



BRILL



brill.com/jps

Messianic Oeuvres in Interaction: Misattributed Poems by Shah Esmā'il and Nesimi

Ferenc Csirkés

Eberhard Karls University, Tübingen

csirkesferenc@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper discusses the philological, literary and cultural-historical background of 23 poems that can be found in manuscript copies of the respective *divān* of both Nesimi (d. 1407), the most prominent poet of the Horufi tradition, and Shah Esmā'il, the founder of the Safavid state (r. 1501-24) who was also known for his popular Turkic poetry with a heavily messianic veneer. One possible reason for this textually detectable confluence and intermixture might be the partially oral, ritual, homiletic context with fluid notions of authorship in which these poems were performed, but there was also a broader socio-religious context of interaction between various popular messianic traditions of the day, the Horufis, the Bektashis, the Safavids and others.

Keywords

messianism – Shah Esmā'il – Nesimi – popular poetry – oral culture – horufism – Safavids

The present paper is an analysis of textual interaction between manuscript copies of the respective *divāns* of Shah Esmā'il I and Nesimi, whose oeuvres are very important for our understanding of the messianic movements of the fourteenth through the sixteenth century in the Islamic world on the one hand, and the development of a Turkic literary language whose closest modern relative is Azerbaijani Turkish and which was used in Eastern Anatolia, Iraq and Iran, on

* I wish to thank Prof. Franklin D. Lewis and Sholeh A. Quinn for their insightful comments on a previous draft of the paper; and I am also grateful to 'Emād al-Din Shaykh al-Hokamayi for his help.

the other hand (Gandjei; Vásáry; Floor and Javadi). Remarkably, there are altogether twenty-three poems that were written either by Shah Esmā'īl or Nesimi but can also be found in various manuscript copies of both poets' respective *divān* under both poets' names.¹ Analyzing the contents of manuscript copies of Shah Esmā'īl's *divān* and data referring to manuscripts as found in the two available critical editions of Nesimi's *divān*, first I will try to clarify the authorship of these poems to the extent it is possible, listing some of the problems the manuscript material and the available editions present us with and showing the limits of the results that textual philology can provide in the case of material like the copies of Nesimi and Shah Esmā'īl's *divāns*. This analysis will be fitted into a larger literary and cultural framework, briefly discussing various forms of literary misattribution in the context of the popular Islamic messianism of the fifteenth through the seventeenth century on the one hand, and contemporary Turkish/Turkic popular poetry, on the other hand.

Sayyed 'Emadü'd-Din ('Emād al-Dīn) Nesimi was the most prominent poet of the Horufi 'lettrist' tradition and was one of the disciples of the founder of the Horufi movement or order, Fazlallāh Astarābādi; Nesimi is said to have met a cruel death, being flayed alive in 820/1417-18 in Aleppo. His literary merits still await a comprehensive modern scholarly appreciation, although his quatrains and the language of his Turkic *divān* have respectively been dealt with in a monograph (Burrill; Hess). He is mostly discussed in nationalist Republican Azerbaijani literary historiography as one of the Azeri classics. Research on him in general, particularly in this paper, however, faces immediate difficulties at the level of basic textology.

Shah Esmā'īl's (r. 1501-24) *divān* is arguably the most important source for what we know about early Safavid religiosity. The founder of the Safavids, the dynasty that marked a watershed moment in Islamic history by making Shi'ism the dominant Islamic denomination in Iran, in many of his poems Shah Esmā'īl expresses extremist (*gholāt*) notions such as *tanāsokh* "metempsychosis," excessive love of 'Alī b. Abī Tāleb, the manifestation of God in human form, the claim to be a divine being, etc. The Safavids were part of the same messianic trend as the Horufis before them, in which spiritual anti-nomianism and social discontent fused in an explosive revolutionary potency. Shah Esmā'īl's poems are essentially of three types with frequent overlapping between the individual categories: love poems of the classicized Persianate

1 Seven misattributions have already been noted by Qāhramānov, editor of Nesimi's *divān*. Examination of a more extensive manuscript base, however, reveals that there are altogether twenty-three suspect poems.

ghazal type, Sufi ghazals and explicitly gholāt propaganda poems where the poet often poses as the reincarnation of the godhead, ‘Ali or as the Mahdi or messiah. Nesimi’s oeuvre can be categorized roughly in the same way, except that most of his messianic output explicitly propagates Horufi ‘lettrist’ tenets. Another important difference of his messianic, religious poetry compared to Shah Esmā‘il’s is that most of Nesimi’s poems are far more complex in terms of both language and content, and it often takes the reader to know something about Horufi lettrism in order to understand them. The majority of Shah Esmā‘il’s religious poetry is simpler and more straightforward, sometimes even with lapses in the poetic meter. One has the impression that the religious poetry of each poet was addressed to a somewhat different audience; at least some of Nesimi’s poems were originally directed at Horufi adepts probably of a more intellectual, urban background, while Shah Esmā‘il wrote largely for his nomadic Turkmen following.

Manuscripts and Editions of Nesimi and Shah Esmā‘il

Nesimi’s Turkish *divān* has two editions that were conceived with philological methodology in mind. Cahangir Qāhrāmanov based his edition on a manuscript found at the Fozuli Institute of Manuscripts in Baku (Füzuli Adına Älyazmalar İnstitutu, M-227/11671; Adilov, pp. 23-24; Qāhrāmanov). He claims that this is a composite copy made up of three types of paper and is probably the work of four hands from different times throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Qāhrāmanov, I, pp. 13-23). He used other manuscripts as well as other editions too, most importantly, a copy from 1700 also preserved in Baku (M-188/5225; Adilov, p. 24). While he was working on his edition, however, he obtained two additional copies: one undated from the Bayezid Library in Istanbul and another one from Tabriz, Iran. Regrettably, Qāhrāmanov gives his readers no more information about the latter copy, but internal evidence suggests that it must have been penned some time before 1109/1697-98 (Sayyed Yunosi, p. 584). Unfortunately, instead of incorporating the latter two copies, the Bayezid and the Tabriz copies, into the philological apparatus of his edition, Qāhrāmanov chose to publish in a separate volume only those poems that he did not find in the other manuscripts, making it difficult to evaluate their relation vis-à-vis the other manuscripts he worked with. The other edition of Nesimi’s Turkish *divān* was produced by Hüseyin Ayan in Turkey. This relatively recent (2002) edition is based primarily on copies found in Turkish libraries. One of its major faults is that it does not show its position vis-à-vis either the Baku edition or the manuscripts that the Baku edition was based on,

but ignores them entirely. Nonetheless, Ayan had access to more numerous and older manuscripts than Qährāmanov.²

The philology of Shah Esmā'il's poetry also suffers from several problems. There are two critical editions of his Turkish *divān*, too. Tourkhan Gandjei's edition (1959) is the work of a distinguished scholar, but it is based on very few manuscripts. Äzizaga Mämmädoṽ, on the other hand, for his Baku edition from 1966 worked with a larger manuscript base, but the quality of his edition is regrettably marred by extremely numerous and serious oversights, and he does not even take notice of Gandjei's edition (Mämmädoṽ).³ The faults of the editions of Nesimi and Shah Esmā'il's *divāns* are aggravated by the fact that the individual manuscripts of both are very different from each other in terms of content, and that the editions leave us completely in the dark about poems ascribed to these poets in *jongs* (miscellanea) or *majmū'as* 'private scrapbooks or anthologies of poetry,' although the latter were a very important medium in the spread of popular poetry in general and of Shah Esmā'il and Nesimi's verse in particular, and finally, that we know virtually nothing about the chronology of either poets' poems.

Let us consider the manuscript evidence at our disposal. The poems in question are ghazals, that is short lyrical poems in the Persianate tradition with a set rhyme scheme (aa-ba-ca-da . . .) and the poet's pen name in the last couplet as well as with a canonized imagery that had largely been crystallized in Persian literature by the fourteenth century. In the case of Shah Esmā'il's *divān*, the present author has primarily used its manuscripts, while in the case of the *divān* of Nesimi, he has been relying on the philological apparatus found in its critical editions. We can identify three main textual traditions among the copies of Shah Esmā'il's *divān*:

1) The Earliest Copies

We are fortunate to have three extant copies executed during the lifetime of Shah Esmā'il, but unfortunate because these three are all greatly deficient.

