**Ines Asceric-Todd (University of Edinburgh)**

**Ottoman futuwwa manuscripts and their transmission from Anatolia to the Balkans and beyond: texts and contexts**

The first instalment of this project introduced Ottoman futuwwa and outlined the main futuwwa works that were copied and circulated across the Ottoman realm and all the way into the Balkans. It then concentrated on a number of futuwwa manuscripts, which were authored or copied in the central Sufi lodge in Sarajevo, seemingly by the Sarajevo kadi at the time. This brought into focus a number of questions regarding the kind of social classes, which, at least in Sarajevo, were involved in the production and distribution of Sufi manuscripts. This present instalment will examine the contents of those manuscripts in order to assess what they tell us about the type of futuwwa tradition that was prevalent in Bosnia at the time, whether the practical craft-related features of these texts reveal an important wider social and cultural role of Sufis and Sufi lodges in those areas, and what this role – together with the previously noted involvement by high-ranking Ottoman officials in the production of these manuscripts – tells us about the influence of Sufi networks in 17th – century Ottoman Bosnian society.

**Samet Budak (University of Michigan)**

**Husayn al-Akhlati: An Elusive Sufi, His Interregional Network, and the Manuscripts of His Understudied Works**

Until very recently, Husayn al-Akhlati (d. 1397 or 1405) was only known as the sheik of the famous or infamous mystic Bedreddin of Simavna (ca. 1420) in modern literature. Within the last decades, thanks to studies focusing on his pupils, al-Akhlati’s significance and endeavors became more visible in historiography. Nevertheless, studies that thoroughly examine his life and times, his works and ideas, and their larger context and reception remain desiderata.

On the other hand, in the eyes of his contemporaries, he was one of the most important authorities of Sufism and the occult sciences. He was the central node of a network of mystic philosophers and occultists from the Balkans to Egypt and Central Asia. His followers saw him as the *qutb* (axis mundi) of his time, whereas his enemies considered him a trickster and disbeliever. In addition to Bedreddin of Simavna, he tutored an illustrious group of thinkers such as Sain al-Din Ibn Turka (d. 1432), Sharaf al-Din Ali Yazdi (d. 1454), Qasim-i Anwar (d. 1433), etc. His network extended through direct and indirect contact with the Nimatullahi, Hurufi, and Safavid circles in Persia and Central Asia. He was also in contact with Sufis active in Anatolia and the Balkans, such as Emir Sultan (d. 1429). He enjoyed the Mamluk sultan Barquq’s patronage in Cairo, which would secure him a comfortable life on the banks of the Nile.

All of his works are on occult topics, such as alchemy, gematria, the science of letters, prognostication, etc. Although he does not discuss it in detail, his philosophical Sufism and occultism were a fusion of the Akbari school of Ibn Arabi (d. 1240), the Platonist school of Suhrawardi (d. 1191) with additional components from Hermetic and Neopythagorean currents in Islamicate traditions. Although they were not Shiites, Al-Akhlati and some of his pupils venerated Ali ibn Abi Talib (d. 661) and other Shite Imams, especially within the context of occult sciences.

This presentation is designed as an introduction to Husayn al-Akhlati and his intellectual world. It will introduce some twenty-five works of al-Akhlati and their dozens of manuscripts, most of which remain untouched. It will demonstrate that the most profound impact and reception of al-Akhlati happened in Iran, primarily through Nimetullahi circles who copied and translated his works. His works had a limited direct impact in the lands of Rum, possibly because of the “dangerous” legacy of his star pupil, Bedreddin. Nevertheless, it is possible to observe some continuation in Safavid/Bayrami circles and in the works of later authors like Abd al-Rahman al-Bistami (d. ca. 1454).

In the final analysis, this presentation aims to provide a panorama of al-Akhlati’s life, network, works, and reception through many manuscripts produced in later Sufi circles in order to facilitate more research on this elusive yet significant Sufi and his interregional impact.

