

РОССИЙСКАЯ
АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК

Институт востоковедения
Санкт-Петербургский филиал

Выпускается
под руководством Отделения
историко-филологических наук

ПИСЬМЕННЫЕ ПАМЯТНИКИ ВОСТОКА

2₍₇₎

ОСЕНЬ — ЗИМА

2007

Журнал основан в 2004 году

Выходит 2 раза в год

В НОМЕРЕ:

ПУБЛИКАЦИИ

- Обращение Поздней Цзинь к династии Мин.
Введение, комментированный перевод
с маньчжурского языка *Т.А. Пан* 5
- Ю. Клапрот. Ци цзя ту хэби* (Головоломка
из семи частей). Предисловие и публикация
Х. Валравенса (на англ. яз.) 21
- Л.Ю. Тугушева.* Фрагменты раннесредневековых
тюркских гадательных книг из рукописного собрания
Санкт-Петербургского филиала Института востоковедения
РАН. Публикация, транслитерация и перевод 37

ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

- А.И. Иванов.* Богобоязненность *ходящих прямыми
путями* (к вопросу о происхождении и точном
значении чжоуских категорий *дэ* 德 и *вэй* 威仪) 47
- Е.В. Ревуненкова.* Малайская рукопись
Крузенштерна *Сулалат-ус-салатин* и ее
культурно-историческое значение (II) 78
- А.М. Соколов.* Эмиси — эдзо — айны. Айны в пределах
японских владений в средние века и эпоху Кинсэй
(области Цугару, Симокита [Хонсю] и Мацумаз
[Хоккайдо]) 97
- Д. Цолин.* Литературные формы библейской истории
Сотворения (Быт. 1:1–2:3) и их риторическая
интерпретация в таргумах 110
- А.С. Четверухин.* Материал для фоно-морфологической
реконструкции ряда египетских служебных морфем.
Предлоги (*j*)*m*, (*j*)*n*, (*j*)*r* и их производные формы 119



«Наука»
Издательская фирма
«Восточная литература»
2007

На четвертой стороне
обложки:

Лист № 11 из китайского альбома
Х-7 (коллекция художественного
фонда СПбФ ИВ РАН)
после реставрации

Над номером работали:

Т.А. Аникеева
Р.И. Котова
А.А. Ковалев
О.В. Мажидова
Н.Г. Михайлова
О.В. Волкова
И.Г. Ким
И.И. Чернышева
Е.А. Пронина
А.В. Богатюк

© Российская академия наук, 2007
© Санкт-Петербургский филиал
Института востоковедения, 2007

<i>И.Т. Канева.</i> Общевопросительные предложения в шумерском языке	140
<i>М. Кемпер.</i> Захваты текке и агиография Хаджжи Бекташа, Хаджжим Султана, Дамир Баба и Караджид Ахмада XV–XX вв. (на англ. яз.)	144
<i>К.В. Военец.</i> Древнеиндийская грамматика Aṣṭādhyāyī (Диалог поколений индийской лингвистической традиции)	168
ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ И ИСТОЧНИКОВЕДЕНИЕ	
<i>И.А. Алимов.</i> «Бэй мэнь со янь» Сунь Гуан-сяня (895? — 968): автор, сборник и персонажи	180
<i>О.Ф. Акимущин.</i> Художник Касим ибн 'Али и рукопись РНБ «Ахсан ал-кибар» (Dom 312)	202
<i>А.М. Стрелков.</i> Новый источник изучения тантры Калачакра — сочинение «Шри Калачакра лагху тантра раджа хридая» в тибетском переводе	209
<i>Б.В. Норик.</i> Кати'и Харави и его антология поэтов императора Джахангира	220
<i>И.Р. Каткова.</i> Мусульманский мистицизм Западной Суматры (устная и письменная традиции)	235
<i>А.Л. Федорин.</i> К вопросу об истории ксилографирования канонических и исторических текстов во Вьетнаме	245
КОЛЛЕКЦИИ И АРХИВЫ	
<i>И.В. Зайцев.</i> Арабские, персидские и тюркские рукописи и документы московских собраний: итоги и перспективы изучения (опыт справочно-библиографического указателя)	252
Взаимодействие питерских и московских Китаистов. Письма П.Е. Скачкова В.С. Мясникову, 1957–1959 гг. Подготовка к изданию В.С. Мясникова	279
РЕСТАВРАЦИЯ И ХРАНЕНИЕ	
<i>Н.В. Степанова, Л.И. Крякина, Ю.Г. Арчакова, И.Н. Кулешова.</i> Опыт исследования и реставрации экспортных китайских картин на тетрапанаксе бумажном из коллекции художественного фонда Санкт-Петербургского филиала Института востоковедения РАН	289
НАУЧНАЯ ЖИЗНЬ	
<i>И.В. Кульганек.</i> Вторые Доржиевские чтения «Буддийская культура: история, источниковедение, языкознание и искусство» (Санкт-Петербург, 9–11 ноября 2006 г.)	298
<i>Т.В. Ермакова.</i> Годичная научная сессия СПбФ ИВ РАН 2006 г.	301
<i>З.А. Юсупова.</i> Заседание, посвященное памяти М.Б. Руденко (1926–1976)	302
РЕЦЕНЗИИ	
Российско-китайские научные связи: проблемы становления и развития (<i>Т.В. Ермакова</i>)	303
<i>Е.В. Бойкова.</i> Библиография отечественных работ по монголоведению: 1946–2000 гг. (<i>Т.И. Юсупова</i>)	305
IN MEMORIAM	
Лев Серафимович Савицкий (1932–2007)	308
Ордихан Джасмович Джалилов (1932–2007)	310

M. Kemper

Tekke Takeovers and Hagiographical Writing, 15th to 20th Centuries: Hajji Bektash, Hajjim Sultan, Demir Baba and Qaraja Ahmed

It is estimated that some ten to fifteen percent of the Muslim population of Turkey and a considerable part of the Turks living in Bulgaria and other Balkan countries regard themselves as linked to Alevi tradition. Yet it is hard to clearly define “Alevism” (Turk. *Alevilik*). In one respect, it stands for a broad complex of various religious rituals and beliefs that emerged in the tribal milieus of Anatolia and Rumelia. These beliefs have been preserved by holy families (*ocaks*) of *dedes* (“Grandfathers”) who function as spiritual leaders of their village communities; they claim descent from ‘Ali ibn Abi Talib and the Shi‘i Imams, and their knowledge is passed down from father to son, that is, by blood lineage. In the context of the 16th century wars with the Shi‘i Iran, the Ottoman empire persecuted Anatolian tribes with Alevi (Qızılbaş) traditions; also, Sunni pogroms and attacks against Alevis have occurred in the Turkish Republic as well. As a result, Alevis often interpret their past as a continuing history of martyrdom.¹

In another respect, Alevilik is also linked to the Bektashiyye Sufi brotherhood (*tarikat*), whose eponym, Hajji Bektash-i Veli, supposedly lived in 13th or 14th century Anatolia, and whose disciples established convents (*tekkes*, *dergahs*) in many parts of Anatolia and the Balkans. Historians regard the Bektashiyye as an umbrella organization that, most probably in the late 15th to 17th centuries, absorbed various “heterodox” and ecstatic Sufi groups of the Qalenderiyye type.² The practices of these dervishes, often interpreted as a syncretistic mixture of Islam and ancient Turkish shamanism,³ stood in opposition to the “sober”, scholarly and shari‘a-oriented Sunni Islam which the Ottomans elevated to the status of “orthodoxy”. By assuming control over these non-conformist dervishes, the Bektashiyye fulfilled an important function in the Ottoman Empire. In reward, Bektashi tekkes enjoyed tax exemptions and support from pious foundations. In rural areas

¹ For Ottoman measures of persecution see for example the numerous documents edited by Baki Öz (*Öz B. Alevilik ile ilgili Osmanlı belgeleri*. İstanbul, 1995, 2nd ed. 1996) and by Ahmet Hezarfen and Cemal Şener (*Hezarfen A., Şener C. Osmanlı Arşivi’nde mühimme ve irâde defterleri’nde Aleviler ve Bektaşiler*. İstanbul, 2002). For the construction of Alevi history in terms of a “Leidensgeschichte” (“history of suffering”) see the discussion in Dressler M. *Die Alevitische Religion. Traditionslinien und Neubestimmungen*. Würzburg, 2002, ch. 4, esp. S. 258ff.

² Faroghi S. Conflict, Accommodation and Long-Term Survival: The Bektaşî Order and the Ottoman State (Sixteenth–Seventeenth Centuries) // *Alexandre Popovic, Gilles Veinstein* (eds.). *Bektachiyya. Etudes sur l’ordre mystique des Bektachis et les groupes relatifs de Hadji Bektach*. P., 1992 [Revue des Etudes Islamiques LX] esp. 173.

³ Ocak A.Y. Bektaşî menâkıbnamelerinde İslam öncesi inanç motifleri. İstanbul, 1983; *idem*. Osmanlı imparatorluğu’nda marjinal sûfilik: Kalenderiler (XIV–XVII. Yüzyıllar). Ankara, 1999. The syncretism theory, mainly going back to the works of Fuat Köprülü, is also expounded in detail by Irène Mélikoff (*Mélikoff I. Hadji Bektach: un mythes et ses avatars*. Leiden, 1998).

especially they assumed important religious, social and economic functions for the population.⁴ Maybe as early as the second half of the 14th century the elite regiments of the Ottomans, the Janissaries, began to link themselves to the Bektashi tradition, and until the early 19th century Bektashi sheykhhs exerted great influence in the Janissary barracks where they served as military pastors.⁵ As a *tarikāt*, the Bektashiyye transmits leadership not by blood, as in the *dede* lineages of the Alevi village communities, but by spiritual initiation and formal transmission of knowledge. Nevertheless, the Bektashiyye also saw the emergence of powerful dervish families in most *tekkes*. The leadership of the main convent *tekke* near Kırşehir has been preserved within the Chelebi lineage that claims descent from Hajji Bektash himself, and whose authority has also been acknowledged by many Alevi *ocaks*.

Today the traditional connection between saintly and lay family lines in Alevi communities is often disrupted by migration. Especially in urban areas, leadership has passed to Alevi lay intellectuals who, with or against *dedes*, reinterpret and “rediscover” Alevism in their religious, political and historical writings.⁶ At the same time, the Bektashiyye has practically ceased to exist in its traditional form, and the Bektashi transmission of knowledge and authority within this brotherhood has largely been interrupted. While Bektashis had survived the first official ban issued by Sultan Mahmud II in 1826, roughly a hundred years later Atatürk’s ban on all Sufi brotherhoods and the confiscation of the Sufi convents brought an end to the Bektashi activities. Several *tekkes* became museums, while others fell into decay.

This concurrent interruption of both the traditional Alevi and the Bektashi transmission chains allows for the transformation of the Alevi-Bektashi complex of traditions that one witnesses in Turkey today. Urban Alevi intellectuals have discovered, occupied and renovated the desolate Bektashi convents, transforming them into public spaces for a religious minority in a formally secularist, but inherently Sunni society. A similar process is underway in Bulgaria, where the Bektashi *tekkes* function as the most visible milestones of a Turkish/Alevi presence in a state with an overwhelmingly Christian population. By connecting to former Bektashi centers, Alevi communities in Anatolia and the Balkans also inherit the rich hagiographic tradition of the Bektashiyye. This is reflected in a huge number of recent publications of Bektashi hagiographies by *dedes* as well as secular Alevi authors.

Hagiographies are often poor sources for the study of the historical personalities they purport to talk about. If they are taken as intentional works, however, they can be extremely rich sources for the study of the time when they were composed, enlarged, changed, and used.⁷ The starting point for this article is the assumption that hagiographies played an important role for the emergence of the Bektashiyye as a more or less unified Sufi tradition in the late 15th to 16th centuries, and that these hagiographies have a similar unifying function for the scattered and dispersed Alevi communities of present. Central to this function is the occupation of pre-existing Sufi *tekkes* and the integration of their saintly

⁴ Faroqhi S. The Tekke of Hacı Bektaş: Social Position and Economic Activities // International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 7 (1976). P. 183–208. On tax exemptions cf. also Hezarfen, Şener. Osmanlı Arşivi’nde. S. 243.

⁵ Cf. Ocak A. Y. Bektaşilik // Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi (TDIA). Vol. 5. İstanbul, 1992. S. 377f.

⁶ Kehl-Bodrogi K. Die ‘Wiederfindung’ des Alevitums in der Türkei: Geschichtsmythos und kollektive Identität // Orient 34/2 (1993). S. 267–282.

⁷ For some recent studies using this approach in the Central Asian context see Paul J. Au début du genre hagiographique dans le Khorassan: Saints orientaux. Ed. Genise Aigle. P., 1995. P. 15–38; *idem*. Hagiographische Texte als historische Quelle // Saeculum 41 (1990). P. 17–43; Allen J. Frank. Islamic Historiography and ‘Bulghar’ Identity among the Tatars and Bashkirs of Russia. Leiden, 1998. Ch. 3; DeWeese D. The Politics of Sacred Lineages in 19th Century Central Asia: Descent Groups Linked to Khwaja Ahmad Yasavi in Shrine Documents and Genealogical Charters // International Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 31 (1999). P. 507–530.

traditions. Our observations will focus on the 15th century hagiography of Hajji Bektash, which represents the central narrative concerning the emergence of the Bektashiyye. A correlation with the very similar hagiography of Bektash's alleged disciple Hajjim Sultan can shed some light on the question of how separate traditions are connected and intertwined. We will then move to the hagiographies of Demir Baba in the Deliorman region of Bulgaria and of Qaraja Ahmed in Istanbul; these two examples will provide insight into how hagiographies are written and used today.