2 These include the following: Ayasofya 3977, copied in 909/1503-04 by Soltān Ahmad Heravi in Istanbul; Millet Library, Hekimođlu Ali Pařa 639, copied in 893/1488; Isparta, Halil Hamid Pařa Library 650, copied by Morād al-Kāteb in 971/1563-64; Süleymaniye, Kadızade Mehmed Efendi 395 (no copy date, but its orthography and the paper made Ayan think that it was from the sixteenth century); Dil Ve Tarih-Cođrafya Library 148 (Milli Library, microfilm (A) 919), copied in 874, 878 or 879/1469-70, 1473-4 or 1474-75 (most probably the first). Cf. Ayan.

3 To be sure, in 1966 a scholar working in the Soviet Union might not necessarily have had access to the volume published in Italy only seven years before, and there were no word processors around to help philological work.

Each one of them contains headings that refer to Shah Esmā'īl as the reigning monarch, and the first two are illustrated with fine miniatures:

Sackler Gallery, Vever Collection, S1986.60 (S), Washington, D.C. (Thackston).

British Library, Or. 11388, London (Gandjei, 1986).⁴

Majles Library, Tehran, 4077.

2) The "Main Group"⁵

Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Supplément turc 995. The copy is undated, but according to Blochet, it was copied in the early seventeenth century (Blochet, II, pp. 122-23).

British Library, London Or. 3880. An undated copy; Rieu thinks it is from the sixteenth century, to which we can add that internal evidence suggests that it must have been executed after 1524 (Rieu, 1888, pp. 205-206).

Tashkent, Al-Biruni Institute of Oriental Studies, 1339 (1412), copied in 942/1535-36 in a fine nasta'liq by Shāh Mahmud Nishāburi (d. 972/1564-65?), a well-known calligrapher, most probably in Tabriz, during the reign of Shah Tahmāsb. Shāh Mahmud had been in the service of the Safavids since the time of Shah Esmā'īl, collaborating with such masters of painting as Behzād.⁶ The manuscript bears no dedication, so we do not know if it was commissioned by Tahmāsb himself or some member of the Qezelbash aristocracy at court.

National Museum and Library, Tehran, 3705, microfilm no. 25. According to the catalog, the copy bears the seal of the Ardabil Shrine Foundation with the date 1022/1613-14, which means it was presented to or acquired by the Foundation at that time.⁷ The copyist was 'Aysī (d. 980/1572-73), who came

4 For a description of the miniatures illustrating the manuscript, see Titley, p. 46.

5 I have named it the main group because most of the extant copies belong to it. They are textually close to each other and, except for the Vatican copy, all of them are fine manuscripts evidently commissioned by patrons or executed in the hope of patronage, although they contain no miniatures. The similarity of the British Or. 3880, Paris Supplément turc 995 and the Ardabil manuscripts has been noted by Tourhan Gandjei in the introduction to his edition of Shah Esmā'īl's *Dīvān*; Gandjei, 1959, p. 8.

6 About Shah Mahmud Nishāburi, see: Sām Mirzā Safavi, p. 133; Minorsky, 1959, pp. 134-38; Akin, pp. 108, 120, 135n., 126, 139, 222-23, 228, 229, 466; Bayāni, I, pp. 295-307. He is best known for scribing in 946/1539 one of Tahmāsb's most celebrated manuscript commissions, namely Nezāmi's *Khamsa* (British Library, Or. 2265; cf. Rieu, 1879, III, pp. 1072-73). Another sign of Shah Mahmud's tremendous prestige as a calligrapher is the legend related by Mostafā 'Āli, according to which, before the battle of Chalderān, Shah Esmā'īl hid Shah Mahmud and Behzād in a cavern for fear of their lives if something should befall him, and after suffering a defeat in the battle his first thing to do was to rush to his two protégé artists and check if they were safe (Akin, p. 223).

7 See the Aghabozorg on-line manuscript database: http://www.ghabozorg.ir/showbook_detail.aspx?bookid=147214 (last accessed on 1 January 6, 2014). See also: Minorsky, 1959, pp. 153-54; Bayāni, I, pp. 545-46.

from Herat but spent most of his career working in Mashhad at the court atelier of Sultan Ebrāhim Mirzā (d. 983/1575-6).⁸

Majles Library, Tehran, 4096. A deficient copy probably from the sixteenth century with its end and beginning missing, along with the colophon.

Vatican, Turco 221. An undated, defective copy with missing beginning and end; therefore, if a poem is absent from it, it might have originally been still included in it (Rossi, p. 193).

3) The "Golestān Group"

Golestān Palace Library, 2194: a finely executed copy commissioned by Shah Solaymān (1666-1694) in 1088/1677-78 and penned by Nur al-Din Mohammad b. Abu Torāb Esfahāni (d. 1104/1693-94), a scion of a family of well-known calligraphers. It is more voluminous than any of the copies of the *divān* previously produced, in that it contains some 65 poems more than even the most extensive of them, this being the Tashkent copy from 1535 (Ātābeg, I, pp. 21-23).

Qom, Ketābkhāna-ye Ayatollah Borujerdi, 2009: executed probably in the eighteenth century (Ostādi, p. 185).⁹ Not only its textual variants but also the distribution of the individual lines and poems on the pages are extremely similar to those found in the Golestān copy, which suggests that they are very close to each other in the paper trail, though the Qom copy is greatly inferior to the Golestān copy in terms of quality and was hardly produced for an elite patron. The production of such voluminous, comprehensive copies of Shah Esmā'il's *divān* as the Golestān and the Qom copies might not be unrelated to the appearance in the seventeenth century of prose romances or gestic on Shah Esmā'il entitled *Shah Esmā'il-nāma*.¹⁰

8 Unfortunately, I have not been able to access a copy that, on the basis of information provided by the critical editions of Shah Esmā'il's *divān*, also belongs to this group: Institute of Oriental Manuscripts in St. Petersburg (B 4544), dated 17 Rabi' I 1245/16 October 1829, but copied from a manuscript that bears the seal of Shah 'Abbās I and was presented to the Ardabil sanctuary in 1022/1613. In preparing his edition, Gandjei also consulted this copy but decided to omit its variants from the critical apparatus, because, as he puts it, its variants agree more or less with those of the younger London and the younger Paris copies (Dmitrieva, pp. 66-67).

9 According to a note on fol. 109r, it was sold on 11 Ramazān 1118/31 January 1768, which gives us the terminus ante quem for its copy date: *Howa'llāho ta'ālā do tumān sheshsad / be-tārikh-e davāzdahom-e shahr-e Ramazān ebtīyā' shod be-mablagh-e do tumān sheshsad dinār-e tabrizi* (May God be exalted! Bought on the date 11 in the month of Ramazān 1118 for 2 tumans and 600 tabrizi dinars).

10 This phenomenon has recently been studied by Prof. Sholeh Quinn. I am greatly indebted to her for lending me a copy of her as yet unpublished paper on the image of Shah Esmā'il in late Safavid historiography. See also: Morton; Wood.

4) This group is only made up of one manuscript, the Older Paris manuscript. Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Supplément turc 1307, an elegant copy with an illuminated title-page, executed in 948/1541-42 (Blochet, 11, p. 229). Minorsky, and in his wake, Gandjei, both considered this the oldest copy of the *divān*, the latter basing his edition on it (Minorsky, 1942).¹¹

5) I have also used two nineteenth-century copies whose position in the paper trail is yet to be established, although they seem closely related to the “main group”:

Ayatollah Golpāyagāni Library, Qom, 5/141. There is no date or copyist, but the text of the legend of the possessorial seals on fols. 10, 57 and 60 (yā ‘azīzallāh, 1284) dates the copy prior to 1867-68.

Tehran University, Central Library, 5160, copied on 23 Moharram 1260/13 February 1844 (Cavanşir and Necef, 158).

6) Bakhtar Museum, Mazār-e Sharif, Afghanistan, copied probably some time in the period from the mid-sixteenth to the early seventeenth century. Since Mämmädoṽ regrettably has not incorporated it into the philological apparatus of his edition, it is impossible to say anything about its relationship with the other copies.¹²

7) “Anatolian group”

Also included in the present analysis are two copies that probably derive from Anatolian Alevi-Bektashi circles and represent a textual tradition greatly different from the one coming from Safavid Iran:

Istanbul, Millet Library, ‘Ali Emiri Mnz. 131: a nineteenth-century or perhaps even more recent copy.

