

On Editing Ottoman Turkish *tekke* Poetry

BILL HICKMAN
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

Eşrefoğlu Rumi (d. 875/1469?) and Ümmî Kemal (d. 880/1475?) are prominent practitioners of Ottoman Sufi (*tekke*) poetry—literature that emerged from the environment of Anatolian Sufi orders. The parallel histories of the transmission of their two *divans* help clarify details of the poets' lives. Conversely, biographical facts may help explain details and oddities of those transmission histories, which themselves may also illuminate features of the late fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Ottoman religious and political landscape of increasing theological rigidity in the face of Safavid pressure and probable persecution of those deemed beyond the pale, features that are still poorly understood. In light of a recent essay by Walter Andrews on prevailing editing practices in Ottoman literature, I offer a critique of the recent handling of both *divans*. After noting previously unrecognized copies of each, I also make suggestions for further study of their poems.

I. INTRODUCTION

In a recent paper Walter Andrews deplored what he finds to be the situation in an area of Ottoman literature of special interest to him, sixteenth-century *divan* poetry.¹ He directed his attention specifically to editions of Baki's *divan* and Latîfî's *Tezkire*, both foundational works, but took aim also at a broader target. Andrews challenged colleagues to find new ways of both conceptualizing Ottoman literary texts and concretizing their results—in short, new ways of handling texts. In his review of prevailing practice in modern Turkey he singled out two specific barriers to the conversion of handwritten Ottoman texts into printed Turkish books.

The first is transcription: Because of the Turkish adoption of the Latin-based alphabet in 1928, which replaced the nearly millennium-long use (among most Muslim Turks) of a slightly modified Arabic alphabet, and because scholars in the young Turkish Republic (or their publishers) generally opted to produce editions of older Ottoman works in that new alphabet, difficulties were immediately encountered—the new alphabet did not convey all of the consonantal distinctions preserved, or the ambiguities allowed, by the Arabic script. Despite this, it was often preferred to the more fully differentiating scholarly transliteration.

This is a review article of Mustafa Güneş, *Eşrefoğlu Rûmî: Hayatı, eserleri ve divânı* (Istanbul, 2006), and Hayati Yavuzer, *Kemâl Ümmî Divânı: İnceleme-metin* (Bolu, 2008). I include some remarks concerning Mustafa Güneş, *Eşrefoğlu Rûmî Divânı: İnceleme, karşılaştırmalı metin* (Ankara, 2000) as well. I am grateful to both of the *JAOS* anonymous readers for their comments. Both noted more copies of Kemal's *divan* not listed in Table 2 below: one in Çankırı, one at the Groningen University Library (partial copy, undated), and one in the reader's private library. I have added diacritics to words of non-Turkish origin in text quotations only, otherwise adhering to standard Modern Turkish spelling.

1. Andrews presented his paper, "Ottoman Textual Studies: Challenging the Past, Visualizing the Future," at a meeting of the Western Ottomanists Workshop in 2014 in Seattle. My remarks (and quotations) below are based on a draft that he made available to me. I have not seen its published Turkish translation, by V. Öztürk, in *Eski metinlere yeni bağlamlar: Osmanlı edebiyatı çalışmalarında yeni yönelimler*, ed. H. Aynur et al. (Istanbul, 2015), 36–58.

The second barrier is even more problematic to Andrews since, in his view, “some significant theoretical textual studies issues and their consequences cannot be adequately taken into account in the case of Ottoman texts.” He continues: “The most obvious of these issues is how to account for the fundamental differences between a corpus of manuscripts and a book, the primary difference being the essential irreducibility of the former to the latter. Simply put, the conversion process rests on the metaphysical assumption that the manuscript tradition represents a collection of imperfect physical manifestations of an ideal (and perfect) single text that existed (only) in the mind of the author or in a lost (and therefore equally non-existent) perfect ‘Ur-text’ or ‘source text’.”

In keeping with the spirit of Andrews’s critique and his hopes for a more persuasive handling of primary literary texts, I offer the following remarks on the recent handling of the divans of two prominent fifteenth-century Ottoman Sufi (*tekke*) poets. My own hope is that they will (1) correct a number of errors that have crept into circulation; (2) help put future study in these cases on firmer footing; and (3) encourage new, more exacting approaches to Ottoman text editing. I also include a catalogue raisonné of known manuscripts.

II. THE POETS

1. *Eşrefoğlu Rumi*

One of the names that appears regularly in accounts of early (Ottoman) Turkish literature is that of Eşrefoğlu Rumi, to use the form Abdullah b. Eşref adopted as pen name (*mahlas*) in his poetry. A prominent representative of the fifteenth-century genre of *tekke edebiyatı*, his popularity has persisted into the twenty-first century, to judge by editions of his poetry recently published in Turkey.² It is no exaggeration to say that after Yunus Emre, whom modern critics have virtually crowned as Turkey’s national poet, Eşrefoğlu is the poet whose verses, remarkably, have been most continuously in demand—in some circles at least—and remained most continuously available, for well over half a millennium. One wonders exactly who all of Eşrefoğlu’s readers were, given that the spread of his order, the Eşrefiyye, was very modest. And who, one may also ask, was the “Indian merchant Hasan Efendi” through whose “assistance” (*marifetiyle*) the moveable type edition was first (and repeatedly) printed?³ By contrast, outside Turkey Eşrefoğlu has almost no name recognition at all.⁴

Eşrefoğlu’s poetry is alternately confessional and exhortative, exuberant and sober. One minute the poet struggles with his disobedient self (*nefs*); the next he complains about the pain (*derd*) of separation from God. But over and over again he celebrates love (*‘ışk*), sometimes extravagantly. Such feelings and expressions are found, of course, in the verses of

2. For an overview of the development of the tradition of *tekke* poetry, with reference to Eşrefoğlu’s place in it, see W. Feldman, “Mysticism, Didacticism and Authority in the Liturgical Poetry of the Halvetî Dervishes of Istanbul,” *Edebiyat* n.s. 4 (1993): 243–65. My own (unpublished) 1972 Harvard dissertation, “Eşrefoğlu Rûmî: Fifteenth Century Anatolian Mystic Poet,” is now largely outdated.

3. Apart from the manuscripts listed below, Eşrefoğlu’s divan was mass produced twice in late Ottoman times: first in an undated lithograph edition; second in 1286/1869, in moveable type. The latter was reset—with only minor changes in some typefaces—and reprinted three times (1296/1878f., 1301/1883f., and 1307/1889f.). (A copy of the lithographed text, with pages misordered, is owned by the UCLA Library.) For Republic-era editions, see n. 6 below.

4. The first mention of Eşrefoğlu in English was probably by M. F. Köprülü in his contribution “Ottoman Turkish Literature” to the original *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (Leiden, 1913–36, 4: 945) (henceforth, *EI*). His remarks did not include an assessment of the poet’s work. In his entry on “Turkish Literature” in *Chambers Encyclopedia* (new rev. ed. London, 1973, 14: 29), C. S. Mundy singled Eşrefoğlu out for the “fervour and imagination” of his prose language; he also did not comment on the poetry. Fahir İz referred to the “warm and flowing style” of his poetry in *EI2*, 12: 283.

many other *tekke* poets, but Eşrefoğlu's seem to have gained special favor among generations of readers, perhaps because his tone is sincere and his language direct. Writing about his poetry, Turkish literary historians and critics often use the word *sade* ("simple, unadorned"). In that simplicity, Eşrefoğlu's verses are diametrically opposite, for the most part, those of the high classical tradition with their complex figures of speech and multiple nuanced meanings. Eşrefoğlu's poetry is generally accessible to the reader, even today. While he is often said to have been a follower (or imitator) of Yunus Emre, or to have composed his poetry in the "manner of Yunus," his style rarely reaches the limpid, lyrical quality of his fourteenth-century predecessor.

An example of his style is the poem that begins *Yüregüme şerha şerha* (Güneş, no. 49), which in the oldest, unordered copies of Eşrefoğlu's *divan* is the first the reader encounters. How this came about is not known; its position has no rational explanation. But it is hard not to think that the poet-sheikh's earliest followers—presumably the ones who organized his written legacy after his death—wanted it so. In some sense, this poem epitomizes Eşrefoğlu's thought, and as much as any one poem can, it can give some idea of his preoccupations:

*Yüregüme şerha şerha yâreler urdı bu ışk / Ğâret etdi gönliüm ilin yağmaya urdı bu ışk.
Şimdi hâkim gönliümüñ iklimine ışkdur benim / Akla nefse tene cânâ hükmini sürdi bu ışk.
Her sıfat kim nefsiñ u aklıñ u rûhuñ var idi / Tartdı seyfullâh yürütdi kamusın kırdı bu ışk.
Bu gönül hücrelerini tahlîye kıldı kamu / Âdemîyet noqtasından sildi süpürdi bu ışk.
Kendü varlığıyle küllî varlığum mahv eyledi / Dôst göziyle bakdı ol dôst yüzini gördi bu ışk.
Çün fenâ dârında benlik Mañşûr'ın dâr eyledi / Dôst eşikinde anâ l-hâkk nevbetin urdı bu ışk.⁵
Gün gün Eşrefoğlu Râmî derdüñ artar pes neden / Zahmuna hõd dôst elinden merhem ęgürdi
bu ışk.*

This love has left my heart in shreds. This love has sacked my heart's domain, left it to be ravaged.

