābd and sent Hājjī Armaghān-Shāh to face them. This commander captured and hanged Bābā Ishāq and some of his disciples, but was later defeated and killed in battle with the Turkmen. Finally, the imperial army, composed of various elements, was very quickly summoned from the eastern borders, and it was able to defeat and rout these fanatical Turkmen tribes who, with their women and children, had fought with great self-sacrifice. It is not correct to search for any great similarity between this very important religio-political movement and certain events like, for example, the Tārābī uprising in Central Asia. There is no doubt at all that Bābā Ishāq, who was one of a great many Qalandarī bābās whom we know were present in Syria, Anatolia, and eastern Iran in the seventh/thirteenth century, pursued a completely political objective under the facade of religion. The fact that Bābā Ishāq invited the Khwārazmian amīrs, who had suffered from the Seljuk sultan's oppressive and destructive policies, to join him shows that he was an expert politician who knew how to take advantage of every opportunity. Furthermore, given their positions on the Seljuk borders at that time, it is highly likely that the Mongol and Ayūbid princes were also involved in his movement. We possess absolutely no documents on what Bābā Ishāq's fundamental belief was, nor on how his supporters, who gladly faced certain death for him with their women and children, interpreted his creed. However, if we think of him as a Turkmen bābā of the extremist cAlawī rite, of being in the Qalandarī mold, and, in my opinion, think of Hājjī Bektāsh Veli as one of his principal successors, we can get a clear and definite idea about the beliefs of both Bābā Ishāq himself and his disciples. I should more correctly state, therefore, as I shall explain below, that the bābā beliefs, which had taken very firm root among the Turkmen in a very extensive part of Anatolia in the second half of the seventh/thirteenth century, because they conformed to their old traditions, continued for centuries after the execution of Bābā Ishāq by being spread and popularized by other Turkmen bābās, above all, Hājjī Bektāsh Veli. In my view, not only were the Turks of the bābās creed in the rebellion of Badr al-Dīn b. Qādī Samāwnā in Dobruja the remnant of the supporters of Bābā Ishāq who went there in 662/1263-64 in the company of Sarī Saltuk -- some of whom returned to Anatolia during the time of Karasbād Pasha in the province of Aydān and the Bābās Turkmen who later emigrated to that province. Furthermore, the present-day Tahtajīs and Chepnis, indeed, all the Anatolian Kızılbaş Turks, were also composed of them. Moreover, I think that I can explain the still very much unknown origins of the state of the Qaramānids in the form of a religiopolitical movement that was similar, and closely related, to this great Turkmen uprising.

In fact, Hayrullah Efendi, who provides information on the Bābās phenomenon and the origins of the Qaramānids in various places in his book -- which is pieced together from different sources that are difficult or impossible to reconcile with each other, and which he made no attempt to criticize -- explains very clearly that the Qaramānids had a very cordial relationship with the Bābās and that Nūrū Şīfī {the apparent father of Qaramān Bey} was one of their followers. When we take into consideration what great influence the Qaramānids exerted for centuries over the Turkmen tribes in Anatolia, and what difficulties the Sunni Ottoman sultans encountered in trying to retain their obedience, as I shall describe to some extent below, then it seems highly likely that the cordial relations between the Qaramānid beys and the Turkmen had a religious connection.
3
Urban Religious Life before the Mongol Invasion

After thus connecting the origin of the religious movements that won favor among the Anatolian Turks -- even though they were contrary to Sunnī doctrines -- to the general intellectual history of the Islamic world, and showing the role that the Turkmen bābās, who represented the old national traditions, played in these movements, we can now turn our attention from the nomadic Ḥūzūs to the cities, which were dominated by Persian culture. Ethnically, the cities were composed of very different local and foreign elements, which mixed and intermingled to various degrees. Ideologically, the cities brought together traditions from many origins. The development of flourishing life in the cities began primarily during the reign of the great ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn ʿAlāʾ al-Dīn (Kai-Qubād I), and the influence of Persian culture was very striking in every aspect of this life. In contrast to a limited number of poets who wrote in Turkish, like ʿAlī Ḥasan, Shayyād Ḥamza, Yūnus Emre, and Gūlshehrī, the great scholars, like Qādī Armağān, poets like Badr al-Dīn Yahyā and Amīr Qāmīcī, and ʿUthmān, like some of those mentioned above, were living testimony to the influence of Arab and especially Persian culture. The ʿṢūfī movement that permeated all the great Muslim cities in the seventh/thirteenth century naturally dominated the cities of Anatolia as well. Beginning with the sultans, all the notables and amīrs had feelings of great respect and affection for the shaikhs. Even the culamāʾ, who strictly adhered to canon law, could not act against the great ʿṢūfīs. In order to comprehend properly the religious situation in the ʿṢūfī cities of the seventh/thirteenth century, we need to review in general, and synthetically, the futuwwa groups that were strongly organized in Anatolia as early
as the sixth/twelfth century and the history of Mawlawism, which became influential in a wide area beginning in the last half of this century.

The futuwwa groups, which appear in all the historical sources and whose members were famous above all under the name of akhīs, did not develop in Anatolia in the Ottoman period as Babinger believes, but in the Seljuk period. And they were connected with the guild organizations, which were prominent in almost every region of the Islamic world and were not, as Ramsey claims, connected with local organizations that resembled them in ancient Anatolia. As Massinon has appreciated and guessed with great insight, the guild groups, which came into existence in the industrial cities of Khurasan, Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Egypt, had a very close relationship with the Ismāʿīlī-bāṭinī propaganda of the Qarmatian missionaries. I have previously asserted that the Anatolian akhīs must be considered to be bāṭinīs. Huart has agreed with and accepted this position. Massignon too has completely adopted this point of view and in one respect has even reinforced it. With regard to the external forms of their religious ceremonies and basic principles, these Anatolian akhīs borrowed much from the Rifāʿīs. In many respects, they were also related to members of such tarīqās as the Mawlawiyas, Bektashiyya, and Khalwatiyya. Because I have prepared a forthcoming work on the akhīs and their important place in the religious and political history of Anatolia {never published}, I shall not go into further details on this subject here. Let me just add that this powerful group, which played a very important political role from the beginning of the seventh/thirteenth century to the ninth/fifteenth century, especially during periods of anarchy, was a major factor in the founding of the Ottoman sultanate and, after the Ottoman central government became strong, simply remained as a kind of guild organization.

The Mawlawī movement, which began in the large cities of Anatolia in the seventh/thirteenth century and continued to expand during the time of the Ottoman and petty states {s. beylik}, was closely tied to the Ṣūfī personality of Mawlānā Jalāl al-Dīn al-Rūmī. As a tarīqa, which was known as the Jalāliyya at the time of Ibn Battūta, it has had a rather profound influence on our general cultural history. It would, therefore, be very useful, with respect to Anatolian history, to shed light on the history of Mawlawism, and the documents in our possession would suffice to do so. Although considerable research has been done up to now on the literary and Ṣūfī personality of Mawlānā, we still lack a proper monograph on the real man. He gathered about him rulers, starting with the amīr Mucīn al-Dīn Parvānā, the Ṣūfīs Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī and Fakhīr al-Dīn al-Clīrāqī, and then a great many jurists, philosophical theologians {mütekkilmler}, and adherents of the futuwwa, but he did not actually found a tarīqa. Nevertheless, thanks to his moral influence, which required one to respect even the invading Mongol amīrs, and his fame, which spread as far as Central Asia, Mawlawīs were opened in various places during the lives of his successors, while the religious ceremonies and principles of the tarīqa itself slowly came into being much later. Mawlawism, which was based on three means {to mystical ecstasy}, namely, music, samāc, and poetry, always found supporters in the cities of Anatolia, which were infatuated with Persian culture, and in the high courts. Islamic fine arts were always held in high regard in Mawlawī lodges {tekke}. Mawlawī shaikhs tried to maintain the current social and political system, worked for the men of power in the central government, and always remained far from religious-political rebellions. The spread of Mawlawīs in every direction in the Ottoman period, beginning with Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Āzarbājān and reaching as far as Pécev {Pécs in Hungary}, resulted from the fact that, with few exceptions, Mawlawism was never persecuted by the government, and its adherents were politically reliable. The Mawlawīs, starting with Jalāl al-Dīn al-Rūmī, regarded the Turkmen bābās in a bad light and saw them as rivals. After the Mongol invasion, they did not take a position against their new rulers, and for a while even preferred the government of the Mongols to that of the Qarmānīs. As for Ṣūfī beliefs, it is necessary to consider Jalāl al-Dīn al-Rūmī to be one of the followers of Muḥyī l-Dīn Ibn al-cArabī. Massignon has described quite well the basic nature of the principle of pantheism {as espoused by Ibn al-cArabī}. It was concealed in obscure and abstruse symbols but did not differ at all from the Qarmatian creed propagated by the Turkmen bābās. However, because Mawlawism skillfully incorporated, albeit outwardly, the basic principles of Islam, thanks to the continuous efforts of its supporters, it was rather safe from the persecution of the madrasa class. It is by no means correct to search for an identity between the patron saints on whom the tarīqās relied and the beliefs and way of life of the members of a given tarīqa. It is, therefore, meaningless to try to establish an absolute connection in this manner between the genuine views of Mawlānā and later Mawlawism. Let me just stress as a historical fact that Mawlawism developed above all in places where Sunnī beliefs prevailed, and Mawlawī dervishes always remained outwardly respectful of canon law. It should be pointed out that
Babinger's opinion in this matter, according to which he regards Mawlawism to be of the same nature as Bektâşîshism, is wrong. Altogether, the cities of Anatolia were basically under the influence of the aforementioned kinds of spiritual movements and organizations while Anatolia was in a state of profound emotional excitement in expectation of a probable attack by the Mongol armies.