Istanbul, Millet Library, Mnz. 631, an anthology (majmu‘a) with a great many additional poems from the so-called Anatolian Khatāyi tradition (i.e., written

11 Minorsky and subsequent scholars put forth a thesis on the putative connection between the individual copies of Shah Esmā‘il’s *divān*, claiming that later copies were purged of their more messianic, self-aggrandizing content, which was a reflection of the Safavids’ shift from messianic extremist (*gholāt*) Shi‘ism to mainstream Shi‘ism. For a refutation of this, see Csirkés, chapter 2.

12 This copy was used by Mämmädoṽ but unfortunately I have had no access to it. He claims it was made at the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth century by none other than the most famous calligrapher of the time, Mir ‘Emād, but the evidence he presents for this is very weak. It is more probable that the copyist was, as is indicated by a note Mämmädoṽ found on the cover of the volume, Mirzā ‘Ali Tabrizi, who worked in the atelier of Shah Tahmāsb; this could date the manuscript to the mid sixteenth century (on Mirzā ‘Ali Tabrizi, see: Minorsky, 1959, pp. 153-54; Bayāni, 1, pp. 545-46. For a more comprehensive comparative analysis of the extant manuscript copies of Shah Esmā‘il’s *divān*, see Csirkés.

by poets using Shah Esmā'il's penname or one similar to it), executed prior to 1203/1789.¹³

The following charts display the distribution of the first couplets (or in one case, quatrain) of the suspect poems in fifteen copies of the *divān* of Shah Esmā'il, and in the *divān* of Nesimi, in the latter case relying on manuscript evidence found in the available critical editions.¹⁴

Distribution of the Suspect Poems in the Manuscripts

Table 1. The provenance of the first two suspect poems is highly problematic. They both appear in the Mazār-e Sharif manuscript used by Māmmādoḡ for his edition of Shah Esmā'il's *divān*, executed some time in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth century, as well as in the Golpāyagāni copy probably from the nineteenth century. Since I have not had access to the former, their provenance is difficult to check and their description in the catalogs and editions is highly defective, it is impossible at this point to decide whether they were written by Shah Esmā'il or Nesimi.

Table 2. These three poems are definitely the work of Nesimi. As the chart shows, they appear in the oldest extant copies of Nesimi's and in the "Golestān group" of copies of Shah Esmā'il's *divān*, the latter dating from much later.

Table 3. These 13 poems most certainly belong to Shah Esmā'il. They can all be found in the "main group" of manuscripts of his *divān*, executed probably in the mid to late sixteenth century, the older Paris manuscript from 1541, and even in the earliest fragments executed during Shah Esmā'il's lifetime. On the other hand, the poems can be located only in the composite copy of Nesimi's *divān*, which Qāhrāmanov based his edition on, coming some time from the sixteenth through the seventeenth century. Only two of them found their way into the "Anatolian group" of Shah Esmā'il's *divān* copies, but this should not weaken our attribution, for, as has been pointed out above, this group represents a greatly different textual tradition.

13 The material of these two copies is included in Ergun's edition, along with that of other anthologies found in Turkish libraries and personal collections (Ergun). I also know of but regrettably have had no access to, two additional copies: Soltān Qorrā'i Library, Tabriz, copied by the noted calligrapher Yāri Haravi (d. 980/1572-73) in 954/1547-48; and Mirzā Esmā'il Shāfe'i; cf. 'Ayyubiyān.

14 The chart contains the incipit couplets of the suspect poems and the names of the manuscripts they can be found in. The abbreviation COMP is used when a defective copy has the entire text of the poem.

Table 4. It is difficult to decide the authorship of these two poems. Of the copies of Shah Esmā'īl's *divān*, they can be found in the old Paris manuscript and the "Golestān group" but not in the "main group." On the other hand, one of them can be found in the sixteenth century composite copy of Nesimi's *divān*, the other, in a late Nesimi copy from 1700.

Table 5. This is also probably a poem by Shah Esmā'īl, found in the "main group" as well as the "Anatolian group" of the manuscripts of his *divān*, and is only attributed to Nesimi in an interesting multilingual (Turkish, Arabic, Persian, Hungarian, Latin, German and Croatian) anthology from late sixteenth-century Ottoman Hungary (Sudár, pp. 176-77).

Table 6. In terms of the copies of Shah Esmā'īl's *divān*, the poem can be found in one of the earliest copies, the "main group," as well as the "Golestān group," but only in an undated copy of Nesimi's *divān*. Therefore, this is most likely a Shah Esmā'īl poem.

Table 7. The poem can be found in a number of manuscripts of the "main group" of Shah Esmā'īl's *divān*, but also in fifteenth-century copies of Nesimi's *divān*, which makes it attributable to the latter.

It seems that only in the case of the four poems in Tables 1 and 4 is it impossible at this point to establish the authorship on the basis of a comparison of the manuscript data. We have seen that the majority of these twenty-three pieces were written by Shah Esmā'īl but misattributed to Nesimi mainly in the sixteenth-century composite Baku copy. As far as the poems written by Nesimi but misattributed to Shah Esmā'īl are concerned, one is tempted to point to the "Golestān group"; the Golestān copy, probably a major investment on the part of the Safavid dynasty at the end of the seventeenth century into the production of the most voluminous copy of Shah Esmā'īl's *divān*, was made in an age of the aforementioned heightened interest in the origins of the dynasty as well as its messianic mission. Particularly the poems in Table 3 were well-known Nesimi pieces, as attested by their occurrence in so many copies of Nesimi's *divān*; thus it is not impossible that they might have been intentionally misattributed by the copyist of the Golestān copy or his sources, for it would well fit such a historic context. Attribution to Shah Esmā'īl might lend royal glory to poems, especially ones with royal imagery, otherwise well-known at Sufi gatherings. It is not impossible, either, that such misattribution was originally intended to rehabilitate Nesimi. For instance, note the case of the following poem:

*Ol perī peyker ki t̄ac-i saltanat başındadır,
Ç̄n ü m̄āç̄ini müsakhkhar eylemek yaşındadır.*

*Tütüyā-yı çeşm-i b̄inādur ayağı toprağı,
Secde-gāh-ı 'ārifān ol qavs ile qaşındadır.*

TABLE 1

Poem	Editions	Old British (before 1524; defective)	Majles 1 (before 1524; very defective)	Vever (before 1524; defective)	Tashkent (942/1535)	Paris 1 (948/1541-2)	Paris 2 (before the early 17th century?)	British OR 3380 (16th century?)	National Museum, Tehran
hüsnüñg beyâni sûre-yi Yes ve hel etâ ey ka'be-yi mübârek vey mürüvve-yi safâ	Mäm. 91-92								
vechingde peydâdur sen- ing envâr-i zât-i kibriyâ ol yüze qarşuda dâyim şermendedür şems al-đuhâ	Mäm. 95-96								

TABLE 2

Poem	Editions	Old British (before 1524; defective)	Majles 1 (before 1524; very defective)	Vever (before 1524; defective)	Tashkent (942/1535)	Paris 1 (948/1541-2)	Paris 2 (before the early 17th century?)	British OR 3380 (16th century?)	National Museum, Tehran	Vatican (undated, defective)
cemâling ka'be-yi ehl-i safâdur visâling qible-yi rükn-i menâdur										

Vatican (undated, defective)	Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh. Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Qom, prior to 1118/1768	Nesimi
			3a	Y				Tabriz (before 1697)
			3b	Y				Bayazid 3353

Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh. Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Nesimi Qom, prior to 1118/1768		
					35a-b	36a-b	Ayasofya (1503), Hekimoğlu (1488), Isparta (1563), Kadızaade (cca. 16th c.)	

TABLE 2 (cont.)