It is love now that has conquered the countries of my heart. This love has spread its rule over mind and soul and reason.

Whatever attributes there are of mind or self or spirit—this love has brandished the sword of God and routed them all.

It has emptied out every chamber of this heart. This love has swept away all traces of human occupation.

With all its own essentials it has destroyed my very being. This love has looked with the eye of the Friend and seen His face.

Since love executed the Mañşûr of ego on the gallows of this transient world, this love has struck the drum of *anâ l-hâkk* at the threshold of that Friend.

Why does Eşrefoğlu daily increase his suffering? With that Friend's hand, this love has applied a salve to his wounds.

5. While the oldest manuscripts agree in their reading of *benlik Mañşûr'ın*, the lithograph has *mülk-i Mañşûr'ı* while the first moveable-type Ottoman edition has *menlik Mañşûr'ı* (a reading followed by A. H. Çelebi). Both Güneş and the editors of the 1967 Çağaloğlu edition (for both, see the next note) read the Turkish line as I do. It is unimaginable to me that an openly dedicated Hallājīan like Eşrefoğlu (see below) would say, as Çelebi's reading would have it, that it was ego (*benlik/menlik*) that killed al-Hallāj. (The reading of the lithograph must come from a misreading of the manuscript it was based on.) Rather, it was al-Hallāj's outspoken expression of love (and, in particular, identification with God) that led to his execution. (It may also be argued that the grammatical and syntactical structure of the first hemistich is exactly mirrored by that of the second, something that would have been pleasing to the reader.) The image of the "drum of *anâ l-hâkk*" was borrowed by the anonymous poet who adopted the *mahlās* Muhyi in his poem in praise of Eşrefoğlu; see my "Two 15th Century Ottoman Sufi Mysteries: An Historiographical Essay. Part I: What Happened to Eşrefoğlu?" *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 46 (2015): 1–42, at 15–16.

Between 1944 and 2006 Eşrefoğlu's poetry was published by five different editors.⁶ The most recent, by the Turkish scholar Mustafa Güneş, offers a more comprehensive overview than previous ones. But, as I will show below, Güneş's handling of the poetry is marred by careless errors that undermine the book's usefulness and perhaps also the reader's confidence in his judgments.⁷

Variouly described as founder of a Sufi order (*tarikāt*) that combined practices of the Bayrami, Kadiri, or Halveti orders, who was Eşrefoğlu? The traditional account of his life links him first with the Bursa ecstatic Abdal Mehmed, then with the legendary Hacı Bayram (d. 1430) of Ankara, and, finally, with the little-known Hısayn of Hama, reputed follower, at several generations remove, of ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Gilānī (d. 561/1166f.). The late sixteenth-century (?) hagiographical work, which has been the basis for almost every subsequent recounting and from which the above details are gleaned, comes from the *tekke* community that, taking his name, flourished after Eşrefoğlu's death (874/1469f.?), mainly in Iznik and Bursa. Its account, however, should be considered suspect when not confirmed by independent sources. The copy of that *menakīb* that has been used routinely for over a century is a slightly doctored recension of the original, adding even more doubt as to its reliability. The copy has been published twice in Turkey but with no acknowledgement of its possibly suspect statements.⁸

From my own revisionist reading of the sources I have proposed alternative interpretations of episodes from that hagiographical life.⁹ I have shown that there is enough independent evidence, however fragmentary, to suggest—but without explaining—sinister events at or near the end of Eşrefoğlu's life. At the same time, stories from the above-mentioned hagiographic source (or others like it) link Eşrefoğlu (or his immediate family) to the Ottoman palace and the highest level of the sultan's inner circle and point to considerable influence on the part of the Iznik sheikh. There is every reason to believe that Eşrefoğlu Rumi's voice was heard beyond the confines of *tekke* walls during the reign of Mehmed the Conqueror.

Besides his *divan* Eşrefoğlu's written legacy includes two prose works: a *Tarikatname* and the widely popular *Müzekki'n-nüfus*, a lengthy and rambling didactic work on the stages of the purification of the "self."¹⁰ Other works commonly attributed to Eşrefoğlu have mostly not been found.¹¹ A single exception is the verse *Nasihatname*, an incomplete copy of which

6. After the Ottoman era, the first edition of Eşrefoğlu's *divan* was by A. H. Çelebi (Istanbul, 1944). That was followed by a collaborative effort published by Cağaloğlu (Istanbul, 1967; principally named editors were R. Yelkenci, A. Öztemiz, and N. Pekolcay) with an appreciation (*takriz*) by M. İz. A few years later (1972?) an anonymously edited version appeared in the Tercüman 1001 Temel Eser series. In this century editions were published by M. Özdamar (Istanbul, 2002) and by M. Güneş, the focus of my discussion.

7. He has previously published *Eşrefoğlu Rûmî* (Istanbul, 1998); *Eşrefoğlu Rûmî: Hayatı, eserleri ve divânı'ndan seçmeler* (Ankara, 1999); and *Eşrefoğlu Rûmî Divânı: İnceleme, kaşıştırmalı metin* (Ankara, 2000). A copy of the 1998 volume appears hard to come by, and I have not seen it.

8. See Bursalı Mehmed [*sic*] Veliyyüddin, *Menâkub-ı Eşrefzâde: Eşrefoğlu Rûmî'nin menkibevî hayatı*, ed. M. Güneş (Istanbul, 2006), and Abdullah Veliyyüddin Bursevî, *Menâkub-ı Eşrefzâde: Eşrefoğlu Rûmî'nin menkubeleri*, ed. A. Uçman (Istanbul, 2009). For a critical comment on both editions, see my "What Happened to Eşrefoğlu?"

9. "What Happened to Eşrefoğlu?" For more on the *menakibname* of Abdullah [b.] Veliyyüddin, see my "Şeyh ve vâlide sultan: Bir on beşinci yüzyıl Osmanlı menâkubnâmesine yaklaşmak" (Tksh. trans. Abdullah Uğur), in *Eski metinlere yeni bağlamlar: Osmanlı edîbiyatı çalışmalarında yeni yönelimler*, ed. H. Aynur (Istanbul, 2015), 258–75.

10. For the first of the two prose works, see the edition by E. Keskinikilç (Istanbul, 2002); for the second, that of A. Uçman (Istanbul, 2007). The former is a scholarly transcription based on several manuscripts; the latter is a simplified modern Turkish paraphrase of the fifteenth-century text.

11. He is said to have written the following: *Dela'ilü'n-nübüvve*, *Fütüvvetname*, *İbretname*, *Mazeretname*, *Elestname*, *Hayretname*, *Münacatname*, *Esrarü't-talibin*, and *Tacname*. Some of the short *mesnevis* included in his *divan* have been given the heading *münacat*, which may have been the source for the otherwise unknown *Münacatname* (Book of Supplication). One copy of the *Tarikatname* has been given the name *Esrarname* (VOHD 13.2: 102, no. 145).

has recently been discovered. That *mesnevi* poem may include a lengthy passage on the martyrdom of the ninth-century Baghdad ecstatic, Maṣṣūr al-Ḥallāj, though the attribution rests on circumstantial grounds and is subject to verification.¹²

While open to closer scrutiny, neither of the above-mentioned prose works appears to contain material that could have brought Eşrefoğlu into conflict with Ottoman religious authority.¹³ His *divan*, on the other hand, contains frequent references to, and “quotations” of, al-Ḥallāj. A single poem, the subject of a later commentary, may also have exposed him to charges of heresy for its open expression of desire for divine manifestation.¹⁴ Eşrefoğlu’s apparent tendency to dissimulation makes close scrutiny of his work—and what is presented as his work—all the more necessary.

As an essential prerequisite to the ongoing reexamination of Eşrefoğlu’s life, and as an incentive to other scholars, I offer here a tentative and still sketchy *catalogue raisonné* of copies of Eşrefoğlu’s *divan*, followed by a preliminary assessment of issues that a cursory review of some of them prompts.¹⁵

Table 1. Chronological list of thirty-nine manuscript copies of the *divan* of Eşrefoğlu Rumi

Year	Sigla	Location
996/1587f.	BL1*	London, British Library, OR 7699 ¹⁶
997/1588f.	OE1*	Istanbul, Belediye, Osman Ergin 769 ¹⁷
1029/1619f.	BL2*	London, British Library, OR 7191 ¹⁸

Table continues on next page

12. See my “‘The Counsels’: A Previously Unrecognized Poem on al-Hallaj by Eşrefoğlu Rumi,” in *Turkish Language, Literature, and History*, ed. B. Hickman and G. Leiser (New York, 2016), 183–90; and “Who Really Wrote the Ottoman Turkish *Story of Hallaj?*” *Der Islam* 93,1 (2016): 170–81.