4 The Effect of the Mongol Invasion on Islam in Iran and Anatolia

The Mongols, who settled in Iran after quickly destroying the great and powerful sultanate of the Khwârazm-Shâhs, defeated Sultan Ghiyâth al-Dîn Kai-Khusraw II at Köse Dağ {in 641/1243} and then imposed their sovereignty on Anatolia as well. By taking advantage of the weakness of the Seljuks, the Mongol khâns gave the country to whomever they wished, appointed and dismissed the sultans, and intervened in the most minor affairs. Indeed, after Hülegü, who put an end to the caliphate in Baghdad, Anatolia became the equivalent of a province of the Il-Khâns. Mucîn al-Dîn Parvâna, the friend and patron of Mawlânâ, was not only the vizir of the Seljuk sultan, but, more importantly, was also the representative of, and governor for, Hülegü. With regard to ethnology, Mongol rule in Anatolia had a significant effect. The military forces that the Mongols sent there settled in different areas and were a seditious and duplicitous element in Anatolia for centuries. The Kara Tatars, whom Timûr later took with him {back to the East}, were a remnant of these Mongols. In great measure, they all slowly assimilated with the people of Anatolia. After Mucîn al-Dîn Parvâna was executed by Abaqa Khân (676/1277), the troubles and anarchy, with which Anatolia was afflicted for years, were beyond imagination: the well-ordered administrative machinery of the country collapsed and the cruelty and oppression of the Mongol military leaders, the selfishness of the Seljuk officials who were compelled to rob the people in order to maintain their positions, the Turkmen rebellions, the revolts and punitive actions that frequently occurred in the relations between the Il-Khâns and their Mongol governors, the intrigues of the sultans of Egypt, and the rivalries of the Seljuk princes all left the
unfortunate people in a ruined state. During the time of the Anatolian governors who were appointed after Öljeitü Khudâ-Banda ascended the throne (693/1294), local beyliks slowly came into being and Mongol power gradually declined. When II-Khânid rule came to an end, the petty rulers of Anatolia were left completely free and independent. 80

After establishing these necessary premises that relate to the political and social history of Anatolia, let us see what kind of consequences all of the aforesaid events produced with regard to religious history. The Mongols, who were essentially bound to their own national religion and generally were tolerant of other religions, 81 slowly began to fall under the influence of Islam as they settled in Iran, that is, in the region dominated by Muslim culture. This movement began with the adoption of Islam by Tegûder Ahmed (680-83/1282-84) and took official and general form with Mahmûd Ghâzân Khân (694)-703/1295-1304). 82 According to Rashîd al-Dîn's account, Ghâzân had a magnificent mausoleum {târbe} built for himself west of Tabrîz in early 696 the fall of 1296 and then created a series of charitable institutions around it. Among these institutions, which were completed in 702/1303, were, according to Vâsâf, a tekke and two madrasas reserved for the Shâfi'is and Hanafis. 83 This is especially worthy of note, because it shows that Mahmûd Ghâzân was a devoted Sunni even though he was favorably inclined toward the dervishes. Based on certain charitable foundations that show Ghâzân's affection for the family of the Prophet and the evidence of Qâdî Nur Allâh al-Shûshtarî in his Majâlis al-mu'mînin, Professor Browne says that this ruler was disposed and attached to Shâicism. 84 According to existing documents, however, it is much more likely that he was inclined toward Shâicism. This, in fact, is supported by a passage in Aflâkî that explains that Qutb al-Dîn al-Shârî'î, Humâ'un Tabrîzî, Khwâja Rashîd al-Dîn, and Shaikh Baraq Bâbî were in the company of Ghâzân, and Cârij Chelebi received important favors from both Ghâzân and his wife Iltîmerish Khâtûn [see Huart's translation, 2:313-14; Köprüli's argument is difficult to follow here unless he is implying that these figures were all Shâfic]. 85 It is especially worthy of note that Shaikh Baraq -- on whom no research has yet been done by the scholarly world -- was among these well-known personalities in the presence of Ghâzân.

Shaikh Baraq Bâbî, according to his own testimony, which contained certain enigmatic Sûfî terminology about which his disciples wrote special commentaries, was a disciple of Sari Saltuk Dede. 86 When we recall Saltuk Dede's relationship to Hâji Bektâsh, 87 then we must also consider Baraq Bâbî to be a bâbâ'î dervish, that is, one of the Turkmen bâbâs whose role we have described above. This Turkmen bâbâ, who denied the next world and affirmed the transmigration of souls, who said that God first united spiritually with Câli and then with Sultan Öljeitü KhudâBanda, and who considered everything forbidden by canon law to be permissible, outwardly reminds us of the Turkish shamans in the Altay. 88 During the reigns of Ghâzân and Öljeitü, he occupied an important position at the court of the Mongols of Iran and, according to Aflâkî's account, even won some important disciples and went to Damascus. There it was believed that he was associated with the ibâhiyya {was an apostate}, as a consequence of which he was subjected to the hadd {Qur'ânic prescribed} penalty {vedîgi hadd-i U+0015Farciden} and died around the end of 706/early 1307 {on his death, cf. EI2, s.v. "Barak Baba" (B. Lewis)}. 89

In any case, the period of the sultanate of Öljeitü was very favorable to the growth and spread of these kinds of ideas. At the court of this new ruler, who was especially interested in theological problems, there were Hânâfi philosophical theologians from Khurâsân, Shâfic, among whom the vizir Rashîd al-Dîn was the most prominent, and scholars who were attached to Shî'î beliefs. 90 As a result of a violent dispute that occurred between the chief Shâfi'î judge Khwâja Câbd al-Malik and the Hânâfi Şadr al-Jâhan of Bûkhârâ, Öljeitü preferred the Imâmî rite to those of these two men, for each of these two scholars severely criticized the rite of the other. 91 Indeed, the ruler, who had become strongly inclined toward the Imâmîs under the influence of Shaikh Jamâl al-Dîn Ibn al-Mutahhar al-Ḫili, who had infiltrated the court thanks to the power and approval of Sayyid Tâj al-Dîn Āvâjî, who was essentially the chief of the Shî'îs, 92 took advantage of this dispute to embrace Imâmî Shī'îsm]. Consequently, not only did Shî'î circles at the court enjoy the favor and support of Öljeitü, but the phrase Câli wali Allâh [Câli is the friend of God] began to be stamped on the coinage in addition to lâ ilâha illâ 'lîah Muḥammad rasûl Allâh {There is no god but God and Muḥammad is the messenger of God} along with the names of the infallible Imâmîs {descendants of Muḥammad who carried the "Prophetic light"}. 93 The religious policy that this ruler adopted prepared the way for the development of the propaganda of the Ismâ'îlî missionaries, who scattered in all directions after the Mongols destroyed Alâmût and the other Ismâ'îlî fortresses in Iran, and for the principles that were spread by the Turkmen bâbâs. Subsequently, dervishes and bâbâs, who were occupied with spreading beliefs
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Muslim Religious Life in Anatolia in the Eighth/Fourteenth Century and the Rise of the Ottomans

As I have stated to some extent above, the government of Anatolia in the Il-Khânid period was in very great disarray. The Anatolian governorate that was created after Öljeytü ascended the throne more or less put the civil administration in order. After Maḥmūd Ghāzān adopted Islam, and the new regulations that placed Islam in a privileged position over all other religions as the state religion were subsequently instituted and applied during the reigns of Öljeytü and Abū Sacīd, the conditions of the Muslims in Anatolia in particular no doubt vastly improved over what they had been in the past. But despite all these measures, the Il-Khâns were not able to bring the political and military anarchy to any kind of conclusion. The governor, Amīr Irenjin, whom Öljeytü had appointed, was unsuccessful in calming the rebellions of the Turkmen tribes on the marches and those that broke out in various places instigated by usurpers who took advantage of the weakness of the central government. He consequently tried to establish proper government by resorting to strong financial and administrative measures and acts of tyranny. On the other hand, ṬūpU012Bshgānuwiyîn, who for a while had been placed in charge of the government of Anatolia before Amīr Irenjin during the reign of Maḥmūd Ghâzân and was a disciple of Sultan Veled, had administered Anatolia with great forbearance and justice as a sincere Sunnî Muslim and was given the byname "the Beardless Prophet" {kōse peygamber} because of the sparseness of his beard. As for Amīr Irenjin, who was notorious for his tyranny and oppression, a significant legend {manqibā} is found in Aflâkî showing that he had not yet adopted Islam and was a pagan Mongol.