Poem	Editions	Old British	Majles 1	Vever	Tashkent	Paris 1	Paris 2	British OR	National	Vatican
		(before 1524; defective)	(before 1524; very defective)	(before 1524; defective)	(942/1535)	(948/1541-2)	(before the early 17th century?)	3380 (16th century?)	Museum, Tehran	(undated, defective)

ol perī peyker
ki t̄ac u salṭanat
başındadur
çin ü māçim
musakhkhar
eylemek
başındadur

nūrna
saldı nazar
ol khāliq-i
perverdigār ābā
dōndi derdim
ol hayretten
oldı tār u mār
ol nūrunğ
qandiline
yazmıştılar ...
lā fetā illā 'Ali
lā seyfe illā
zū'l-fiqār

Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh. Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Nesimi Qom, prior to 1118/1768
					37a-b	38a-b Ayasofya (1503), Isparta (1563), Dil ve Tarih (btw. 1469-74)
					17a-b, 108a	Ayasofya (1503), Isparta (1563), Baku M-188/5225)

TABLE 3

Poem	Editions	Old British (before 1524; defective)	Majles 1 (before 1524; very defective)	Vever (before 1524; defective)	Tashkent (942/1535)	Paris 1 (948/1541-2)	Paris 2 (before the early 17th century?)	British OR 3380 (16th century?)	National Museum, Tehran
dilberā 'iškīng tenimde sevgülü cāndur manga pertev-i mihr-i rukhang khuṣṣīd-i tābāndur manga	Mām. 73; Gandjei #29, pp. 27-28			4b-5a	16a	18a-b	1b	10b-11a	1b-2a
'ārīzında sünbülīn 'anber-feṣān etmiṣdūrūr sanasın kim 'aqreb ile meh qurān etmiṣdūrūr	Mām. 194; Gandjei #72, p. 53			17b	33b	30a	9b	20b	9b
dilberā ol ay yūzüng khuṣṣīd-i tābāndur manga bağçeng içinden akhan su āb-ı hayvāndur manga	Mām. 77; Gandjei #26, pp. 25-26			5b	17a	17b	3a	12b	3a

Vatican (undated, defective)	Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh. Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Qom, prior to 1118/1768	Nesimi
27b		1a (last 2 beyts)					1b-2a	2b-3a	Baku M-227
14b	7b-8a	10a	8b				97a	21a	Baku M-227
27b	69b	2a-b	2a					4a	Baku M-227

TABLE 3 (cont.)

Poem	Editions	Old British (before 1524; defective)	Majles 1 (before 1524; very defective)	Vever (before 1524; defective)	Tashkent (942/1535)	Paris 1 (948/1541-2)	Paris 2 (before the early 17th century?)	British OR 338o (16th century?)	National Museum, Tehran
bir perī hayrānīyam bilmen mekānī khandedūr kimse bilmez dünyāda nām u nişānī khandedūr	Mām. 169-170; Gandjei #65, pp. 48-49			17a-b	29b-30a	28a	9a	19b-20a	8b-9a
‘işqing ey dilber köngül takhtında şāh olmuşdurur sūreting cān mülkine khürşid ü mäh olmuşdurur	Mām. 174-5; Cavaşşir-Necef 326-7			24a only verse 5, illustrating a minia- ture; 24v. vv. 4, 6-7	30b-31a	32a-b; Mām 7a erroneously claims it is missing from P1		17b	
menem bir ten veliken cān anıngdur ki her kim cān qıyar cānān anıngdur	Mām. 180-182; Gandjei #83, pp. 59-60; Cavaşşir-Necef 328-9			14a-b	33b-34a	33a-b	19b	33a-b	22a-b

Vatican (undated, defective)	Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh. Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Qom, prior to 1118/1768	Nesimi
17b	7a	9a	10a-b				first 6 beyts	20b	Baku M-227
14a	4b	7a	7b		8a		62b	23b	Baku M-227
9b	20a-b	21a-b	18a-b				75a	19a	Baku M-227

TABLE 3 (cont.)

Poem	Editions	Old British (before 1524; defective)	Majles 1 (before 1524; very defective)	Vever (before 1524; defective)	Tashkent (942/1535)	Paris 1 (948/1541-2)	Paris 2 (before the early 17th century?)	British OR 338o (16th century?)	National Museum, Tehran
ol perī-peyker ki çeşmimden nihān olmuşdurur bāqī ‘ömrüm olsun ol cismimde cān olmuşdurur	Mām. 123	2a, vv. 2-5; 12b, v. 1 COMP			19b-20a	38a	7b	18a	
geldi sarrāhī meclise def eylemiş niqāb nūr eyledi bu meclisi zerrīn pür-āftāb	Mām. 101-102		6b-7a		18b	20b-21a	4b	14a-b	4a-b
māhumı gördüm ki yüzünden niqāb almış gider pertev-i nūrundan anınğ āftāb almış gider	Mām. 152; Gandjei #78, pp. 56-57		9b		26a-b	31b	10b	21b	10b

Vatican (undated, defective)	Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh. Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Qom, prior to 1118/1768	Nesimi
14b	5a	7b	8a				9a-b	12a-b	Baku M-227
8a-b	66b	4a	4b-5a				3a-3b	6a-b	Baku M-227
	8b-9a	10b-11a	11a				19b	14b	Baku M-227

TABLE 3 (cont.)

Poem	Editions	Old British (before 1524; defective)	Majles 1 (before 1524; very defective)	Vever (before 1524; defective)	Tashkent (942/1535)	Paris 1 (948/1541-2)	Paris 2 (before the early 17th century?)	British OR 3380 (16th century?)	National Museum, Tehran
cān u dilimi qoymişam yolungda men ey dilrübā tā ki uykhuda görer men sen teki bir meh-liqā	Mäm. 86; Gandjei #35, p. 31			6a		19b-20a	3b	13a-b	3a-b
haqīqat bahr-i zāt-i ekber oldı sıfātından anın bir gevher oldı	Mäm. 57-59; Gandjei #13, p. 15	COMP 11a-b			13a	10a-b	46b-47a	74a-b	55b-56a
ezelden pīr-i 'ışqung peyreviyüz tārīqat ehl-i fazling rehberiyüz	Mäm. 48-49				11a-b		26b-27a	42a-b; 1/2 <i>rehreviyüz</i>	

Vatican (undated, defective)	Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh. Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Qom, prior to 1118/1768	Nesimi
28a	65b	3a	2b				3b-4a	Baku M-227
5a-b	56a-b (order of vv. somewhat different)	53a-b	55a-b	9b	16b-17a	10a	103a	Baku M-227
	29a-b	29a-b	27a-b			40a-b; has an additional beyt after beyt 5: <i>eger sorarsa münkir söyle ey cān / kemāl u fazl ile haqq Ca'feriyüz</i>	41a-b	Tabriz (before 1697)

TABLE 3 (cont.)

Poem	Editions	Old British (before 1524; defective)	Majles 1 (before 1524; very defective)	Vever (before 1524; defective)	Tashkent (942/1535)	Paris 1 (948/1541-2)	Paris 2 (before the early 17th century?)	British OR 3380 (16th century?)	National Museum, Tehran
ta'ālā ṣa'nehü ekber bu ne hüsn-i dilarādur cemālng hūriden yeğrek boyung tübādan a'lādur	Mäm. 220	COMP 16a		20a	82a-b		12b	24b	13b

TABLE 4

Poem	Editions	Old British (before 1524; defective)	Majles 1 (before 1524; very defective)	Vever (before 1524; defective)	Tashkent (942/1535)	Paris 1 (948/1541-2)	Paris 2 (before the early 17th century?)	British OR 3380 (16th century?)	National Museum, Tehran
dudağing qand imiş bal anda neyler ne nāzik khatt imiş khāl anda neyler neler geldi gelesidür meded hey cihān ehli olasıdur meded hey	Mäm. 230								
						24a			
	Mäm. 540-1; Gandjei #254; p. 157					78b			

Vatican (undated, defective)	Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh. Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Qom, prior to 1118/1768	Nesimi
------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---	--	--	-------------------------	--	--------

10a-b	11b	13a-b	13b				27a	29a	Tabriz (before 1697)
-------	-----	-------	-----	--	--	--	-----	-----	----------------------------

Vatican (undated, defective)	Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh. Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Qom, prior to 1118/1768	Nesimi
------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---	--	--	-------------------------	--	--------

37a	38a	Baku M-227; Tashkent P-1794
-----	-----	-----------------------------------

14a	107a	Baku M-188/5225
-----	------	--------------------

TABLE 5

Poem	Editions	Old British (before 1524; defective)	Majles 1 (before 1524; very defective)	Vever (before 1524; defective)	Tashkent (942/1535)	Paris 1 (948/1541-2)	Paris 2 (before the early 17th century?)	British OR 3380 (16th century?)	National Museum, Tehran
'aşıq iseng gel berü kim cân-i cânân mendedür zâhidâ pes khandesin kim nür-i imân mendedür	Mâm. 140-2. Cavanşir-Necef 361-2; Gandjei #47, pp. 37-38				24a-b	23a-b	8b	19a-b	8a-b