13. The *Tarikatname* does, however, include especially laudatory language in speaking of the fourth caliph, ‘Alī. See Hickman, “What Happened to Eşrefoğlu?” 17.

14. For this poem (*Tecelli şevki . . .*) see Güneş, ed. 2006, 325–26 (no. 85). For bibliography on the subject and an eighteenth-century commentary (*şerh*), see Ö. Ceylan, *Tasavvufi şiir şerhleri* (Istanbul, 2000), 49–50.

15. In Table 1, manuscript copies of Eşrefoğlu’s *divan* are given in chronological order, grouped by century; undated copies follow the last dated manuscript. Before a date < means “not later than.” For identifying sigla (second column) I have adopted my own combination of letters and numbers. Güneş (ed. 2006, 9–10, and cf. 75) assigned single letter identifiers to a dozen (of the twenty-two) manuscripts he listed, but his list is error-filled so I have not taken over his usage. An asterisk (*) immediately following a siglum indicates a manuscript unknown to Güneş. The city and library where the manuscript may be found, together with its catalogue number, are listed in the third column, where a propos I give the sequential identifying number assigned to ten copies of the *divan* by the editors of *İstanbul kitaplıkları Türkçe yazma divanlar kataloğu* (1947, hereafter, *İKTYD*), 1: 23–27, the first serious attempt to describe copies of Eşrefoğlu’s poetry. Many more copies are undoubtedly still to be found, especially in Turkish and private libraries.

16. This manuscript was copied by an unknown scribe in Bursa in the month of Şaban. The script is a fully vocalized *nesih*. The colophon reads as follows, with obliterated passages indicated by an ellipsis: تمت الديوان الشريف بعناية الله الملك اللطيف بيد احقر مخلوقات الله فوق العاده [...] المعروف [...] في اوائل شهر شعبان من شهر سنة ست و تسعين و تسعماية من الهجرة النبوية بمدينة بروسه المحروسة حميت عن الافات و البلية

17. Eşrefoğlu’s poems are bound together with (and preceded by) poems of Yunus Emre and Abdürrahim Tîrsî (d. 926/1519f.), Eşrefoğlu’s successor sheikh at the Iznik *tekke*. The first pages of Eşrefoğlu’s *divan* are missing but perhaps account for only three poems. The colophon (fol. 96b) reads as follows: تمت الديوان الشريف بعناية الله الملك اللطيف بيد . . . احمد بن عبد الرحمن . . . في اواسط شهر ربيع الآخر من شهر سنة سبع و تسعين و تسعماية بقريت كيكلي بابا

The “village of Geyikli Baba” cannot be identified today, but was likely in the vicinity of Iznik/Inegöl. Similarities between the wording of this passage and the one in n. 16 above are striking. The unreadability of key words is unfortunate.

18. This manuscript, copied in the middle of Receb, was earlier in the library of E. J. W. Gibb. It was listed, but not described, by Gibb’s posthumous editor E. G. Browne in his preface to Gibb’s *A History of Ottoman Poetry* (repr. London, 1965, 2: xxii, no. 270). Eşrefoğlu’s poems are followed by those of Muhyî (probably the same as in n. 5 above).

Table 1.—Continued

Year	Sigla	Location
1035/1625f.	NP	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Nafiz Paşa 866 ¹⁹
1038/1628f.	U*	Uppsala, Univ., MS O Bj. 46 ²⁰
1041/1632	G1	Bursa, Orhan Camii, Genel 312 ²¹
1109/1698	W*	Wrocław, Univ., Ms. or I 161 ²²
1155/1742f.	G2	Bursa, Orhan Camii, Genel 724 ²³
<1159/1746	MS	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Mihri Şah Sultan 383 (<i>İKTYD</i> , no. 7)
1181/1767f.	EE	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Esad Ef. 2590 (<i>İKTYD</i> , no. 1)
<1195/1780	AE27	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Emiri Manzum 27 (<i>İKTYD</i> , no. 3)
<1233/1817?	AE28	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Emiri Manzum 28 (<i>İKTYD</i> , no. 4)
<1250/1834	HH	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Hacı Hayri 55 (<i>İKTYD</i> , no. 2) ²⁴
1250/1834	MM1*	Konya, Mevlana Müzesi, 2436 ²⁵
<1256/1840	HM	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Hacı Mahmud 3437 (<i>İKTYD</i> , no. 6)
1263/1846f.	IU 5677	Istanbul, Univ., TY 5677 (<i>İKTYD</i> , no. 10)
1268/1851f.	TA	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Tahir Aga 623
1305/1887f.	HP	Üsküdar, Selim Ağa, Haşim Paşa 81 (<i>İKTYD</i> , no. 8)
?	MM2*	Konya, Mevlana Müzesi, 3993 ²⁶
?	G3	Bursa, Orhan Camii, Genel 1235 ²⁷
?	VT*	Vatican City, Library, VT 206 ²⁸
?	BN1*	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Turc 829 ²⁹
?	BN2*	Paris, Bibl. Nat., Suppl. Turc 829
?	C	Cyprus A 1139/3 ³⁰

19. The manuscript was copied by a certain *al-hājj* Ali b. Ibrahim at an unspecified place.

20. The manuscript consists of ninety-two folios mostly in a fully vocalized *nesih*. After Eşrefoğlu's poems, poems by Abdürrahim Tirsi, Muhyiddin, and Hamdi are included. The volume was superficially described by C. J. Tornberg, *Codices arabici, Persici et turcici Bibliothecae Universitatis Upsaliensis* (Uppsala, 1849, repr. Osnabrück, 1988).

21. The manuscript was copied during Ramadan in Iznik by Ali b. Şeyh Hamdi, presumably the Eşrefiyye order's successor sheikh sometimes known as Sırr Ali Sultan (see Mehmed Şemseddin, *Bursa Dergâhları Yâdigâr-ı Şemsî*, ed. M. Kara and K. Atlansoy [Bursa, 1997], 90), who describes himself in the colophon as *al-munzawî bi-zâwiyati Eşrefzâde*. Eşrefoğlu's *Tarikatname* precedes his poems, with those of Hamdi following.

22. For a description of the manuscript, see T. Majda, *Katalog rekopisow turekich i perskich* (Warsaw, 1967), 67–68, no. 89.

23. The poems of Abdürrahim Tirsi follow those of Eşrefoğlu (fols. 2b–56a). The entire volume was copied by Derviş Mehmed al-Bursevî at an unspecified location. The script is a fully vocalized *nesih*.

24. I follow the identification from the Süleymaniye Library's card catalogue from the late 1960s. The *İKTYD* editors identify this manuscript as Hacı Mahmud 55, Güneş as Hasan Hayri Abdullah Efdendi 5/55.

25. For a description of this copy, see A. Gölpinarlı, *Mevlânâ Müzesi yazmalar kataloğu*, 4 vols. (Ankara, 1967–94), 2: 357–58.

26. *Ibid.*, 3: 163. This *mecmua* contains around one hundred poems by Eşrefoğlu as well as Sufi verse by several others, including Ümmi Kemal (see below).

27. Eşrefoğlu's poems fill fols. 3b–104b; unvocalized *nesih kırmısı* script. Per the Library's cataloguer (Mehmed Öz, in 1969), the manuscript likely dated from the latter half of the sixteenth century.

28. E. Rossi, *Elenco dei manoscritti turchi della Bibliotheca Vaticana: Vaticani, barberiniani, borgiani, rossiani, chigiani* (Vatican City, 1953), 181. The volume has lost folios; Eşrefoğlu's *divan* breaks off at fol. 57. The remainder of the volume is taken up by the poems of Ümmi Kemal.

29. E. Blochet, *Catalogue des manuscrits turcs* (Paris, 1932–33), 2: 72, no. 829. The selection of Eşrefoğlu's poems, in a different hand, fills fols. 105–47. Apart from Blochet's comments on this manuscript, see my "The Counsels'" (n. 12 above).