Hajji Bektash

Hajji Bektash-i Veli al-Khorasani, the eponym of the Bektashiyye, stands out as the mythical model for all the greatly revered "saints from Khorasan" (*Horasan erenleri*) of the Alevis and Bektashis. His icon is present in all Alevi congregational buildings (*cem evis*), and the pilgrimage to his convent-turned-museum, the Hacı Bektaş Pirevi near Kırşehir in Anatolia where his shrine is revered, has become an annual event where tens of thousands of Alevis from all over the world meet and celebrate.⁸ This pilgrimage, which has actually obtained the character of a gigantic Alevi fair, is the most prominent example of the recent takeover of former Bektashi monasteries by the Alevi communities.

The historical documentation on Hajji Bektash is very meager. Historians have identified him as a disciple of Baba Resul (or Baba Ilyas al-Khorasani), a Qalenderi dervish who led a rebellion against the Anatolian Seljuks in 1240. Presumably Hajji Bektash survived the defeat of this rebellion and moved to the village of Soluja Qarahöyük in Central Anatolia, where he preached, gathered adepts, and died in 669 (1270–71), or at least before the end of the 13th century.⁹ By contrast, the Bektashi tradition itself does not connect Hajji Bektash to the Babâ'î movement; according to Bektashi manuals, Hajji Bektash was born in Nishapur/Khorasan in 648 (1247) and died in 738 (1337) in Soluja Qarahöyük, the present-day Hacıbektaş near Kırşehir.¹⁰

The richest source of the legends surrounding Hajji Bektash is his hagiography, the *Velâyetnâme-i Hâjî Bektash-i Veli*.¹¹ As the *Velâyetname* consists of various text layers and also contains some appendices, it may safely be assumed that the book has been edited and expanded over time by several generations of writers. Judging from the various historical personalities implied or actually mentioned in the appendices, one can conclude that the book obtained its present form between 1481 and 1501.¹² The contents of the main text, however, appear to be significantly older.¹³ Most copies of the *Velâyetname* that still

⁸ On the Hajji Bektash pilgrimage and the festival see Sinclair-Webb E. Pilgrimage, Politics, and Folklore: The Making of Alevi Community // *Les Annales de l'Autre Islam*, №. 6. P., 1999. P. 259–274; Norton J. D. The Development of the Annual Festival at Hacıbektaş 1964–1985 // *Popovic, Veinstein* (eds.). Bektachiyya. P. 191–200.

⁹ *Keuprulu Zade M. F.* Les origines du Bektachisme. Essai sur le développement historique de l'hétérodoxie musulmane en Asie mineure. Extrait des Actes du Congrès international d'histoire des religions (tenu à Paris en octobre 1923), 1926. P. 21f.; *Ocak A. Y.* La révolte de Baba Resul ou la formation de l'hétérodoxie musulmane en Anatolie au XIIIe siècle. Ankara, 1989. P. 90–93; *Ocak A. Y.* Bektaşî menâkıbnamelerinde. S. 87f.

¹⁰ *Birge J.K.* The Bektashi Order of Dervishes. Hartford (Conn.), 1937. P. 34f.

¹¹ Some late copies mention one Bektashi called 'Ali oğlu Musa Süflü Dervish as the author, but it is possible that this person was merely a later editor (cf. *Gölpınarlı A.* Vilâyet-Nâme — Manâkıb-i Hünkâr Hacı Bektaş-i Veli. İstanbul, 1958. P. XXVI).

¹² *Gölpınarlı.* Vilâyet-Nâme. P. XXIX. The Ottoman historian 'Âlî (d. 1008/1599–1600) had already a complete version of the *Velâyetname* — including the Appendices — at his disposal; cf. *Tschudi R.* Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hâdschim Sultan, eine türkische Heiligenlegende. B., 1914. S. VI, XI.

¹³ The *Velâyetname* was edited in 1958 by Abdülbâki Gölpınarlı in the modern Turkish alphabet (*Gölpınarlı.* Vilâyet-Nâme, and subsequent editions). Gölpınarlı's aim was to make this hagiography accessible to a wide audience, and so he did not render the text literally, but chose to simplify and partly re-narrate it in modern Turkish. Added to Gölpınarlı's publication was a facsimile of the seemingly oldest surviving manuscript, which dates from 1034/1624 and which is kept today in the Hajji Bektash Museum. Unfortunately, this facsimile is

exist today, in prose and poetry, were made in the late 19th century. This can be explained by the fact that most Bektashi *tekkes* were closed by the Sultan's decree in 1826, and as a result many old books and libraries perished.¹⁴ In the late 19th century new copies were made, and the continuing popularity of the book is also reflected in another rhyming version that was produced by the poet Nihani as late as 1296 (1878–79).¹⁵

In the *Velayetname*, Hajji Bektash's authority is asserted by a seemingly endless chain of miracles (*keramet*, *velayet*). The Sufi tradition explains *keramets* generally as evidence of God's grace towards the performer, who often acts on the behalf of a petitioner. While this is also true for the *Velayetname*, Hajji Bektash tends to be described as a permanent source for miracles which he uses more freely at his own discretion. Much emphasis is placed on the veneration that he enjoys from the people, due to his miraculous powers. The *Velayetname* mentions roughly eighty of his *keramets*,¹⁶ many of which deal with procuring water, food, money, clothing, harvests, as well as enhancing female fertility and healing, thus reflecting the nomad and peasant background of rural Anatolia. Even more miracles, however, display various forms of punishment for sinners and opponents; in fact, violent stories of harsh punishment by miracles appear as the most characteristic element of Hajji Bektash's *Velayetname*. Of these punishment stories, not less than thirteen are directed against Islamic scholars and mollahs who are described as pretentious, or who made false allegations against Hajji Bektash. This clearly indicates that the Bektashis had to defend their practices and views against the influence of the growing urban Islamic establishment. Fighting rivals also appears as a means to win adherents: miracles either crush opponents or bring them to repentance so that they accept Hajji Bektash's supremacy and submit to him. This reflects nicely the Bektashiyye's "gathering" of other religious traditions which presumably took place in the 15th to 17th centuries.

The *Velayetname* mentions a huge number of historical or legendary Sufi personalities whom Hajji Bektash wins over to his cause, or who accept his authority during meetings and conversations with him. To begin with, Hajji Bektash, who allegedly was born in Nishapur in Khorasan as a descendant of the seventh Shi'i Imam Musa al-Kazim (d. 799), is trained in Khorasan by the great mythical sheykh Ahmed Yasavi (introduced as a scion of Ali's son Muhammed ibn al-Hanefiyye) and by a supposed disciple of Yasavi, Loqman

hardly readable. Later editions of Gölpınarlı's popular edition replaced it with a better facsimile of another manuscript which was copied in 1226 (1811). I have taken Gölpınarlı's edition of 1995 (İnkilap Kitabevi, İstanbul) as the basis. The change of the facsimiles has gone unnoticed by scholars and is nowhere mentioned in the book itself, where reference is still made to the manuscript of 1624. In addition, the sequence of the folios is heavily confused in the new facsimile, and parts of other texts are included as well. The page numbers of the facsimile folios are not always readable. As the facsimile pages of Gölpınarlı's 1995 edition are not included in the pagination of the book, I counted the pages consecutively from the last paginated page onwards; thus the whole book has 248 pages. When quoting from the facsimile I will give these running page numbers. As there are four manuscript pages on each page of the facsimile edition, I will also give a number ranging from 1 to 4 to indicate which manuscript page is referred to.

¹⁴ Cf. Öz G. Yeniçeri-Bektaş ilişkileri ve II. Mahmut. Ankara, 1997.

¹⁵ A first rhymed version goes back to İlyas ibn Hızır or Firdevsi-i Rumi (Uzun Firdevsi), a professional literary man who lived in the second half of the 15th century, and who is known for his rhymed versions of various books as well as for his Turkish translations of Persian literature (*Gölpınarlı*. *Vilâyet-Nâme*. P. XXViff.). A copy of the rhymed *Velayetname* dating from 1044 (1634–35) has been edited by Dr. Bedri Noyan in 1986 as a transcription in the Latin alphabet (Doç. Dr. *Bedri Noyan* (ed.). *Firdevsi-i Rûmî Manzûm Hacı Bektaş Veli Velâyetnâmesi*. Aydın, 1986; for Nihani cf. P. 4). In Noyan's view, appendices of the prose version mentioning Sultan Bayezid II were most probably added at a later date and do not give an indication about when the *Velayetname* was actually produced. According to Noyan, some copies mention the year 844, 744, 644, and allegedly even 444 as the date of writing, of which 744 (1343–44) should be regarded as "the most likely". However, the similarity of these dates is so striking that one should better dismiss them altogether; cf. also the above-mentioned rhymed copy allegedly dating from 1044.

¹⁶ For a good overview of the miracles see also the excellent German re-narration of the *Velayetname* by Erich Gross (*Gross E. Das Vilâyet-Nâme des Hâğgî Bektasch. Ein türkisches Derwischvangelium*. Lpz., 1927).

Perende.¹⁷ It is in Turkestan with Yasavi and then in Badakhshan where Bektash performs his first heroic miracles. Yasavi then bestows upon him the Sufi cloak and other dervish attributes — that is, he makes him his deputy — and sends him out to Rum (Anatolia). The travel to Rum takes him first to places like Kurdistan, Mecca, Medina, Damascus and Aleppo, where he continues to perform *keramets*. He then sends his greetings to the dervishes of Rum, who, under the leadership of their seer (*gözcü*), Qaraja Ahmed, are just having a congregation. Obviously apprehensive of Bektash's competition, the dervishes block Bektash's way: by connecting their holy wings to each other they set up a gigantic wall. Bektash, however, takes on the form of a dove, flies over the wall and settles down in Soluja Qarahöyük. In the following encounters he forces many other Anatolian dervishes to accept his leadership, saying that whoever has not yet entered a *tarikāt* should now join his. Besides Qaraja Ahmed¹⁸ he meets Tapdıq Emre (to whom Bektash delegates the spiritual training of the poet Yunus Emre),¹⁹ Mahmud Hayrani (whom he defeats in a competition of miracles),²⁰ Jan Baba and Huva Ata (who, sent by Hajji Bektash, convert the Tatars to Islam),²¹ and Sarı Saltık²² (sent by Bektash to convert Rum, Georgia, and the Dobruja to Islam). In addition, Hajji Bektash establishes himself as an equal to Jelaluddin Rumi and his disciple, Sadruddin Qonavi (of the Mevleviyye *tarikāt* in Konya), as well as to Akhi Evran (who obviously stands for the *ahi* and guild organizations of Central Anatolia).²³ He also renders homage to the Turkish hero Seyyid Ghazi by performing a pilgrimage to the shrine and convent of Seyyid Ghazi near Eskişehir (which was to become famous as a Bektashi center, see below). Thus Hajji Bektash's spiritual life and action not only link Turkestan/Khorasan with Anatolia, but also unite various spiritual and heroic folk traditions of Anatolia itself, some of which had already been attested in other hagiographies and epics (*destans*). In addition, the *Velayetname* also unites various social layers of society, for Bektash deals not only with sheykh's and scholars, but also with princes, officials, craftsmen, shepherds, peasants, gardeners, ship captains, Christian monks, and especially with women and children, not to mention the various sorts of animals with which he has conversation. These encounters also mark a holy topography, with the central narratives describing the various structures and sites in and around Bektash's *tekke*; as these are still part of the Alevi pilgrimages to Hacıbektaş, the book can also be read as a pilgrim's guide.

The Appendix on disciples in the *Velayetname* of Hajji Bektash

The *Velayetname* has an extensive part on several of Hajji Bektash's deputies (*halifes*); I would propose to call this part an Appendix, for it is obviously attached to the main text.²⁴

¹⁷ On the Yasavian tradition of Turkestan/Khorasan see DeWeese D. The Mashâ'ikh-i Turk and the Khojagân: Rethinking the Links between the Yasavî and Naqshbandî Sufi Traditions // *Journal of Islamic Studies*, vol. 7/2 (July 1996). P. 180–207, and the discussion below.

¹⁸ On Qaraja Ahmed see below.

¹⁹ On Tapdıq Emre (Tapduq Baba), as the alleged teacher of the famous poet Yunus Emre, cf. *Ocak*. Osmanlı imperatorluğu'nda marjinal süffilik. S. 69.

²⁰ Cf. van Bruinessen M. Haji Bektaş, Sultan Sahak, Shah Mina Sahiband and Various Avatars of a Running Wall // *Turcica* 21–23 (1991). P. 55–69 and plates.

²¹ For conversion miracles of this kind see DeWeese D. Islamization and Native Religion in the Golden Horde: Baba Tükles and the Conversion to Islam in Historical and Epic Tradition. Pennsylvania (Penn.), 1994. P. 232–252.

²² On the legends of Sarı Saltık see *Ocak* A. Y. Sarı Saltık. Popüler İslâm'ın Balkanlar'daki destânı öncüsü (XIII. Yüzyıl). Ankara, 2002.

²³ Taeschner F. Legendenbildung um Achi Evran, den Heiligen von Kırşehir // *Jäschke* G. (ed.). Festschrift Friedrich Giese. Lpz., 1941. S. 61–71.