**Marc Czarnuszewicz (ANAMED/St Andrews)**

**When a *Ṭāʾifa*fails: The collapse of the Ḥāṭimīyān of Khurasan and the Mongol Conquest**

Istanbul University Library hold a unique and little studied 13th century Persian manuscript, generally referred to as the *Manāqib Shaykh Ḥāṭimī*. The text describes both the life and deeds of its subject, a Sufi Sheikh based in Khurasan in the years prior to the Mongol Conquests, and the difficulties faced by his followers when the death of their leader coincided with a deteriorating political situation. Touching on themes varying from property inheritance to female leadership and from symbiosis with Turkish groups to Alid marriage alliances, this paper will reconcile the text with the wider situation of the period.

**Konrad Hirschler (Hamburg University)**

**Preserving manuscripts and transmitting knowledge in Sufi convents, c. 12th – 14th centuries**

This paper takes reading and endowment notes from Damascene manuscripts circulating between the 12th and 14th centuries as a source corpus to address the question of the role of Sufi convents in manuscript cultures. It suggests that convents played an important role in the urban topography of the handwritten book as sites of manuscript preservation and manuscript circulation. Their role in manuscript production, in contrast, is methodologically more difficult to trace. Numerous convents appear as sites of reading sessions where manuscripts circulating throughout Damascus were read. These sessions easily ranked among the largest events in the scholarly and ritual life of the city. Some convents also hosted substantial libraries and the books from these libraries could as well circulate in the city and had thus a role well beyond the walls of their host organisation. The close integration of convents in the scholarly and ritual life raises the question to what extent their role is in these cases expression of a specifically ‘Sufi’ manuscript culture?

**Zeynep Oktay (Boğaziçi University)**

**The Bektashization of Yunus Emre’s Poetic Tradition: What the Earliest Manuscripts Tell us**

Yunus Emre (d. 1320?) is a Bektashi saint for many contemporary Alevis. This common belief can be traced to the hagiography of Hacı Bektaş, put down in writing in the late fifteenth-early sixteenth century, which includes an account of Yunus Emre’s encounter with Hacı Bektaş. As the foundational figure for Turkish Sufi poetry, Yunus provided the prototype for Alevi-Bektashi poetry, including the deyiş, i.e. poetry sung during ritual. However, his own poetry bears few traces of Bektashi doctrine, which developed from the fifteenth century onwards. Despite this apparent time lag between Yunus himself and Bektashis, certain elements of Bektashi doctrine appear in the earliest manuscripts of Yunus Emre’s Dīvān. These rare additions in the fifteenth century manuscripts include the Ceremony of the Forty (ḳırḳlar cemʿi), the doctrine of Muhammad-Ali, and the doctrine of Four Gates and Forty Stations (dört ḳapı ḳırḳ maḳām). The Dīvān also includes terms that occur in Sufi literature (in Yunus’s own poetry) and later become part of Alevi (Ḳızılbaş) and Bektashi repertoires, such as semāʿ (audition/ritual dance) and meydān (ceremonial room). This paper seeks to trace the Bektashization process of Yunus Emre’s poetic tradition through an examination of the Bektashi additions that appear in the earliest manuscripts of his Dīvān. These demonstrate not only the early Bektashi readership of Yunus’s corpus, but also the role of Bektashi scribes in the dissemination of Yunus Emre’s poetry. They also hint at the origins of the subsequent proliferation of poetry under the name of Yunus, in both oral and written forms.

**Ertuğrul Ökten, İstanbul Medeniyet University**

**Following the traces of written word in the Naqshbandiyya**

Searching for the scriptorium in Sufi convents is a challenging task one of the challenges being lack of information on place of composition. Still, it is possible to argue that Sufi convents facilitated the composition written works. This paper attempts to shed light on how Sufi convents could serve as space for the production of written word by analyzing first *Fasl al-Khitab* of Muhammad Parsa, an early Naqshbandi Sufi from the beginning of the 15th century. *Fasl al-Khitab* offers significant insight on the transition from the oral to the written word and also leads to questions about the relationship of the text with its space of production. By analyzing the text itself and various manifestations of the work my aim is to observe how space (of production) becomes relevant in the work, and to develop questions/approaches to attack the problem of Sufi convents as scriptorium. Picking up Muhammad Parsa for such a study is particularly meaningful since he had a personal library. Still, other texts may be included in our analysis to the extent they shed light on the phenomenon of Sufi scriptorium.

**Alexandre Papas (CNRS-EPHE, Paris)**

**A seventeenth-century Ottoman Sufi addendum (*zeyl*) and the world around it**

Writing addenda is a well-known practice in the Islamic manuscript culture. There were used to complete a book in terms of content or chronology, and to make up for its deficiencies. In Sufi milieux, the *dhayl* (addendum in Arabic) was often the work of hagiographers who wished to add biographical information or to complement the list of individual biographies, thus extending both the geography and the history of sainthood. Ottoman Sufi authors composed in Turkish a large number of *zeyl* to make additions to, for example, Persian classical compendia or to later Ottoman hagiographies, with the ambition to show the ubiquity of Muslim mystics in the Empire, especially in the Balkans and in major cities, such as Istanbul of course but also Bursa and Edirne. In this paper, I will focus on one of these Ottoman Sufi addenda. Completed in 1723 by the Halvetî Enfî Ḥasan Hulûṣ (d. 1724 or 29), the *Tezkiretü-l-müte’âhhirîn* is known through four manuscript copies, of which MS Ankara, Milli Kütüphane A 3481/3 seems the most reliable. By carefully reading the explanations given by the author himself, I will try to reconstruct the social and intellectual world that surrounded him in order to understand the way in which he proceeded to write his *zeyl* and to situate his work in the long Ottoman Sufi tradition of hagiographic writing.

**Andrew Peacock (St Andrews)**

**Sufi Manuscript Cultures of Ahlat**

Ahlat, on the crossroads of eastern Anatolia, the Jazira and Caucasia, was known in the medieval period a major centre of Sufism, as well as a precarious frontier town. Its hospital, founded by the famous physician Ibn Hubal, also attracted renown. This paper examines the Sufi and broader intellectual culture of Ahlat through the manuscripts known to have been produced in the city, focusing in particular on two majmu’as, produced in Ahlat in the late 12th and early 14th century, the first in Arabic, the second in Persian.

**Florian Schwarz (Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna)**

**Before the classic silsila. Ijāzāt in an early 14th-century manuscript from Samarkand (?)**

It is by now well established that the silsila as a formalized chain of transmission of authority and initiation and a communal identifier became the norm for Central Asian Sufi communities only relatively late and fully developed only in the 15th century. In the process, silsilas were systematized and projected back on earlier periods, and the diversity of Sufi traditions was reduced into what emerges from the hagiographical literature since the late 15th century as a relatively limited set of major Sufi traditions in Central Asia. The role of factors such as communal rivalry or political competition in this process has been relatively well studied, largely on the basis of narrative hagiographic works and from the vantage point of the established silsilas (with still much to be done). Less well understood is the 13th- and 14th-century background of this process. In my presentation, I take a close look at a manuscript that documents a series of ijāzāt which may throw some light on the transformation of established forms of transmission of authority and initiation in 13th and 14th centuries Central Asia: Ms. or. Oct. 294, preserved in the Staatsbibliothek Berlin (Ahlwardt 3346; Pertsch Persisch 202, accessible online at <https://digital.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/werkansicht/?PPN=PPN1740775694> ).

**Elif Sezer-Aydınlı (Freie Universität, Berlin)**

***Cönks* as the Repositories of Sufi Memory**

The ‘archival turn’ has recently found a strong echo in ‘manuscript studies’ by reappraising the archive as a set of social and cultural practices rather than merely a spatial repository. Inspired by this approach, this study aims to extend the meaning of ‘archiving’ as a social practice of certain groups in collecting, preserving, and ordering their collective memory. As a case, this study will focus on the ‘genre’ of *cönk*s of the 18th and 19th-century Ottoman written world to discuss the content and ways of operation while archiving the Sufi memory.

*Cönk*s -a specific format of miscellanies- awaits an exclusive study on their position within the history of reading and writing and how they served within certain reading groups. Although there are many studies on the literary content of these miscellanies, the paratextualities of the manuscripts such as personal notes, seals, handwriting, use of page layout are neglected despite their value in discussing the production, circulation, and perception of the genre, specifically within Sufi reading groups.

Thus, this study will interrogate the mystical content alongside the paratextual aspects of this genre by some questions: How we can explain the over-weighted numbers of Sufi poets/poetry in *cönk*s? Is it possible to attain a Sufi identity for the majority of *cönk* readers? Does the rise in *cönk* production by the 19th century signalize a preservation act of the almost lost Sufi memory? What is the evidence for the purpose of archiving -and maybe- disseminating the Sufi memory?

**Tobias Sick (University of Münster)**

**Exploring the role of translations within Sufi manuscript culture: The *Pandnāma-yi ʿAṭṭār* and its translations as a case in point**

The presented contribution will discuss one particular instance of Sufi manuscript culture in the Early Modern Ottoman Empire, namely the transmission, translation, and reception of the so-called *Pandnāma-yi ʿAṭṭār* (*Attar’s book of wise council*, penned around the middle of the 15th century), a work pertaining to the genre of mystical advice literature. Even though it was likely not authored by the eponymous Farīd al-Dīn ʿAṭṭār (d. 618/1221), the work enjoyed a significant traction and wide popularity – as a work of this author – among different strata of Ottoman society, reaching from Sufi mystical circles to courtly educational institutions. It thus constitutes a particularly salient object for a study on Sufi manuscript culture: The large number of its adaptions, i.e. translations, commentaries, and versified commentaries in addition to (oftentimes in conjunction with) the original circulating within and beyond Sufi circles, and their extant manuscript corpus offer important insights into specific ways of engagement with mystical texts and manuscripts. In this context, especially the verse translation of Emre (d. 964/1557) and the commentary of Şemʿī (d. 967/1559) are of interest due to their broad transmission and reception throughout the Early Modern period. These are then compared to those adaptions which constituted personal projects like the translation penned by Siyāhīzāde (1197/1783) and Meḥmed Ẓahrī Efendi’s (d. 1202/1787–88) versified commentary*.* In particular, the presentation will take up the question of the role of verse and prose translation(s) within this manuscript culture and juxtapose different versions of the text while constantly highlighting the environments, readerships, and individual modes of reading based on the extant manuscript corpus. This includes a discussion of paratextual features in addition to the main texts, in which colophons, glosses, ownership statements, and stamps (etc.) are analysed to render visible the (motivations of) translators, copyists, and readers, and trace the circulation of these works within and beyond Sufi institutions. The aim of the presented contribution is to describe the dynamics of the aforementioned trajectories; specifically in the context of the reception of mystical advice literature and the production and usage context of manuscripts during the Early Modern period.

**Derin Terzioğlu (Boğaziçi University, History Department) and Ensar Karagöz (Türkiye Yazma Eserler Kurumu)**

**A Sufi Reader in Action: Personal Notes of Niyazi-i Mısri (d. 1694) in the Margins of Muhyiddin Ibn Arabi’s (d. 1240) ‘*Anqa Mughrib***

This paper is an attempt to use codicological evidence from Sufi manuscripts to shed light on the reading practices of a seventeenth-century Sufi. The Sufi in question, Mehmed el-Niyazi el-Mısri, was one of the most ardent and idiosyncratic readers of the works of Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi in the seventeenth-century Ottoman Empire. Until now, we could trace Mısri’s highly personalized engagement with Ibn Arabi’s ideas through his own writings, including his poetry, prose works and several personal notebooks. But recent research has also brought to light manuscript copies of Muhyiddin Ibn ‘Arabi’s ‘*Anqa Mughrib* and *Futuhat al-Makkiyya* that belonged to Mısri and that bear marginal notes by him.

The first aim of this paper is to introduce these volumes and establish that they indeed belonged to Mısri and that the marginalia that we find in them are by his pen. Then, we shall focus specifically on the marginalia in Mısri’s copy of the ‘*Anqa Mughrib*, which was the work he consulted and cited the most frequently in his years of exile on the island of Rhodes (1674-1675) and Lemnos (1677, 1693-4). By crossreading his notes in this manuscript, most of which are dated, with references to the ‘*Anqa Mughrib* in his other writings, we shall try to determine when Mısri began to study this work more intensively and how the nature of his engagement with it changed over time. We shall also addresss the relationship between Mısri’s marginal comments and the text of ‘*Anqa Mughrib* itself, identify those parts of the ‘*Anqa Mughrib* that elicited the most comments from Mısri and conclude with some general observations about how Mısri related to and made sense of this text.

**Richard Todd (Birmingham)**

**Was Orhan Gazi a Sponsor of Philosophical Sufism? What manuscript sources can tell us about early Ottoman patronage of Ibn ʿArabī’s school.**

The mature Ottoman state’s generally favourable stance towards the legacy of the Andulusī Sufi theorist Ibn ʿArabī (d. 638/1240) is epitomised in several well-known examples – from Sultan Selim’s restoration of Ibn ʿArabī’s tomb to Ibn Kemal Pasha’s defence of the legitimacy of Ibn ʿArabī’s doctrines and the appointment of a noted advocate of Ibn ʿArabī’s philosophical Sufism, Ibn Hamza Fanārī, as the first Ottoman *şeyhülislam*.

But at what point did the close association between the Ottomans and Ibn ʿArabī’s school begin? Although the traditional view, following the historian Taşköprüzade, holds that this relationship starts with the appointment of Dāwūd al-Qayṣarī (d. 750/1351) – a prominent commentator on Ibn ʿArabī – as head of the first Ottoman madrasah, recent scholarship has questioned this view’s historical accuracy, suggesting instead that al-Qayṣarī’s headship is more likely to have been a later invention intended to assign to Ibn ʿArabī’s legacy a putative role in the very beginnings of Ottoman intellectual life.

Based, however, on a close reading of the signature *alqāb* or honorific titles that are applied to his otherwise unnamed patron in the earliest extant manuscripts of al-Qayṣarī’s treatise on the nature of time, the present paper argues that the patron in question is almost certainly Orhan Gazi, the second Ottoman sultan, and that it therefore seems highly probable that al-Qayṣarī switched patrons, from the Ilkhānid vizier Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad in the northern Iranian city of Tabriz to the Ottoman sultan Orhan, shortly after the founding of Orhan’s madrasah in Iznik in 1335.

The Ottoman sponsorship of al-Qayṣarī in the first half of the fourteenth century may thus be placed in relation to a cycle of Anatolian and northern Iranian patronage of Ibn ʿArabī’s school that began in the Seljuk Sultanate of Rūm (Central and Eastern Anatolia), a century earlier, with Ibn ʿArabī’s arrival at the Seljuk court and Konya’s rise to prominence as the most important centre for the study of Ibn ʿArabī’s thought and for the production of manuscripts of his works, before shifting eastwards to the court of the Ilkhānids following the collapse of the Rūm Sultanate.

**F. Betul Yavuz (Seoul National University)**

**Between Tracts, Letters, and Poetry: Tracing the Bayrami-Melami Community in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul through a *Mecmu‘a***

The Bayrami-Melami (Hamzavi) order had been under scrutiny in Bosnia after the execution of Hamza Bali (d. 1573) and eventually moved their headquarters to Istanbul during the time of Murad III (r. 1574-95). The presentation will provide a close look into the community in Istanbul through the study of a *mecmu‘a* found in Berlin Staatsbibliothek Ms. or. oct. 2746. This *mecmu‘a* is titled *Mir’at-ı Hazret-i Hakiki*, and is closely associated with Hakiki (d.ca. 1640), a disciple of Lamekani Hüseyin Efendi (d. 1625) and the author of several tracts that served to explain the order’s worldview to the audiences in Istanbul. The *mecmu‘a* begins with his important tract titled *İrşad-name*, followed by another tract, *Esraru’l-Arifin* *İrşadu’l-Aşıkin,* possibly authored by Abdurrahman el-Askeri (d. 1550).Hakiki also seems to have been close to the famous *pir* of the time, İdris Muhtefi (d.1625), and collected copies of letter exchanges between him and his followers. Among these, we find İdris’ letters to İbrahim Pasa (d.1601), the conquerer of Kanije, and Murad III’s son-in-law. The letters, along with tracts, and poetry, allow us get a glimpse of the community by opening up new venues for reconsidering intricacies of relationships between the frontiers in Bosnia and politics in Istanbul.