30. See Ramazan Şeşen et al., eds., *Kıbrıs İslâm yazmaları kataloğu* (Istanbul, 1995), 22–23.

?	H* ³¹	
?	AE 28m	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Emiri Ef. 28 mük. (<i>İKTYD</i> , no. 5)
?	L	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Laleli 1732
?	IU2	Istanbul, Univ., TY 2933 (<i>İKTYD</i> , no. 9)
?	IU 3	Istanbul, Univ., TY 6516
?	V*	Vienna, Kaiserlich-königlichen Hofbibliothek ³²
?	VT2*	Vatican City, Library, VT 19 ³³
?	RY	Ankara, Milli, Raif Yelkenci 891 ³⁴
?	OE2*	Istanbul, Belediye, Osman Ergin no. 448 ³⁵

The following five (undated) manuscripts were listed by Güneş but neither described nor used in his edition:

?	Ankara, Milli, BL 130
?	Ankara, Milli, BL 3306
?	Ankara, Milli, BL A756 ³⁶
?	Ankara, Türk Dil Kurumu, BL A229
?	Çorum, İl Halk, 2220/3

These last two (undated) manuscripts are identified, but not described, on the website of the Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism (www.yazmalar.gov.tr):

?	Ankara, Milli, 34 Ha 119/8
?	Ankara, Milli, 42 Kon 1876/1

In addition to the above manuscripts, poems by Eşrefoğlu are often found in literary miscellanies (sing. *mecmua*) or their poorer cousins (sing. *cönk*).³⁷ Some of his poems, set to music, retained popularity in the setting of *tekke* ceremonies.

Immediately striking—and most astonishing—about the preceding list is that not a single dated copy of Eşrefoğlu's divan survives from before the very last years of the first Muslim millennium (latter years of sixteenth century C.E.), well over one hundred years after his death. Given the obvious popularity of his poetry in succeeding centuries and the existence of an institutional network (*tarikât*) that must have supported his poetry's preservation, it is difficult not to avoid the conclusion that most early copies of his poetry were destroyed, or were kept closely guarded to limit further copying. The suppression of his divan—if it can

31. This manuscript was offered for sale in 1970 by Harrassowitz. The sale catalogue (Spezial-Listen 68, p. 4) described it as dating to the twelfth/eighteenth century. No further information is available and its whereabouts today is unknown.

32. For this undated copy, see G. Flügel, *Die arabischen, persischen und türkischen Handschriften der Kaiserlich-königlichen Hofbibliothek zu Wien*, 3 vols. (Vienna, 1865–67), I: 636–37, no. 677. Eşrefoğlu's poems (fols. 44–81) are preceded by those of Yunus Emre.

33. Rossi, *Elenco*, 170–71; Eşrefoğlu's poems comprise only a few folios of this manuscript (seventeenth century?), which mainly contains the divan of Abdürrahim Tirsi.

34. Eşrefoğlu's poems are followed by those of Nesimi, Usuli, and others.

35. The text containing Eşrefoğlu's poems is titled *divan-i Eşref Rumi*. It was copied at an unspecified date and place by Hasan b. Hüseyin.

36. Although Güneş cites this copy often in his critical apparatus (ed. 2000), he does not describe it.

37. Examples of the former are too numerous to cite, though there are none in the early collective volumes noted in section III.1, below. Eşrefoğlu's poems are found in nine of thirty-five *cönks* (mostly written in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries) in a special collection held by the UCLA Library (based on their detailed descriptions in a handlist by I. Başgöz). For a characterization of the *cönk* and a select bibliography of relevant articles, see G. Leiser, "A *khutba* in the Name of Sultan Mahmut II: An Arabic Sermon to an Uncomprehending Congregation," *Journal of Oriental and African Studies* 25 (2016): 72–81.

be explained as such—would accord well with the arguably dark circumstances surrounding the end of his life, however much needs still to be explained.³⁸

2. Ümmi Kemal

E. J. W. Gibb first brought the name of Eşrefoğlu's close contemporary, Ümmi Kemal,³⁹ to the attention of English readers in his *History of Ottoman Poetry* with an excerpt of five couplets from a single poem, recognition that he had withheld from Eşrefoğlu himself. M. F. Köprülü added a one-line rave review years later in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.⁴⁰ Thereafter, however, Kemal attracted little attention: he was ignored altogether or given only minimal space in a number of Republic-era histories and anthologies,⁴¹ and his name occurs only in passing in the ambitious new four-volume history of Turkish literature edited by Talat Halman; comment is limited mainly to bio-bibliographic details.⁴² By contrast with Eşrefoğlu, the divan of Ümmi Kemal remained unprinted throughout the Ottoman period. It was published only in the first decade of this century.⁴³ Outside Turkey, Kemal's divan was printed four times (!) in Kazan between 1860 and 1906. The surge of interest in him among the Tatars remains inadequately explained, despite recent publications.⁴⁴

Poems in Kemal's divan reveal his close association with the Safavid *tarikāt* and his devotion to both the third sheikh of that Iranian-based order (Hoca Ali) and to one of his Anatolian followers, Sheikh Hamid, popularly known as Somuncu Baba. Although Kemal himself came to be portrayed as a venerated sheikh in the area of Bolu, his place in the Safavid organization is unclear. That network may have helped spread his poetry, which would explain an early proliferation of divan copies. From a line in Eşrefoğlu's *Müzekki'n-nüfus*, we learn that Kemal's poetry was known to other Sufis of Anatolia for some time before his death.⁴⁵ Kemal is unlikely to have benefited from a well-organized *tarikāt* in the way that Eşrefoğlu

38. Similarly, dated copies of Eşrefoğlu's *Müzekki'in-nüfus* cannot be found much before the end of the same century. The still uncatalogued BL Or. 16141 from the year 1001/1592 is one of the oldest. My thanks to M. I. Waley for information on this manuscript, previously no. 108 in the private collection of the late C. S. Mundy.

39. Ümmi Kemal (Kemal-i Ümmi) is occasionally confused with his close contemporary Sarı(ca) Kemal; e.g., E. Birnbaum, "Turkish Manuscripts: Cataloguing since 1960 and Manuscripts Still Uncatalogued. Part 5: Turkey and Cyprus," *JAOS* 104.3 (1984): 502, where a divan, dated 858/1454, is attributed to "Şarı Kemāl [= Kemāl-i Ümmī]." The author is, in fact, the former, for whom, see J. R. Walsh, "The Divānçe-i Kemāl-i Zerd (Şarıca Kemāl)," *Journal of Turkish Studies/Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* 3 (1979) [=Tarlan Memorial Volume]: 403–42.

40. Gibb, *History of Ottoman Poetry*, 1: 413–14. The entire poem is no. 127 in the edition by Yavuzer (hereafter *KÜD*), the focus of my review. For Köprülü's assessment, see *Eİİ*, 4: 945.

41. His name does not appear in the first edition of N. S. Banarlı, *Resimli Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (Istanbul, 1948; and only insignificantly in the expanded second edition of 1971–79), nor in S. K. Karaalioğlu, *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (Istanbul, 1973), or A. Bombaci, *Histoire de la littérature turque*, tr. I. Mélikoff (Paris, 1968). Vasfi Mahir Kocatürk devoted a page to him in his semi-popular survey, *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (Ankara, 1964).

42. T. S. Halman, ed., *Türk edebiyatı tarihi* (Ankara, 2006).

43. Yavuzer's book was, in fact, the second published edition. He was apparently unaware of Muzaffer Akkuş, *Kemâl Ümmî divânı* (Niğde, 2007). (And neither writer mentions Ramazan Sarıççek's unpublished 1997 İnönü University [Malatya] doctoral thesis "Kemal Ümmî hayatı sanatı, eserleri ve divanı: İnceleme ve metin," which I have not seen.) I saw Akkuş's work too late to include it here. He describes Kemal's language in detail but has virtually nothing to say about his editorial practice. Providing more extensive footnoted variants to Kemal's poem texts, Akkuş's volume is especially useful for a legible reproduction of codex BU1 and a comprehensive glossary aiming to show every occurrence of every lexical item.

44. See D. J. Matthews and R. Bukharaev, eds., *Historical Anthology of Kazan Tatar Verse* (Richmond, Surrey, 2000); Fâil Fâtkhtdinov, *Ommi Kâmal: Sufi shag'yir* (Ufa, 2015). My thanks to Matthew Kendall for his help with the Russian text.

45. Eşrefoğlu was writing his prose treatise in 852/1448. For a quoted line from Kemal's poem (*KÜD*, no. 122 l. 6) see A. Uçman's edition of *Müzekki'n-nüfus* (n. 10 above), 440.

did, however—through the long survival of *tekkes* that focused on preservation and dissemination of his teachings in Iznik and (later) Bursa. Safavid followers in Anatolia were hunted down and largely eliminated by Selim I after the final radicalization of the order under Shah Ismail in the early sixteenth century. A narrative anecdote alluded to by the poet-biographer Latifi (and hinted at by the historian Âli) strongly suggests that Kemal also was martyred.⁴⁶

The poem below (Yavuzer, no. 70)—notable for its use of the rhetorical device known as *iade*, “return,” a strategy best understood by looking at the last and first words of succeeding Turkish couplets—can give only a suggestion of Kemal’s verbal creativity.⁴⁷ To my eye Kemal is the more self-conscious poet. Perhaps sensing the same preoccupation with cleverness, Abdülbaki Gölpınarlı considered him a representative of Ottoman “classic” poetry (*divan şiiiri*), distinguishing him from many others whom he saw as *tekke* poets.⁴⁸ However that may be, Kemal remained popular for years, clearly sometimes in the same circles that favored Eşrefoğlu.