that were contrary to those of Sunnism, rapidly increased throughout all the areas ruled by the Mongols of Iran, and not just in Sultânîyya. It is certain that many of the religious movements that developed in Anatolia and Iran in the eighth/fourteenth century, and had significant political consequences in the ninth/fifteenth century, took root in this period. During the time of Abū Sacīd Bahâdur Khân (717-36) / 1317-35), whom we can regard as the last of the powerful and mighty Mongol khâns of Iran, honor and respect did not fail to be given to the culamā and Şûfîs, although traces remained of the efforts to spread Shâcîism in the reign of Öljeytü. Not only were all references to cAlawîsm removed from the coinage, but conspicuous respect was also shown to the other caliphs {i.e., the first three in addition to cAlî}. The author of the Ṭuhfâ-yi ihtmâcasharîyya, claims, this ruler, who won over all the people of Iran with justice and benevolence and whose Islamic zeal was generally regarded as sincere by historians, was widely perceived as being favorably inclined toward Sunnism. We have fairly clear information on the religious conditions in cjrâq al-c Ajam, Iran, and Azarbâjân during this period, which witnessed the careers of such famous Şûfîs as cAlâ’ alDawâlî Simmânî and cAbd al-Razzâq Kâshî. We learn from the information provided by Ḥamdullâh Mustawfî Qazvînî that the Şâfîcî and Imâmî-Ihtmâcasharîyya madhhabs were quite common in the aforesaid regions, while theidânsî and bâhîni beliefs were confined to a small minority. In the event, during that time, a number of religious movements were secretly being organized in those regions where the Imâmî-Shîcîs had long been rather powerful and where they boldly and freely came into the open following the Mongol invasion – especially in the reign of Öljeytü -after being driven underground for a long time in the face of the Sunnî policy of the Seljuks and Khwârazmians. We shall see the outward manifestations of this in the periods of anarchy that followed the death of Abû Sacîd. But before doing so, let me try to describe the situation in eastern and central Anatolia when it was subject to the Mongols of Iran, and especially the kinds of religious factors from which the Ottoman state, which came into existence and rapidly developed in western Anatolia, benefited.
The only governor who properly established Il-Khānid power in Anatolia -- albeit for a short time -- put the usurpers in their place, and forced even the tribes on the marches to submit to the central government was Demirtash {or Temür-Tash} the son of Amīr Choban, who was the chief amīr {amīr al-umāra} of Sultan Abū Saʿīd. Demirtash, who later revolted against his sovereign, fled to Egypt after a great many adventures, and was executed there in 728/1327 at the request of Abū Saʿīd, was a just, pious, and resolute governor. 106 He acted with great benevolence toward the Sūfīs and even knew how to take advantage of their spiritual influence to calm some rebellions. 104 After Shaikh Ḥasan Kabīr Jalāyiрид, the last Il-Khānid governor of Anatolia, established the Il-Khānid {rather, the short-lived Jalāyiрид post-Il-Khānid} state in Iraq and ʿĀzarbājān, sovereignty over eastern Anatolia passed to a number of small Turkmen beyliks, the most important of which was that of the Qaramānids. It is especially necessary, however, to study the historical development of another of these beyliks, namely, that of the Ottomans, in order to shed light on the political and religious history of Anatolia. 105

Although the problems of the origin of the Ottoman sultanate and the ethnicity of the Ottoman Turks have been the subjects of research by the old and new generations of scholars from Hammer to Marquart and Babinger, they are still not understood and are surrounded by fables. Compared to other works, the most detailed information on these topics is found in the history {Osmanlı tarihi} of Asim and Arif, but it cannot be considered satisfactory because of the inadequacy of extant documents. Furthermore, not only are Byzantine documents insufficient, but the earliest Ottoman chronicles were written rather late and were based primarily on oral traditions. When we add to this the fact that the work of the annalists is highly corrupt, we can appreciate how confused the matter is 106 Nevertheless, it is true that, according to the documents in our possession, the Ottomans belonged not to the Qay but to the Qayi: Qayi, an Oghuz clan that ethnically may have been separate from the Qay, and they were established on the Byzantine frontier by the Seljuk rulers in the seventh/thirteenth century. 107 A great many historians have considered them to be a very important tribe numerically, or a collection of tribes, and have searched for their influence in the ethnic and linguistic history of western Anatolia. 108 In my view, however, this is completely pointless because there were among the other Oghuz who went to Anatolia in the Seljuk period large Turkish groups that were more important than the Qayi. Furthermore, there were in the company of Ertuğrul and Osman various Turkish elements that they had encountered on the migration routes, and there were others who joined them on the marches. 109 In light of this, which is based on positive proof, it is obvious how meaningless it is to regard the Ottoman sultanate as originating from a large tribal migration that possessed special ethnic qualities, and it is clear that no change came about in the ethnic {kavmi} and linguistic features of Anatolia as a result of the formation of the Ottoman state. We can consider this fact to be a significant advance in the present state of knowledge on this subject.

Thanks to a number of legends {manāqīb}, various miracles, and symbolic dreams that fill the chronicles, it is fairly clear that religious factors were of considerable importance in the founding of the Ottoman state. However, in order to be able to show in a positive manner how influential these factors were, by studying each one separately, we must first understand the spiritual conditions on the marches, which were the original milieu in which this sultanate took form. The nomadic Turkmen tribes that lived on the Byzantine frontiers, which were always fraught with difficulties and dangers, lived a harsh army life with their households and herds, as their grandfathers who had first invaded Anatolia had done. Beneath an external veneer of culture borrowed from the Arabs and Persians, they maintained their old national heroic traditions; troubadours played the kopuz {an old Turkish stringed instrument} and Turkmen bābā s were active. This "alp-even period" -- an excellent expression used by the Sūfī poet cĀshq Pasha meaning "way of life devoted to performing epic deeds" -- was characteristic of life on the marches, where orders and threats from the Mongol governors were ignored. 110 These regions were pervaded by religious sentiments and an ethos that encouraged heroic acts. The religious sentiments that generally appeared and developed under various forms of Sīfism did not paralyze society by shutting up the active Anatolian Turkmen in dervish lodges or mosques. As generally seems to be the case in all the epic deeds {manāqīb} of the Sūfīs, the Turkmen bābā s who directed the religious life of the active and warlike Turkmen were dervishes preoccupied with holy war. There was undoubtedly a very prominent and major difference between these fighting Turkish Sūfīs - - who went to war with wooden swords against the unbelievers, crushed thousands of the enemy with a handful of disciples, seized fortresses, and spread Islam in the lands of unbelief with the power of the sword -- and the Arab and Persian Sūfīs, who spent quiet and contemplative lives secluded in lodges. 111 In fact, the symbolic dreams
ascribed to Ertughrul and Osman in our old chronicles, the favors that our first rulers bestowed on, and the lodges they made for, the Turkmen bâbâs like Abdül Kümârî, Abdül Mâsâ, and Geyikli Bâbâ, all of whose military exploits with wooden swords filled the old manâqib works, are all the product of these Şûfi-heroic sentiments on the frontiers. These dervishes, whom cAâšeq Pasha-Zâde calls rûm abdâllarî, and who are generally referred to under the title Khurâtân ârenleri in certain other historical and religious sources, were none other than the successors of the bâbâs. These bâbâs or abdâls, who had a completely different mentality from that of the ignorant village religious teachers {khwâjas or hojas}, to whom the people of Anatolia mistakenly gave the byname fâqî instead of fâqîh {jurist}, who remained faithful to the Turkmen traditions, and who vigorously spread a very simple and spontaneous form of Islam on the frontiers and among the people in the newly conquered countries, scattered to every corner of Anatolia from the very beginning. Above all, they went to the marches, the areas that were the freest from the influence of those who abided by canon law, and settled there. The general view according to which they were believed to have come from Khurâtân -which at that time had in fact assumed the nature of a Turkish country -and were thus of Iranian origin is unquestionably wrong. Our first rulers, who were nothing more than Turkmen chiefs who were too illiterate and simple to understand the subtleties of religious questions, tried, on the one hand, to attract these Turkmen bâbâs and, on the other, acquired the services of the "fâqîs" in the towns and the leading members of the akhî organization and took advantage of their assistance. It is highly probable that Shaikh Edëbalî was a member of the akhîs, and there were a great many akhîs among the commanders in arms of Osman and Orhan. After the Ottoman beyilik had sufficiently expanded and developed, leading to the creation of a more or less well-ordered administration in the reign of Orhan, Hanafi theologians, who had slowly arrived from the major cities of Anatolia and even distant Muslim countries, gradually acquired great importance, and regular madrasas were opened in the towns. In short, as the central government grew in strength, the political significance of the akhîs and Turkmen bâbâs diminished. On the other hand, the Şûffîs who were to reconcile Sunnî beliefs and mystical theories -- even if only in appearance -- began to become dominant. This phenomenon, which was still rather low-key during the reign of Murad I, later appeared full-blown after the magnificent development in court life at the time of Bâyezîd I Yûldûm. As I shall explain below, this was a very natural occurrence.