²⁴ The main reasons for regarding the section on the disciples as a separate Appendix are formal (it has a separate introduction; all disciple descriptions follow more or less the same narrative pattern) and relating to contents (the section introduces some disciples as main deputies that had merely been mentioned in the main text,

According to the Appendix, Bektash sends his favorite disciple Jemal Seyyid to the place where a wolf would slay his mule (which happens to be in the region of Altıntaş); the *halife* Sarı İsmail flies (as a hawk) to Menteşe region where he converts the local Christians to Islam; similarly, Resul Baba, taking on the forms of a golden hind and a dove alternatively, converts Christians of the region of Altıntaş; and Pirab Sultan establishes a tekke in the Mevlevi stronghold of Konya. Most space in the Appendix is allotted to another of his disciples, Hajjim Sultan; he takes over the pre-existing dervish convent of Seyyid Ghazi and, in a subsequent episode, kills a dragon by spitting fire himself. These episodes in the Appendix once again emphasize the integrative powers of miracles and conversions, and, together with the Sarı Saltık episode mentioned in the main text of the *Velayetname*, logically explain the spread of the Bektashiyye to Western Anatolia and the Balkans by conversion, force and cooptation.²⁵

The *Menakıbnâme* of Hajjim Sultan

Interestingly, this Appendix of the *Velayetname* of Hajji Bektash also mentions “the *menakıb* of Hajjim Sultan”, to which readers should have recourse for more details on Hajjim Sultan. In fact, Bektash’s aforementioned disciple, Hajjim Sultan, has his own hagiography which has come down to us. This book, which we will refer to as *Menakıbnâme* in what follows, was edited and translated into German under the title of *Vilâyetnâme-i Hâjjim Sultân* by Rudolf Tschudi in 1914.²⁶ The text of the hagiography mentions that it was written by one Burhan Abdal, who appears in the work as a devoted servant of Hajjim.²⁷

As in the Appendix of Bektash’s *Velayetname*, Hajjim Sultan is introduced as a disciple and follower of Hajji Bektash. According to Hajjim’s own hagiography, however, Hajjim already joined Hajji Bektash while the latter was still in the presence of Ahmed Yasavi in Khorasan. When Hajji Bektash obtained the Sufi attributes from Yasavi and was sent out by Yasavi to Soluja Qarahöyük in Anatolia, Hajjim Sultan asked Yasavi for permission to accompany Bektash to Rum. Bektash, however, rejected this request. Then Hajjim addressed Hajji Bektash himself, but the latter still refused to take him and asked of what help Hajjim would be as companion (*yoldaş*). Hajjim answered that as his companion he would hit Bektash’s foot whenever he strayed from the path. Then Bektash gladly accepted him as companion and called him his cousin (*amm-zade*).²⁸ Before leaving, Bektash obtained a wooden sword from Yasavi. Then Bektash and Hajjim traveled from Khorasan via Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem and Kurdistan to Anatolia. It is obvious that these episodes in Hajjim’s *Menakıbnâme* are based on the *Velayetname* of Hajji Bektash, with only slight

while it does not mention disciples like Sa’deddin who is dealt with in several episodes) and to function (spread of the movement by connecting to other places, yet mainly without Bektash’s personal involvement except as initiator). — A German translation of the Appendix is given by E. Gross (*Gross E. Das Vilâyet-Nâme des Hâğgî Bektasch*).

²⁵ Another independent appendix mentions the names and years of tenure of the first guardians of Hajji Bektash’s tomb (i.e. his first successors in what was to become the central dergah of the order). This section also mentions the care of Ottoman sultans for the tomb, and it ascribes the creation of the Ottoman Segban and Janissary troops to Hajji Bektash’s intervention. This pro-Ottoman appendix, no doubt of relatively late origin and only poorly interwoven with the previous sections, makes sense of the special relationship between the Janissaries and their Bektashi sheykh. Already in an earlier episode of the main text of the *Velayetname*, Hajji Bektash girds the founder of the Ottoman dynasty, Osman, and gives him a sword as well as a long conical hat that Osman would later pass on to his troops.

²⁶ Tschudi R. *Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hâdschim Sultan, eine türkische Heiligenlegende, zum ersten Male herausgegeben und ins Deutsche übertragen*. B.: Mayer und Müller, 1914. Tschudi’s edition is based on a manuscript of 1175/1762.

²⁷ Ibid., ed. S. 107/transl. S. 96.

²⁸ Ibid., ed. S. 14/transl. S. 17.

adaptations; quite logically, the two enter Anatolia in the form of a double-headed dove. In later episodes Hajjim often performs the same miracles that Bektash does in his *Velayetname*; in fact one gets the impression that the disciple is put in his master's shoes, or that Hajjim is even merging with Bektash. At the same time, however, several elements point out a certain tension between Bektash and Hajjim in Hajjim's *Menakıbnâme*, which reveals itself already in Hajjim's avowed readiness to hit Bektash's foot if he strays from the straight path.

It is worthwhile to have a closer look at the function of Ahmed Yasavi in the two hagiographies. In Bektash's book the Yasavi episode is clearly meant to legitimize Hajji Bektash as a saint who later on, probably in Anatolia, accepts Hajjim as his disciple. This is a clear and classic story of how three generations of Sufis are connected by initiation. By contrast, Hajjim's *Menakıbnâme* is more complicated; while still representing Hajjim as Bektash's disciple, it provides Hajjim with a similar Khorasanian/Yasavian legitimacy, mainly by Yasavi's intercession to persuade Bektash to take Hajjim as his companion. As a result, the hagiography of Hajjim accords Hajjim a higher status than the one he enjoys in the Appendix of Bektash's *Velayetname*. Hajjim even appears as a peer [sic!] to Hajji Bektash, which is expressed by Bektash's calling him his cousin. In addition, the book ascribes to Hajjim an Alid genealogy equally valuable to that of Hajji Bektash.²⁹

Does this mean that the *Menakıbnâme* of Hajjim is just an adaptation of Bektash's *Velayetname*? While there are undeniably many similarities in both hagiographies, the matter seems to be not so easy. Taking into consideration that Hajji Bektash's *Velayetname* contains an open hint at Hajjim's own hagiography (*menakıb*), Rudolf Tschudi already concluded that a "Wunderbuch" of Hajjim Sultan must have existed at the time when the final version of the *Velayetname* of Bektash was written down.³⁰ More recently, the leading Turkish specialist on Bektashi and Qalenderi hagiographies, Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, even stated that Hajjim Sultan's *Menakıbnâme* should be regarded as being some twenty or thirty years older than the one of Hajji Bektash. Ocak based his argument on the observation that Ahmed Yasavi is dealt with more broadly in Hajjim's book than in the *Velayetname* of Hajji Bektash.³¹ Basically, the *Velayetname* of Bektash deals with Ahmed Yasavi only in the beginning, when Bektash obtains his spiritual education as well as his license from Yasavi.³² Hajjim's book, as we have seen, repeats this legitimizing story with the serious modification that it has Hajjim taking part in it as well. In addition, there are several other references to Yasavi in Hajjim's book, and this is probably what Ocak has in mind. In one episode Hajjim performs a miracle by procuring a well in the region of Qarahisar, and a local notable (*bey*) offers to build a convent (*asitane*) for Hajjim in that region. Hajjim,

²⁹ Ibid., ed. S. 3–5/transl. S. 4–5.

³⁰ Cf. Tschudi. Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hâdschim Sultan. S. XI, who already asserted that a "Wunderbuch" of Hajjim Sultan must already have existed at the time when the final version of the *Velayetname* of Bektash was written down. Tschudi, however, did not make a distinction between the main text of Hajji Bektash's hagiography and its Appendices.

³¹ Ocak A. Y. Hacı Bektaş Vilâyetnâmesi // TDIA. Vol. 14. İstanbul, 1996. P. 472; cf. Ocak. Hacı Sultan, ibid., vol. 14. P. 505. In his "Bektaşî menâkıbnâmelerinde İslam öncesi inanç motifleri" (İstanbul, 1983) Ocak based his argumentation on the fact that Hajjim Sultan's *Velayetname* mentions a person by the name of Osman, whom he identifies with Otman Baba, a Qalenderi sheykh who reportedly died in 1478 (P. 9). This argumentation is not convincing either, above all because a reference to Otman Baba (if it is really him who is alluded to in that episode) could have been integrated at any time, not just during or shortly after Otman's lifetime.

³² In the context of Bektash's arrival in Anatolia the *Velayetname* of Bektash also mentions that Yasavi gave a little demon (*dev*) to Hajji Bektash, which Bektash now confers upon Qaraja Ahmed, whose shrine it would guard after his demise; this, so the text continues, is the explanation why so many miracles happen in the tekke of Qaraja Ahmed today (on Qaraja Ahmed and his healing powers see below). The demon story is simply reiterated in Hajjim's *Menakıbnâme*. In other episodes of Bektash's *Velayetname* the name of Yasavi is just mentioned without adding further information to the initial Khorasanian episodes.

however, declines this offer and explains that he cannot stay there because he had been sent out by Ahmed Yasavi to a place called Susuz in the region of Germiyan.³³

For Ocak, the repeated reference to Yasavi in Hajjim's *Menakıbnâme* provides evidence for his assumption that Hajjim's hagiography is older than Bektash's. His reasoning is obviously guided by the idea that one would have to expect more information on the Yasavi/Khorasani origin of the saints in the oldest hagiographies, and that this layer would later be superseded by Anatolian events. This, however, must not be the case. To begin with, there are no other sources that would give us any indication of real or alleged contacts between Ahmed Yasavi and his groups of followers and Hajji Bektash or any other Anatolian representatives of what would later be labelled the Bektashiyye. As Devin DeWeese has shown, the Central Asian Yasavian tradition as we know it is itself a construction of later centuries (heavily manipulated by rival Naqshbandi authors and misunderstood and distorted by the influential Turkish historian Fuad Köprülü),³⁴ and it seems that the available Yasavian sources from Central Asia do not mention any contacts with Anatolian sheykhs, let alone with sheykhs that were later included into the Bektashi tradition. We also do not know of any other Anatolian sources that would link Bektashi sheykhs to Yasavi, who supposedly lived in the late 12th century. As a result, the first mention of this alleged connection is found in our Bektashi hagiographies, which, probably dating from the late 15th or early 16th centuries, cannot be regarded as historical sources for events that allegedly took place some three centuries earlier in Central Asia. No matter whether there were links or not, the name of Yasavi must have been well known in Anatolia at the time when the vitae were composed, for the Bektashi hagiographies reveal great respect for him. It is obvious that the Yasavi episodes in both *Velayetnâmes* serve the goal of legitimizing Bektash and Hajjim as Yasavi's disciples.³⁵ Even Hajjim's servant, Burhan, is reported as originating from Khorasan, where Hajjim appeared to him in a dream and told him to meet him in Anatolia.³⁶ In fact, the Khorasani background of the saints — with or without Yasavi — developed into a literary topos that occurs in one way or another in most, if not all, Bektashi hagiographies of all periods. For this reason a second reference to Yasavi in Hajjim's hagiography must not be regarded as an older layer of hagiography, but as reflecting a continuing need for legitimacy. In fact, the references to Yasavi (which never bear any historical information about that sheykh or his contacts to Anatolia) can even lead us to the opposite assumption: the more Yasavi, the later the source!³⁷

Another indication clearly suggesting that the *Menakıbnâme* of Hajjim Sultan is an adaptation of Bektash's hagiography concerns the investiture which Hajjim Sultan obtains in Anatolia from Hajji Bektash. Again, this story is crucial for the legitimation of Hajjim as

³³ *Tschudi*. Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hâdschim Sultan, ed. S. 37/transl. S. 46. A third and fourth mentioning of Yasavi occur on ed. P. 40 and 59f. (transl. P. 48 and 69) where Hajjim informs other dervishes that Yasavi had sent him together with Hajji Bektash from Khorasan to Rum.

³⁴ See DeWeese D. The Mashâ'ikh, for a thorough critique of the current Western, Russian and Turkish perceptions of the Yasaviyya; *idem*. Iasaviia, in: *St. M. Prozorov* (ed.). Islam na territorii byvshei Rossiiskoi imperii. Entsiklopedicheskii slovar. Vol. 4. Moscow, 2003. P. 35–38. See also DeWeese's critical foreword to *Köprülü M. F.* Early Mystics in Turkish Literature. Transl., ed. Gary Leiser and Robert Dankoff. L.–N. Y. 2006. P. VIII–XXVII.

³⁵ DeWeese even regards the Yasavi stories in the Bektashi tradition as serving the goal of showing Bektash's superiority (Iasaviia, P. 37). However, while it is true that in the *Velayetname*, Bektash performs several miracles that actually help Yasavi (or his son) in dangerous situations or save them, he is still depicted as being Yasavi's respectful disciple.

³⁶ *Tschudi*. Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hâdschim Sultan, ed. S. 53/transl. S. 63.

³⁷ How fluid the Yasavi topos was can be seen from the fact that the above-mentioned Qarahisar episode contradicts the first Yasavi episode in the same book, where no mention is made of Yasavi sending out Hajjim to Susuz.

a sheykh in his own right, and thus for his inclusion in the Bektashi tradition. According to the Appendix of Hajji Bektash's *Velayetname*, Hajji Bektash girded Hajjim with a wooden sword, thus giving him the title of "executioner" of the *tekke*. Against Bektash's explicit admonition not to misuse the sword, Hajjim tests the power of his weapon and cuts a mule in two halves, whereupon Bektash punishes him by a curse that inflicts paralysis on Hajjim.³⁸ After the intercession of other disciples on Hajjim's behalf, however, Bektash revokes the punishment and makes Hajjim's arm (*kolu*) "open" (*açık*) again. This gave Hajjim the name of Qolu Achiq.