*İy karındaşlar eger ‘âbidler ise şapuñuz / Mâsivâllahı koñ ol ma‘bûduñuza şapuñuz.
Şapuñuz kulluğñuz gayrine bâtıldur Hakkıñ / Çünki anuñ kapusından özge yokdur şapuñuz.
Şapuñuz bir hak naşihat işidecek tız dutuñ / Cehd ile şeytân-ı düşmen şapuların yapuñuz.
Yapuñuz bünyâduñuz bu köbri üzre fânidiür / Geçüñ andan Hakkâ kaçuñ himmet atın şapuñuz.
Şapuñuz tevbe kılıcı birle nefsuñ boynnu / Zîrâ yokdur andan artuk yapışacak şapuñuz.
Şapuñuz düşmen yolından döst iline girüñüz / Andan artuğa demeñ kim biz gülâm-ı şapuñuz.
Şapuñuz imdi hemân nefsanî hazzı terk eđüñ / Bu Kemâl Ümmî bigi ‘âciz degülse şapuñuz.*

Oh, brothers, if you are worshippers, put aside everything other than God and worship God.
Your worship and service of any other than the Truth is false, because you have no other place
of service than His.
Seize true advice. When you hear it, grab hold of it. With every effort make fast the doors
[against] your enemy, the devil.
Your body, your corporeal being is transitory on this bridge. Get across. Flee to the Truth. Spur
on the steed of zeal.
Strike off the neck of the self with the sword of repentance. You have nothing to cling to other
than it.
Turn off the highway to the enemy; enter the land of the Friend. Do not say “We are your
slaves” to anyone other than Him.
Now worship God. Abandon sensual pleasures, if you are not too weak, like this Kemal Ümmi.

The following table offers a preliminary list of the manuscripts of Kemal’s *divan*.⁴⁹

46. Yavuzer has included an extended examination of Kemal’s life in his edition. See now also my “Two 15th Century Ottoman Sufi Mysteries: An Historiographical Essay. Part II: The Case of Ümmi Kemal,” *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 47 (2016): 39–66.

47. I made no attempt in my translation to incorporate the effect in Kemal’s poem. For an excerpt from a poem by the well-known sixteenth-century Ottoman poet Fuzuli illustrating the same device, see W. G. Andrews Jr., *An Introduction to Ottoman Poetry* (Minneapolis, 1976), 97–98.

48. A. Gölpınarlı, *Divan şiiiri* (Istanbul, 1954), 11, 35–36.

49. The manuscripts are grouped as in Table 1. Before a date, < means “not later than”; > “not earlier than.” In the second column I retain the identifying letter-number combinations found in Yavuzer’s book. A second identifier in brackets indicates an earlier siglum that I used in [W. C. Hickman,] “On the Manuscripts of the *Divan* of Ümmi Kemal,” *Journal of Turkish Studies/Türklük Bilgisi Araştırmaları* 3 (1979) [=Tarlak Memorial Volume]: 197–207, one not adopted by Yavuzer. When separated by a slash, the numbers in the third column denote, first, those sequentially assigned to the forty-eight manuscripts listed by Yavuzer; second, the number used in my survey (page and note number are given instead when I discussed a manuscript but gave it no siglum); and third, the number-identifier following the ordering in *İKTYD*, 1: 28–31. (N.B. That list includes an erroneously identified copy of the *divan*—no. 5, “Hacı Mahmud Ef. 3357.” It is not clear which copy at the Süleymaniye is being described, but HM Ef. 3357 is not a copy of Kemal’s *divan*.) Although there is some duplication involved, all three sources may be consulted for complementary

Table 2. Chronological list of manuscript copies of the divan of Ümmi Kemal

Year	Siglum	Source Ref.	Library
890/1485	MRE	43	Hacı Bektaş, 196 (<i>Mecmû'a-i resâ'il u eş'âr</i>) ⁵⁰
901/1495	T	--	Tirana, Albania Nat. Library, Dr 6/43 G ⁵¹
918/1512f.	CN	44/199 n. 23	Istanbul, Beyazıt Devlet, 5982 (<i>Câmi'ün-nezâ'ir</i>)
923/1517	MC	1/1	Istanbul, Atatürk, Muallim Cevdet K485
928/1522	MK1	2	Ankara, Milli, B167
937/1530	Z	--	Kütahya Zeytinoğlu Halk Kütüphanesi, 1089 ⁵²
940/1533f.	NO/N	47/199 n. 24	Istanbul, Nurosmaniye, 4904 (<i>Câmi'ül-me'ânî</i>)
942/1535f.	X ⁵³	--	
963/1556	AÖ1	3	Ankara, Milli (?), Adnan Ötügen 423 ⁵⁴
963/1556	MCon1/[Con]	4/19	Ankara, Univ. (DTCF), Mustafa Con 717 ⁵⁵
983/1576	BU2	31	Istanbul, Beyazıt Devlet, 5308 ⁵⁶
1021/1612f.	MK2	18	Ankara, Milli, A5161
1028/1619	MK3	19	Ankara, Milli, A1887
1033/1624	DB	32/2	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Dügümlü Baba 416
1050/1640f.	AE1	7/31	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Emiri, manzum 41
1095/1684	FB	6	Ankara, Milli, Fahri Bilge 218
1109/1698	W	--	Wrocław, Univ., Ms. 161 ⁵⁷
<1130/1717f.	AE2	8/4/4	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Emiri, manzum 42
1138/1726	M	--	Birmingham, Univ., Ming[ana] 1438 ⁵⁸
1168/1755	A	16/5	Ankara, Univ. (DTCF), A. 122
1172/1758f.	S	41/6	Sarajevo, Oriental Inst., 3370 ⁵⁹
[1175]/1762	Bod	--	Oxford, Bodleian, Turk d. 51 ⁶⁰
>1205/1790f.	IE 1	37/7	Istanbul, Univ., İbnü'l-Emin Mahmud Kemal T. 2832
1221/1806	AÖ2/[K]	14/8?	Ankara, İl Halk, Adnan Ötügen 2554
1226/1811	TS	11/9/2	Istanbul, Topkapı Sarayı, Sultan Reşat 545
1229/1814	AÖ3/[C]	15/10	Ankara İl Halk, Adnan Ötügen 1154

(or occasionally conflicting) details about the volume in question. The final column identifies the whereabouts of each manuscript today: library names are followed by shelf numbers (and a title, in the case of collective volumes).

50. This is one of three notable early collective volumes (*mecmua*) included in this list; it is the oldest dated manuscript containing a (presumably small but unknown) number of poems by Kemal—neither poems nor number have been discussed in print. The manuscript was apparently not examined by Yavuzer and not thoroughly described by his source, Mustafa Tatcı. See *KÜD*, 88 n. 299.

51. For more on this manuscript, see section III.2 below.

52. See B. Aktan, “Kemal Ümmî dîvânı'nın makâlât adlı yazması ve dil özellikleri,” *Türkiyat Araştırmaları Dergisi* 20 (2006): 99–111.

53. This copy, which does not survive today, can be presumed from a colophon note in manuscript FB.

54. Other volumes from the collection of Adnan Ötügen are said by Yavuzer to be at the Ankara İl Halk Kütüphanesi.

55. DTCF (Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi) stands for the Faculty of Languages, History, and Geography. My own notes on this copy do not agree with Yavuzer's description; while he identified this copy as MCon1, he nowhere mentions an MCon2.

56. The article by Necla Pekolcay, cited by Yavuzer in his note to the manuscript, was published in *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 10 (1951–53), not *Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Dergisi* (1954).

57. See n. 22 above.

58. A full description of this manuscript, including a transcription of its colophon, is available through the university library's online “Virtual Manuscript room,” where the volume may be viewed. My thanks to Muhammad Isa Waley for helping me locate this copy.

59. The late Vančo Baškov provided me with a copy of this manuscript, whose survival today I cannot confirm.

60. For this copy, see G. Kut, *Supplementary Catalogue of Turkish Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 2003), 115–16. The text is a vocalized *nesih*. My thanks to Adam Talib for examining this manuscript for me in Oxford in 2012.