TABLE 6

Poem	Editions	Old British (before 1524; defective)	Majles 1 (before 1524; very defective)	Vever (before 1524; defective)	Tashkent (942/1535)	Paris 1 (948/1541-2)	Paris 2 (before the early 17th century?)	British OR 3380 (16th century?)	National Museum, Tehran
dilberâ şemsü'z- zuhâdur şu'le-yi rukhsârıngız âyet-i çâhâ ve ye'sîn sûret-i didârıngız	Mâm. 274			21b	38b		27b	44b	31a

Vatican (undated, defective)	Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh. Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Qom, prior to 1118/1768	Nesimi
	6b-7a	8b-9a	10a	21b-22a, 11 vv.	6b-7a	25b-26a	27b-28a	Palatics (1598-99)

Vatican (undated, defective)	Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh. Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Qom, prior to 1118/1768	Nesimi
19b	30b	30b	27b-28a			40b	41b	Bayazid 3353

TABLE 7

Poem	Editions	Old British (before 1524; defective)	Majles 1 (before 1524; very defective)	Vever (before 1524; defective)	Tashkent (942/1535)	Paris 1 (948/1541-2)	Paris 2 (before the early 17th century?)	British OR 3380 (16th century?)	National Museum, Tehran
sen manga ger yâr sen var ey göngül yâr isteme yâre dildâr ol sanga ger yâr u dildâr isteme							41a-b	54a	48b

*Bu qamer devrinde hergiz görmesün şāhum zevāl,
Üç otuz on yaşı olsun on iki yaşındadır.*

*Sihr ile eyler imāmet gözleri āşıqlara,
Secde-i āzādeler hem çeşm ü hem qaşındadır.*

*Şerbet ü āb u şerābı āh u derd ü khūn-ı dil,
İy Nesimi bil haqīqat āşıqung āşıdadur.*

(QĀHRĀMANOV, I, no. 81, pp. 192-93; AYAN, I, no. 119, p. 328)

The fairy faced one who has the crown of sovereignty on his head,
Is at the age when he wants to conquer China and beyond.

The dust of his feet is collyrium for the seeing eyes,
The Gnostics would prostrate themselves before the arch of his eyebrows.

May this moon (my king) never see eclipse in his circle,
May he reach age three times thirty and ten; now he is twelve.

With his spell he casts the eyes of the imamate at the lovers,
The free ones (Sufis) prostrate themselves before his eyes and brows.

Vatican (undated, defective)	Majles 2 (17th century? defective)	Tehran University (1260/1844)	Golpāyegani (19th century)	Mzr. Sh.	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 631 (majmu'a, 18th century?)	Istanbul, Millet, Ali Em. 131 (19th century?)	Golestān (1088/1677)	Masjed-e A'zam, Qom, prior to 1118/1768	Nesimi
	49b	47a	50b						Ayasofya, Dil ve Tarih, Hekimoğlu, Isparta, Kadı-zade, Mevlana Müzesi, Tehran

His sherbet, water and wine is sighs, pain, affliction and the blood of the heart,
O, Nesimi, know that the Truth is in the broth of the lover.

Remarkably, Nur al-Din Mohammad b. Abu Torāb Esfahāni, the scribe of the Golestān copy, recorded several interesting changes in the text of the poem. He altered the last word of the first couplet as follows:

*Ol perī peyker ki tāk-i saltanat başındadır,
Çün ü mākīni müsakhkhar eylemek başındadır.*

The fairy faced one who has the crown of sovereignty on his head,
Has got it in his head to conquer China and beyond.

The benediction in couplet three is also strengthened:

*Bu qamer devrinde hergiz görmesün şāhum zevāl,
Cāvidān ömri ola çün on iki yaşındadır.*

May this moon (my king) never see eclipse in his cycle,
 May he have eternal life now that he is twelve.¹⁵

The warrior king's image also gets more emphasis in couplet 4. Magic is a black art, and by contrast, the secrets of the Qebla are white art. Falcon hunting is not appropriate at the Qebla, for that is a sacred site, but here royal and divine activities are merged.

*Sıhr ile qılır çu ğāret gözleri 'āşıqları,
 Qıblening esrārı anıng quşlayan qaşındadır*

When his eyes with their spell raid against the lovers,
 The secrets of the Qebla are wherever he hunts with his falcon.

The following Nesimi ghazal may have been recorded in the Golestān copy of Shah Esmā'il's *divān* due to its strong Shi'ite message.

*Cemāling qıble-yi ehl-i safādur,
 Visāling ka'be-i rükn ü Minādur.*

*Şeh-i merdāna qul olğıl gönülden,
 Ki ol sultān imām-i pişvādur.*

(...)

*Ālını bilmeyen nefsinı bilmez,
 La'ın ü müşrik ü qatlı revādur.*

*Imām-i Mehdī-yi Hādī uş ol kim
 Çırāğ-i cümle çeşm-i enbiyādur*

(QĀHRĀMANOV, I, no. 50, pp. 128-29; AYAN, I, no. 56, pp. 248-49, G 35 a-b; Q 36 a-b).

15 *Qamer devri* 'the lunar cycle', stands for the time between the Hejra (Mohammad's emigration from Mecca to Medina in 622) and the Day of Judgment, as well as for the time shortly before that. According to popular lore, people born shortly before the Day of Judgment obviously have a shorter life; the poet's wish that the patron (who can also be 'Ali as well as the king) have eternal life may thus have eschatological connotations (cf. Deniz). I thank Ahmet Tunç Şen for this reference.

Your beauty is the Ka'ba of the people of purity/Mt. Safa,
Union with you is the Qebla, [its] pillars and Minā.¹⁶

Be the servant of the Shah of Mankind from the heart,
For that sultan is a guiding imam.

(...)

He who does not know/acknowledge 'Ali does not know himself,
He is accursed, an idolater; killing him is lawful.

The imam Mahdi the Guide is he who is
The light of the eyes of all the saints.

It is probably the explicitly eschatological, messianic content of the following Nesimi *morabba'*, a poem made up of quatrains with the last line of each quatrain serving as a refrain, that made it suitable or prone to appear as a Shah Esmā'il piece:

*Nūrına saldı nazar ol khāliq-i perverdigār,
Ābā döndi derdim ol hayretten oldu tār u mār.
Ol nürung qandiline yazmışdı der rüz-i şümār:
Lā fatā ellā 'Alī lā sayf ellā zo'l-feqār.*

The Creator Omnipotent cast a glance at his light ('Ali),
My affliction was dissolved and destroyed by that astonishment.
On the Day of Judgment He wrote into the candle of that light:
"There is no man (like) 'Ali and no sword (like his) Zo'lfeqār."

(QĀHRĀMANOV, II, ILAVELER no. 17, pp. 502-506; AYAN, II, pp. 767-69).

This is a heavily Alid poem which also displays some Horufi tenets, for example, in the following quatrain:

*Ādem'e virdi kerāmet khuld ü cennātü'n-na'ım.
Cümle anga secde qıldı gayrū şeytānı'r-racım.
Ādem'üñ vechinde yidi khattı yazmışdı qadım:
Lā fatā ellā 'Alī lā sayf ellā zu'l-feqār.*

16 Mt. Safā and Minā are two Islamic landmarks near Mecca.

He gave the paradise of delights to Adam as a miracle.
 All bowed before Adam except Satan the execrable.
 God inscribed the seven lines into Adam's face;
 "There is no man (like) Ali and no sword (like his) Zo'lfeqār."¹⁷

The case of the thirteen poems in Table 3 is just the other way round: they are Shah Esmā'il's poems presented as Nesimi's in the sixteenth-century composite Baku copy. Our explanation can only be conjectural. It may have been convenient to attribute "heretical" verses that might cause objections to someone who is dead. That was probably the case for 'Omar Khayyām, and it may be the case for these Nesimi ghazals. Since he was dead long before Shah Esmā'il, it is not impossible that there is an ideological reason for some scribes to pawn off Shah Esmā'il's poetry on someone else, in which case Horufi poets in general and Nesimi as a slain heretic or Ḥosayn-like martyr might in particular be likely culprits. Let us consider, for example, parts of the following poem:

*Haqiqat bahr-i zāt-i ekber oldi,
 Sıfātundan anung bir gevher oldi.*

(...)

*Erişdi va'desi sâhib-zamânung,
 Ulu dīvân quruldu mahşer oldi.*

*Zühür etdi tecellisi imâmung,
 Münâfiq görmedi kûr dîger oldi.*

*Olar ki tâbi'-i Mervânilerdür,
 Sürüldi çıkhtı dînden ebter oldi.*

17 In Horufi lore, the seven lines of hair (the hairline, the two eyebrows and the twice two sets of eyelashes) in man's face are related to God's message in the first chapter of the Koran, which is also made up of seven verses. "The idea here was again that God's creative commands existed in bifurcated forms in bodies and sounds in the physical world and that we could see the correspondences between the two facets by correlating major aspects of a body (the human being) with a form of speech (the Qur'an). The fact that these two entities in particular were comparable was no surprise since they were, respectively, the best body and the most perfect form of materialized language, God's ultimate scripture" (Bashir, p. 52).

*Şāhing evlādına iqrār edenler,
Akhīler gāziler abdāllar oldı.*

*Velāyet bāgçesining bāgbāni,
Yüzin açdı cihānı enver oldı.*

*Şāhing āstānesinde qulları çokh,
Khatāyi cümlesinden kemter oldı¹⁸*

(MÄMMÄDOV, I, pp. 57-59; QÄHRÄMANOV, II, ilaveler no. 9, p. 628).

The Truth emanated as the sea of the Greatest Self,
A pearl came forth from His attributes.

(...)

The age of the Lord of Time has arrived,
The sublime court has been set up, the [Day of] Gathering¹⁹ has come.

The bodily manifestation of the Imam has appeared.
The hypocrites could not see it; they have become deaf and blind.

The followers of the Marwanids²⁰
Were dragged away, excommunicated and became wretched.

Those who pledged allegiance to the progeny of the Shah (i.e., 'Ali),
Were akhis, ghazis and abdāls.

The gardener of the garden of sanctified authority
Revealed his face and his world was shining.

The Shah ('Ali) has many servants at his threshold,
The smallest of whom is Khatāyi.

The authorship of the two poems in Table 4 is difficult to establish with complete certainty. The numerological motifs in the second couplet of the first one

18 Mämmädov, pp. 57-59; Qährämanov, II, ilaveler no. 9, p. 628.

19 That is the Day of Judgment.

20 A line of the Umayyad dynasty that usurped power from 'Ali and ruled the caliphate until 132/750.

would make it more probable that this is a Nesimi poem. Let us see the two versions side by side:

Nesimi:

*Dudağing qand imiş bal anda neyler,
Ne nâzik khatt imiş hâl anda neyler?
Yedi harf oldı çün her bir varaqda,
Elif yâ lâm-elif dâl anda neyler?*

Your lips are sugar, why put honey on them?
How beautiful your hairlines are! Why add a mole there?
When there are seven letters on each page,
Why write the letters alef, or lâm-alef and dâl on them?

The seven letters refer to 'Ali and Mohammad, whose names put together are made up of seven letters. The straight shape of the letters *alef* (ا), or *lâm-alef* (لا) as well as *dâl* (د) might refer to the movements of standing and prostration in the Muslim prayer. The couplet thus elevates the message of the previous one (the beloved is perfect and cannot be made more beautiful) in a spiritual, antinomian sense: it is enough to mention 'Ali and Mohammad, there being no need for prayer. The older Paris manuscript of Shah Esmâ'il's *divân* from 1541, however, has a different version for the second couplet which has no numerical reference:

*Elife nisbet ettüm qadd-i dâling.
Elif üste elif dâl anda neyler.*

I have straightened your dâl-like figure into an alef.
It is now an alef on alef (i.e. perfectly straight). Why have a dâl there?

(QĀHRĀMANOV, I, no, 125, p. 282)

The Golestân copy of Shah Esmâ'il's *divân* from 1677 alters the second hemistich of the latter couplet, further simplifying the meaning:

*Elife nisbet ettüm qadd-i dâling.
Şol elif rāstdür dâl anda neyler.*

I have straightened your dâl-like figure into an alef.
This alef is already straight. Why have a dâl there?²¹

21 Shah Esmâ'il, *Divân* (ms), Golestân, fol. 37a.

The second poem in Table 4 gives us no such clue. As a strongly messianic poem, it could have been written by either poet.

The Phenomenon of Poetic Misattribution

In the preceding sections we have been able to establish the authorship of the majority of the suspect poems with a fair degree of certainty. It is perhaps time to turn, however, to probably the most interesting question: how and why did it all happen that twenty-three poems, that is every twentieth poem, found in copies of Shah Esmā'īl's *divān*, appear in the copies of Nesimi's *divān* as well? Was this sheer scribal ignorance, as poet laureate Bahār would have us think (Bahār, I, pp. 288-96)? Did these misattributions occur just because the two pen names, Khatayi and Nesimi, were identical in meter and rhyme? How could we contextualize the phenomenon?

Misattribution of literary works is universal. One form is plagiarism, that is, intentional appropriation of someone else's work, which is a possible explanation for the poems in Tables 4 and 7. Dedications, prefaces, prologues, etc. have, aside from introducing the work, the added function of claiming authorship and intellectual property rights over it, even in pre-nineteenth century contexts where there was no legal concept of intellectual property. Of course, one can come across plagiarism in the Islamic tradition as well. One might recall Hojviri, who complains in his *Kashf al-mahjub* that on two occasions his works were subject to plagiarism (Hojviri, p. 2). The appropriation of another poet's works, *sareqa* or *enteqāl* (theft, plagiarism), was a well-known practice in the pre-copyright world of Arabic and Turko-Persian poetry. We even know of the phenomenon called *eghāra* 'plunder' from pre-Islamic Arabic poetry, when a famous poet takes away the work of another one, claiming that he should have written it, and the less famous versifier submits for fear of being lampooned (Von Grunebaum, pp. 234-53; Naaman, pp. 271-85). However, it is not only through plagiarism that works of one author find their way into those of another. The concept of *sareqa* was sharply distinguished from the practice of *esteqbāl* (welcoming) and *nazira* (parallel poem), that is, poetic emulation, according to which the poet imitated another one, citing features, sometimes entire lines from him in the same meter but trying to transcend him at the same time (Zipoli, pp. 8-16; Losensky, pp. 9, 107, 112). Accordingly, we know of several poems by Shah Esmā'īl that are clearly poetic imitations of certain Nesimi poems.

Subsequent reception might play a role, too, in misattribution. A well-known practice is pseudo epigraphy, which we can find related to Shah Esmā'īl's poetry as well. In this practice, works are attributed by a later tradition to a famous or paradigmatic author. As examples, we can adduce the *Tariq*

al-tahqiq misattributed to Sanā'i, or 'Omar Khayyām from Classical Persian and Yunos Emre from thirteenth-century Turkish poetry, the literary tradition attributing so many poems to these latter two poets that now it is impossible to establish their complete oeuvre, and consequently instead of oeuvres it is better to talk in their cases about the "Omar Khayyām textual tradition" or the "Yunos Emre textual tradition" (Utas, p. 115-134; Fouchécour). In the case of 'Omar Khayyām, in certain instances concerning later generations of pseudo-Khayyāms, it may have been safer to attribute their more antinomian poems to a poet who was already dead, a phenomenon similar to many versifiers in the Alevi-Bektashi tradition in Anatolia, who expressed their spiritual attachment to Shah Esmā'il by writing poetry in the same vein as his and adopting either his pen name, Khatāyi, or pen names that were similar to or alluded to him, such as Shah Khatāyi, Dervish Khatāyi, Jan Khatāyi, Derdimend Khatāyi, Pur Khatāyi, Soltān Khatāyi (Aslanoğlu, pp. 333-338; Gandjei, 1971, pp. 263-66).