The order that was the most involved in the establishment of the Ottoman state, and especially in the founding of the janissary corps, which was a strong source of support for that state for centuries, was the Bektashîyya. Here we need to describe -- albeit concisely -- this tariqa, which undoubtedly played one of the most interesting and significant roles in the religious history of Anatolia, and the personality of Hâjjî Bektash Veli. Because I have prepared a separate detailed volume on the obscure history of this subject, which distinguished Orientalists, like Jacob, Browne, and Huart have not been able to clarify in any way despite all their efforts, I shall be satisfied for now to record and describe here the major results of my research {the promised work was never published, but see Köprülî's article "Bektaş", in İA}. As I stated above, Hâjjî Bektash Veli, the most famous of the bâbâtâ'î successors who spread throughout Anatolia in the seventh/thirteenth century, was a Turk from Khurâtân. He was considered the leader of a new tariqa that was virtually no different from the Qalandarî-Haidarî tariqa. The Arabic Maqâlât-i Şîhîyânâ, which he wrote in the tradition of the shaikhs of that period, was translated into Turkish prose by one of his disciples named Sadc al-Dîn. In the eighth/fourteenth century, it was translated from Arabic into Turkish verse by Khaftî-oğlû. On the one hand, the existence of this important work and, on the other, the date of his Manâqîbname, which contains certain historical facts, refute the biased statement of the historian cAâšeq Pasha-Zâde, according to which the aforesaid was too obsessed with divine love {in a mystical sense} to be capable of establishing a tariqa, and consequently also completely change the point of view that I asserted in TEIM to correct Professor Jacob on the founding of Bektâshîsm. In the works of this scholarly bâbâtâ'î shaikh, who connected his tariqa with a chain of great personalities like Qub al-Dîn Haidar, Luqmân Sarakhshî, and Ajmad Yasawî, and whose knowledge of the Islamic sciences was beyond doubt, there were no major characteristics to distinguish them to any significant degree from those of the Şûffûs who preceded him. These works only show that he had a definite inclination toward Twelver Shi'îsm, because he recommended that the Twelve Imâms be acknowledged as well as {the Khûriî principles of} tawalla and tabarra respectively, "solidarity" with the just Imâm and "dissociation" from the unjust Imâm, see EI2, Imâmâ (W. Madelung), p. 1167}.
It should not be overlooked, however, that works like these, which were reserved for beginning devotees, were generally of a zāhīrī, that is, exoteric, nature and never contained bāṭinī (esoteric) instruction, which was reserved for those who had mastered their studies. The Bektāshīs especially call to mind the Qalandaṛi-Ḥaidarı dervishes with regard to their external attire and, like the bābā’īs, must be placed in the same category with them with respect to fundamental beliefs.  Just as it was quite natural for a number of accounts concerning the relations between Ḥājjī Bektāsh Veli and Osman Ghāzī, which are found in the old Bektāshī manāqib works, to be later fabrications, the famous tradition according to which Ḥājjī Bektāsh Veli blessed the creation of the janissaries is also an old myth that is completely incompatible with the historical facts. The clear statement of the historian cĀshīq Pasha-Zāde on this matter, and existing documents, corroborate this very well. Because the Turkmen bābās, or, to use another expression, the rūm abdāllari, who participated in the continuous frontier warfare during the time of Osman and Orhan, were almost all disciples of Ḥājjī Bektāsh Veli, and the memory of him was quite strong when the janissary corps was established, it appeared that he had blessed it. Later, as word of this blessing spread from mouth to mouth, it was finally accepted as a historical fact. In any case, it is quite obvious that Bektāshism and the akhīs had a rather important role in the founding of the janissaries. In fact, Ibn Battūṭa, who wandered through a large part of Anatolia around that time, adequately describes the significance, power, and abstract nature of this futuwwa [i.e., akhī] organization and at the same time provides some very important information on religious conditions in Anatolia. This can be of great use if it is subjected to strict and proper criticism. My purpose in adding this latter reservation is that this credulous Muslim traveler quite naturally could have had absolutely no idea about the bāṭinī nature of Akhism, for example, and one later finds in his work that he makes hasty generalizations and reaches false conclusions, such as “there were no heretics or innovators {erbāb-ī rafz ve bid’at} in Anatolia.” Apart from this, he describes very well the way of life of various Turkmen beys, the contemporary economic and social conditions in the cities of Anatolia, and the traditions of the Turkmen.

In order to complete this brief summary of religious conditions in Anatolia in the eighth/fourteenth century, let me add that the same religious conditions obtained in all the Turkmen principalities, including that of the Ottomans, that Mawlawism and the influence of Mawlānā and Sultan Veled were very strong in the great cities that there were shaikhs who were famous for their poetry, like Gūlshehr, cĀshīq Pasha, and Elvan Chelebi, that the Šūfī movements went to such extremes that the shaikhs themselves were compelled to complain, and that even the culamā and poets could not save themselves from this great Šūfī influence. If we mention that the Khalwatiyya tarāqa entered Anatolia from the East during this century via the influence of certain great Šūfīs and that the Rifāʿīyya was also rather well established and widespread in the same area, then we would complete this concise picture. In short, Anatolia was continuously Turkified ethnically, and Islamized religiously, during the eighth/fourteenth century. On the one hand, under the influence of the Šūfī movements, Shīcī and bāṭinī beliefs continued to spread vigorously among the nomadic Turkmen tribes in particular, as they had in the past, and, on the other, Sunnism was formally adopted in the large cities, and an accord or understanding was reached between the culamā and some of the Šūfīs. Sooner or later a clash was inevitable, however, between the bābā’ī-Bektāshī movement, which prevailed among the nomadic Turkmen, and the central powers, which politically favored and defended Sunnism. Around the end of the eighth/fourteenth century, some important religious movements that had taken place in Iran spread toward the West and merged with the bāṭinī movements that were especially found in Anatolia. They later benefited from the great material and spiritual anarchy caused in that region by the invasion of Tīmūr and were manifested as a politico-religious uprising. This marked the beginning of bloody religious warfare that completely filled the ninth/fifteenth and tenth/sixteenth centuries. In order to investigate properly and study these new factors that came from the East, we must turn our attention to the regions of Iran and Azarbājān in the eighth/fourteenth century.
Muslim Religious Trends in Iraq, Āzarbāijān, and Iran in the Eighth/Fourteenth Century

The time, about half a century, from the death of Abī Saʿīd Bahādur Khān to the founding of the empire of Tīmūr was a very inauspicious and disastrous period of anarchy for Iran, Iraq, and Āzarbāijān. To give even a simple sketch of this period -- with regard to political history -- which was characterized by the internal and external struggles of the Chobanids, Muẓaffarids, Sarbadārids, Karts, and a great many other local dynasties and amīrs would take us rather far from our subject. Therefore, instead of discussing the detailed material in the Muslim sources on the political history of this period, I shall be satisfied with examining only those events that were of significance to religious history. The bātinīs, who, as I previously stated, always pursued a political objective because their fundamental belief was based on the concept and issue of the Imāmate, either infiltrated the central governments and took them over, as occurred in the reign of Oljeitū, or, if they were not able to do this, took advantage of a government's weakness and tried to launch various rebellious movements in favorable areas. Consequently, with the fall of the Il-Khānid Empire, the appearance of certain noteworthy religio-political movements in all these regions was quite natural. One must, of course, search for their roots in the past and then, for the most part, study their influence on later periods.

Although Sunnism received state protection in Il-Khānid territory before and after Oljeitū, the existence of poets who were well known for their Ismāʿīlī propaganda, like Nizār Kūhistānī for instance, and even some unsuccessful Shīʿī movements are definite proof of the activity of Shīʿī and bātinī groups that lived in large numbers -- sometimes weak,
which began in 736/1335 and lasted for about fifty years, was a republic generally characterized by its reverence and respect for dervishes. The Sarbadārids made Sabzvār their capital, captured a great many places in Khurāsān, and killed Toghā-Timūr Khān (754/1353). In addition to the fact that this movement started in Pāshṭīn with the support of a religious group, that is, the dervishes of Shaikh Ḥasan Jūrī, we know that Khwāja Wajī al-Dīn Mscūd, who took the place of his brother cAbd al-Razzāq (738/1338), became a disciple of Shaikh Ḥasan Jūrī at the end of his life. We also know that he and the shaikh fought together against Toghā-Timūr and Ḥasan Kart, that the shaikh was martyred in battle (743/1342-43) against the latter, and, according to historians, that his death was attributed to the treachery of Khwāja Wajī al-Dīn. Furthermore, we know that during the time -- still the Il-Khānids period -- of the ill-natured and bloodthirsty Amīr Shams al-Dīn cAlī Sarbadārī, who became head of the government in 748/1348 and for a while banned wine and hemp {beng} and had 500 prostitutes thrown in a well, Sayyid Qawām al-Dīn, who was the successor of Amīr Sayyid clzz al-Dīn Sūghandī, the chief of the dervishes of Ḥasan JūrīU+12B, retired to Māzandārān -- which was where this bātinī movement originated -- and, as a result of very strong propaganda there and around Sārī, won a great many disciples and finally took control of the area (760/1358-59). In addition, the historians confirm that Shams al-Dīn's successor, Amīr Yahyā Karrābī (753-56/1352-55), showed extraordinary reverence to the culamā and the dervishes of Ḥasan Jūrī and that even the servants and functionaries in his suite were completely "šāflu and bōrklū," that is, dressed in dervish garb. During the time of Pahlavān Ḥasan Dāmhāni (761-66/1360-64), Dervish cAzīz, another successor of Ḥasan Jūrī, first retired to Mashhad and then, with a group of fiery disciples whom he had gathered about him, seized Tūs. He was later defeated, but obtained a pardon. This, however, was not the end of his political ambitions, for he subsequently allied himself with Khwāja Najm al-Dīn cAlī Muʿayyad (766-83/1364-81), defeated Pahlavān Ḥasan, and took possession of the Sarbadārid state jointly with Khwāja cAlīU+12B. But as soon as Khwāja cAlī, a very clever and deceitful man, took control of the government, he executed Dervish cAzīz and about seventy of his leading disciples at the first opportune moment. Moreover, he destroyed the graves of Shaikh Khuṭīnī {a mystic from Māzandārān, see below} and Ḥasan Jūrī in Sabzvār and turned them into a dung hill and for a rather long time vigorously and relentlessly persecuted the dervishes of Ḥasan Jūrī.
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Later in the reign of Khwāja cAlī, who expressed his fidelity and allegiance to Timūr when he appeared, the Imāmī-Shīʿī madhhab was adopted as the official religion in Khurāsān for the first time since Ōljaitū. Not only did he revere the sayyids (descendants of Muhammad) far more than the kulamā', but he also used to ready a horse every morning and evening for the ṣāḥib-i zamān (Lord of the Age, i.e., the mahdi or Twelfth Imām). In addition, the names of the Twelve Imāms were inscribed on the coinage. With regard to ethnicity, the Turkish character of Khurāsān at that time was rather prominent. This is corroborated by various historical documents. One could, therefore, make a strong argument that the Turks played a fairly important role both in the state of the Sarbadārābīd and among the successors of Shaikh Ḥasan Jūrī. Malik Ghiyāth al-Dīn Kart, a fanatical Sunnī, declared war, with a fatwā from the kulamā' of Herāt, to extinguish this Shīʿī movement, but his effort quickly proved fruitless.