1244/1828f.	PP	12/11/3	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Pertev Paşa 415
1250/1835	DŞ	13	Bolu, Danyal Şenburç private collection
1263/1846f.	IU2/[IU1]	36/12/7	Istanbul, Univ., TY 5677
1287/1870	Br	--	? ⁶¹
1290/1873	MK4	20	Ankara, Milli, A3754
1312/1896	OE1	34	Istanbul, Atatürk, Osman Ergin 295

Undated Manuscripts

?	BU1/[U]	5/14/6	Istanbul, Beyazıt Devlet, Umumi 3357
?	HM	9/17/8	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Hacı Mahmud 3343
?	IU1/[IU2]	10/16/9	Istanbul Univ., TY 584
?	ST	--	Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, 4152 ⁶²
?	B	17/18	Ankara, Univ. (DTCF), B10
? ⁶³	MK5	21	Ankara, Milli, A3674/1
?	MK6	22	Ankara, Milli, Fahri Bilge 326
?	MK7	23	Ankara, Milli, A4356
?	MK8	24	Ankara, Milli, A3886
?	MK9	25	Ankara, Milli, A1182
?	MK10	26	Ankara, Milli, A3674/2
?	ML11	27	Ankara, Milli, A1229
?	MK12	28	Ankara, Milli, A764
?	MK13	29	Ankara, Milli, A1184
?	MK14	30	Ankara, Milli, A3753
?	YB	33	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Yazma Bağışlar 2635/1
?	OE2	35	Istanbul, Atatürk, Osman Ergin 296
?	IE2	38/13	Istanbul Univ., İbnü'l-Emin Mahmud Kemal T. 3331
?	MM1	39	Konya, Mevlana Müzesi, 4981 ⁶⁴
?	KM	40	Konya, Koyunoğlu Müzesi, 14033
?	VT	42/15	Vatican City, Library, VT 206
?	ME	45	Ankara, Milli, Fahri Bilge 442 (<i>Mecmû'a-i eş'âr</i>) ⁶⁵
?	Mec.	46	Istanbul, Süleymaniye, Reşat Ef. 1186
?	SZ	48	Bolu, Salih Zeki Kutucuoğlu private collection
?	GK	--	Istanbul, Günay Kut, private collection ⁶⁶
?	Ir	--	Baghdad, Iraq Nat. Library (Turk/Ott?) 6405 ⁶⁷

Table continues on next page

61. This manuscript, copied by Süleyman b. Salim b. Mustafa Sola-zade, was briefly described in an E. J. Brill sale catalogue (no. 550, March 1986), item no. 1128. I have been unable to determine its subsequent whereabouts. My thanks to Eli Birnbaum for bringing it to my attention.

62. *Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, vol. 13, pt. 5: H. Sohrweide, *Türkische Handschriften* (Wiesbaden, 1981), 193. The manuscript was copied by Yusuf b. Abdullah "in the palace in Edirne" (*der sarây-i Edirne*) at an unspecified date.

63. Yavuzer uses a question mark to indicate that something is "unknown," as, for example, the date of a copy or the name of its copyist; he also leaves it in many other places in his manuscript descriptions, suggesting that his examination of a copy has not been completed. It is thus not clear whether all the manuscripts in the list that follows are indeed undated.

64. For a description of this copy, see Gölpınarlı (n. 25 above), 3: 270–71 (no. 4981). As with the copy MCon1, Yavuzer's siglum suggests that there is a second manuscript of Kemal's poetry in Konya; although he does not mention it, one does, in fact, exist (see the third to last item on the list).

65. This collection contains only three poems by Kemal. Yavuzer's source, Müjgân Cunbur, believed that the manuscript dated from the late fifteenth century; Yavuzer apparently did not see it himself.

66. My thanks to Günay Kut for providing me with a copy of this manuscript.

67. This copy was brought to my attention by my former colleague, Grace M. Smith. The manuscript is described by M. H. 'Alî, *Makhtûât al-adab al-makûba bi-l-lughâ al-turkiyya fi l-Markaz al-Waṭani li-l-Makhtûât* (Baghdad, 2007), pt. 1: 77–79. At this writing I have been unable to confirm its safekeeping.

Table 2.—Continued

Year	Siglum	Source Ref.	Library
?	MM2	--	Konya, Mevlana Müzesi, 7064 ⁶⁸
?	MMMec	--	Konya, Mevlana Müzesi, 3993 ⁶⁹
?	L	--	St. Petersburg, Oriental Institute, B2523 ⁷⁰

Other manuscripts in private collections of M. F. Köprülü, M. Z. Oral, and Raif Yelkenci.

The sustained popularity of Kemal's poetry is noteworthy, as are also the widespread locations of its copying: a summer pasture (*yayla*, MC), a palace (ST), and probably as far from Anatolia as Jerusalem (AÖ3). Yet, most striking about this list are (1) the sheer number of surviving manuscripts; (2) the number of those from the first century following Kemal's death (880/1475?); and (3) the appearance of his poems in highly regarded early collections (CN and NO). In each case, the contrast with Eşrefoğlu's *divan* could not be sharper.

III. THE EDITIONS

1. Eşrefoğlu's *divan*

The history of Eşrefoğlu's *divan*, by which I mean the history of its transmission through more than five centuries, is instructive. Although the first century of that history now seems irrevocably lost—barring the discovery of a manuscript copied well before 1587—it is almost certain that he left at his death an unordered mass of poems that only later, but not later than 1029 A.H. (the date of BL2), was put into something like the arrangement of a traditional collection, i.e., poems grouped by subject matter and then further ordered alphabetically according to the final rhyming letter. In fact, ordered copies of Eşrefoğlu's *divan* distinguish only between three types of poem: monorhyme, *mesnevi*, and *rübai*; the first (and largest) group is undifferentiated as to subject matter. While almost all of the oldest copies of the work have either lost or rearranged folios, as best as can be determined almost all of them retain nearly the same, apparently random, “arrangement,” giving the impression that the collection as a whole was only once significantly reordered. A small group of copies retains a somewhat different (but related) “random” ordering, the oldest of these being NP and U, copied only a few years apart.⁷¹

Güneş's 2006 edition of Eşrefoğlu's poetry is more ambitious than his earlier one and those of other editors.⁷² He rationalized his new edition saying (p. 75) that he found previously published volumes “lacking” (*oldukça yetersiz*).⁷³ What Güneş found lacking, principally, was a handful of poems in late (or undated) manuscripts that he has now brought

68. For a description of this manuscript, see Gölpinarlı (n. 25 above), 4: 86–87. Gölpinarlı believed this to be a seventeenth- or eighteenth-century manuscript, but copied from a considerably older one.

69. This collection includes approximately fifty poems by Kemal in addition to twice that number by Eşrefoğlu. For a summary description, see Gölpinarlı (n. 25 above), 3: 162–63.

70. See L. V. Dmitrieva, *Opisanie tiurkskikh rukopiseĭ Instituta vostokovedeniia*, vol. 3: *Poëziia i kommentarii k poëticheskim sochineniiam, poëtika* (Moscow, 1980), 44.

71. For the relationship of NP (and U) to the other (older) copies, see my thesis (n. 2 above), 67–68.

72. His 2006 edition lacks the critical apparatus of the 2000 edition, but not only does it reprint a virtual catalogue of names and motifs from the earlier one and reproduces a biographical section on the poet from his 1999 book, it also adds a twenty-page glossary and index (for which, see below).

73. Çelebi had used only three manuscript copies for his edition (EE, incorrectly identified; L; and HP) as well as the Ottoman Muhib press version. The Tercüman editors had recourse to NP, L, EE, HH, HM, MS, and TA, but did not explain how they proceeded. None of them, Güneş included, was aware of the three oldest manuscripts in the list above (BL1, OE1, and BL2).

into Eşrefoğlu's corpus. Apparently believing that every poem that found its way into a manuscript copy of Eşrefoğlu's poetry should be accepted without question, he includes three poems with no *mahlas* (nos. 93, 94, and 120); two with the *mahlas* Rumi (nos. 32 and 144); and three with the *mahlas* Eşrefoğlu (nos. 36, 62, and 145). Since none of these poems is attested in early manuscripts, I believe that they should be rejected, or at least marked "of doubtful authenticity."⁷⁴ A better argument than "lacking" might have been made based on the considerable carelessness of previous editions: Çelebi's edition, published during World War II, shows signs of still uncertain spelling in the recently adopted Latin-based Turkish alphabet; the 1967 Cağaloğlu editors expurgated numerous lines that they must have presumed would be offensive to a Sharia-minded audience; and the Tercüman edition (my copy at least) was bound with numerous blank pages. Unfortunately, his new edition is marred by its own haste, especially in the production phase, and by numerous errors.

In his seeming eagerness to expand the corpus of Eşrefoğlu's work as far as possible, Güneş included not only the aforementioned eight poems, but also five poems from previous editions that repeat the name 'Abd al-Qādir (nos. 30, 63, 64, 113, and 142).⁷⁵ Found only in late, or undated, manuscripts, the history of this group of poems is curious: they were excluded from the nineteenth-century Ottoman editions, adopted by Çelebi, rejected by Yelkenci et al., restored once more by the anonymous Tercüman editors, and now retained by Güneş, all without a word of comment by any of the editors. Through his own silence on this curious situation, Güneş missed an opportunity to delve more deeply into possible issues at the very heart of Eşrefoğlu's teaching and life story.