This story is also rendered in Hajjim's own *Menaqıbname*. Here, however, Hajjim offers an excuse — he claims he had to test the sword in order to understand its power — and Bektash does not punish him. Nevertheless Bektash gives him the name of Qolu Achiq. Interestingly, the reason for this name is not given, although the naming is still linked to the sword episode.³⁹ The comparison of these two versions shows clearly that the Appendix of Bektash's *Velayetname* offers the complete story, for only here the naming makes sense. The reason why the punishment was dropped in Hajjim's *Menakıbname* seems to be quite obvious: the strike with paralysis is a clear token of Bektash's limitless power over Hajjim. By omitting it, the hagiography elevates Hajjim's rank without generally denying Hajji Bektash's position as his sheykh.

Seyyid Ghazi in the *Velayetnames* of Hajji Bektash and Hajjim Sultan

The aforementioned episodes would indicate that, contrary to Ocak's assumption, Hajji Bektash's *Velayetname* and its Appendix came first, and thus served as model for the hagiography of Hajjim. However, the issue is still more complex. In the following I would like to look at another topic that occurs in both *Velayetnames*, that of Seyyid Ghazi. The Seyyid Ghazi narratives are of special interest because they reflect how the Bektashiyye expanded by taking over pre-existing *tekkes* of other dervish groups. The Seyyid Ghazi *tekke*, located in the village of Seyitgazi south of Eskişehir in northwestern Central Anatolia, is linked to the legendary Arabic hero Seyyid Battal Ghazi, whose adventures and fights for the spread of Islam are described in a popular epic (*destan*).⁴⁰ The *tekke* is a Seljuk foundation; it is not certain when exactly its dervishes began linking themselves to the Bektashiyye. As Suraiya Faroqhi has pointed out, in 935/1528–29 the *tekke* had 48 servants on its payroll and housed about two hundred sheykhs at that time; unfortunately the documents do not make clear whether it was a Bektashi center at that time or not.⁴¹ Some years later, in the mid-16th century, some "heterodox" dervishes of the *tekke* (called *ıstık* or *abdal* in the documents) were exiled or imprisoned by the Ottoman authorities.⁴² The fact that these persons are not explicitly linked to the Bektashiyye led Fuad Köprülü to the assumption that the Bektashis took over Seyyid Ghazi only after these events, in the second

³⁸ Bektash makes him *çolak*, which can either mean that he paralyzed his arm or that he made him one-armed.

³⁹ *Tschudi*. Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hâdschim Sultan, ed. P. 24–25/transl. S. 32–34.

⁴⁰ The Turkish epic tradition describes Seyyid Battal Ghazi as an Arab hero of the 9th century who fought the Byzantines and spread Islam by force in Anatolia. The *destan* stresses his Alid genealogy. Although he is not directly depicted as a saint like Hajji Bektash, he has the support of saints and prophets, and with their help he performs a number of miracles. See *Ethé H.* Die Fahrten des Sajjid Bathal: ein alttürkischer Volks- und Sittenroman. 2 vols. Lpz., 1871; *Melikoff I.* al-Battâl (Sayyid Battâl Ghâzi) // *Et*.²

⁴¹ *Faroqhi S.* Seyyid Gazi Revisited: The Foundation as Seen through Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century Documents // *Turcica* 13 (1981). P. 90–92.

⁴² *Şener C.* Osmanlı belgeleri'nde Aleviler-Bektaşiler. İstanbul, 2002. S. 26–27 (doc. of 24 Ramadan 966/30 June 1559, about an investigation against *ıstıks* living in Seyyid Ghazi).

half of the 16th or the early 17th centuries.⁴³ However, it cannot be ruled out that Seyyid Ghazi was a Bektashi *tekke* already before the mid-16th century, for it is possible that the mentioning of Bektashi links was generally avoided in warrants and other official documents to avoid confronting the Janissaries, who backed the Bektashi order.⁴⁴ Seyyid Ghazi was definitely controlled by Bektashi dervishes when the traveler Evliya Chelebi visited the place around 1648.⁴⁵ In the early 20th century the *tekke* still housed Bektashi dervishes.⁴⁶

In order to analyze the changes and adaptations of the Seyyid Ghazi stories in both *Velayetnames*, I suggest we look separately at the individual texts and fragments.

(1) *Seyyid Ghazi in the main text of Hajji Bektash's Velayetname*

The episode in the main text is short.⁴⁷ It claims that the place where Seyyid Ghazi was buried had been unknown until the mother of the Seljuk ruler 'Alâ' al-Dîn saw the site in a dream, whereupon she built a shrine (*mezar*) on that place.⁴⁸ However, people were still skeptical as to whether this was really his burial site. Then Hajji Bektash lent his authority to the new mezar by making a pilgrimage to the shrine, which dispersed all doubts. The narrative also recounts how Hajji Bektash is warmly received at Seyyid Ghazi by the spirits of hidden saints,⁴⁹ and how he then communicates with Seyyid Ghazi himself at the shrine. Before leaving, Bektash bites a stone at the entrance of the Seyyid Ghazi *tekke*, thus leaving an impression which can still be seen, as the hagiographer tells us.

(2) *Seyyid Ghazi in the Appendix of Hajji Bektash's Velayetname*

The Seyyid Ghazi *tekke* is dealt with in more detail in the section on Hajji Bektash's disciple Hajjim Sultan in the Appendix.⁵⁰ According to the Appendix, the hero Seyyid Ghazi had himself predicted that one day a disciple of Hajji Bektash by the name of Qolu Achîq Hajjim Sultan would settle down in the region where he was going to be buried. As long as the exact place of his tomb was still unknown, Hajji Bektash used to conduct memorial celebrations (*mehyâ*) in Seyyid Ghazi's honor in his own *tekke* in Soluja Qarahöyük. This is followed by a repetition of the above mentioned story, telling how the burial site was discovered by the Sultan's mother. Hajji Bektash's confirming pilgrimage is also mentioned, but without details.

The main part of this section describes Hajjim Sultan's trip to Seyyid Ghazi and the events connected to it. Approaching the *tekke* with his followers, he is welcomed by the spirit of Seyyid Ghazi who appears to him in the form of a stag. The arrogant dervishes residing in the *tekke*, however, do not pay due attention to Hajjim, their guest. By performing a *semâ* dance in the *tekke*, Hajjim then kills several of them with the hem of

⁴³ Cf. Köprülü F. Abdal // Türk halkedebiyatı ansiklopedesi. Ortaçağ ve yeniçağ Türklerinin halk kültürü üzerine coğrafya, etnoğrafya, etnoloji, târih ve edebiyat lûgatı. Vol. 1. İstanbul 1935, esp. S. 30–35; *Faroqhi* S. Der Bektaschi-Orden in Anatolien (vom späten fünfzehnten Jahrhundert bis 1826). Wien, 1981. S. 42.

⁴⁴ Cf. *Faroqhi*. Der Bektaschi-Orden. S. 44 and 91.

⁴⁵ *Chelebi* E. Seyâhatnâme. İstanbul 1314/1896–97. Vol. 3. P. 13.

⁴⁶ *Wulzinger* K. Drei Bektaschi-Klöster Phrygiens (Beiträge zur Bauwissenschaft 21). B., 1913, S. 10; *Menzel* Th. Das Bektâshi-Kloster Sejjid-i Ghâzi / Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin. Vol. 28, No. 2 (1925). S. 92–125.

⁴⁷ *Gölpınarlı*. Vilâyet-Nâme, fols. 83v–84r and fols. 85r–85v. The narrative is interrupted by another episode which has no visible connection to the Seyyid Ghazi topic (84r–85r). In the confused facsimile of Gölpınarlı's edition the folios are located on pages 228 and 211.

⁴⁸ This episode, probably with reference to the Seljuk sultan 'Ala' al-Din Kay-Qubad (reg. 616–34/1220–37), is also found in the *destan* of Seyyid Battal Ghazi; cf. *Ethé*. Die Fahrten. Vol. 1. S. 213.

⁴⁹ *batın erenleri*, referring to the topic of the legendary forty Abdal in hiding (*ghayba*). Cf. *Goldziher* I., *Kissling* H. J. Abdâl // *EF*.

⁵⁰ *Gölpınarlı*. Vilâyet-Nâme, fols. 148r–152r.

his whirling garment. In response, the evil sheykh of the *tekke*, Qara Ibrahim, has all the weapons of the guests thrown into the huge oven (*tennur*) of the convent, whereupon they melt. Hajjim Sultan orders his servant Burhan Abdal to climb into the oven and take the red-hot items out, which Burhan achieves in a miraculous way. Hajjim then curses the sheykh Qara Ibrahim, who as a consequence is killed by a thunderbolt crashing down from the sky. On the request of Ibrahim's wife, Hajjim blesses her innocent son Hasan.

(3) *Seyyid Ghazi in Hajjim Sultan's Menaqibname*

This is the most detailed account on Seyyid Ghazi. It begins with Bektash sending out Hajjim to a place called Susuz in the region of Germiyan [the place which had already been announced to Hajjim by Yasavi]. Bektash also foretells that Hajjim would take 1,001 oxen from the region of Menteşe to the shrine of Seyyid Ghazi, where he would open an *'imaret*, that is, a soup kitchen for guests of the convent.⁵¹ This narration is located quite early in the hagiography (*Tschudi*. Ed. S. 23). It is followed by several episodes and miracles of various contents that seemingly have little to do with Seyyid Ghazi. However, this whole line of miracles is directed towards Seyyid Ghazi, and the latter's name is mentioned several times. Hajjim remembers his obligation (i.e., to go to Seyyid Ghazi) and meets other dervishes who would accompany him on that pilgrimage (58–59); after a miracle performed by Hajjim (a father is desperate because he has no sons, so Hajjim transforms his daughter into a young man),⁵² grateful people from Menteşe bring Hajjim the 1,001 oxen that he is destined to bring to Seyyid Ghazi (68); Hajjim summons his dervishes to bring new life to Seyyid Ghazi (70); during his fight against a dragon Hajjim recollects that he had once been fighting together with Seyyid Ghazi against unbelievers (75); Hajjim and his dervishes finally approach the convent of Seyyid Ghazi (76), and in the *tekke* he performs further miracles (76–84). These miracles are quite the same as those ascribed to him in the Appendix of Bektash's *Velayetname*: the greeting by Seyyid Ghazi in the form of a stag, the arrogant behavior of the dervishes, a miracle to assert Hajjim's authority (in this case, the Seyyid Ghazi dervishes are not killed, but expelled),⁵³ the oven miracle of his disciple Burhan (here, however, simply as a probation, with no mention of weapons), and finally the curse and the thunderbolt killing Qara Ibrahim, whose son is then adopted by Hajjim. The feast starts, and the oxen are sacrificed. Then Hajjim bites into the stone at the entrance of Seyyid Ghazi's shrine. Finally he instructs an erudite person in Sufism and makes him his deputy at Seyyid Ghazi.

Comparing the Seyyid Ghazi sections in all three texts, it is obvious that Bektash's *Velayetname*, including the Appendix, had served as the main source for the narration in Hajjim's *Menakibname*. Hajjim's hagiography not only takes up Seyyid Ghazi as a key element, it even takes Seyyid Ghazi as the guiding thread for the whole line of narration. It also introduces some new elements, but in general remains within the frame of what is told in Bektash's *Velayetname*. Characteristically, it is not Hajji Bektash who marks the convent for himself by biting into the stone, but Hajjim.⁵⁴

⁵¹ *Tschudi*. Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hâdschim Sultan, ed. S. 23/transl. S. 30. Strikingly, this story contradicts the Khorasanian episode mentioned earlier, in which it was Yasavi who announced to Hajjim his final place of destination.

⁵² Actually he performs this miracle by spending several nights with her; *Tschudi*. Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hâdschim Sultan, ed. S. 62–66, transl. S. 72–77.

⁵³ Hajjim Sultan takes seat on the prayer rug of Seyyid Ghazi, and as he performs a miracle (his sword three times goes out of the scabbard and reenters it, which is taken as a confirmation that the person sitting on the rug is a descendant of the prophet Muhammad — and thus entitled to leadership), Qara Ibrahim's dervishes run away in fear (*Gölpınarlı*. Vilâyet-Nâme, fols. 151rv; S. 171/4–170/1).

⁵⁴ According to Evliya Chelebi's mid-17th century report of the Seyyid Ghazi compound it was another Bektashi shaykh, Gizlije Baba from Khorasan, who bit into the marble stone at Seyyid Ghazi's threshold; *Seyahatname*. İstanbul, 1314/1896–97. Cilt 3. S. 14.

At the same time Hajjim's hagiography omits a number of elements from the Appendix that testify to Hajji Bektash's priority at Seyyid Ghazi. Most importantly, it does not mention that the establishment of Seyyid Ghazi's *mezar* goes back to Hajji Bektash. Furthermore it also lacks Seyyid Ghazi's prediction that *a disciple of Hajji Bektash* would settle down in the vicinity. Instead, Hajjim even defines himself as an old comrade in arms of Seyyid Ghazi, that is, as equal in rank.