The historical resources in our possession on the Shaikh Khalīfā Ḥasan Jūrī dervishes, who had a very close connection with the religious and political history of Khurāsān and Māzandarān, do not give us a very detailed picture from the religious point of view. With what kind of fundamental beliefs did Shaikh Khalīfā, Ḥasan Jūrī, Sayyid Qawām al-Dīn, and Dervish cAzī z inspire their disciples? Although we presently have no documents that will allow us to answer this question, it is not impossible that this mystery will be solved as the result of future studies and research. The documents that we currently possess -- for example, the statements of the historians and then Shaikh Ḥasan's letter to Amīr Muḥammad Bey b. Arghūn-Shāh -- shed some light on the history of this religious group, but they contain nothing very explicit about its beliefs. Nevertheless, a careful study of these documents, which only give an idea of the external nature of this group, shows undeniably that in the final analysis it was a Shīʿī-bāṭinī movement. Shaikh Khalīfā, who was the primary agent of this movement, was a Sūfī who grew up in Māzandarān, which had long been known for its Shīʿī-bāṭīnī tendencies. After first obtaining the guidance of Shaikh Bālāwī Āmulī in Māzandarān, he went to Simnān to complete his religious training and attached himself to the great Sūfī shaikh Rūkn al-Dīn cAlī' al-Dawla Simnānī. When the shaikh asked him which of the four madhhabs he wished to join, he answered, "The one that is sought is above these madhhabs." The shaikh was angered by this extremely bold answer and struck his disciple so hard on the head with the pen-case in front of him that he broke it. Afterward, Shaikh Khalīfā went to Bahrābād, to the zāwiya of Khwāja Ghiyāth al-Dīn Hībat Allāh Ḥamawī, but was not able to obtain what he wished.

He finally went to Sabzavār, where he chose to reside in a mosque {masjid}. According to Mirkhwānd, a large group of people acquired faith in him because he recited the Qur'ān with a beautiful voice. The jurists wanted to expel this Sūfī from the mosque, because they were suspicious of his influence and perhaps also of the bāṭinī ideas that he was expressing, but it was not possible. They finally sent to Abū Sa'īd Bahādur Khān for his assent to issue a fatwā for his execution. The ruler asserted that he did not want to stain his hands with the blood of a dervish and ordered the governors {hakimler} in Khurāsān to act in this matter in accordance with canon law. This naturally resulted in considerable enmity between the jurists of Sabzavār, who became quite angry at this, and the disciples of Shaikh Khalīfā. About that time, a mudarris (a professor in a madrasa) named Ḥasan from the village of Jūr gave up his teaching profession and became a disciple of Shaikh Khalīfā. About that time, a mudarris (a professor in a madrasa) named Ḥasan from the village of Jūr gave up his teaching profession and became a disciple of Shaikh Khalīfā, which further strengthened this Sūfī group. The hatred and spite of its opponents continued to increase, however, in the same proportion as this group grew in strength. Finally, one morning Shaikh Khalīfā was found hanged from a pillar of his mosque. Ḥasan Jūrī attributed the shaikh's mysterious death to his enemies. Terrified by this incident, Ḥasan Jūrī fled to Nishāpūr without delay (736/1335). From there he went to Mashhad, Abīward, and Khabūshān. He eventually traveled to Iraq, where he remained for a year and a half. Wherever he went, a great many of Shaikh Khalīfā's former disciples followed and established themselves. Although he eventually returned to Khurāsān at the urging of these Khurāsānī disciples, he could not stay very long out of fear for his life and fled in 739/1338 to Turkistan. After spending some time in Balkh, Tirmīdī, Herāt, Khwāf, Khištān, and Kirmān, he returned to Mashhad and from there went to Nishāpūr and spent time in the nearby mountains and secret caves. He claims -- quite naturally -- in his letter that he only occupied himself with spiritual matters and giving religious guidance to people, but, in fact, he spread very forceful and extensive bāṭīnī propaganda. As Mirkhwānd, the author of Rawālīt al-ṣafā, says, "he had found a great many sincere and faithful disciples who were ready to sacrifice themselves for him, so he urged them to prepare arms and promised that, after he had remained a while in concealment, the signal for revolt would be given at a certain time." Finally, this suspicious situation (i.e., the large number of his disciples and the powerful Shīʿī-bāṭīnī propaganda
that they had spread) attracted the attention of the government. After making an investigation, Amīr Arghūn-Shāh became anxious about the activities of the Sarbadārids, which began to increase in significance, and arrested Ḥasan and had him sent to Qalcat-i Tāq. Thanks to the efforts of one of his disciples named Khwāja Asadūnī, however, Ḥasan escaped from prison and joined Amīr Wajih al-Dīn Mascūd Sarbadār. Because of the large number of his disciples, his spiritual influence, and the fact that even the ruler became one of his adherents, he generally participated in governing the Sarbadārid state until he was killed on the battlefield.

We must recognize Shaikh Khalīfa and Ḥasan Jūrī, who had the greater influence of the two, as the original agents of the strong and continuous Shīʿī-bāṭinī movements that, as I described above, acquired political power in the regions of Khurāsān and Māzandarān until the period of Timūr. During the time following the decline and disintegration of the Il-Khānid state, this particular religio-political form of the bāṭinī movement, which had suddenly appeared and flourished under the Sarbadārid state and the dervishes of Ḥasan Jūrī, naturally went underground in the first aggressive years of Timūr's empire on the basis of the Shīʿī principle of taqiyya (dissimulation of one's religion under duress or threat), but tried to reappear at the first opportunity. As I shall describe below, the Ḥurūfī movement, for example, which expanded so rapidly in the ninth/fifteenth century and had immense influence not only in Iran and Azarbāiǰān but also especially in Anatolia and Rumelia, arose in northern Iran in the second half of the eighth/forteenthd century under the influence of the various factors that I have described, in part, above.

---

7 Muslim Religious Trends under the Timūrids and the Rise of the Šafavīds

The establishment of the Timūrid Empire put an end to the great anarchy that had prevailed in the regions of Iran and Azarbāiǰān since the death of Abū Saʿīd Bahādūr Khān and brought under the same political control a great many large countries of Asia, from the frontiers of China to the Mediterranean and from the banks of the Syr Darya and Volga to the center of India. These military successes, which, exactly like the Mongol invasion, were achieved with blood and fire, were simply a passing flood, a temporary whirlwind propelled by the powerful and outstanding personality of a great world conqueror. After this terrible flood had passed, the kingdoms (tahtlar) that had collapsed at the far corners of the empire were reestablished. Above all following the death of Shāh Rukh, a number of princes, who had until then been formally subject to him, proclaimed their independence and immediately began to quarrel over the remains of the disintegrating empire. In order not to go beyond the scope of my study, I do not wish to go into a discussion here of these long and complicated events, even summarily. Instead, let me try to shed light on, and bring to life, a hitherto completely unstudied and obscure aspect of Timūrid history, namely, the consequences that the founding of this great Turkish empire had in Asia with regard to religious history, and show in particular the causes and factors behind the Šūfi-bāṭinī movements that occurred in this period. In this manner, the answers to a number of puzzling questions concerning the religious history of Anatolia, and especially the factors leading to the founding of the Šafavī sultanate, should become clear and manifest.
Timūr, who was a genuine and zealous Muslim, tried to ensure for himself the moral support of the *culamā* and Śūfs in Transoxiana from the very beginning of his political life. Therefore, taking advantage of the power of Islam by no means escaped his notice and he made the greatest possible use of this powerful weapon to defeat the Chaghatay princes. 163

In the large cities that were dominated by Islamic culture jurists and specialists in canon law, on the one hand, and, on the other, YasawiNaqshbandī dervishes, who extended their moral influence to the popular masses and nomads, worked with all their strength for his success. 164

And he, in turn, showed his gratitude for this service by supporting the faith. Inspired by the legal principles of Islam, he not only annulled and abolished the yasa {ordinances, law} of Jenghiz Khān in the course of organizing the empire that he founded; 165 but he also showed great favor and kindness to the *culamā*, Śūfs, and sayyids, 166 set aside rich waqfs for them and built türbes and tekkes. 167 By the end of Timūr's reign, Nestorian Christianity, which had survived among the Turks in Almalk and in the regions of the Chu River, disappeared, along with the remnants of the old Mongol religion, and Islam thus became the unrivaled and dominant faith throughout those regions. 168 Despite the groundless accusations of certain historians who were against him, it can by no means be denied that Timūr performed a great service in the Islamization of the Turkish world. 169

In view of the respect he showed to the leading members of the Sunnī *culamā*; like Sayyid Sharīf Jurjānī and Sacd al-Dīn Taftāzānī, we can deduce that Timūr was definitely a Sunnī. 170 Although there were some things that exhibited Twelver Shīʿī tendencies in his government organization, and he had certain personal characteristics that revealed cAlawī sympathies, we possess absolutely no definite proof from which to conclude that he was an Imāmī Twelver, for example. 171 Thus, despite the rather prominent cAlawīism of the great world conqueror, it would by no means be a mistake to consider him a Sunnī, indeed, a Ḥanafī, for this kind of cAlawī influence had long been fairly strong among even the most fanatical Sunnīs, and especially in the Śūfī tariqas like the Yasawiyya and Naqshbandiyya. 172 The continuation of this Sunnī trend with equal vigor during the reign of Shāh-Rukh and the Shīḥbāʿīnī movement's position of total opposition to Timūr's sultanate -- as I shall now describe -- can also corroborate this. The vast area that Timūr ruled was very heterogeneous with regard to religious ideology. Although he may have acquired certain political benefits as a result of the cAlawī sym-

pathies that he clearly displayed, he never ceased his support of Sunnism. Later, in the time of Shāh-Rukh, support for Sunnism became even more pronounced, for it then constituted a major pillar of the religious policy of the empire.