In addition to their authenticity having to be considered suspect since none is found in any of the oldest manuscript copies, the partisan character of these six 'Abd al-Qādir poems is obvious, as each includes a repeating refrain line with his name thus. As noted above, Eşrefoğlu's connection to the *tarikāt* named after 'Abd al-Qādir al-Gīlānī is highlighted in the widely accepted *menakīb* account of his life. But one wonders whether these poems, if written by someone other than Eşrefoğlu, were not intended to re-orient the public reception of the sheikh's teaching. Much remains to be done to clarify the views Eşrefoğlu espoused, how those views were received, and whether they left him vulnerable to retaliation.

Güneş claims to present the texts for 145 monorhyme poems, but there are actually only 142, for (1) no. 82 (*Yine bu derdlü gönül . . .*), attested in a single manuscript, is only a very slight variant of no. 124 (attested in all the early copies) and should not be considered a distinct poem; (2) the eight lines he offers as no. 119 are actually the final verses of no. 108, not a separate poem; and (3) no. 143 is omitted from the volume.

An index listing the poems' first half lines concludes the volume. While this could have been a handy reference tool, it is riddled with so many errors that it will likely only frustrate the reader and discourage its use. Some examples: (1) only a single poem (no. 144) with final rhyme letter *-y* is indexed, whereas twenty-four are included in the edition; (2) two poems (nos. 107, *Her kim der-ise dâ'im . . .*, and 120, *Hüdâ da'vet eder. . .*), both with a line ending in *-h*, are omitted; (3) the half lines are accompanied by two sets of numbers, one of which has no correspondence to numbers used anywhere else in the volume; and (4) for poems composed of quatrains, of which there are several, Güneş gives the first two lines of the opening stanza, assigning numbers to each.

74. Çelebi implicitly raised the issue of the inflation over time of copies of Eşrefoğlu's *divan* when he questioned the authenticity of Güneş's poem no. 48 (with rhyme word *el-vedâ'*), first attested only in the eighteenth-century copy EE. Andrews also noted the problem of inflation in his paper (n. 1 above), pp. 8–9.

75. A sixth poem (no. 62) was included from one of Güneş's newly found texts.

Finally, a few words about Güneş's approach. To begin with, while twenty-two copies of the *divan* are listed (p. 75), he had relied predominantly on five of them (NP, EE, L, IU2, and the Milli A756 copy) to establish his "critical" edition of 2000. There he identified only some of the twenty-two; in this later edition the abbreviations he uses to identify the copies are confused, and, as a result, in his source notes the reader is often directed to the wrong manuscripts. In addition, nowhere is there any information about any of the manuscripts beyond library name and number. Whoever reads Eşrefoğlu's poetry for the first time here will likely have difficulty following Güneş's choices.

Although he mentions age as a factor in making his choices, Güneş never seriously explains his editorial "method" beyond indicating which manuscripts he has drawn on for each poem. Of his preferred manuscripts, only two that he uses consistently are dated. He rejected two other relatively early copies (G1 and G2), but for no stated reason. As noted, he was entirely unaware of the three oldest dated copies, among several others.

Güneş transcribes the poem texts in the modern Turkish alphabet, without the additional diacritics typically used to represent Ottoman.⁷⁶ Of course, generations of copyists managed to introduce much confusion as well—in the case of Eşrefoğlu's *divan*, even the oldest copies display what seems to me a substantial amount of misreading. This is surprising, especially when we recall that those writers were, by their own colophon descriptions, the sheikh's followers. Over time those errors multiplied, and it is precisely here where one hopes for the best scholarly interpretation. Güneş often disappoints. Two examples will illustrate my point.

(1) No. 59 (l. 5) reads:

*Nefs te'hîrcidur te'hîrci edegörün nefse güci / Bâkî dirlik isterseñüz döst derdiyle öligörün.*⁷⁷

With no glossary support for the unfamiliar *te'hîrci* ("delayer"?) it is unclear how Güneş understands the line. (His apparatus in the 2000 edition offers an equally unsatisfactory variant.) But OE1 has, vocalized, *hîrci*, a dialectal variant of *kırcı* (an instance of phonetic variation found often in Eşrefoğlu's poetry). Hence the meaning of the line is clear: "The *nefs* is a killer; it's a killer. Apply force to it! / If you seek life eternal, give up your own now by suffering [absence] from the Friend."

(2) No. 1 (l. 1) reads:

İşk beni yağma kılpudur sen beni şorma baña / Ben beni bilemezem nite haber verem saña.

The other manuscripts Güneş consulted (and the older OE and OR, which he did not) all preferred to read the third word of the second hemistich as *bulmazam*. That reading is consistent with the phonetic development of Old Anatolian Turkish and should be accepted.⁷⁸ Hence we understand: "Love has ravaged me. Do not ask me about myself. / I cannot find myself. How should I give you an answer!"

2. Kemal's *divan*

Hayati Yavuzer made a major contribution to the study of Ottoman poetry (especially in the *tekke* environment) with his recent publication of *Kemâl Ümmî Dîvânı: İnceleme-metin*. This massive volume of nearly 800 pages comprises a comprehensive survey of the life of the poet; a critical edition of the poet's *divan*; and an exhaustive description of that poetry in the form of a virtual catalogue of types, forms, literary figures, and meters used, as well as annotated lists of ideas, concepts, and proper names found in the nearly 150 poems. It is dif-

76. Of all the editors discussed in this article, Akkuş alone used a scholarly transcription.

77. I have added diacritics. Çelebi read the beginning as *Nefs hayratıdır harcı*, but noted "It does not entirely make sense" (*tam mana çıkmıyor*) (p. 131). The Çağaloğlu editors read *Nefs hayratıdır hırcı* (p. 65, without comment), while Tercüman suggested *Nefs hayr nice dir harcı* (p. 166, without comment).

78. Even in a fully vowelized manuscript, *bul-* could easily be misread as *bile-*. The Çağaloğlu editors read the word as *bulmazam*; the Tercüman editors proposed *bulmazım*, neither of which is acceptable. Çelebi read it as I do.

ficult to imagine a more inclusive treatment of the life and major work of a fifteenth-century Ottoman poet.

Of the forty-eight copies known to him, Yavuzer seems to have examined closely only nos. 1–13, all but ignoring the rest. He based his edition exclusively on those thirteen copies. In particular, and inexplicably, he ignored without comment three early collective volumes—two from the first half of the sixteenth century (CN and NO) and the oldest copy of all (MRE)—as well as two other dated copies, both from the first quarter of the seventeenth century (MK2 and MK3).⁷⁹ A significant amount of material thus still remains to be examined.

Of the copies unknown to Yavuzer, the most significant addition to the list above is T, a manuscript now in the National Library in Tirana, copied in 901/1495. My attention was drawn to it in 1981 by the late Andreas Tietze, who had been invited by the government there to survey the library's Ottoman holdings. While I have been unable to find any trace of his visit in any of his published writings, I was able to follow up on his tip in the summer of 2015 when I was briefly in Tirana myself.

The volume consists of 115 folios; the text is in two columns, fifteen lines per page. The pages measure approximately 12.5 cm × 18 cm; the writing occupies a space of about 7 cm × 11.5 cm. The divan is written in a fine, confident, and very small calligraphic (modified *talik*) hand, which soon strains the eye.⁸⁰ The writer was well practiced in his art; there appear to be only rare errors that have been corrected. I saw no sign that pages had been lost or misordered as a result of rebinding. However, letters sometimes lacked the requisite dots. The text was only infrequently voweled, leaving possible ambiguity of interpretation. The conjunctive *vav* was often omitted, opening the door to further misreading.

Most significantly, however, T is the oldest extensive copy of Kemal's poems, predating by more than twenty years the copy MC, previously believed by both Yavuzer and me to be the oldest, and dating from just twenty years after the poet's death. The copyist does not name himself or the place where he copied it. How it wound up in Albania is unknown, although it has a stamp showing that it was once in a private library. As the oldest known copy of Kemal's poetry, T would be an outstanding starting point for many of Andrews's proposed approaches for investigating an important text. Unfortunately, the library in Tirana has so far not allowed it to be copied. My hope to publish a facsimile of it—and a further study of the divan—is thus currently on hold.

As I pointed out several years ago, almost all (examined) copies of Kemal's poetry can be divided into three non-overlapping groups. The first two are made up of those with only a semblance of poem order and those in which poems are gathered together in identifiable subgroups (or poem types: *tevhid*, *na'at*, *mersiye*, etc.) and then further grouped by the alphabetical order of the line-ending consonant letter—thus, the classic Ottoman arrangement of a formal divan. The third group is made up of a single manuscript (MC), whose poem order is related to that of the first group. That relationship remains difficult to describe, however,⁸¹ and apparently even harder to rationalize. In other words, the collecting and ordering of poems must have taken place at three different times, the first perhaps by the poet himself, imperfectly and prematurely. Except for incidental influence (“contamination”) of one group on the other, we may conclude that, in each group, copies can be traced back to a single common “ancestor.”