There can thus be no doubt that Hajji Bektash's hagiography served as a model for the *Menakıbnâme* of Hajjim, and therefore must be regarded as an earlier source. However, we should keep in mind that its Appendix contains a direct hint at the *menaqlıb* of Hajjim Sultan, that is, at Hajjim's hagiography (which, however, at that point may not yet have assumed the final written form). While this hint may just be a late addition, it nevertheless indicates that the two hagiographies developed in mutual contact. It is therefore legitimate to ask whether Hajjim's *Menakıbnâme* could not also have exerted some influence on Bektash's book. Could the Appendix of Bektash's *Velayetname* be regarded not only as a blueprint for, but also as a response to Hajjim's *Menakıbnâme*?

We have seen that the general aim of Hajjim's *Menakıbnâme* is to depict Hajjim as an independent saint, and that it therefore tends to downplay the authority and influence of Hajji Bektash on him; this is mainly achieved by pronouncing the legacy of Ahmed Yasavi and Seyyid Ghazi. If the Appendix of Hajji Bektash's *Velayetname* was a response to Hajjim's claims for independence, then we would have to expect in it elements that reassert Bektash's preeminence and superiority. If such a response occurred, it could probably be detected by comparing the Seyyid Ghazi references in the main text of Bektash's *Velayetname* to those in its Appendix. Also, these "responses" would have to be missing in the text they responded to, namely, in Hajjim's book.

In fact, there is only one element that fits this description. The Appendix mentions memorial ceremonies (*mehyâ*) for Seyyid Ghazi which Hajji Bektash conducted at his own tekke before the burial site was discovered.⁵⁵ These ceremonies are not mentioned in the main text of Bektash's *Velayetname*. Ocak identifies the *mehyâ* celebrations with the *muharrem matemi*, i.e. the commemorations for Hüseyin, the son of 'Ali. According to 16th and 17th century European travel accounts, several thousands of dervishes gathered at Seyyid Ghazi at these occasions, consuming opium, singing, dancing and cutting their limbs in a state of ecstasy.⁵⁶ As Suraiya Faroqhi has pointed out, documents show that the annual *mehyâ* ceremonies were connected to a fair at which parts of the *tekke*'s agricultural produce were sold. They were forbidden in the mid-16th century in the context of the repression of extremist dervishes (*ıyıks*), but were still held around 1600.⁵⁷ In the light of the conflicts around the tekke and its *mehyâ*, its mentioning in Bektash's *Velayetname* can be seen as a defense of the ceremony, but as we do not know when the *mehyâ* was introduced this does not give us a clue to the time when the *Velayetname* was written, or when the *tekke* actually fell into Bektashi hands. Another remarkable feature in the Appendix is that it repeats the whole story of Bektash's role in establishing the site of Seyyid Ghazi's shrine with the same words as in the main text. Both elements, the new features as well as the blind repetition of the old, can be regarded as a device to underline Bektash's priority at Seyyid Ghazi against the *Menakıbnâme* of Hajjim. While these two elements appear to be responses to Hajjim's hagiography, a definite answer to this riddle cannot be given until more manuscripts are compared, and, above all, until we possess a critical edition of Hajji Bektash's *Velayetname*.

Another important aspect that has hitherto escaped the scholars' attention is the relationship of the two *Velayetnames* towards scriptural Islam. In Hajji Bektash's

⁵⁵ See de Jong F. Mahya // *EF*.

⁵⁶ Ocak. Osmanlı imparatorluğu'nda marjinal sûfilik. S. 170–172.

⁵⁷ Faroqhi. Seyyid Gazi Revisited. P. 96–97.

Velayetname there is a clear tension between the saint on the one hand and mollahs, muftis, and qadis on the other; in several episodes Hajji Bektash leads the devotional zeal of hypocritical mollahs ad absurdum (for example by making their ablution water blood-red), and people accuse him for not fulfilling the ritual prayers. Hajji Bektash exceeds in supererogatory fasting, but not in fulfilling his prayer duties. The Quran is mentioned only once in Bektash's hagiography, when his disciples recite from it immediately before Bektash's own demise. By contrast, Hajjim, in his *Menakibname*, is depicted as a strict adherent to the ritual prayers. He or other personalities from his hagiography quote verses from the Quran at least a dozen times, and in one instance even a hadith is rendered. At Seyyid Ghazi, Hajjim instructs the new sheykh in "*shariat, hakikat, tarikat and marifat*", underpinning that Sufism is not in opposition to Islamic law; and his disciple Burhan — the supposed author of the hagiography — is described as carrying books with him,⁵⁸ presumably of religious content. Remarkable for an Alevi saint, Hajjim even has regular conversation with the Prophet Muhammad in dreams. It would be no exaggeration to say that Hajjim's hagiography appears as a "Sunnitized" form of Bektash's type of narratives; references to the Shi'i Imams do not alter this impression.⁵⁹ This circumstance may lead to the assumption that Hajjim's *Menakibname* dates not from the 15th century, as Hajji Bektash's probably does, but from the mid- or late 16th century when Bektashi convents — as well as Seyyid Ghazi — were under severe pressure from the state to conform to Sunni standards. However, these questions can only be discussed after a thorough examination of the manuscript evidence.

For the time being, it is clear that Hajjim's *Menakibname* is not just a copy of Bektash's hagiography or another Appendix. It not only continues the Bektash hagiography but also modifies it, and as we have seen it is not impossible that it had repercussions on Bektash's *Velayetname* itself. What is important is that the two *Velayetnames* are intertwined; we must assume that the compilation of the traditions developed in interaction. The compilers of both texts had to adjust their stories to one another in order to keep up the link between the two saints: Hajjim Sultan cannot replace Hajji Bektash completely, for he needs him for his spiritual legitimacy, and Bektash needs Hajjim for the spread of his movement. Given the assumed 15th or 16th centuries origin of these sources, the two hagiographies give us some insight into "hagiography in the making", and reflect the ongoing integration of the Bektashiyye as a broader movement.

Interestingly, both *Velayetnames* also deal with the important question of whether the tradition of Hajji Bektash is based on blood lines, as Alevi dedes and the Bektashi Chelebis would claim, or merely on spiritual initiation, as celibate Bektashi *dedebabas* would argue. According to Bektash's *Velayetname*, Bektash lived in the house of a woman by the name of Qadinjiq who, it seems, was still married to another man.⁶⁰ Qadinjiq was the first to serve Hajji Bektash, witnessed many of his miracles, and had the habit of drinking the water that he used for his ablutions. Once a drop of blood had fallen from Bektash's nose into that water. Qadinjiq, though forbidden by Bektash to do so, drank the water, with the result that she became pregnant. She bore him three sons, one after another, to whom Bektash gave the names Habib, Hızır Lalam, and Mahmud. Bektash refers to them as *yurt*

⁵⁸ For ritual prayers see *Tschudi*. Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hâdschim Sultan, ed. S. 41/transl. S. 49, 50 (59), 51 (61), 63 (73), 70 (80); the Prophet in dreams: S. 38–39 (47), 44 (52f), 49 (58), and cf. 73f. (84); recitations and quotations from the Quran: S. 22 (28), 26 (34), 26 (35), 42 (51), 43 (52), 49 (58), 57 (66–67), 57 (67), 65 (74), 66 (75), 69 (79), plus various places where the Quran is just mentioned; the hadith: S. 48 (57); Burhan's books: S. 59 (68). In one episode people build a mosque for Hajjim (S. 56/66).

⁵⁹ Cf. *Tschudi*'s ed. S. 3 (transl. S. 3), 4–5 (4–5), 7–8 (8–10), 10–11 (12–13), 14 (16), 21 (27–28). In addition, Bektash, Hajjim and also Yasavi are often explicitly mentioned as belonging to 'Ali's family.

⁶⁰ *Gölpınarlı*. Vilâyet-Nâme, fol. 52r (S. 216/2)

glu, which can be understood as “adopted sons”.⁶¹ According to a spiritual testament of Bektash (*vasiyyet*, described in a second appendix to the *Velayetname*), Hızır Lalem was to become custodian (*türbedar*) of the *tekke* for 50 years, to be followed by his son Mürsil for 48 and his grandson Yusuf Balı for another 30 years.⁶² The *Velayetname* thus describes the emergence of the Chelebi dynasty of chief dervishes that were obviously “from his blood”, and at least on one occasion does the *Velayetname* refer to later heads of the *tekke* as Chelebis, i.e. to the historical lineage that has been claiming leadership of the Hajji Bektash *tekke* until our days.⁶³ The peculiar construction of the conception miracle, however, still leaves room for the opinion that Hajji Bektash remained a bachelor (*mücerred*).

On the issue of dervish families the *Menakıbnâme* of Hajjim Sultan is more explicit than that of Hajji Bektash. Hajjim Sultan takes as his wife an eighty-year old woman who has proven her belief in him, and the hagiography is quite outspoken in describing how Hajjim Sultan “jumps” over this woman. As a result, the old woman gives birth to a son, called Osman, whom Hajjim Sultan later sends to Germiyan in order to build a *tekke*.⁶⁴ The name of Osman’s son, Chaqır Chelebi, again reminds us of the Chelebi dynasty of the Hajji Bektash *tekke*, and places Hajjim’s offspring on a similar level to that of Bektash. The Appendix of Hajji Bektash’s *Velayetname* has basically the same story, but does not mention the high age of the woman, thus taking away the miraculous character of Hajjim Sultan’s impregnating her. Also, it introduces a new element by claiming that Osman led the life of a highway robber before he at last turned to spirituality.⁶⁵ Again, the Appendix safeguards Hajji Bektash’s and his family’s precedence.

Judging from the great number of existing manuscripts of Hajji Bektash’s *Velayetname* (probably most of them being in private possession of dedes), this book was read at various places, and it wove these sites into the Bektashi network of *tekkes*. Interestingly, this integrative force of the *Velayetname-i Hajji Bektash-i Veli* is still at work today: it is reflected in the various popular editions that the book has seen in recent years.⁶⁶ By contrast, the *Menakıbnâme* of Hajjim Sultan (whose shrine is venerated in Hacım Köyü, formerly Susuz, near the city of Uşak in Western Anatolia)⁶⁷ survived only in few manuscripts, and to the best of my knowledge it has never been published or even re-narrated in Turkey. Although the figure of Hajjim Sultan plays a role in the Alevi ritual,⁶⁸

⁶¹ *Gölpınarlı*. Vilâyet-Nâme, fols. 67r–68r (S. 201/4 followed by S. 208/1–3); cf. *Gross*. Das Vilâyet-Nâme des Hâğgî Bektasch. S. 118.

⁶² *Gölpınarlı*. Vilâyet-Nâme, fols. 158v–159r (P. 167/3–4).

⁶³ Lists of Chelebi dervishes and of the *mücerred dedebabas* (who resided side by side in the Pirevi) provides *Rif’at*. Mir’ât al-ma’âsîd, 182–188. For the struggle between Chelebis and dedebabas over the *dergah* and especially its material resources see *Birdoğan N. Çelebi Cemalettin Efendi’nin savunması* (Müdafaâ). 2nd ed. İstanbul, 1996. In recent times the Chelebi branch (*kol*) of the Bektashiyye has been represented by members of the Ulusoy family.

⁶⁴ *Tschudi*. Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hâdschim Sultan, ed. S. 85–90. Ocak identifies this Osman with another famous Qalenderi/Bektashi saint, Otman Baba (Hacım Sultan, 505).

⁶⁵ *Gölpınarlı*. Vilâyet-Nâme, fols. 150r–151r (S. 171/2–4). The Appendix also mentions that Osman became the head of the *tekke* of Hajjim Sultan, without saying where this *tekke* is.

⁶⁶ Most modern Turkish popular editions are based on *Gölpınarlı*’s re-narration, which they misunderstand as an edition. See for example *Hacı Bektaş Veli*. Vilâyetname (Menakıb-ı Hacı Bektaş Veli), ed. Esat Korkmaz. İstanbul: Ant, 1995; *Hacı Bektaş Veli*. Vilâyetname. İstanbul: Karacaahmet Sultan Dergahı yayınları no. 6, 2001); even a French translation is based on *Gölpınarlı* (Villayet Nâme [sic]. Le livre des amis de Dieu, Huncar Hadj Bektaş Veli. Traduit du turc par Ahmed Kudso Erguner et Pierre Manez. P., 1984). Unfortunately, *Sefer Aytekin*’s Vilâyetname-i Hacı Bektaş-i Veli (Ankara, s.a., but most probably dating from the 1950s) has not been available to me.

⁶⁷ *Faroghi S.* Der Bektaschi-Orden in Anatolien (vom späten fünfzehnten Jahrhundert bis 1826). Wien, 1981. S. 27; *Ocak*. La révolte de Baba Resul. P. 94.

⁶⁸ Traditionally the *meydan taşı* in the convent or *cem evi* is linked to Hajjim Sultan; it is the place where, before the *cem* ritual, sinners receive their punishment; cf. *Korkmaz E.* Ansiklopedik Alevilik Bektaşilik terimleri sözlüğü. 2nd ed. İstanbul, 1994. S. 242. This, of course, goes back to his girding with the wooden sword to

Alevi authors are seemingly not very interested in his hagiography, perhaps because the doublings with Bektash's hagiography are too blatant. Obviously Hajjim Sultan could not replace Hajji Bektash, but was neutralized by the latter's "parental" tradition.