In 794/ 1392 Timūr defeated the sons of Sayyid Qawām al-Dīn, who ruled Māzandarān and its environs, and destroyed all the fortresses there. Furthermore, in the regions of Māhānah Sar, Āmul, and Sārī, he carried out a very terrible massacre of the dervishes of Sayyid Qawām al-Dīn, who were notorious for sīcaqīda {evil faith}, that is, for their blatant Shīʿī-bāʿīnī tendencies. He also accused the descendants of Qawām al-Dīn of bāʿīnī sympathies and drove some of them into Khwārazm and some to Tashkent. All this shows that he was a staunch opponent of extremist Shīʿī tendencies. 173 In the following year he punished the Ismāʿīlīs in the area around Iṣfahān. This is additional strong evidence of his Sunnism. 174 In the event, with respect to the security of the state, Timūr found it necessary, despite all his c Alawī sympathies, to carry out punitive actions in these regions that had been infected with intense bāʿīnī ideas for centuries.

It is obvious that during the strong and resolute administration of Timūr -- especially after these punitive operations -- the extremist Shīʿī movements that were to characterize the following century did not cease their secret activity, although none resulted in a bāʿīnī movement of any political significance, and during the apparent tranquillity of those years a great many important actions were being planned for the future. During this period, in which the Shaikh Khalīfa-Hasan Jū dervishes had not yet lost their {religious} importance but were of minor political significance, 175 a great many leading Śūfī poets, like Gejjī (?), Tabrīzī, Kamāl Khujandī, and Maghrībī; 176 claimants to the Imāmate, like the family of Ḥafi'ī 'l-Dīn Ardashī, for example; 177 and Khwāja Bahā' al-Dīn Naqshbandī had a major influence on Sunnism in Central Asia. 178 Furthermore, outstanding bāʿīnīs, like the author of Kitāb Aṣrār al-naqbat, namely, Amīr Sayyid cAlī b. Shīkhbāʿī al-Dīn b. Muhammad Hamadānī, 179 who wrote commentaries on Ibn al-ʿArabī and Ibn al-Fārid, and Imāmī poets like Lutf Allāh Nishāpūrī, who wrote odes in praise of the Imāms, 180 flourished in this great transitional period. Indeed, it was during this time that Fadl Allāh Astarābādī, who was a famous HurṢūfī known under the pseudonym Naqāmī, tried to spread his beliefs and was consequently arrested and executed. 181 Thanks to the efforts of scholars like Browne and Huart, considerable light has been shed on the principles.
and nature of Ḥurūfīsm, and on the personality of Fadl Allāh, who established it, most likely under the influence of the successors of Shaikh Khalīfa-Hasan Jū in a milieu in which the old bāṭinī beliefs had thrived for centuries. However, because these scholarly efforts were confined to certain narrow aspects of Ḥurūfīsm, and especially to Ḥurūfī belief that are easier to study because of the texts in our possession, the history of the development of this sect, the manner in which it spread, the nature of the factors that facilitated and hastened its development and expansion, and the political objective it sought to achieve are unfortunately not understood. In this short study, in which I have tried to explain in a well-connected and systematic manner the religious movements that continued for centuries in the geographical areas that were closely related to each other, I hope it will be possible to show the nature of the history of the Ḥurūfī movement to the fullest extent.

Shāh-Rukh was the last ruler who can be said to have preserved to some degree the unity of the great Timūrid Empire. During his reign, this intelligent, just, and peace-loving ruler showed great respect to the shaikhs and cūlamāʾ, while the old bāṭinī movements followed their natural course and became stronger day by day. He maintained the Sunnī religious policy of the empire and even made it a stronger pillar of the state than it had been under Timūr. During his reign, the preachers {ṣ. wāciz} were so sure of his [sense of] justice and zeal as a Muslim that they did not refrain from openly criticizing some of his rare actions that were not in conformity with Islamic prescriptions. We also know that wine shops {ṣ. sharabkhāne} were forbidden during his rule in the name of religion. On the other hand, contemporary historians record that some fanatical Ḥanafī theologians complained about certain poets {ṣ. wāqif} who wrote Ṣūfī poetry without restraint and in free and easy language. In the event, despite all of Shāh-Rukh's fanaticism and zeal, the Imāmī-Shīḵī faith in Iran not only fully maintained its old powerful position, but it also slowly began to spread. It became, for example, the official religion in the territory of the Rustamārdīs through the efforts of Kayūmarth. Thanks to the influence of well-known Ṣūfīs whose spiritual fame dominated this period -- like Sayyid Qāsim al-Anwār, Shāh Nicmat Allāh Kirmānī, and Khwāja Ḩusain Khuttaḷānī, who was the successor of Sayyid cAlī Hamadānī and later rebelled against Shāh-Rukh, and their disciples -- the Shīḵī-bāṭinī movement developed very strongly in Iran, Iraq, and Āzarbājān. In order to understand this movement, which subsequently had very important consequences with regard to both political and religious history, it is first necessary to describe in some detail these great personalities.

Sayyid Qāsim al-Anwār (or, as his disciples preferred to call him, Shāh Qāsim al-Anwâr), who was censured because there were a great many bāṭinīs among his disciples associated with branches of the Qalandariyya and Ḥaidariyya orders, but whose Śūfī works in rhymed prose in the style of Mawlawānā and Maghrībī were read with pleasure and as an act of worship for centuries, was born in 757/ 1356 in Āzarbājān (according to Dawlatshāh, Surkhbāb-i Tabrīz). He spent time in the company of Šadr al-Dīn Ardaḵbī in particular and, after completing his mystical studies {ṭekmīl-i sulāk} in the service of other Śūfīs, went to Herāt. He acquired great influence in Khurāsān and attracted thousands of disciples. Because Qāsim al-Anwār won so many followers and behaved very disdainfully toward Shāh-Rukh and his children -- one of Ḩusain Khuttaḷānī's problems [ṣ. wāqif] -- he attracted the enduring interest and suspicion of the central government, which regarded such Śūfī groups with unease. Furthermore, it was learned about that time from the investigation of the attempted assassination of Shāh-Rukh by Ḩusayn Lūr (Friday, 23 Rabīʿ I, 830/ 21 February 1427), a disciple of Fadl Allāh Ḥurūfī, that Ḩusayn Lūr had occasionally visited the tekke of Qāsim al-Anwār. Consequently, Qāsim al-Anwār was forced to leave Herāt and went to the court of Ulugh Beg in Samarkand. According to the primary historical sources, this great Śūfī later settled in a vineyard in Kharjīrd, which was subject to Jām, and he died there in 837/ 1433. A türbe and a soup kitchen {cīmar} were built for him by Amīr Sayyid Nārī Ḥusainī and Amīr Ḩābīr cAlī-Šīḵ NawānU+ ṭajīf, who were among the sayyids of Khurāsān. The fact that this Śūfī, who can be said to have great spiritual influence in Transoxiana, Khurāsān, Azerbaijan, and Iraq in the ninth/tenth century, was associated, on the one hand, with the Ṣafavids of Ardabīl -- to the extent that he was later regarded as a member of the "Ṣafavid family" -- and, on the other, with the Ḥurūfīs, and the tradition that there were a great many bāṭinīs among his disciples, certainly cannot be attributed simply to coincidence. This Śūfī's chain of sayyids was arranged to end with Imām Muhammad Bāḡīr, who was born in Kūhind in 730 or 731/ 1329 or 1330. After completing his education, he roamed from country to country to meet men of God. He even went to Egypt, where once a year for three years he
spent forty days in retreat in the cave in which Qayghusuz Bābā was buried {Qayghusuz was not buried in Egypt; cf. Elf, s.v. "Kaghusuz Abdal" (F. Iz), and Abdurrahman Güzel, Kaygusuz Abdal bibyografyası, pp. 1–2}. He spent a rather long time in Medina and Mecca, where he met with a great many shaikhs. Among them was Shaikh cAbd Allâh Yâficî, with whom he completed his Sûfî training and devoted seven years to ascetic exercises. He took leave from this shaikh in Mecca in order to return to his homeland. En route he passed through Egypt, where he met Sayyid Husain Akhlafî. In Tabrîz he gave a blessing to Sayyid Qâsim al-Anwâr, who was still very young at that time, and also met Sadr al-Dîn Ardabîlî. He spent forty days in retreat on Kuh-i Sâf, wandered about Transoxiana and Khurâsân, and then finally settled in Mâhân, which was part of Kirmân. Shâh Nicmat Allâh found favor with Timûr and his children, and was deemed worthy of very great homage and reverence by Sayyid Sharîf {al-Jurjâni} in Shîrâz. He also received the great respect of the sultan of Deccan, Ahmad Bahmânî, who placed the "twelve-seamed green turban" on his head to signify his status as a religious scholar {câlim}, and obtained a great many gifts from him. Shâh Nicmat Allâh wrote -- exactly as Qâsim al-Anwâr had done -- considerable Sûfî poetry and a great many treatises in the style of Mawllânâ and Maghrîbî. He died on Thursday, 22 Rajab, 834/ 5 April 1431. The Nicmat Allâhî silsilah {this term usually means "chain of authorities," but Kâprûuli seems to use it to mean tarîqa} began to spread vigorously in the ninth/fifteenth century in Iran, Àjurbâijân, and India and became, even after the Sâfavids, the most influential and widespread tarîqa in the Shi'î countries. By preparing the ground for the spread of Shi'î beliefs in the ninth/fifteenth century, it became one of the major factors in the founding of the Sâfavid sultanate. Shâh Nicmat Allâh, who had made appropriate contact with the Bekâshî at the convent {dergâh} of Qayghusuz {in Egypt}, accepted the twelve-seamed green turban, which was obviously symbolic of his Twelver sympathies. He later became an admirer of Qub al-Dîn Haidar, about whom he wrote eulogies. He accepted people of all professions and beliefs into his circle of students. When one of his special dervishes {havâîdarvâshînî} suggested that he control his disciples, he stated that his dervishes did not need the local magistrate {dârughâ}, that is, a disciplinary official. He also saw no need to adopt a particular garment for his tarîqa. In short, all this shows rather clearly the Shi'î-bâtinî tendencies of the Nicmat Allâhiyya. The Shi'î tendencies of Nicmat Allâh, whom Sâfavid historians say predicted in his poetry a century in advance that Shâh Ismâ'îl would come to power, are much more pronounced than those of Qâsim al-Anwâr. Consequently, Jâmî, who was a zealous Sunnî, made it a point not to mention him in his Nafahât. In any case, the Nicmat Allâhiyya spread in all directions at that time.