79. While Yavuzer had recourse to NO on two occasions (his poems nos. 39 and 70), he omits any information about the manuscript, deferring to an earlier writer's description (*KÜD*, 88 n. 299).

80. A couplet of Kemal's poetry, occupying more than five inches of the printed page in Yavuzer's transcription, fills barely half that space in T.

81. “On the Manuscripts” (n. 49 above), 201–2. Yavuzer (*KÜD*, 89 n. 304) seems not to have understood my description of the ordering of poems in MC in relation to the first group.

Yavuzer reached the same conclusion regarding the grouping of manuscript copies. He illustrated his understanding of the situation with a diagram (p. 91) with the appearance of a stemma. A closer look shows that he has mainly arranged the manuscripts in three columns with only a hint of sub-branching, as if each later dated copy descended directly from the next earliest to it in time, in its group.⁸² If things were as his diagram suggests, one could argue that whenever the oldest surviving copies on two (of the three) branches agree in their reading at a disputed point, then logically that must be preferred over the variant in the third branch, the reasoning being that two copyists are unlikely, independently, to make the same mistake. In that case the plethora of variant readings that Yavuzer patiently lists at the bottom of almost every page could mostly be dispensed with. But the matter is not so simple, and the stemma of copies of Kemal's divan cannot be drawn so confidently.

With the exception of MC, because of its singular poem order, the oldest complete volumes of Kemal's poetry (T, MK1, and AÖ1) belong to the first group. On the other hand, the arrangement of the poems in one of the important collective volumes (NO) is closely related to the ordering of poems in the second group, characterized by formal divan organization. Most probably, the unidentified compiler of this *mecmua* selected from an existing volume that was already "alphabetically" arranged. In other words, the establishment of Kemal's poems as a divan had already taken place by 940 A.H. when NO was compiled. Is this alphabetically arranged group a distinct recension of Kemal's poetry? That does not appear to be the case, as no other significant differences separate this from the other two groups.

Yavuzer described his approach to editing Kemal's poetry: "While approaching the text, rather than pick a single manuscript and then compare it with the rest, I proceeded as follows: from the three different manuscript groups I took advantage of the most important copies from the point of view of their age, arrangement, language, and orthography in order to arrive at a new text, one closest to the author's."⁸³ In practice, what Yavuzer did was to pick the oldest surviving copy of each poem and use it as his "base," substituting at will when he found a "better" reading. In traditional fashion he listed variant readings in notes—typically drawn from five or six (occasionally as many as eight and once from nine) copies. His preferences, we understand, are based on his own feeling for what is right. He rarely offers specific rationalizations for his choices, beyond his general reference above to age, arrangement, language, and orthography.

Thus, 111 of the poem texts are drawn from MC;⁸⁴ 23 come from MK1; and the remaining handful are based on AÖ1, MCon1, AE1, AE2, and FB. Despite Yavuzer's apparent disavowal, it is hard to see how he proceeded differently from many other editors of Ottoman texts. Like that of Güneş, Yavuzer's is a reconstructed text, precisely what Andrews railed against, viz., a "text that existed (only) in the mind of the author or in a lost (and therefore equally non-existent) perfect 'Ur-text' or 'source text'." To be fair, Yavuzer undoubtedly knows the poetry of Ümmi Kemal better than anyone else; nevertheless, his "new text" is a recreation of what he imagines Kemal left behind in a now lost manuscript (the authorial autograph).

82. Yavuzer actually adds a separate branch to his tree for the single, very abbreviated codex, MCon1, which he felt shared characteristics of both MC and the copies in the alphabetical group.

83. *Metin oluşturulurken bir nüshayı esas alıp diğerleriyle karşılaştırmak yerine, tespit edilen farklı nüsha gruplarından tarih, tertip-tasnif, dil ve imla bakımlarından en önemli nüshalardan faydalanılarak, yeni fakat müellif-inkine en yakın bir nüsha oluşturmak yoluna gidilmiştir* (KÜD, 414).

84. Because of missing folios, MC comprises a substantially smaller version of the divan than several of the other copies.

Can we do better? The sorting of divan copies into three distinct groups is a fruitful (and obvious) starting point. For the next level of “fineness” I suggest that those copies be further subdivided according to the criterion of line order. A caveat is that my examination of more than twenty copies of Kemal’s divan reveals frequent copyist error, e.g., a couplet was overlooked by the copyist and then reinserted further down. Sometimes a line was overlooked entirely without the error ever realized. Therefore, given two versions of a poem, differing only in the sequential ordering (or number) of lines, it is difficult, if not impossible, to say which one is correct.⁸⁵ (In such cases, one could argue that the shorter poem text is the “original” and that lines appearing in other copies have been added by an inspired copyist.) Nevertheless, in both of the preceding situations (lines interchanged; lines dropped or added), further non-overlapping subgroups emerge, adding more potentially useful data.

IV. CONCLUSION

Andrews appears skeptical even of the goal of the elusive “source text,” yet I suspect he is more disturbed by careless scholarship than by serious efforts grounded in thoroughgoing analysis of all available data. The particular problems unique to editing Ottoman texts involving transcription from one alphabet to another are not insurmountable, even if additional diacritics may be required. I fail to see how the Ottoman case is substantively different from Greek, Latin, Old English, or Arabic texts, just to mention some other linguistic traditions of which scholars have produced worthwhile critical editions, and there is no reason why Ottomanists cannot do the same.

While I do not entirely agree with Andrews’s skepticism regarding the larger project of converting works of Ottoman literature into useable critical editions, his own specific proposals for future work are valuable, including digital scans, computerized data collection, and a much greater concern for the history, broadly, of a given text. Computer programs have been developed that may assist with some of the thornier problems. Surely Andrews would welcome a rigorously researched, painstakingly prepared, and scrupulously annotated text.

Following upon this, I propose two principles for editing *tekke* poetry. First, individual poem texts shrink over time, that is, they suffer the loss of lines. Second, the corpus, as a whole, tends to grow. While I cannot offer proof for either of these assertions, in support of the second I can point to the collections of both poets considered here.⁸⁶ As for the first, the accidental dropping of a line is readily explained, as anyone who has copied a text will agree. Randomly creating a line to fit into the middle of a fully formed poem seems to me an extremely unlikely tactic, except perhaps in a highly polemical situation—one more likely to result in the creation of an entire poem (as argued above in the case of Eşrefoğlu’s supposed ‘Abd al-Qādir poems). Careful application of these two principles can help further winnow the authentic from the spurious.⁸⁷ Admittedly, carrying out this further analysis is a cumbersome task for the conscientious editor, but it should provide important information and ought to be done.

85. For a discussion of line order in Ottoman poems, see Andrews, *Introduction to Ottoman Poetry*, 136–41.

86. Kemal’s divan, in fact, appears to be fairly stable, with only a handful of poems, previously unattested, appearing in later copies. These are nos. 133, 135, 136, and 143 in Yavuzer’s edition—the second attested only in AE1, the other three only in FB (mid- and late seventeenth century respectively). To these I would add two more poems found in PP (fols. 27b–28b), apparently unnoticed both by Yavuzer and Akkuş.

87. In the case of Kemal’s divan, while Yavuzer notes lines that have been inadvertently dropped (he implicitly agrees with my first principle), he omits altogether any indication of “line arrangement.” For his part, Güneş’s apparatus notes in his 2000 edition are difficult to follow.

Given the widespread importance of the *tarikāt* in the Ottoman empire, a persuasive case can be made that *tekke* poets are at least as representative of Ottoman culture as such renowned figures as Zati, Baki, Hayali, or Nabi, whose works, over the years, have attracted the attention of the most highly respected scholars of Turkish literature; major *tekke* poets and their work should be as deserving of the same scholarly attention, which has rarely happened in nearly a century of Republic-era scholarship. Is it too far fetched to imagine, as Andrews does, a team of scholars collaborating to produce just the sort of edition he envisions of a poet like Eşrefoğlu or Kemal?

In an introductory chapter, Güneş echoes remarks by Eşrefoğlu himself when he suggests that words may not be able to penetrate or elucidate certain mystical states. However true this may be, respectful scholarship should not be walled off from, or made unwelcome to, any aspect of spiritual experience, regardless of its intimate nature for convinced believers. Scholars should not shy away from engagement with subjects that were once considered dangerous.

The study of the history of the Ottoman empire would be well served if the role and influence of its many Sufi orders were more openly embraced and the literary work of their numerous sheikhs more fully explored. The ongoing popularity of the poetry of Eşrefoğlu and Kemal demonstrates their relevance today, providing all the more reason for exacting scholarship.