In the Persianate tradition, where both Nesimi and Shah Esmā'il's poetry can be located, and particularly in the genre of the ghazal, the figure of the poet is on conscious display: it is a requirement of the ghazal to end with a signatory verse, that is, one that contains the poet's pen name. To misattribute a ghazal in a fully literate context, therefore, would constitute a conscious act on the part of the plagiarist to appropriate the real author's authority, or it could indicate ignorance or other unknown motifs on the part of the scribe to alter the pen name in the signatory verse. But what happens if a certain set of poems serves communal, for instance ritual, purposes? In such a case, members of the community, especially in a pre-modern context, might be regularly exposed to the work in an oral setting, for example, when they are listening to a homily. The poetry might become part of the ritual in the form of chants sung together, and the members might feel attached to the text. Indeed, they might, consciously or unconsciously, alter, omit from or add to it. Misattribution is perhaps only the next step in this process, the text coming to be attributed to another member of the community's Pantheon. Accordingly, in the context of a dervish community, poems were recited and it was probably easy to mix up the person reciting or singing the poem with the author. Several *robā'is* in Foruzānfar's standard edition of the *Divān-e Shams Tabrizi* were in fact not written by Jalāl al-Din Rumi but were likely attributed to him early on in the dervish context or recited by himself and recorded as compositions of his own (Lewis, p. 532). During a mystical ritual, a *zehr* or *samā'*, it is *hāl* (mystical state, ecstasy) and not *qāl* (saying, speech) that is paramount.²² As is put succinctly

22 I thank Prof. Franklin Lewis for this comment.

by Shah Esmā'il in one of the aforesaid poems in the older Paris manuscript that is likely a Nesimi poem:

*Khatāyi qāl evinden hāle yetdi,
Bu bir hāl evidür qāl anda neyler.*

Khatāyi has reached a mystical state from the way-station of speech,
This is the station of mystical state. Speech has no place here.

(MÄMMÄDOV, I, p. 230)²³

A useful analytical tool could be the concept of “textual community” as put forth by Brian Stock in relation to tenth-eleventh century European literacy, when he tries to interpret “. . . the persistence of the oral, the ritualistic, and the symbolic within an increasingly literate society” (Stock, p. 71). Accordingly, social or religious groups used texts

[. . .] both to structure the internal behaviour of the groups' members and to provide solidarity against the outside world. In this sense they were ‘textual communities.’ The term is used in a descriptive rather than a technical sense; it is intended to convey not a new methodology but a more intensive use by groups hitherto dependent on oral participation in religion. What was essential to a textual community was not a written version of a text, although that was sometimes present, but an individual, who, having mastered it, then utilized it for reforming a group's thought and action (Stock, p. 90).

This is a process parallel to how Amelia Gallagher describes the reception of Shah Esmā'il's poetry in the Alevi-Bektashi tradition. According to her analysis, the historic figure of Shah Esmā'il was gradually forgotten and he simply became the legendary pir (saint) of the dervish order alongside, one would add, other poets like Pir Soltān Abdāl and, of course, Nesimi (Gallagher, pp. 224-235).

Both poets' works are steeped in the oral context of nomadic Turkmen in the territory that includes Anatolia, the Balkans, Syria, Iraq, Iran and Central Asia. When such works get written down, especially if they are entered into a lavishly executed manuscript, a new dynamic sets in. The poetry steps out of the realm of the religious community and enters the realm of politics. It

23 The poem can also be found in Qährāmanov, I, no. 125, p. 282. About the two versions, see below.

is now also used for the representation of power, accompaniment to political ritual, illustration of the grandeur of a dynasty, etc., as can be illustrated by the aforementioned Vever and older London copies of Shah Esmā'il's *divān*. Sometimes, as we can see in the case of Shah Esmā'il's poems, poetry used for political purposes might reenter the realm of the populace, or it might exist in two spheres at the same time. In the popular realm it might be subject to a wholesale new range of modifications whereas in the palace with trained scribes the textual tradition probably tends to be more conservative. Both of our poets' works were on the margin between literacy and orality; their poetry retains features of both spheres. It is thus useful to quote the cultural historian Walter J. Ong's words:

Manuscript cultures remained largely oral-aural even in retrieval of material preserved in texts. Manuscripts were not easy to read, by later typographic standards, and what readers found in manuscripts they tended to commit to at least somewhat to memory. Relocating material in a manuscript was not always easy. Memorization was encouraged and facilitated also by the fact that, in highly oral manuscript cultures, the verbalization one encountered even in written texts often continued the oral mnemonic patterning that made for ready recall. Moreover, readers commonly vocalized, read slowly aloud or sotto voce, even when reading alone, and this also helped fix matter in the memory (Ong, p. 117).

Another factor facilitating misattribution of poems by Shah Esmā'il and Nesimi was the literary-social context of this type of poetry, which spread not only in the form of *divāns* that were commissioned by a patron, but also orally and in private anthologies, with the text of the poem opening up greatly with lines being added and omitted or modified. Such a context has fluid notions of authorship and text, a phenomenon not at all limited to the Persianate world. Speaking about eighteenth-century Hungarian popular literature, István Rumen Csörsz introduces the concept of variogenesis:

Variogenesis excludes any hierarchy between the textual variants and thinks in its stead in terms of texts of equal value. Not even the text (or a part of it) with the earliest provenance is superior to more recent ones; it is only the first sign that a text has entered the variogenetic field. Such a piece is not born but generated, not created but compiled, and it is identical with itself not in a textological but in a performative sense (Csörsz, p. 32).

Variogenesis was expedited by reliance on memory. Learning huge quantities of texts by heart was part of training in the humanities in the West, too, up to quite recent times, and it still is in the Persianate world today. In the pre-print context of the Islamic world, memorization of poetry especially was a fundamental way to learn the profession of the learned man. Meter, rhymes, tropes etc, the entire stock-in-trade of literature was mastered through learning by heart. As is most succinctly put by Nezāmi 'Aruzi Samarqandi, an eleventh-century litterateur from Eastern Iran:

But to this rank [of immortality—F.Cs.] a poet cannot attain unless in the prime of his life he commits to memory 20,000 couplets of the poetry of the Ancients, keeps in view [as models] 10,000 verses of the works of the Moderns, and continually reads and remembers the *dīwāns* of the masters of his art, observing how they have acquitted themselves in the strait passes and delicate places of song, in order that thus the different styles and varieties of verse may become ingrained in his nature, and the defects and beauties of poetry may be inscribed on the tablet of his understanding (Nezami 'Aruzi, p. 39).

I have mostly referred to *divān* copies of Shah Esmā'il, a number of which were commissioned and paid for lavishly, as is made probable by the high quality of some of the manuscripts. However, the textual history of this type of poetry is equally strongly related to the world of popular anthologies of poetry that were made for private purposes or to serve the pious needs of a religious community. The appropriation of Nesimi's poems in early sixteenth-century copies of Shah Esmā'il's *divān* could also be the result of intentional plagiarism. Safavid propaganda may have felt it expedient to appropriate the messianic potency as well as the literary prestige of some of Nesimi's poems. As to the latter appropriations, the context of the Golestān copy of Shah Esmā'il's *divān* with its many Nesimi poems might be reflecting the increasing interest in Shah Esmā'il and his messianic mission in the late seventeenth century.

Regarding the appearance of Shah Esmā'il poems disguised as Nesimi poems in copies of the latter poet's *divān*, the motifs are more difficult. One option might be the above-mentioned open nature of the poetic text in popular poetry. Moreover, in the same Bektashi tradition in Anatolia that produced the pseudo-Khatāyis, we find poets that used the pen name Nesimi, like Qul Nesimi, in the late seventeenth century. A more complex picture could be drawn, however, with more exact information about the copies of Nesimi's *divān* in both Iran and Anatolia.

There was a broad socio-religious context of interaction between various popular messianic traditions of the day, the Horufis, the Bektashis, the Safavids and others, as is shown by this remarkable and textually detectable interaction of the Horufi and Safavid traditions. We know from the literature about the importance of lettrist, numerological Horufi techniques for the Bektashis.²⁴ Both Shah Esmā'il and Nesimi, as well as the pseudo-Shah Esmā'īls and pseudo-Nesimis, became part of a common popular Sufi lore, which operated through the language of Persianate mysticism, in which messianic elements as well as ecstatic expressions of the *unio mystica* were just as much present as originally Horufi or lettrist ideas.

Bibliography

For Shah Esmā'il's poetry, see T. Gandjei, 1959, and A. Mämmädoṽ; for Nesimi's poetry, see C. Qährāmanov.

- A. A. Adilov, *Katalog tyurskikh rukopisei* 11 tom (Poeziya), Baku, 2009, pp. 23-24.
- E. Akin, *Mustafā Alī's Epic Deeds of Artists: A Critical Edition of the Earliest Ottoman Text about the Calligraphers and Painters of the Islamic World*, Leiden and Boston, 2011.
- İ. Aslanoğlu, *Şah İsmail Hatayî: Divan, Dehnâme, Nasihatnâme ve Anadolu Hatayîleri*, Istanbul, 1992.
- B. Âtâbeg, *Fehrest-e divānhā-ye khaṭṭi-ye Ketābkhāna-ye Saltānati 1: Divānhā*, Tehran, 2535 [1976].
- H. Ayan, *Nesîmî Hayatı, Edebi Kişiliği, Eserleri ve Türkçe Divanının Tenkitli Metni*, 2 vols., Ankara, 2002.
- ‘Obaydallāh Ayyubiyān, “Divān-e Khatā’i,” *Majalla-ye Dāneshkada-ye Adabiyāt va ‘olum-e ensāni* (Dāneshgāh-e Tehrān) 1.1 (1343/1964), pp. 289-309.
- M. T. Bahār, *Sabkshenāsi yā tārikh-e tahavvul-e nasr-e fārsi*, 2 vols., Tehran, [1321/1942].
- Sh. Bashir, *Fazlallah Astarabadī and the Hurufis*, Oxford, 2005.
- M. Bayāni, *Ahvāl o āsār-e khoshnevisān*, 2 vols., Tehran, 1363/1984.
- E. Blochet, *Catalogue des manuscrits turcs*, 2 vols., Paris, 1932-33.
- K. R. F. Burrill, *The Quatrains of Nesimi: A Fourteenth-century Hurufi*, The Hague, 1972.
- F. Csirkés, “Chaghatay Oration, Ottoman Eloquence, Qizilbash Rhetoric: Turkish Literature in Şafavid Persia,” Ph.D. diss., The University of Chicago, 2015.
- I. R. Csörsz, *Szöveg szöveg hátán: A magyar közköltészet variációs rendszere (1700-1840)*, Budapest, 2009.

24 For the Horufi influence on the Bektashis, see Ocak, pp. 106-35.

- L. V. Dmitrieva, *Opisanie tiurkskikh rukopiseĭ Instituta vostokovedeniya III: Poeziya, Poëziya i kommentarii k poëticheskim sochineniyam, poëtika*, Moscow, 1980.
- S. Deniz, "Klasik Türk Şiirinde Devr-i Kamer Anlayışı," *Türklük Araştırmaları Dergisi* 19 (2008), pp. 149-78.
- Sadeddin Nüzhet Ergun, *Hatâyî Divanı: Şah İsmail Safevî Edebî Hayatı ve Nefesleri*, Istanbul, Maarif Kitaphanesi, 1946.
- W. Floor, and H. Javadi, "The Role of Azerbaijani Turkish in Safavid Iran," *Iranian Studies* 46.4 (2013), pp. 569-81.
- Ch.-H. de Fouchécour, "Umar Khayyam 2: The Quatrains," in *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, New Edition, ed. P. Bearman et al. Brill Online, 2013. (http://reference.works.brillonline.com.proxy.uchicago.edu/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/umar-khayyam-COM_1284).
- A. Gallagher, "The Fallible Master of Perfection: Shah Ismail in the Alevi-Bektashi Tradition," Ph.D. diss., McGill University, 2004.
- T. Gandjei, ed., *Il Canzoniere di Šāh Ismā'īl Hata'ī*, Napoli, 1959.
- Idem, "Pseudo-Khatā'ī," in *Iran and Islam: In Memory of the Late Vladimir Minorsky*, ed. C. E. Bosworth, Edinburgh, 1971, pp. 263-66.
- Idem, "A Note on and Illustrated Ms of Shāh Ismā'īl," *Turcica* 18 (1986), pp. 159-64.
- Idem, "Turkish in the Safavid Court of Iran," *Turcica* 21-23 (1991), pp. 311-18.
- ʿAlī b. ʿOsmān al-Jullābī Hojviri, *The Kashf al-mahjūb: The Oldest Persian Treatise on Sūfism*, London, 1967.
- M. R. Hess, *Die Sprache des Menschengottes: Untersuchungen zu ʿImad ʿad-Din Nāsimis (fl. ca. 1400) türkischem Divan*, Aachen, 2009.
- F. D. Lewis, *Rumi: Past and Present, East and West*, Oxford, 2008.
- P. E. Losensky, "Welcoming Fighānū: Imitation, and Individuality in the Safavid-Mughal Ghazal, 1480-1680," Costa Mesa, California, 1998.
- A. Mämmədov, *Şah İsmayıl Xatai əsərləri*, 2 vols., Baku, 1966.
- V. Minorsky, "The Poetry of Shāh Ismā'īl I," *BSOAS* 10.4 (1942), pp. 1006a-1053a.
- Idem, *Calligraphers and Painters: A Treatise by Qādī Ahmad, Son of Mūr-Munshī, circa A.H. 1015/AD 1606*, Washington, 1959.
- A. H. Morton, "The Date and Attribution of the Ross Anonymus: Notes on a Persian History of Shah Isma'īl I," in *Pembroke Papers I.*, ed. Ch. Melville, Cambridge, 1990, pp. 179-212.
- E. Naaman, "Sariqa in Practice: The Case of Al-Sahib ibn ʿAbbad," *Middle Eastern Literatures* 14.3 (2011), pp. 271-85.
- Nezāmi ʿArūzi Samarqandi, *Chahār maqāla*, tr. E. G. Browne, as *The Chdahar Maqāla (The Four Discourses)*, London, 1921.
- A. Y. Ocak, *Osmanlı Toplumunda Zındıklar ve Mülhidler*, Istanbul, 1998.
- W. J. Ong, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word, 30th anniversary edition with additional chapters by John Hartley*, London and New York, 2002.

- R. **Ostādi**, *Fehrest-e noskhahā-ye khatti-ye Ketābkhāna-ye Masjed-e A'zam-e Qom: 3955 noskha*, Qom, 1365/1986.
- C. **Qāhrāmanov**, *Īmadaddin Nāsīmī əsərləri*, 3 vols., Baku, 1973.
- Ch. **Rieu**, *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 3 vols., London, 1879.
- Idem**, *Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum*, London, 1888.
- E. **Rossi**, *Elenco dei manoscritti turchi della Biblioteca vaticana: vaticani, barberiniani, borgiani, rossiani, chigiani*, Città del Vaticano, 1953.
- Sām Mirzā Safavi**, *Tazkera-ye Tohfā-ye Sāmi*, ed. Rokn al-Din Homāyun Farrokh, Tehran, n.d.
- V. **Sayyed Yunosi**, *Fehrest-e Ketābkhāna-ye melli-ye Tabriz*, Tabriz, 1348/1969.
- B. **Stock**, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretations in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, Princeton, NJ, 1983.
- B. **Sudár**, *A Palatics-kódex török versgyűjteményei: Török költészet és zene a XVI. századi hódoltságban*, Budapest, 2005.
- W. M. **Thackston**, "The Diwan of Khata'i: Pictures for the Poetry of Shah Isma'īl I," *Asian Art* 1.4 (1988), pp. 54-60.
- N. M. **Titley**, *Miniatures from Turkish Manuscripts: A Catalogue and Subject Index of Paintings in the British Library and British Museum*, London, 1981.
- B. **Utas**, *Tarīq ut-taḥqīq: A Sufi Mathnavi Ascribed to Ḥakīm Sanā'ī of Ghazna and Probably Composed by Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan b. Muḥammad an-Naxčavānī: A Critical Edition, with a History of the Text and a Commentary*, Lund, 1973.
- I. **Vásáry**, "The Beginnings of Western Turkic Literacy in Anatolia and Iran," in É. M. Jeremiás, ed., *Irano-Turkic Cultural Contacts in the 11th-17th Centuries*, Piliscsaba, [2002] 2003, pp. 245-53.
- G. E. von **Grunebaum**, "The Concept of Plagiarism in Arabic Theory," *JNES* 3.4 (1944), pp. 234-53.
- B. D. **Wood**, "The Tarikh-i Jahanara in the Chester Beatty Library: An Illustrated Manuscript of the "Anonymous Histories of Shah Isma'īl," *Iranian Studies* 37.1 (2004), pp. 89-107.
- R. **Zippoli**, *The Technique of the Ġawāb: Replies by Nawā'ī to Ḥāfiẓ and Jāmī*, Venice, 1993.