Among the other Shi'î Sûfis of the ninth/fifteenth century who were generally considered the heralds of the Sâfavid sultanate were Khwâja Is'hâq Khuttalânî and his disciple Sayyid Muhammad Nârbakhsh. They inspired, and played a major role in, their own movement, the Nûrbakhshîyya. According to the information provided by al-Shâshî, the author of Majâlis al-mu'mînîn, Khwâja Is'hâq Khuttalânî, who was one of the leading disciples of Sayyid cAlî Hamadânî, and most probably his successor, tried to propagate Shi'îsm. He, therefore, nourished a special enmity toward the Timûrids and, in particular, Shâh-Rukh, who strongly advocated the spread of Sunnism. Indeed, the entire Hamadânîyya silsila formed a very powerful circle around him. About that time a young boy named Sayyid Muhammad, who traced his genealogy to Imâm Mûsâ al-Kâzîm {the Seventh Imâm for the Twelvers}, joined Khwâja Is'hâq in some manner. Khwâja Is'hâq wanted to take advantage of this young boy, whose descent from the Prophet was not doubted. He gave him the byname Nûrbakhsh {light-gift} (supposedly as the result of a dream), pledged his allegiance to him, and urged all those in his company associated with the Hamadânîyya to do the same. Because some of his followers and his leading successor Sayyid cAbd Allâh would not agree to this, they were given the name dhahabiyya-yi ightishâshiyâ {perhaps more correctly madhhabiyya-yi ightishâshiyâ, rebellious sectarians}. In this way a minor schism occurred in the Hamadânîyya silsila. The majority, however, naturally remained with Khwâja Is'hâq Khuttalânî. He asserted that Sayyid Nûrbakhsh was the mahlî and Imâm and prepared for a religious uprising in his name against Shâh-Rukh. Thus, he hoped to imitate the role played by Abû Muslim al-Khurâsânî in the formation of the c Abbâsîd state. For this purpose, he took Sayyid Muhammad, who was only ten years old, to his side (826/ 1423) and withdrew to a fortress in Khuttalân. Then he openly called upon the people to join the new mahlî. What form did this movement take and how successful was it? The limited documents in our possession do not say very much about this matter. We only know that this rebellious movement was crushed by the Amîrs of Shâh-Rukh and that Is'hâq Khuttalânî and Sayyid Muhammad were brought to Herât, where Is'hâq, his brother, and a number of his support-
ers were executed, while Sayyid Muḥammad, who was still very young, was imprisoned. 208 After his release, the central government kept close watch on him for a long time. Sayyid Muhammad led a difficult and vagabond life. After the death of Shāh-Rukh, he went to Shahrīyar in the environs of Rayy and settled in the village of Sūlgān. Until his death in 889/1484, he occupied himself there with powerful but manifestly obscure Shiḥchī propaganda. 209 The leading successor of Sayyid Muḥammad Nūr bakhsh was Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Yaḥyā b. cAlī al-Jilān al-Lāḥījī, who had the respect of scholars like Ṣadr al-Dīn Shībāzi and Jālāl al-Dīn Dawārī and also had the confidence and favor of Shāh Ismāʿīl Ṣafavī. He wrote a very famous commentary on Gulshan-i rāz {by Sacd al-Dīn Mahmūd Shabistarī (d. 720/1320)}. After the death of his shaikh {i.e., Nūr bakhsh}, he went to Shīrāz, where he established a well-known tekke called Khānqāh-i Nūriyya and was extremely active in developing the ideas that prepared the way for the Ṣafavid sultanate. 210 Sayyid Muḥammad’s son, Sayyid Shāh Qāsim Fāḑ bakhsh, made a great effort to popularize the Nūr bakhshiyya tariqa in Iran. 211 By the ninth/fifteenth century, in fact, this tariqa had reached India and even there had very clear and striking bātīnī characteristics. 212 In the event, in the regions of Iran, Khurāsān, and Āzarbājān, the Nūr bakhshiyya and Nicmat Allāḥiyā tariqas, based on the age-old Shī-ḥabīnī trends, rendered a very important service with regard to preparing the spiritual milieu that was necessary for the founding of the Ṣafavid state -- indeed Jāmī does not include them among the Sūfī silsilas known for their Ṣunnī zeal.

In order to show more clearly how widespread these Shī-ḥabīnī trends were during the sultanate of Shāh-Rukh, despite the specific religious policy of the state against them, it is not without profit to recall a number of famous poets like Kamāl al-Dīn Ghiyāth Fārisū. 213 Amīr Shāhī. 214 a Turk whose ancestors were among the most outstanding Sarbadārīs of Sar bāzār, Ṣabzavārī, who was also from Sabzavār and was an Imāmī who died in 854/1450-51, 215 the Shī Fakhr al-Dīn Awhād Mustawfī, who wrote odes in praise of Imām cAlī al-Ridā. 216 Ibn Ḥusām, Bābā Südāṭī, and Kāṭīb TurShīzī. 217 and to mention that Shāh Nicmat Allāh had a very great and sincere and adoring followers, the chief of whom was Shaikh Ādharī, whose works retained their importance among Sūfīs for centuries. 218 Despite all these indications that the Shīcī mentality was clearly predominant in the regions of Iran, U+100zarbājān, and Iraq, Shāh-Rukh did not refrain from vigorously protecting Ṣunnīsm -although he made no effort to protect his sultanate against the call for the seizure of power by an expected mahdī, who might appear anywhere under any name, with a religious zeal as great or greater than his own. Shāh-Rukh and his Amīrs were adherents of the great Sūfī Zain al-Dīn Khwāfī (d. 838/1434-35). 219 They showed great respect to the Sūfī Amīr Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad (d. 824/1421), 220 and about the same time gave very great honor and reverence to Sūfīs like Shaikh Abū ʾl-Wafā Khwārzamī (d. 834/1430-31) and the Naqshbandī Shaikh Khwāja Pārsā (d. 822/1419), who had no connections with Shiḥism. 221 A great many Ṣunnī authors presented works in Shāh-Rukh’s name. 222 In short, all this shows very clearly the kind of religious policy that Shāh-Rukh followed.

We cannot say for sure how and to what extent Shiḥbīnī trends were popularized in Iraq and Āzarbājān when those areas were under the control of the Kara-Koyunlu and Ak-Koyunlu. It is only related that the Kara-Koyunlu ruler, Jāhān-Shāh, was bloodthirsty and accustomed to lewdness and debauchery and was ”inclined to heterodoxy and unbelief and did not obey the sharī’a,” and the same tendencies were even seen in his son Ḥasan cAlī. 223 As for the Ak-Koyunlu, who were related to the Bayyūnd clan of the Oghuz Turks, Dihlawī says categorically that Shiḥism was held in high regard in their time. 224 Yet the Ottoman historians do not deny that Uzūn Ḥasan, the most famous ruler of this dynasty and the patron and admirer of Jālāl al-Dīn Dawārī, was known for his great respect for the culamā’ and shaikhs, although these historians were by no means sympathetic to him. 225 It can also be said that, at the same time, Uzūn Ḥasan, who did not hesitate to become related by marriage to the Sūfīs of Ardashīl, acted favorably toward the Nicmat Allāḥīn and that there were a number of people who were doubtless much more inclined to Shiḥism than to Sunnism among the earringed {kulağa küpeli} Turkmen, who formed the backbone of his army. 226 We must admit, however, that we currently possess no document that acknowledges that Shiḥism was the official religion. A strange incident that occurred to the Sūfī poet Jāmī in Baghdad, which was then in the territory ruled by the Ak-Koyunlu, shows clearly that Shiḥism did not constitute a pillar of the religious policy of the Ak-Koyunlu, although it does reveal that Shiḥī currents had become rather strong in that region and were tolerated by the state. 227 I shall explain below how the later Ak-Koyunlu rulers followed a dubious and two-faced policy toward the Ṣafavīds, who were usually their rivals, although they were related to them by marriage. In any case, no matter what the religious policy of the state, it can definitely be claimed that Shiḥism grew in strength daily in these regions, especially among the
Turkmen. Along with the Rūshanī dervishes, who were among some of the Šīfī poets who filled the court of Sultan Yaqūb [of the Ak-Koyunlu], there were certainly a number of poets who, in imitation of the Ḥurūfī Naṣmī, had the most extreme and confused beliefs, which, in turn, entered the government. However, the fact that the clear Sunnī policy followed by the Shirvān-Shāhs against the Šūfīs of Ardabīl prevented, to some extent, the spread of Šīfī beliefs in the region around Shirvān leads me to believe that a Sunnī tariqa, the Khalwatiyya, whose "second founder" was Sayyid Yaḥyā Shirvānī, who had thousands of supporters in the areas of Bākū, Shirvān, and Shamākhū, had a significant role in this. At that time, it took the form of a local tariqa in that region and, despite having cAlawī tendencies, took great care not to leave the Sunnī fold. Thanks to the vigorous propaganda of Dede cUmar Rūshanī, the successor of Sayyid Yaḥyā, and his successor Ibrāhīm Gülshenī, this tariqa became rather widespread in the area governed by the Ak-Koyunlu. Dede cUmar Rūshanī, in fact, went to Tabrīz on the invitation of Sultan Yaqūb, who, according to tradition, was related to him, and spent considerable time propagating his religious path in the zāwiya that the sultan had built for him. He died in 892/1486, leaving his disciples to Ibrāhīm Gülshenī. Sultan Yaqūb’s behavior in this respect was the result of a politically expedient religious policy, as political rivalry between the Šafavids, but this policy had no permanent effect on the powerful Šīfī currents in the region and, upon the immediate and very stunning successes of Shāh Ismā’īl Šafavī, Ibrāhīm Gülshenī, like a great many other Sunnī Šūfīs, was forced to flee from the area.