The *Tekke* of Demir Baba in Bulgaria⁶⁹

As a result of *tekke* takeovers, the Bektashiyye emerged as a loose network of independent centers, many of which had distinct pre-Bektashi traditions. However, hagiographies certainly had an important function in emphasizing the commonalities of the local *tekkes*, mainly by the presumed Alid and Khorasanian origin of the *erenler* and their movement, but also by the type of saints they represented and the miracles that were reported from them. In addition, Hajji Bektash figures in most Bektashi hagiographies in one way or another. Most commonly he is remembered in episodes relating to the origin of the local saint or *tekke*, thus providing a source of legitimation. A special case is the *Velayetname* of Veli Baba, which is a collection of traditions not of one, but of a family of Velis from a *tekke* in Ulugbey near Senirkent and Isparta (South West Anatolia). It seems that the book was written down in its present form at the turn of the 20th century, for an appendix mentions the *tekke's* dervishes until 1312/1894. What is remarkable is that in one short episode Hajji Bektash appears in the *tekke* and invests a new *halife* as the head of the *tekke*. This episode, however, is not related to the founding of the *tekke* or to a Bektashi takeover, as in the Seyyid Ghazi stories; rather, the context makes it clear that it pertains to events in the 19th century. It is well documented that at least since the early 17th century the Chief Dervish (*sejjade-nishin*) of the Chelebi family in the central Hajji Bektash *dergah* in Hajji Bektash claimed the right to determine the candidates for the leading position in other *tekkes*;⁷⁰ the story thus seems to reflect the interference of the mother convent in matters of local succession.⁷¹

To be sure, the Bektashi tradition has been too heterogenous to develop collective hagiographies, a genre which is well represented in other Sufi brotherhoods. In fact, it is hard to imagine how a hagiographer would bring into one volume all these powerful velis with their claims to ultimate authority.⁷² However, as the example of the *Veli Baba Velayetnamesi* shows, there are Bektashi hagiographies that describe families of saints, and there are also *Velayetnames* that describe several interconnected *tekkes* of one area. An example of this type is the *Velayetname* of Demir Baba, a Bektashi saint from the Deliorman region in northeastern Bulgaria. The book has been edited in the form of a transcription in the modern Turkish alphabet by Dr. Bedri Noyan Dedebara.⁷³ According to Noyan, his

perform the office of executioner (*meydanın celladlığı*, as mentioned in the *Velayetname* of Hajji Bektash; *Gölpınarlı*. Vilâyet-Nâme, fol. 146v/P. 173/3). Today Hajjim is also linked to education (<http://www.basakli.com/Hacim%20Sultan.htm>, Jan. 9, 2006).

⁶⁹ I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Veysel Bayram (Razgrad) for his tremendous hospitality and help during our tour to the *tekkes* of Demir Baba, Aqyazılı Sultan, and to the site of the former Sarı Saltıq *tekke* in April 2004.

⁷⁰ *Faroghî*. Conflict, Accomodation. P. 174ff.; *idem*. The *Tekke* of Hacı Bektaş. P. 197f.

⁷¹ Doç. Dr. *Bedri Noyan Dedebara* (ed.). *Veli Baba menakıbnamesi*. 3rd ed. İstanbul, 1996. P. 170f. However, the passage of the text in question is confusing even to the editor, who believes that the manuscript had been manipulated here.

⁷² It could be argued that the task of "gathering of the saints" has been performed by Dedebara Dr. Bedri Noyan, to whom we owe the edition of many individual Bektashi hagiographies. At the same time Noyan also tried to write a synthesis of the Alevi-Bektashi tradition in his multi-volume) "Bütün yönleriyle Bektâşîlik ve Alevîlik" (İstanbul: Şahkulu Sultan Dergahı, vol. 1: 1998; vol. 5: 2002). Noyan died in 1997.

⁷³ Doç. Dr. *Bedri Noyan* (ed.). *Demir Baba Vilayetnâmesi*. İstanbul: Can Yayınları. The edition available to me mentions on the title back page that the first edition was published in 1976. This seems to be a mistake, for Noyan mentions in the colophon that he finished the transcription into the Latin alphabet in 1984. I therefore assume that

source was a manuscript of 1948/49 which was based on a copy dated 1239 (1823–24); the latter, in turn, had allegedly been copied from a manuscript produced in 1029 (1619).⁷⁴ A second manuscript, seemingly dating from 1129 (1716–1717), has been available as a photocopy to the Bulgarian scholar Nevena Gramatikova who described the *Velayetname* in an article.⁷⁵ As it seems, all extant manuscripts are kept in private possessions.

The *Velayetname* of Demir Baba begins with the life of Aqyazılı Sultan. Aqyazılı Sultan is regarded as a disciple of Otman Baba, a famous *abdāl* of the mid- to late 15th century who is buried in Haskova, Bulgaria (and who is the hero of a distinct *Velayetname*).⁷⁶ In Demir Baba's hagiography, Aqyazılı Sultan is depicted as the foremost Bektashi sheykh of the time of Sultan Süleyman (1520–66). During his frequent travels one of his disciples by the name of Hajji carries Aqyazılı on his back. While Hajji is dedicated to live a celibate life as Aqyazılı's devoted servant, the latter orders him to marry, and foretells him that he would have a son who would become a great saint. Hajji has to obey and marries; in the longstanding dispute between the celebrarian Bektashis and the family *dedes*, this *Velayetname* obviously sides with the families. The marriage ceremony is conducted in one of the Alevi villages in the presence of many saints.⁷⁷ The young Demir Baba, offspring of Hajji's marriage, accompanies Aqyazılı and Hajji from *tekke* to *tekke*, where he meets several local saints and obtains his spiritual education and initiation. Demir Baba's book mentions all kinds of rituals, ceremonies and spiritual ranks, so that it might also have served as a guidebook for Alevi ritual life in the region.⁷⁸

After this Bektashi education, Demir Baba becomes known not only as a sheykh, but also as a ringer (*pehlivan*). Several stories describe him as a powerful warrior-dervish who fights the unbelievers. In one episode he brings down an approaching cavalry of unbelievers by emitting a yell which makes the horses throw off their riders. As in the case of Hajji Bektash and Hajjim, Dede Baba has miraculous power over animals. In one story he is invited to the land of the Tatars (obviously the Dobruja or the Crimean lands, for Demir Baba enters the country after just swimming through the Danube river), where he kills a dragon with a gun.⁷⁹ When the king of Muscovy (i.e. Russia) hears of Demir Baba's

the first edition was published either in 1986 or in 1996. — It seems that Noyan has largely preserved the wording of the original. A modern Turkish version recently published by Hakkı Saygı (*Saygı H. Demir Baba Velâyetnâmesi*. İstanbul, 1997), underlines the importance of the Demir Baba hagiography for the Alevi Turks of Bulgaria.

⁷⁴ Noyan. *Demir Baba Vilâyetnâmesi*. S. 28.

⁷⁵ Gramatikova N. Zhitieto na Demir Baba i sizdavaneto na rikopisi ot miusiulmanite ot kheterodoksitate tehnii na islama v severoistochna Bilgaria (izvor za kulturnata i religioznata im istoria) // *Rositsa Gradeva, Svetlana Ivanova* (eds.). *Miusiulmanskata kultura po bilgarskite zemi: Isledvania*. Sofia, 1998. S. 400–435. It seems that the Turkish edition of Noyan was not known to Gramatikova.

⁷⁶ See Şevki Koca (ed.). *Odman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi: Vilâyetname-i Şâhi Gökçek Abdal*. İstanbul, 2002. Otman (Odman) Baba is depicted as an *abdāl* who lived during the time of Mehmed II, and this sultan appears in several episodes. The reportedly unique manuscript of the *Velayetname* of Otman Baba stems from 1759. Halil Inalcik regards the *Velayetname* of Otman Baba as an authentic account of the Baba's life, and thus different from the "stereotyped stories common to such hagiographic literature"; *Inalcik H. Dervish and Sultan: An Analysis of the Otman Baba Vilâyetnâmesi* // *Inalcik H. The Middle East and the Balkans under the Ottoman Empire: Essays in Economy and Society*. Bloomington, 1993. P. 19.

⁷⁷ Noyan. *Demir Baba Vilâyetnâmesi*. S. 63–66; Gramatikova. *Zhitieto na Demir Baba*. S. 408, 416–419. Interestingly, Babinger notes that the local population calls Demir Baba's father "Ali Dede from Khorasan", and obviously he was not aware of the existence of a written hagiography; *Babinger F. Das Bektaschi-Kloster Demir Baba* // *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen der Friedrich-Wilhelm-Universität zu Berlin*, No. 34 (1931). S. 89.

⁷⁸ Gramatikova. *Zhitieto na Demir Baba*. S. 416–421. By contrast to the *Velayetname* of Hajji Bektash (but not to that of Hajjim Sultan), Demir Baba's book emphasizes abdest and prayer, and not only Allah and Ali, but also Muhammad is invoked at several occasions. Curiously, in one instance Demir Baba even establishes a substantial *vakıf* for the Muslims of Medina (Gramatikova. *Zhitieto na Demir Baba*. S. 423).

⁷⁹ Noyan. *Demir Baba Vilâyetnâmesi*. S. 92; Gramatikova. *Zhitieto na Demir Baba*. S. 422.

success in the land of the Tatars, he invites the saint to kill another beast that is devastating his own country. Demir Baba accepts the invitation, saying that evil-doers have to be punished wherever they are. The king is so despaired that he is even ready to sacrifice himself to the dragon, but Demir Baba saves his life by binding him. In the meeting with the dragon Demir Baba has butterflies (*kelebek*) settle down on the dragon's eyes, so that Demir Baba is able to catch the long tongue of the blinded monster with an animal trap or net. After a short dialogue with the dragon the saint kills it. Overwhelmed with gratitude, the king falls to Demir Baba's feet and thanks him with enormous presents of gold, cattle, and slaves.⁸⁰ In this story it is Christians whom Demir Baba saves, and the episode is based on commonalities between Muslims and Christians. When asked by the Christian king to what faith he belongs, Demir Baba says that he belongs to the *millet* of Abraham, thus pointing out the common prophetic background of Islam and Christianity.⁸¹

The region of Deliorman has been inhabited by Muslims as well as by Bulgarian Orthodox Christians, and the local saints, it seems, have always been a matter of contention between the two confessions. Yet what seems like a ferocious struggle over sacred spaces, symbols, and salvation can also be regarded as a form of common ground between the two communities. Located in a forested valley, the miracle-producing sites of the Demir Baba *tekke* — a cavity in the sarcophagus one would squeeze one's hand into, a stone bench to lie on, a hole in a stone wall to creep through, a well to drink from — have been attractive to Muslims and to Christians. As Hasluck pointed out, many shrines in Rumelia were in use simultaneously by Christian and Muslim communities, in which cases the saint was referred to by a Muslim as well as a Christian name.⁸² As for the Demir Baba *tekke* we know that in 1930 the crescent on top of the cupola had a cross underneath.⁸³

Yet besides the religious dimension the contest over Demir Baba's shrine has still another side, which is connected to national sentiment. Located near Sveshtari (Mumcular in Turkish), to the northwest of the town of Ispirikh in the district of Razgrad, the *tekke* is at a distance of just a few hundred meters from ancient burial mounds (*kurgans*), some of them as high as 21 meters. Bulgarian archeologists have carried out extensive excavations not only on and around the qurgans, but also near the *tekke* and it seems even in its inner court.⁸⁴ Its close proximity to the burial mounds has led some scholars to the assumption that Demir Baba's *tekke*, which dates most probably from the 16th century,⁸⁵ had in fact been built directly on the ground of a Bulgarian sanctuary, or even on the burial site of the Proto-Bulgarian Khans Asperukh (d. in 700), the founder of the first Bulgarian empire, or Omurtag (reg. 814–31). This argumentation, which first came up in the early 1900s,⁸⁶ does not seem to have found any support from archeological facts. Quite understandably, it is also vehemently rejected by the local Turkish population. The Turks of Bulgaria were subjected to discrimination and serious reprisals through almost the whole of the 20th

⁸⁰ *Noyan*. Demir Baba Vilayetnâmesi. S. 94–97; *Gramatikova*. Zhitieto na Demir Baba. S. 423f.

⁸¹ *Noyan*. Demir Baba Vilayetnâmesi. S. 95. *Gramatikova* (Zhitieto na Demir Baba. S. 424) does not see the religious meaning of millet, which she understands as pertaining to the ethnic origin and renders as "people" (*narod* in Bulgarian).

⁸² *Hasluck F. W.* Christianity and Islam under the Sultans. Ed. by Margaret M. Hasluck. 2 vols. Oxf., 1929.

⁸³ *Babinger*. Das Bektaschi-Kloster Demir Baba. S. 91; *M. Türker*. Demir Baba tekkesi üzerine bir araştırma // *Yol: Bilim-Kültür-Araştırma*. № 11, Mayıs-Haziran 2001. S. 7. Türker mentions that the crescent-cross was taken down in 1928, but Babinger still saw it in place on his trip in early 1930.

⁸⁴ *Türker*. Demir Baba tekkesi. S. 3–6.

⁸⁵ *Babinger*. Das Bektaschi-Kloster Demir Baba. S. 92; *Türker*. Demir Baba tekkesi. S. 6.

⁸⁶ See the references in *Gramatikova*. Zhitieto na Demir Baba. S. 430.

century well into the late 1980s,⁸⁷ and they see their ethnic and cultural identity endangered by Bulgarian nationalism. This contest over shrines between Bulgarians and Alevis is also reflected in the hagiographies themselves, and produces curious results at times. In his edition of the *Demirbaba Velayetnamesi*, Noyan reports that the Bulgars brought their claim against the Demir Baba *tekke* before a Bulgarian court. In order to prove the Turkish origin of the complex, the Muslim side is said to have come up with a copy of the *Velayetname* of Demir Baba, which the court indeed accepted as a proof. Another story has the University of Sofia conducting a bone analysis of the remnants of the person buried in the Demir Baba shrine, which produced evidence that the person must have been of an enormous stature. This, according to the argumentation of Muslims/Alevis, is a clear proof in favour of Demir Baba, for he is described by local tradition as a powerful ringer.⁸⁸ As they are mentioned in the introduction to the hagiography, these stories — no matter whether they have any factual background or not — create a new link between the saint of the past and the Alevi present, and it can well be argued that they are in the process of becoming part of the hagiography itself — just as the various appendices of Hajji Bektash's *Velayetname* now form part of the work as a whole.

Yet Bektashi shrines in Bulgaria have indeed changed hands several times in history. This can be illustrated by the example of the shrine of the aforementioned Aqvazılı Sultan in Batova, which also boasted a huge and very solid outhouse for pilgrims. Reportedly this complex was destroyed by the Russian army in 1829.⁸⁹ The subsequent wars and Bulgarian independence resulted in the expulsion or emigration of most of the local Muslim population, and of the Bektashi dervishes with them.⁹⁰ Obviously by 1910 the *tekke* was taken over by Christians, and the tomb identified with that of St. Athanasius.⁹¹ After the Second World War the shrine was declared an architectural monument and taken under control of the state, thus becoming a kind of neutral ground. Some elderly representatives of the local Muslim population told us in 2004 that they remember the place still being in use by Muslims at the occasion of feasts, as well as by Roma. Today, the renovated *tekke* is still administered as a monument of architecture. The Bulgarian custodians, however, have removed all items that would remind of its Muslim past; instead, the chamber is full of Christian icons, candles, and wooden Easter eggs. This, however, does not deter Alevi pilgrims from visiting the *tekke* and attaching donations to the shrine.⁹² The shrine as well as the hagiography are still symbolic and physical manifestations of the historical presence of Alevis in Bulgaria.

⁸⁷ As the development of Bulgarian nationalism was always linked to the Christian Orthodox faith of the majority population, the 20th century witnessed several phases of forced assimilation and severe discrimination against the Muslims of the country: cases of forced baptismal in 1912–14 (with many victims later returning to Islam); forced “Bulgarization” of Muslim names and culture in 1938–44 and 1962–64; a ban on Islam in the public sphere since the late 1940's; and an enforced “Bulgarization” with a ban on Turkish language and culture, connected with enforced propaganda against Islamic rites and symbols and the demolition of mosques and cemeteries between 1971–89. There were several waves of mass emigration to the Ottoman Empire / Turkey, the more recent ones being in 1950–51 (140,000 Muslims), when immigration was possible for a short period, and then in the summer of 1989 when more than 300,000 Turks were expelled by the Zhivkov government (many of whom later returned to Bulgaria). See also Neunburger M. *The Orient Within: Muslim Minorities and the Negotiation of Nationhood in Modern Bulgaria*. Ithaca–London 2004.

⁸⁸ Noyan. *Demir Baba Vilayetnâmesi*. S. 27–28.

⁸⁹ Hasluck. *Christianity and Islam*. P. 90.

⁹⁰ Ara Margos. *Teketo 'Ak İazılı Baba': Pitevoditel (Okırzhen istoricheski muzei Tolbukhin, s.a.)*, 4. See also Babinger. *Das Bektaschi-Kloster Demir Baba*. S. 84–93.

⁹¹ Hasluck. *Christianity and Islam*. P. 90–92; Margos. *Teketo 'Ak İazılı Baba'*. P. 7; Lory B. *Essai d'inventaire des lieux de culte Bektachis en Bulgarie // Popovic, Veinstein*. *Bektachiyya*. P. 396f.

⁹² Field observations in May 2004.

Bektashi Shrines and the Alevi Revival: Qaraja Ahmed (Istanbul)

The continuing popularity of Bektashi shrines is also attested to in Turkey, where several major convents have recently been developed into huge Alevi cultural centers. As Alevism is not acknowledged as a religion in Turkey, there are officially no Alevi prayer houses (*cem evi*s). Since the mid-1960s, however, Alevis have established cultural associations for the architectural preservation of Bektashi *tekkes*. In İstanbul and elsewhere, cultural associations of this kind have renovated several Bektashi *tekkes*, and have turned them into Alevi public and religious places. Probably the most impressive example is the Shahqulu Sultan *tekke* in Merdivenköy on the Asian side of İstanbul.⁹³ After its renovation, this complex now boasts a huge hall where *cem*s and other ceremonies and events are conducted, a kitchen for the several hundred guests, other rooms where Alevi music and dance are being practiced, the complex's own administration, and a bookshop with a huge assortment of literature on Alevi history and beliefs; the shop also sells music cassettes and icons of Ali, the Imams, Kemal Atatürk, Hajji Bektash and other saints. The old shrines and tombstones of the legendary Shahqulu Sultan (who is supposed to have died after 1402) and other Bektashi sheykhs at the entrance to the inner yard still figure prominently;⁹⁴ however, it is safe to say that most visitors are attracted by the modern facilities of the complex, not by the graveyard.

At the same time that the convents and mausolea were rediscovered and transformed, Alevi intellectuals have developed a huge interest in the hagiographies of the saints that are buried there. Especially since the 1980s, Bektashi hagiographies of numerous *velis* have been edited, transcribed, translated, popularized and simplified, as well as reinterpreted.⁹⁵ How these two processes go hand in hand can best be studied with the example of Qaraja Ahmed, whose convent in Üsküdar has become another major Alevi cultural center on the Asiatic side of İstanbul. Here the shrine of the saint Qaraja Ahmed is still of central importance. Located in one of the halls, the sarcophagus is highly venerated by visitors who perform the circumambulation and make donations. The Karacaahmet Sultan Culture and Solidarity Association,⁹⁶ founded as early as in 1969, has published two books on Qaraja Ahmed which clearly reflect his continuing popularity, and which, I would like to argue, represent a continuation of the old Bektashi hagiographical tradition with several new elements. The first of these books was composed by the *lise* teacher Mehmed Yaman, and was published in 1974;⁹⁷ the second one came out in 1998, and although the foreword mentions that it was composed with the support of the Alevi historian and anthropologist Burhan Kocadağ, the title page does not reveal an individual author.⁹⁸ By contrast to the new editions of hagiographies like that of Veli Baba or Demir Baba, the composers of Qaraja Ahmed's hagiography did not have an old manuscript at their disposal; therefore the two books represent new and original collections of traditions about the saint. They show how Alevi intellectuals try to make sense of the Bektashi tradition for

⁹³ On this center see Kocadağ B. Şahkulu Sultan dergâhi ve İstanbul Bektaşî tekkeleri. İstanbul, 1998; Bacqué-Grammont J.-L. et al. Le tekke bektachi de Merdivenköy // Anatolia Moderna (Yeni Anadolu) 1–2, 1991. P. 29–135.

⁹⁴ Kocadağ. Şahkulu Sultan dergâhi. S. 110–117.

⁹⁵ Apart from the saints already mentioned, there are currently numerous popular editions of other saints linked to the Bektashi tradition, including Abdal Musa, Hamza Baba, Qayghusuz Abdal, Otman Baba, and Seyyid Ali Sultan.

⁹⁶ Karacaahmet Sultan. Kültürünü Tanıtma-Dayanişma ve Türbesini Onarma Derneği (lit., Association for Solidarity and Propaganda of the Karacaahmet Sultan Culture and for the Restauration of His Shrine).

⁹⁷ Yaman M. Karaca Ahmed. İstanbul: Karacaahmet Sultan Türbesini Koruma Derneği, 1974. S. 207.

⁹⁸ Karacaahmet Sultan. İstanbul: Karacaahmet Sultan Kültür ve Tanıtma Derneği, 1998, № 1.

a contemporary audience, and thus develop it into a new direction. A comparison of the two publications will also reveal some changes in the Alevi discourse over the last three decades.

The first book, published in 1974, begins with an historical discussion of the significance of Hajji Bektash and the other Khorasanian dervishes for the occupation and Turkification of Anatolia, and thus for the cultural heritage of the Turkish nation. This part is based mainly on the *Velayetname* of Hajji Bektash,⁹⁹ but it also contains quotations from the Mevlevi tradition and hagiographies of other Bektashi saints like Otman Baba, as well as nationalist slogans of Kemal Atatürk.¹⁰⁰ The central message is that in the 13th century it was the Bektashi dervishes who spread the Anatolian culture of the Turks, and who defended it against foreign influences, especially against “fanatical” Sunni scholars from Arabia.¹⁰¹ Special mention is made of the narrative in which Hajji Bektash blessed Osman, the founder of the Ottoman dynasty, and explains that he also played a crucial role in the founding of the Janissary corps, the elite troops of the Ottomans.¹⁰² The book thus underscores Bektash’s importance in the founding of the Ottoman empire. This is followed by an account of Kemal Atatürk’s visit to the main Bektashi convent in Hacıbektaş in 1919, where he allegedly found a warm reception from the incumbent Chelebi, the head of the saintly family.¹⁰³ This narrative is meant to display the true devotion of the Bektashis and Alevis vis-à-vis the new, secular Turkish state (in fact, the book even contains a *dua* prayer for the Turkish army, navy and air force, which should be seen in the context of the Turkish occupation of Northern Cyprus in 1974).¹⁰⁴ Not mentioned, however, is the fact that just a few years later Atatürk ordered all Sufi convents, including all Bektashi *tekkes*, to be closed.

Qaraja Ahmed is introduced — rather late, on page 67 — as a dervish and military leader (*gazi*), but above all as a healer and psychiatrist. Again, the main source is the *Velayetname*, and again reference is made to Ahmed Yasavi. The reader is told that Yasavi gave Hajji Bektash a demon (*dev*), which Bektash then transmitted to Qaraja Ahmed.¹⁰⁵ The demon is obviously understood as a good spirit that helps the sick and other petitioners at Qaraja Ahmed’s (future) tomb. Also mentioned is the story of the *Velayetname* according to which Qaraja Ahmed tried to prevent Hajji Bektash from entering Anatolia, as well as his subsequent submission to Bektash.

Besides that, the book ascribes to Qaraja Ahmed some features which, in the *Velayetname*, belong to other figures. For instance, the reader is told that it was Qaraja Ahmed who mounted a lion and rode to Hajji Bektash to challenge him; Hajji Bektash reacted to this challenge by giving life to a wall and riding it, thus performing an even greater miracle.¹⁰⁶ In the *Velayetname*, it is not Qaraja Ahmed but another dervish, Mahmud Hayrani, who challenged Bektash in this “duel of miracles”. As Martin van Bruinessen has shown, the riding of the lion and of a wall (or rock) is a “wandering” and very widespread motive in hagiographies that seems to have its roots in India.¹⁰⁷ A similar transmission of features from the *Velayetname* is to be found in the wooden sword, which, as we have already seen, Hajji Bektash consigned to Hajjim Sultan according to the *Velayetname*; in Mehmed Yaman’s book it was Ahmed Yasavi who handed over the

⁹⁹ Yaman. Karaca Ahmed, S. 30–45 and passim.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. S. 10; 16.

¹⁰¹ Ibid. S. 13f.

¹⁰² Ibid. S. 19–25.

¹⁰³ Ibid. S. 48–52.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. S. 46–47.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid. S. 78.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid. S. 78f.

¹⁰⁷ van Bruinessen. Haji Bektaş.

wooden sword, and not to Hajji Bektash or Hajjim but to Qaraja Ahmed.¹⁰⁸ As in the case of Hajjim Sultan, we see that Hajji Bektash is “circumvented” by his alleged disciple Qaraja Ahmed so that the latter participates directly in the blessing by Ahmed Yasavi.

The author also makes mention of a *vakf* document issued by the rulers of Saruhan in 773/1371, which mentions a certain Qaraja Ahmed, son of Suleyman from Khorasan, as a witness. Without explaining the historical context of the document, Yaman takes this mentioning of a Qaraja Ahmed as scientific evidence for Qaraja Ahmed’s historical existence in late 14th century West Anatolia.¹⁰⁹

A certain difficulty arises from the fact that several places in Anatolia and Rumelia claim to host Qaraja Ahmed’s mausoleum. Again the reader is confronted with the contradictions and ambiguities of the hagiographic tradition, and the author, who purports to have visited several of Qaraja Ahmed’s tombs, lets the contradicting stories stand side by side without resolving the riddle; although to him “it is most probable” that Qaraja Ahmed is buried in Üsküdar.¹¹⁰

The next topic is Qaraja Ahmed’s work as psychiatrist. His convent in Üsküdar, so Yaman, was famous as a center for healing mental sickness. As no accounts on Qaraja Ahmed’s methods have come down to us, Yaman includes in their stead some short treatises written by the Turkish medicine historian Dr. Süheyl Ünver on traditional Turkish methods of treating nervous disorders.¹¹¹ These methods range from the immobilization of patients and special diets to light work, musical therapy, and talking sessions. The book ends with a list of quotations on Qaraja Ahmed from historiographical works, an anthology of Bektashi and Alevi poems on Qaraja Ahmed, a short autobiography of Yaman, and a report on the foundation of the Karaca Ahmed Association in 1969.

The 1998 publication has a similar structure, but differs from Yaman’s book in several ways. In particular, it has to struggle with the fact that in the meantime, mainly thanks to the works of Ahmed Yaşar Ocak, it had become common knowledge that the “historical” Hajji Bektash was a disciple of Resul Baba, who was killed in the course of his rebellion against the Seljuqs in 1240.¹¹² This newly accepted wisdom that Hajji Bektash flourished in the middle of the 13th century clashes with the traditional view that Bektash was a contemporary of Osman (ca. 1281–1326), and that he died in 1337. From here emerge even greater problems for the historical identity of Qaraja Ahmed, who, as we know from the *Velayetname*, is supposed to have been present in Anatolia already before Hajji Bektash arrived, which would therefore mean before 1240. According to the book of 1998, Qaraja Ahmed came to accept Hajji Bektash as his master and was then sent out by the latter until he arrived at the above-mentioned tekke of Merdivenköy (the present-day Shahqulu Sultan *tekke*) in Istanbul. The Turkish conquest of Merdivenköy, however, is reported to have taken place as late as 1329; accordingly, the booklet concludes quite logically, Qaraja Ahmed must have already been some 120 years old when he came to Merdivenköy. Later Qaraja Ahmed must have moved over to the other *tekke* which today bears his name. The author suggests that he probably died around 1335, at the age of 130. While this sounds barely credible, it is only the logical result of the author’s attempt to combine information from the *Velayetname* (Qaraja Ahmed being a disciple of Bektash) with the modern historians’ view (Hajji Bektash being a disciple of Baba Resul who died in 1240, and

¹⁰⁸ Yaman. Karaca Ahmed. S. 79.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid. S. 83. Reportedly, the document is discussed in Çağatay Uluçay. Saruhan oğulları ve eserlerine dair vesikalar (773–1220h.). Vol. 1. İstanbul, 1940. S. 19–28 (not available to me).

¹¹⁰ Yaman. Karaca Ahmed. S. 85–91. Qaraja Ahmed’s *türbes* in other places are discussed on S. 103–116.

¹¹¹ Yaman. Karaca Ahmed. S. 129–142. Ünver’s articles are followed by small contributions from other Alevi authors.

¹¹² Ocak A. Y. La révolte de Baba Resul. Ankara, 1989. P. 90ff.

Merdivenköy being taken in 1335).¹¹³ Interestingly, the booklet also mentions the vaqf document from 773/1371, in which the name of Qaraja Ahmed is listed as a witness; as we have seen, this document is used as important historical evidence by Mehmed Yaman in 1974. By contrast, the anonymous author of the 1998 publication prefers to reject the credibility of this source for the simple reason that accepting it would mean to ascribe Qaraja Ahmed a life of more than 165 years,¹¹⁴ which seems to be too much even for him.

Besides this change in the attempt to bring the legendary life of the saint in line with historical data, we observe an important shift in how Qaraja Ahmed is depicted, and how his activities are explained. It is here that we see the influence of the current Alevi discourse on identity.

Like Mehmed Yaman before, the 1998 booklet describes Hajji Bektash's merit for defending Turkish culture and religion against the encroachments of Christian missionaries from Byzantium and Islamic mollahs from Arabia. In this situation it was Hajji Bektash who, by uniting the local *eren* under his leadership, created "intelligent organizations" (*dirayetli organizasyonları*) that actually helped the Ottomans in building a state.¹¹⁵ With reference to the *Velayetname* and other sources, the booklet provides a long list of saints of various places in Anatolia and Rumelia who united to "work under Hajji Bektash's directives".¹¹⁶ I would argue that this focus on the assumed organizational aspect of the Bektashiyye reflects the growing role of (cultural) organizations — the word is used in the plural in the book — in the life of 20th century urban Alevis.

A similar reflection of current trends can be found in other narratives of the 1998 book, for instance in its account of Hajji Bektash's arrival in Anatolia. As mentioned above, according to the *Velayetname* it was a group of dervishes led by Qaraja Ahmed who set up a gigantic wall in order to prevent Hajji Bektash from coming to Anatolia, and this wall was the reason why Hajji Bektash took on the form of a dove to fly over it. According to the 1998 booklet, Qaraja Ahmed then sent out one of his dervishes in the form of a hawk to fly to the dove and catch it. When the hawk tries to get hold of the dove, the dove (Hajji Bektash) says, "What are you doing? A saint (*er*) does not approach another saint in wrath. I came in the garment of the oppressed (*mazlum donunda*). I came for peace, friendship and love."¹¹⁷ Here the author makes Hajji Bektash profess all the cherished ideals of today's Alevi philosophy, and the quotation excellently reflects the self-portrait of the Alevis as an oppressed minority. Hajji Bektash, who is a powerful and punishing saint in the *Velayetname*, turns into a "peace dove".¹¹⁸ Similarly, the booklet praises Qaraja Ahmed's work as a medical man, stating that his mission was humanity, equality, and fraternity, and that he stood up for a just distribution of resources to the people.¹¹⁹ This, again, reflects some of the values and stereotypes that are so often repeated in the current discourse on Alevism, as well as a certain socialist background.

The 1998 booklet also takes a different stance with regard to the explanation of miracles. Miracles, it says, should not be taken at face value but are to be understood as

¹¹³ Karacaahmet Sultan. S. 18, 73–75.

¹¹⁴ Ibid. S. 74–75.

¹¹⁵ Ibid. S. 15.

¹¹⁶ Ibid. S. 16.

¹¹⁷ Ibid. S. 24–25. In fact, some manuscripts of Bektash's *Velayetname* have this wording, however without reference to peace, love and friendship: "You came to us in the garment/form of an oppressor, but we came to you in the garment/form of the oppressed. If we had found a form that would give even better expression to our being oppressed, we would have taken on that form" (*Siz bize zalim donunda geldiniz. Biz size mazlum donunda geldik. Eğer güvercinden dahi mazlum donulsak ol don ile geldik*); Ms. of the *Velayetname* used by Tschudi. *Das Vilâyet-nâme des Hâdschim Sultan*. P. 24. It should be kept in mind that Hajji Bektash says these words while he is strangling the dervish-hawk!

¹¹⁸ Karacaahmet Sultan. S. 15–16.

¹¹⁹ Ibid. S. 22–23.

mythologies.¹²⁰ The anonymous author presents Qaraja Ahmed in scientific terms, and he translates the language of exclusive religious power used in the *Velayetnames* into one of humanity and all-encompassing compassion. This also fits well to the general agenda of the Alevis in our time, which is often described as a combination of undogmatic spirituality with humanity, tolerance, equality, solidarity, and an openness to the modern way of life. Last but not least, Qaraja Ahmed's dedication to social and medical services is also expressed in the statutes of the Cultural Association that bears his name. According to its mission statement, the Association is not only dedicated to the advancement of (Alevi) belief, culture, education, research, and the restoration of the convent, but also offers social services and stipends and tries to achieve a cost reduction for its members in private clinics.¹²¹

To conclude, there are several arguments to support the thesis that the Bektashi hagiographical tradition is still very much alive today, although now in the hands of Alevi intellectuals. In the first place, this continuity concerns the sources and their use, and therefore also the contents and motives of the works discussed. As for the sources, they are mostly hagiographical; as we have seen, also the modern books on Qaraja Ahmed rely almost completely on earlier hagiographies. The authors repeat many episodes from the *Velayetname*, and Mehmed Yaman also takes the liberty of ascribing certain features and activities of other shaykhs to Qaraja Ahmed. We met this phenomenon of "wandering topoi" most clearly in the *Menakıbnâme* of Hajjim, which assigned several of Hajji Bektash's miracles to Hajjim. Another common feature is the ambiguity of the Bektashi tradition; books can offer several contradictory narratives without discarding any of them.

The continuity is also palpable in the structure of the works. Like the *Velayetnames* of Bektash, Hajjim and Demir Baba, the books on Qaraja Ahmed begin with a long legitimizing part. Like in the old Bektashi hagiographies, this legitimation is achieved by connecting Qaraja Ahmed to other saints, especially to Ahmed Yasavi and Hajji Bektash. In addition, the legitimizing part in Mehmed Yaman's book contains numerous quotations from Atatürk on the glory of the Turkish nation; but even these quotations (as well as the episode of Atatürk's visit to Hacibektaş in 1919) serve the goal of connecting Qaraja Ahmed to another, in this case national, saint. As for the structure of the hagiographies, it is also worth mentioning that both publications on Qaraja Ahmed also boast extensive appendices which, like those in the *Velayetname* of Hajji Bektash, connect to the reader's era. In the case of Demir Baba, it is the editor's introduction that performs this function.

Besides that there are, of course, several new elements in the modern hagiographies. To these belong the illustration with photos of türbes and tombstones, as well as the mentioning of several accounts from modern history books which serve the aim to underscore the historical authenticity of Qaraja Ahmed's personality. The 1998 publication makes more reference to scientific explanations, e.g. for healing miracles, than the first publication of 1974; however, both books use historical documentation in a similar selective fashion, accepting documents when they back the hagiographical tradition and dismissing them when they do not fit. As for the inclusion of short articles on medical history, they are obviously meant to transfer the mysteries of Qaraja Ahmed into the present time, and to make the significance of the saint understandable to a modern audience. Another product of the 20th century is the strong Turkish nationalist tone of Yaman's book. The 1998 publication retains the patriotic stance in its presentation of the dervish's defense of Anatolia, but it does so without any reference to Atatürk.

The adaptation of hagiographies to changing contexts and the occupation of tekkes like that of Seyyid Ghazi is still going on. For the new hagiographies, the *Velayetname* of Hajji Bektash is still the central source of inspiration; in fact the linkage to Hajji Bektash is much

¹²⁰ Ibid. S. 23.

¹²¹ Ibid. S. 91, 96–97.

more prominent in the newly written hagiographies than in the old *vitas* of other dervishes, like Demir Baba and Veli Baba, which have a strong and independent regional background. Today hagiographies are composed by Alevi intellectuals and historians under the auspices of cultural associations that have taken over the saints' *tekkes*; and Hajji Bektash, with Ahmed Yasavi in his shadow, is the one saint that serves the purpose of connecting them all. As the old hagiographies describe the dervishes as all-powerful and oftentimes even violent, this is surely not the type of saint that adherents would easily be able to believe in, let alone to imitate today.¹²² In order to reassert the saints' authority in the 20th/21st century, hagiographies have to be brought up to date. This leads to a merger of old and new, when miracles are explained through the prism of modern sciences, when formerly sectarian Sufi motives are formulated as expressions of general human values, and when a saint's identity is proven by a bone analysis.

М. Кемпер

**Захваты текке и агиография Хаджи Бекташа,
Хаджим Султана, Дамир Баба и Караджи Ахмада XV–XX вв.**

Главные сюжеты бекташской агиографической традиции представлены в восходящей к концу XV в. Вилайат-наме Хаджи Бекташа. В первой части статьи автор сопоставляет это агиографическое сочинение с одноименным «житием» Хаджим Султана, которого считают учеником Хаджи Бекташа. Оба Вилайат-наме обосновывают святость своих героев, связывая их введение в братство с шайхом Ахмадом Йасави, архетипом тюркского «святого» из Туркестана. В этом и других отношениях «житие» Хаджим Султана явно повторяет, если не копирует Вилайат-наме Хаджи Бекташа. Любопытно, что реакцией на появление первого стало Приложение к Вилайат-наме Хаджи Бекташа, в котором подчеркивается первенство и преобладание Хаджи Бекташа над Хаджим Султаном. В развитии агиографии обоих шайхов заметны тесные связи между их линиями и забота о единстве подвижной сети отделений *бекташийи*. Пришедшееся на XV–XVI вв. создание единой организации братства как объединения разных синкретичных суфийских общин отразилось в центральном для Вилайат-наме Хаджим Султана рассказе о захвате *бекташийей* обители Сайида Гази.

Во второй части статьи рассматривается захват обителей-текке сегодня и использование в этих целях бекташской агиографии. В современной Болгарии *текке* Дамир Баба, традиционно почитаемое также христианами, стало центром, объединившим турецких алевитов из области Делиорман, прибегающих для обоснования своих прав на него к древней агиографии этого «святого». После роспуска суфийских братств Ататюрком и последующего упадка многих суфийских обителей в Турции бекташские *текке* также стали сегодня играть все большую роль. В середине 60-х годов XX в. здесь появляются ассоциации алевитских общин, пытающиеся восстановить некоторые *текке*, превратив их в алевитские культурные центры. Вместе с ними алевиты унаследовали от *бекташийи* могилы и «жития» ее «святых». Начиная с 80-х годов алевитские *dede* и другие представители духовной элиты братства публикуют множество популярных турецких изданий и переводов бекташской агиографии, что говорит о растущем интересе алевитов к этим шейхам. Алевитские историки создают новые агиографические работы о почитаемом в одном из стамбульских *текке* шейхе Караджа Ахмеди, «жития» которого прежде написано не было. Хотя в бекташской агиографии 70–90-х годов XX в. хорошо заметны следы современной эпохи, она также обнаруживает преемственность с восходящей к XV–XVI вв. бекташской традицией, повторяя не только ее излюбленные темы, но и приемы, рассмотренные в настоящей статье на примере Вилайат-наме Хаджи Бекташа и Хаджим Султана.

¹²² On distant saints and saints to be imitated see *Vauchez A.* Saints admirables et saints imitables: les fonctions de l'hagiographie ont-elles changés aux dernières siècles du Moyen Age? // Les fonctions des saints dans le monde occidental (IIIe–XIIIe siècles). Actes du colloque organisé par l'Ecole Française de Rome. P., 1991.