We have precious little information on the religious history of Khurāsān and Transoxiana, which were ruled by the Timūrids until the Šafavids created a state through the powerful and determined leadership of Shāh Ismā’īl. We know very well that there were a number of people having the most extreme and unconstrained beliefs in the company of the Timūrid ruler Abū l-Qāsim Bābur, who combined his own hedonistic rovindane and Qalandarī tendencies with free thought serbest nazariyeler under the rubric of Šūfism. Furthermore, we can say that at the time of the Timūrids Sultan Abū Sa’īd (855-73/1451-69), who ruled a wide area from Kāshghar to Tabrīz, beginning with Samarkand, Turkistan, and Transoxiana and then Khurāsān, Khwārazm, Kābul, and Badakhshān, Abū l-Qāsim was a disciple and follower of Khwāja cUbaiḍ Allāh Ahrār and under his auspices the Naqshbandiyya became powerful throughout Transoxiana and spread to some degree in other areas by taking advantage of government influence. Its popularity in Khurāsān at that time was especially indebted to the religious policy of Abū Sa’īd. After this period, we learn from contemporary sources that the Timūrid Ḥusayn Bāqarār, whose sultanate undoubtedly constituted the most brilliant era of the Turks in Khurāsān, had Šīfī tendencies and that when he invaded Khurāsān, after Abū Sa’īd was killed in Qarābāgh at the hands of the Ak-Koyunlu, even considered spreading the Imāmī-Šīfī faith there as the official religion. But in southern Khurāsān, and especially Herāt, the majority of the people rejected it and remained firmly committed to Ḥanafism. As I shall describe below, Herāt and Khurāsān, which together had long been a strong center of Sunnīsm which indeed had become a hotbed of Sunnī fanaticism at the time, above all, of the Kart dynasty, and where Ḥanafī poets like cĀrifī Harāwī, for example, settled in the reign of Shāh-Rukh — were incorporated in the Šīfī sphere by Shāh Ismā’īl with rather great difficulty. During the time of Sultan Ḥusayn Bāqarār, a tomb attributed to cĀlī was discovered in the village of Khwāja Khairān in the environs of Balkh. This and some other details provided in the contemporary sources show how strongly feelings of respect and affection for the family of the Prophet had taken root among the people in those areas even though they were formally under Sunnī rule. In addition, the same sources reveal the presence of Qalandarīs in those areas. Although he was a disciple of Shāh Qāsim Faijbakhsh and had clear Šīfī sympathies, Sultan Ḥusayn Bāqarār had the utmost respect for the great Šūfīs and poets at his court who were firmly committed to Sunnī beliefs, like Jāmī and Nawāṭ, and a great many Sunnī theologians and Šūfīs who fled Iran upon the invasion of Shāh Ismā’īl found refuge in the lands that he ruled. Unlike Shāh Ismā’īl, Sultan Ḥusayn Bāqarār never desired to take advantage of Šīicism for political purposes. The cAlawīsm that was quite noticeable at that time among the leading personalities of Khurāsān, like Ḥusayn al-Wāīz cĀṣifī, Jāmī, and Nawāṭ, was in fact a common characteristic among most Sunnī Šūfīs in virtually every period. As for Transoxiana, thanks to the Naqshbandī movement, which vigorously spread to that area through the efforts of Shāh Bahā’ al-Dīn Naqshband and the great Šūfīs like Khwāja cUbaiḍ Allāh Ahrār who were his followers, it remained almost completely beyond the influence of Šīfī trends. Later, the political rivalry between the Ūzbek khāns and the Šafavids caused the khāns to defend their Sunnīsm as the state religion against the Šafavid rulers in the most fanatical manner.
Therefore, when all this diverse information is considered, it becomes immediately apparent that the various Shi'i-batin movements that occurred during and after the reigns of Tīmūr and Shāh-Rukh were not isolated and independent of each other as has been believed up to now. Instead, as I have previously described (above), it is quite obvious that they were strongly connected to past movements and were very closely related to each other. The uprising of Fadl Allāh ḤūrṢūfī against Tīmūr, the revolt of Ishāq Khuttafānī against Shāh-Rukh, and, shortly after that, the attempted assassination of the latter by the ḤūrṢūfī Ṭāhirūdīn ḤūrṢūfī against Tīmūr, the revolt of Ishāq Khuttalānī against Shāh-Rukh, and, shortly after that, the attempted assassination of the latter by the ḤūrṢūfī Ahmad Lūr, Qāsim al-Anwār's connection with this and his connection, in turn, with Ṣadr al-Dīn Ardabīlī and Shāh Nicmat Allāh, and then the self-evident Shī'ī nature of the Ṣafavid, Nūrbakhshīyya, and Nicmat Allāhiyya orders and the manifestation of the most extreme bātinī tendencies among certain people associated with these orders -- in short, all these various phenomena were very significant events that were too important to be explained as simple ordinary coincidences. All these phenomena were aimed at overthrowing the sultanate of Shāh-Rukh, that is, against a Sunnī Turkish family, but one should not try to explain them as simply "Iranian rebellions against Turkish rule," in other words, attribute a racial cause to these actions. While describing above the causes and motivating factors of these religious movements, which were rooted in the past, I have presented such strong evidence, in fact, to make it impossible to leave this to such a mistaken and simple explanation, and I have shown how clearly related were the old Turkmen customs to the Shī'-bātinī trends within the general history of the Islamic religion. In addition, because these trends were not suppressed by the Kara-Koyunlu and AkKoyunlu states, even though they did not have the absolute support of their rulers, we can also say that this resulted from the fact that Shī'-bātinī beliefs were quite common among the Turkmen who constituted the primary military force of these states, and the rulers -- whatever their own ideas may have been -- were forced to respect the sentiments of their armies. Let me state furthermore that ḤūrṢīfīsm found its strongest supporters among the Turks, that Ṣadr al-Dīn Ardabīlī and even Qāsim al-Anwār were most certainly Turks, that Shāh Nicmat Allāh was under the influence of Bektāshīsm, that the Ṣafavid movement -- as I shall describe in detail below -- relied almost exclusively on Turks, and that people of Turkish race were by no means a negligible number among the Nicmat Allāhī and Nūrbakhshī dervishes. All this further strengthens my point of view. I shall now describe the religious trends that occurred in Anatolia and Rumelia up to the founding of the Ṣafavid sultanate. While doing so, I shall base my interpretation of these trends on clearer and stronger evidence than has heretofore been presented. The religious trends in Anatolia and Rumelia were directly and intimately related to the events that I have discussed above, so that before analyzing them it is absolutely essential to understand the basic factors in the establishment of the Ṣafavid sultanate {see Mazzaoui, Origins of the Ṣafawids, especially chap. 3}.

To be continued

{Never completed}
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dawlatshāh</td>
<td><em>Tadhirat al-shucara‘</em>, ed. E. G. Browne (Leiden, 1901)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFM</td>
<td><em>Darülfünün Edebiyat Fakültesi Mekmasi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI¹</td>
<td><em>Encyclopaedia of Islam</em>, 1st ed. (Leiden, 1913-42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI²</td>
<td><em>Encyclopaedia of Islam</em>, 2nd ed. (Leiden, 1960-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL</td>
<td>Carl Brockelmann, <em>Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur, 1st ed.</em> (Leiden, 1898-1902)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMS</td>
<td>Gibb Memorial Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOW</td>
<td>Franz Babinger, <em>Die Geschichtsschreiber der Osmanen und ihre Werke</em> (Leipzig, 1927)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ĪA</td>
<td><em>İslam Ansiklopedisi</em> (Istanbul, 1940-88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IJMES</td>
<td><em>International Journal of Middle East Studies</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JA</td>
<td><em>Journal Asiatique</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCA</td>
<td>Körösi Csoma Archivum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KhwāndAmīr</td>
<td>Ābāb al-siyār (Bombay, 1273/1857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mīrkhwān</td>
<td><em>Rawdat al-ṣafā</em>, ed. Ridā Qulī-Khān (Tehran, 1270-74/1853-56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOG</td>
<td><em>Mitteilungen zur osmanischen Geschichte</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTM</td>
<td><em>Millī Tettebūlar Mekmasi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td><em>The Muslim World</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nā'īb al-Ṣadr

RHR  Revue de l'Histoire des Religions
SI  Studia Islamica
TM  Türkîyat Mecmuası
TOEM  Tarîh-i Osmâni Encümenî Mecmuası
TTEM  Türk Tarîhi Encümeni Mecmuası (a continuation of TOEM after 1924)
WZKM  Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes
ZDMG  Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft