JUDITH M. WILKS
Independent scholar, Chicago

The Persianization of Köroğlu
Banditry and Royalty in Three Versions of the Köroğlu *Destan*

Abstract

The story of Köroğlu, one of the most widespread of the Turkic *destan*s, is shared not only by nearly all Turkic peoples, but also by some Iranian and other non-Turkic neighboring communities. In general the versions can be separated into two major groups, the western and the eastern, with the Caspian Sea as an approximate boundary between them. It is generally agreed that the earliest versions are all from the south Caucasus, especially Azerbaijan, and that the *destan* traveled mainly eastward from there. The earliest dated recorded version, the *Kuroğli-nāma,* was written in Persian in the vicinity of Tabriz in the 1840s at the request of Alexander Chodźko, a Polish scholar and diplomat. The manuscript of this Azerbaijani version is one of three versions that are discussed in this paper, the other two being a Turkmen version and a Tajik version. In tracing the transformation of Köroğlu's occupation from robber in the western versions to ruler in the eastern versions, it is suggested that there has been considerable influence from the Persian epic tradition.

Keywords: Köroğlu—folk epic—Turkish legend—Persian epic—social banditry

THE STORY OF KÖROĞLU is one of the most widespread of the Turkic *destan*s.[1] It is shared not only by nearly all Turkic peoples, but also by some non-Turkic neighboring communities, such as the Armenians, Georgians, Kurds, Tajiks, and Afghans. There are, of course, differences among these many versions, but in general they can be separated into two major groups, the western and the eastern, with the Caspian Sea as a rough boundary between them.

Both groups of versions have ties, whether geographical or cultural, to Persia. Although the *destan*'s path of transmission is not yet fully understood, most researchers agree that it originated in the south Caucasus region, most likely Azerbaijan, and traveled eastward from there (also slightly westward, into Anatolia and the Balkans, but it is the eastward movement that concerns us more here).[2] The earliest written version of this Turkic *destan* was recorded in Persian near Tabriz in the mid-nineteenth century, and interest in the story still exists in present-day Iran. Versions also exist in other varieties of Persian, such as Tajik and Afghan Dari. Also, as I hope to demonstrate, the Persian epic tradition has had a significant influence on the transformations the *destan* underwent during the transmission process. So while the *destan* itself may be Turkic, its roots and its branches are largely within the Persian cultural sphere.

One of the fundamental criteria distinguishing the two groups from each other is the occupation of the hero. In the western versions (the Azeri and all the other Caucasian and Anatolian versions), Köroğlu is a murderous outlaw; in the eastern (mostly central Asian) versions, he is a wise and just ruler. Focusing only on the change in Köroğlu's occupation, we can see two separate factors at work: (1) the typological evolution of a popular heroic tale, and (2) the influence of the classical Persian epic tradition in the entire area of distribution of the Köroğlu story. The present study aims to demonstrate how these two factors made possible Köroğlu's transformation from a robber to a ruler. To do this, I discuss three versions of the *destan,* one near each east-west geographical extreme and one in the middle. These versions

are: (1) the Azeri (CHODŹKO 1842, SĀDEQ Beg 1842), which is most likely the original and certainly the one with the most plausible connection to historical events; (2) the Turkmen (GOVŠUDOV 1980), which is widely acknowledged as a transitional version; and (3) the Tajik (BRAGINSKII et al. 1987), which—not surprisingly—best reflects the Persian epic influence that is also, however, reflected in other versions at the eastern end of the *destan*'s area of distribution.

In the Azeri version, as in all the other western versions that stem from it, Köroğlu is simply a bandit. This is perhaps the best-known image of Köroğlu: he robs merchant caravans and other travelers, kidnaps women and children, and fights the local rulers. He acquired the name Köroğlu, which means "son of the blind man," when his father, who was the chief herdsman for the shah of Turkestan, was blinded for angering his employer. In selecting a group of prime colts for the shah's own stable, Köroğlu's father included two scrawny-looking colts that he knew to be of magical parentage, but he was unable to convince the shah of their worth and was blinded in punishment. The young Köroğlu avenges his father's mistreatment and gathers a band of followers around himself, eventually establishing a fortress-hideout called Çamlıbel.

According to the stories, Köroğlu is a great trickster, attempting (and usually succeeding in) very bold endeavors (e.g., capturing the daughter of the Ottoman Sultan), and having an uncanny ability to evade capture. He often uses clever disguises to achieve his goal and is never recognized, despite his great physical size and his use of his own name as a *maxlas* (pen-name) in the songs he improvises. But notwithstanding these amusing aspects of his character, he is basically a murderous robber, coarse and even obscene in his manners, holding nothing sacred but his wondrous horse, Kırat (which was one of the two scrawny colts rejected by the shah). This criminal Köroğlu was, however, soon transformed in the popular imagination into a hero of the oppressed people, their avenger against the tyrannical local rulers. A convenient parallel in western European legend would be the story of Robin Hood, a bandit similarly idealized into a champion for social justice. It would not be too far off the mark to imagine the Köroğlu of the Azeri version as a musically-inclined Robin Hood with a horse.[3]

POSSIBLE HISTORICAL PROTOTYPES OF KÖROĞLU

The Köroğlu of the Azeri version is not a totally fictional character. More than a dozen late sixteenth-century documents in the *Mühimme Defterleri* (Ottoman state reports of provincial disturbances) mention Köroğlu or members of his band (who also occur in the *destan*) as Celali rebels.[4] Eight of these, dated between 1580 and 1585, deal with Köroğlu himself. He is

indeed described as a daring and amazingly elusive bandit. One document even describes how he and his men, disguised as theological students, robbed a caravan; so the disguise element seems to have some basis in fact. According to these documents, Köroğlu was active in the region of Bolu and Gerede in northwest Anatolia; one even says that Köroğlu was from the village of Sayık, near Gerede. So the historical Köroğlu was quite likely from western Anatolia. Nevertheless, it is generally agreed that the legend concerning him took root in eastern Anatolia and Azerbaijan, where he was active at a later stage in his career, and where his songs are sung even today (SÜMER 1987, 9–46).

The government documents are mostly orders for Köroğlu's arrest, and so they make no mention of his musical abilities. These talents of his, however, are noted by the early seventeenth-century Armenian historian Arakel of Tabriz, who mentions that the songs of Köroğlu the Celali are widely sung by the traditional balladeers of the region, the *aşıks* (BORATAV 1946, 38). So it seems that Köroğlu's songs were famous within one generation of the bandit's lifetime. Arakel also mentions several of Köroğlu's comrades' names, and says that Köroğlu was famous for his tricks (BORATAV 1946, 194). Later in the seventeenth century, the Ottoman traveler EVLIYA Çelebi in his *Seyâhatnâme* mentions a bandit named Köroğlu in northwest Anatolia (1982 V, 18). Slightly later, in the early eighteenth century, the Armenian Ilyas Mušegyan included some of Köroğlu's poems in a collection of songs from the Tabriz area, written in Azeri Turkish using the Armenian alphabet. He also provides some background on Köroğlu, noting that he lived in the hills of Kars and Erzurum during the reign of Shah 'Abbās (1587–1629) in Iran and Sultan Murad (i.e., Murad III, 1574–1595) in Turkey (RA'IS-NIYĀ 1988, 302–303).

However, the matter of Köroğlu's identity is not quite that simple. Other evidence indicates that there may have been more than one Köroğlu in the area at that time. Besides Evliya Çelebi's one reference to the bandit Köroğlu, he also mentions a folk-poet by that name twice (see BORATAV 1955, 911; EVLIYA V, 283; I, 638–39), without relating the two individuals. It is not completely clear whether the folk-poet Köroğlu and the Celali Köroğlu of the *destan* are one and the same person. In his verses, the poet Köroğlu mentions having served in the Ottoman army under Özdemiroğlu Osman Pasha in the campaigns in the Caucasus and the conquest of Tabriz. The poetry of this soldier Köroğlu is of a heroic nature; especially eloquent is his lament upon the death of his commander. Scholarly opinion is divided on the matter (YILDIRIM 1983, 113),[5] but there is no reason why the Celali and the soldier-poet could not be the same person. The dates involved are not irreconcilable, and former Celalis were sometimes pardoned and accept-

ed into the military or government service. (For example, one of Köroğlu's associates both in the oral tradition and in the archival documents, a bandit named Deli Hasan, sought pardon and also requested a post in the government. Both requests were granted: he was made *beylerbeyi* of Bosnia and was sent there together with ten thousand of his followers, and thus he was no longer a menace in Anatolia.) Furthermore, there is some overlap in the names of Köroğlu's associates in the archival documents, the oral tradition, and Arakel's history. So the soldier-poet and the bandit were most likely one person.

In the documents from the Mühimme Defterleri, however, there is some indication that there may even have been more than one bandit named Köroğlu in late sixteenth-century Anatolia. In some of the documents, Köroğlu's name appears far down on a list among the names of many other outlaws, as though he were not even a minor leader; in others he is obviously already well-known to all and greatly feared (SÜMER 1987, 19–20). There also exists a Safavid document from the early seventeenth century that implies that Köroğlu was an employee of Shah 'Abbās; he captured a traitorous tribal chief and his relatives and sent them to the shah. There is also some evidence of a Turkmen chieftain of one of the Afshar tribes named Sultan Hüsrev Köroğlu who lived in the hills of Kerman and Kiluye at about the same time (BORATAV 1931, 96).[6] So the name seems to have been a popular *laqab* (nickname). In any case, it is clear that there was at least one bandit named Köroğlu, and he is the hero of the Azeri version.

THE AZERI VERSION: CHODŹKO'S KUROĞLI-NĀMA

The first compilation of stories about this semi-historical character was recorded in Azerbaijan in the mid-nineteenth century by Alexander Chodźko. Chodźko's English translation of the Persian and Azeri Turkish original, and also S. S. Penn's Russian translation of Chodźko's English translation, have been important contributions in the study of Köroğlu; they are regarded as representing the basic Azerbaijani version. Chodźko was a scholar of Persian, working as an interpreter at the Russian consulate in Tabriz; he was the author of a Persian grammar, a book on Gilan, and other works. He is said to have known Turkish very well, having lived among the Turks of the Caspian region for eleven years, and he certainly had an avid interest in their oral literature (RA'IS-NIYĀ 1988, 305–306).[7] But for some reason, he preferred to do his translation from Persian; in the original manuscript, only Köroğlu's songs are in Azeri Turkish.[8] Given the starkness of the prose portions in Persian, one can understand why Chodźko felt a need to reconstruct the story a bit when doing his English translation, but in so doing he managed to distort the image of the rough bandit significantly. Not only did Chodźko con-

form to the nineteenth-century trend toward glorifying the heroic past when dealing with folklore,[9] but it is also clear from his introduction that he had the heroes of the Shāhnāma in mind when doing the translation, though he does not equate the two works in terms of quality (CHODŹKO 1842, 4–6). The result is that sometimes Köroğlu's words (and even his deeds) appear much nobler than would be appropriate for a crude outlaw. Köroğlu here is closer to the bawdy Rostam of 'Obayd-e Zākānī's *Axlāq al-Ašrāf* than to any hero of the Shāhnāma (cf. SPRACHMAN 1995, 58, 60).

So the romanticization and Persianization of Köroğlu's character had a small beginning even in this very first translation of the stories. Here is just one brief example of Chodźko's tendency towards embellishment and exaggeration: During Köroğlu's encounter with the ruler who blinded his father, the ruler notices Köroğlu's horse. In his English translation, Chodźko writes that the prince was "captivated by the uncommon beauty of the horse, as well as by the noble appearance of the rider..." while the original says simply: "The shah's eye fell upon the horse" (*čašm-e šāh bar asb oftād*). Chodźko's translation also includes some outright errors that serve to exaggerate Köroğlu's greatness: e.g., at one point he renders *beg* ("lord, master") as "god," presumably lapsing for a moment into his native Polish, where *bóg* means "god" (CHODŹKO 1842, 22–27; SĀDEQ 1842, 4–6).

THE TURKMEN VERSION

It is generally accepted that the Azeri version, the basic western version of the *destan*, has influenced to some degree all other present versions, and that it traveled mainly eastward from the south Caucasus region.[10] It is only logical to assume that the Turkmen played an important role in this eastward movement of the *destan*. The Turkmen being a partly migratory population with a presence on all shores of the Caspian Sea and into Central Asia, stories of Köroğlu could have accompanied them on their comings and goings, which would have been a much more rapid and effective means of spreading the story over a wide area than if it were being carried by only a few wandering minstrels (BARTHOLD 1934). Furthermore, Köroğlu himself is acknowledged in most versions (both eastern and western) to have been a Turkmen of the Teke tribe, though the *destan* is not confined to the Teke tribe alone.

The Turkmen version of the *destan* does indeed include several features that can be considered transitional between the western and eastern groups. It is written in a western Turkic language (Turkmen being of the Oğuz group, together with Azeri and Ottoman), but in many other respects it resembles the versions of the eastern group. As in most eastern versions, the hero's name is Görogli, "son of the grave" (Persian: *gur,* "grave"), as he was miraculously born after his pregnant mother's burial. But in this Turkmen

version, the meaning of "blind man's son" is also retained, as the hero's grandfather (Cigaly Beg, who in some variants is his father) has been rendered blind by some injustice. Both meanings of the hero's name have given rise to theories about the origins of the *destan,* as one or the other of these motifs (i.e., either blinding over a horse dispute or miraculous birth in the grave) occurs in numerous earlier legends within the *destan*'s area of distribution. There are, for instance, Armenian and Georgian legends about sons of blinded fathers rising up to avenge this injustice; some of these even involve disputes over horses (RA'IS-NIYĀ 1988, 104). Some researchers contend that Görogli is the original form of the hero's name, and that the *destan* was brought from Central Asia to the Middle East and was later simply enriched by the incorporation of the stories of Köroğlu the bandit (KARRYEV 1982, 76–77).[11] Whether or not this argument has any validity, it is very probable that the Köroğlu *destan* in its present forms represents the conflation of several different characters and the incorporation of motifs from several different legends.

But the most important feature of the Turkmen version for our purposes is the change in the hero's occupation. Görogli is no longer an outlaw living on the fringes of society, but the chieftain of his people. In this Turkmen tribal setting, however, his high station does not prevent Görogli from robbing caravans, conducting raids on enemies, and personally engaging in fierce combat (MEMMEDYAZOV 1982, 29–30, 34–35).[12] He still sings his poetry, as in the Azeri version, and is more or less comparable to the Arab hero 'Antar, a physically powerful tribal warrior famous for his poetic abilities (SÜMER 1987).[13] Görogli can be both the ruler of his own people and the robber of others.

This dual aspect of the Turkmen Görogli's occupation, in my opinion, marks an important turning point in the development of the *destan*. As has been said, the distinction between Köroğlu the bandit and Görogli the ruler has been a basic criterion in categorizing the versions, but the distinction is, to some extent, a false one: any bandit with sufficient power may be in effect a ruler; and a ruler with sufficient power may behave like a bandit if he so chooses. Görogli's role as chieftain and the tribal setting in which that role occurs make it clear that power is the crucial element, and what form it takes is rather secondary. In any case, the Turkmen version represents an important step in transforming the rough bandit Köroğlu into a kingly character.

It is also in the Turkmen version that the beginnings of a genealogy of Görogli appear. His father and grandfather were tribal leaders before him, so his legitimacy is established, paving the way for an Iranian-type hero-king in versions farther east, and also initiating a biography for the hero, which is a first step in the cyclization of a *destan* (RYPKA 1968, 162–66). The supernatural element is also much increased here, which may be seen as a sign of

the disintegration of the heroic-epical texture of the *destan* and the beginning of its transformation into a folk romance.[14] In the Azeri version this supernatural element was almost totally absent, but in the Turkmen version Görogli marries fairies, for example, instead of princesses, and he has powerful allies such as 'Ali, Khezr Elyās, the Forty Pirs, etc. He sometimes can hardly manage a simple kidnapping without assistance from some *deus ex machina,* whereas the Azeri bandit Köroğlu is quite earthly and self-sufficient.

A brief comparison of one episode that occurs in both of these versions—and, in fact, in almost all other versions as well—will help illustrate these differences. Köroğlu has an encounter with a powerful and wealthy *bezirgān* (merchant); the two men struggle for a long while, the *bezirgān* being Köroğlu's equal in strength; finally the *bezirgān* defeats Köroğlu and sends him away. However, a little later the angry Köroğlu returns quietly, and kills the *bezirgān* with an arrow in the back. In the Azeri version, that's about all there is to the story, except that after killing the *bezirgān,* Köroğlu also strips him naked and is pleased to discover that this capable fighter was not a Muslim, but an Armenian. The Azeri Köroğlu being a fervent Shi'i, he would not want to admit that a despised Sunni could have been such a worthy opponent. Köroğlu takes the merchant's possessions and leaves, feeling no compunction whatsoever about having killed him in a cowardly manner.

In the Turkmen version, Görogli's wife, Aga Yunus Peri (a fairy), challenges him in the presence of others to ride out to collect the toll from the mighty *bezirgān.* Thus, it is a matter of honor as well as profit to deal with this merchant. Again, the two men fight, but then they agree to be brothers. On his way home, Görogli meets a *ḳampir* (an old sorceress) who tells him that the *bezirgān* will come and plunder Görogli's household if left alive. The superstitious Görogli believes this and returns and kills the *bezirgān* with an arrow in the back. Before dying, the *bezirgān* asks Görogli (who has apologized) to look after his younger sister, Aysultan, and the remorseful Görogli agrees. Feeling very guilty, he builds a commemorative dome over the *bezirgān*'s grave. When the lovely Aysultan hears of her brother's death and appears on the scene dressed as a warrior to avenge him, Görogli shows her the memorial dome, admits his crime, and offers her his dagger as her weapon of revenge. She pardons Görogli and ultimately marries one of his heroes. The story ends with a great wedding feast being held in their honor.

So in the Turkmen version Görogli is no longer an irreverent bandit operating as a free agent. He takes matters of honor seriously and acknowledges and fulfills his responsibilities, acting more like a ruler than a mere robber. Though the tribal setting is the reason for this feature of the hero's character, and not any direct influence of the Persian epic tradition, the

Turkmen Görogli still can be said to have facilitated the further development of the Persianate courtly hero from the Turkic popular hero. The supernatural elements, the genealogy, and the neat completeness of the story—even ending as it does with a wedding in the usual manner of folk tales—are typical changes in the later stages of folk *destan*s.

THE TAJIK VERSION

This brings us to the third version we wish to consider, the Tajik Gurogli. In the most recently published Tajik version, based on the narrations of three *Gurogli-xwān*s (reciters of Gurogli tales), there is no separate episode devoted to the encounter with the *bezirgān*. Merchants do indeed appear in the stories, sometimes as visitors to the court of Gurogli Sultan (as he is called) in the mythical kingdom of Čambul-i Maston. One visitor with evil intentions even tries to gain admittance to Čambul-i Maston disguised as a *bezirgān,* which would be a very unwise way to approach the bandit of the Azeri version. Gurogli here is indeed a sultan, so much so that he hardly does any of the fighting himself. He is much more involved with *bazm* (feasting) than with *razm* (fighting); he does still sing, but he has become more of a Key Kāvus than a Rostam. He rules his kingdom with wisdom and justice, assuring protection from foreign invaders, sitting enthroned while his adopted son Avaz (who appears in all versions, though not so prominently) rides out like a knight to deal with challengers to Gurogli's power. The stories continue with the adventures of the descendants of Gurogli and his original followers, and so the cycle goes on.

Researchers differ in their views of the Tajik version of Gurogli. Some see it as the result of Uzbek influence (CEJPEK 1968, 630), others claim it to be a unique national creation with little relation to other versions (CHADWICK and ZHIRMUNSKY 1969, 285).[15] I would suggest that, in the creation of the Tajik version, the Uzbek influence hardly goes beyond providing the characters' names; it is much less important than the powerful influence of the Persian epic tradition in the region. This affected the form as well as the content of the *destan*. While most Turkic versions are in prose with only Köroğlu's songs in verse, the Tajik versions (alike in Tajikistan and northern Afghanistan) are entirely in verse, as is preferred in Persian epics. They are, however, not in *motaqāreb* or any other classical meter; nor are they in any regular syllabic meter, though some scholars prefer to think of it as syllabic.[16] So far no one seems to understand the unique meter of the Tajik Gurogli or its provenance, though several suggestions have been put forth.[17] In Tajikistan the Gurogli stories are also recited in a manner similar to that used in some Shāhnāma performances—a solo performer singing in a roughened voice and accompanying himself on a stringed instrument.

The Tajik Gurogli was not scientifically studied or published until the 1930s, although the story is thought to have existed among the Tajiks since the second half of the eighteenth century (BEČKA 1989, 380). It is interesting to note that even in the Soviet era the feudal setting of the story was retained. Čambul-i Maston is not a state run by the workers, but rather conforms to the Iranian ideal of a just ruler in an orderly society with happy, contented subjects and strong, loyal warriors. The common people do sometimes help in repelling the enemies of the land, but hints of aristocratic bias are also apparent. For instance, Avaz, Gurogli's adopted son, is the natural son of a butcher in this as in almost all other versions; but only in the Tajik version is his lowly ancestry a cause for occasional jeering.[18]

So the story of Köroğlu, which in its eastward progress had lost some of its heroic features, gained a fresh infusion of epic elements from the Persian tradition in the Tajik version. This is not surprising in a region where the Shāhnāma tradition was so firmly entrenched that even the common people expected a courtly cast of characters in a heroic tale. This is not to imply, of course, that the Shāhnāma has no influence in Azerbaijan. But Azerbaijan was the scene for at least some of the historical events upon which the *destan* is most probably based, and it was there that the legend of the bandit Köroğlu took root very early and lasted until the present day. In Azerbaijan the bandit could not easily become a king. In Central Asia, far from its point of origin and having undergone transformations in the transmission process, the *destan* was ready to accept a royal hero.

NOTES

1. Regarding the term *destan* (Persian, *dāstān*): While *destan* is often translated as "epic," both "epic" and *destan* are really very imprecise terms and are not exact equivalents. The question of what constitutes an epic has been debated since the time of Aristotle, and the many versions of the Köroğlu story vary in how well they fit the suggested criteria. Also, *destan*s can be of many types; see, for example, the table of contents of Zabihollāh SAFĀ's study of the Iranian epic (1955), where many subtypes of *dāstān* are listed. Pertev Naili BORATAV, the pioneer in the study of Köroğlu, vacillates in his many writings over the years (1939, 1943, 1955, 1964) as to whether or not Köroğlu qualifies as a *destan* and whether or not a *destan* is an epic. In the present paper, although *destan* can be loosely translated as "folk epic" or "popular oral heroic tale," I have chosen to retain the native term for this genre for the reasons given by Karl REICHL in his *Turkic Oral Epic Poetry* (1992): many subgenres of *destan* are possible, and the native term differentiates *destan* most clearly from other types of tales (*masal, hikâye*). Thus *destan* is as inclusive and as exclusive as it needs to be, while "epic" is not specific enough.

2. The question of the origin of the Köroğlu *destan* is still far from settled. Although the historical evidence is inconclusive, the scanty facts that do exist have become the basis for rival claims to national possession of the Köroğlu *destan,* the most plausible of them being made by Anatolian Turks, Azeris, and the Turkmen. In short, the situation is this: the best-documented

prototype for the hero is the bandit from northwest Anatolia (SÜMER 1987); the earliest recordings of the *destan* are all from the Caucasus, primarily Azerbaijan (BORATAV 1931, 21; CHODŹKO 1842; TAHMASIP 1969; EVLIYEVA 1990; and many others); and the hero in many versions is said to have been a Teke Turkmen. Thus, Anatolian Turks point to the Bolu region as the birthplace of Köroğlu, while others point out that there were many Turkmen living in the Bolu region at the time (MEMMEDYAZOV 1982, 38–39, describing the viewpoint of Azeri folklorist X. G. Köroğlu); and a major Azeri folklorist (Tahmasip), while conceding that the *destan* may have originated among the Turkmen in the Caucasus, insists that these Turkmen spoke Azeri and practiced Shi'ism at the time the *destan* arose (RA'IS-NIYĀ 1988, 107). A few scholars still insist that the *destan* arose in Central Asia and traveled west from there (YILDIRIM 1983), a view once very popular with pan-Turkists, but now largely discarded by folklorists (MEMMEDYAZOV 1984, 25).

3. HOLT (1982, 10–11) discusses how even Robin Hood does not fit the mold of the idealized sort of bandit envisioned by HOBSBAWM (1969) and others who subscribe to the idea of "noble banditry." Köroğlu does not conform to this notion any better than other real-life bandits do (BLOK 1972). Köroğlu's later idealization is the result of a process involving romanticism, nationalism, and various political currents in the areas where the story is known. An especially strong criticism of the Turkish idealization of Köroğlu can be found in KAPLAN 1985, 101–11.

4. Celali (i.e., *Jalāli*) refers originally to the followers of one Shaykh Jalāl, who led a rebellion against the state in 1519. Although this rebellion was effectively put down, the term was later applied to members of any group that caused trouble for the state, and it continued to be used throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

5. Again, Dursun Yıldırım is in disagreement with many others on this issue. He finds it hard to reconcile the personalities of the hero and the folk poet.

6. Here Boratav quotes an unpublished work by Ahmet Zeki Velidi, *Türk Tarihi Dersleri* (Lessons in Turkish history). Also, Rahim RA'IS-NIYĀ (1988, 152), cites a sixteenth-century Persian-language history that mentions this chieftain: *Ahsan al-Tavārix* by Hasan Bey Rumlu.

7. For further information on Chodźko, see also Jean CALMARD 1983, 502–504.

8. Some indications in the manuscript of the *Kurogli-nāma* lead me to believe that Chodźko's Turkish was not very good. There are interlinear translations of the Turkish songs, and also numerous glosses of Turkish words into Persian, French, or Chodźko's native Polish.

9. FINNEGAN 1979, 31–41, contains a good discussion of the shortcomings of the romantic and evolutionist theories of oral poetry.

10. The dissenting opinions are discussed in note number 2 above.

11. See also Braginskii quoted in KARRYEV (1982, 76). Dursun YILDIRIM (1983, 113) doubts that the bandit and the khan could have developed from the same character. He contends that the eastern and western versions arose side by side.

12. Memmedyazov comments here on the prevalence of tribal features in the Turkmen version. HOBSBAWM (1969, 14) also has some interesting observations on the different perspectives on banditry that exist in tribal societies.

13. Faruk SÜMER (1987, notes) mentions that, among the forces fighting in Syria during World War I, the Arabs sang songs of 'Antar, while the Turkmen sang songs of Köroğlu.

14. This is similar to the process described by HANAWAY (1978, 91–93), where he discusses the later transformations of Shāhnāma stories into romances. A similar case is described by J. A. ROSS (1980, 90) in discussing Old French *chansons de geste.*

15. See also BERDIEVA 1991, 330. The Tajik author of this article sounds just as possessive of the Gurogli *dāstān* as any Turkic scholar: "Some of the people of Zarafšon and Farḡona regard Gūrūḡlī as belonging to the Turks, some of the people of Xatlon ascribe the *šašmaqom*

[classical musical modes] to the Uzbeks, whereas both of these belong to our nation, both *šašmaqom* and Gūrūglī."

16. Those who regard the Tajik Gurogli as syllabic include CEJPEK (1968, 634); BRAGINSKII et al. (1987, 44); ASRORI and AMANOV (1980, 260); Beliaev, as cited in REICHL (1992, 327); and HISOMOV 1980.

17. See BRAGINSKII et al., 1987, 43–44. CEJPEK (1968, 634), however, sees the entirely versified forms of the Tajik Gurogli as evidence of the Persian preference for metrical epics. A preference for end-rhymes in the Tajik version has been noted by several scholars, e.g., BRAGINSKII et al. (1987, 44) and ASRORI and AMANOV (1980, 260). Stress patterns have also been suggested as a clue, with musical accompaniment being a crucial element, and a possible relationship to pre-Islamic Persian epic verse meters has been discussed. Such meters may have been a step in the development of the Persian epical meter *motaqāreb* (BRAGINSKII et al., 1987, 44). Gilbert LAZARD (1994, 82, 86) has suggested something similar regarding the oral epic verse forms of the Baluch. On the other hand, arguing against a Persian source for this unusual meter, Walter Feldman has pointed out (in a personal communication) that some of the most archaic Turkic epical works (*Dede Korkut* or the South Siberian epics) also employ uneven syllabic verse, and the Tajik meter also bears some resemblance to the *žir* form from Uzbekistan, so the influence need not be from the Persian epic tradition.

18. I was told by Walter Feldman in a personal communication that this jeering also occurs in some Uzbek versions.

REFERENCES CITED

ASRORI, V. M. and R. AMONOV

1980 Eposi qahramonī [The heroic epic]. In *Folklori Tojik,* 260–61. Dushanbe: Maorif.

BARTHOLD, W.

1934 Turkomans. In *Encyclopedia of Islam,* 1st ed. vol. IV, 896–98. Leiden: Brill.

BEČKA, Jiří

1989 Review of I. S. Braginskii et al., Gūruğlī. *Archív Orientální* 57: 380–81.

BERDIEVA, Buriniso

1991 "Hama rostī jūyu mardonagī" [Strive ever after honesty and courage (a quotation from the Shāhnāma)]. In *Darsi xeštanšinosī II,* ed. A. Mahmadnazar and Qodiri Rustam, 328–33. Dushanbe: Irfon. (Reprinted from Omūzgor, 25 July 1989)

BLOK, Anton

1972 The peasant and the brigand: Social banditry reconsidered. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15: 494–503.

BORATAV, P. N.

1931 *Köroğlu destanı.* Istanbul: Evkaf Matbaası.

1939 *Folklor ve edebiyat* [folklore and literature]. Istanbul: Arkadaş Basımevi.

1946 *Halk hikâyeleri ve halk hikâyeciliği* [Folktales and their telling]. Ankara: Millî Eğitim Basımevi.

1955 Kör-Oğlu. In *İslam Ansiklopedisi* VI, 908–914. Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası.

1964 L' épopée et la 'hikâye'. In *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta,* ed. Jean Deny et al., 11–44. Wiesbaden.

BORATAV, P. N. and Halil Vedat FIRATLI

1943 *İzahlı halk şiiri antolojisi* [Annotated anthology of folk poetry]. Ankara: Maarif Matbaası.

BRAGINSKII, I. S., X. NAZAROV and B. ŠIRMUXAMMEDOV

1987 *Gūrūğlī, 'eposi xalqii Tojik/ Gurugli, tadžikskii narodnyi 'epos* [Gurugli, the Tajik

national epic]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Nauka.

CALMARD, Jean

1983 Chodźko. In *Encyclopaedia Iranica,* ed. Ehsan Yarshater, V, 502–504. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

CEJPEK, Jiří

1968 The Gurughli epic cycle and other subjects of Iranian folk-epics. In *History of Iranian literature,* ed. Jan Rypka et al., 634–39. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

CHADWICK, Nora K., and Victor M. ZHIRMUNSKY

1969 *Oral epics of Central Asia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHODŹKO, Alexander

1842 *Specimens of the popular poetry of Persia as found in the adventures and improvisations of Kurroglou, the bandit-minstrel of northern Persia.* London (reprinted New York: Burt Franklin, 1971).

EVLIYA Çelebi

1982 *Seyâhatnâme* [Travels]. Topkapı Saray Museum Library MS: Photocopy, University of Chicago Library Dept. of Photoduplication, Vol. 5.

EVLIYEVA, Dilara

1990 *Köroğlu*'nun yeni el yazması nüshası [A new *Köroğlu* manuscript]. *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları* 67-69: 19–43.

FINNEGAN, Ruth

1979 *Oral poetry: Its nature, significance, and social context.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

GOVŠUDOV, Ata, ed.

1980 *Görogli. Türkmen xalk eposı* [Görogli: The Turkmen national epic]. Ashkabad: Türkmenistan Nešriyatı.

HANAWAY, William L., Jr.

1971 Formal elements in the Persian popular romances. *Review of National Literatures* 2: 139–60.

1978 The Iranian epics. In *Heroic epic and saga,* ed. Felix J. Oinas, 76–98. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

HISOMOV, Q.

1980 Gurugli. In *Enciklopediiai sovetii Tojik,* II, 182. Dushanbe.

HOBSBAWM, Eric.

1969 *Bandits.* London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

HOLT, J. C.

1982 *Robin Hood.* London: Thames and Hudson.

KAPLAN, Mehmet

1985 *Köroğlu.* Series Türk Edebiyatında Araştırmaları. Istanbul: Dergâh Yayınları.

KARRYEV, Seyit.

1982 *Türkmen 'eposı, dessanları, ve gündogar xalklarının epiki döredijiligi* [The Turkmen epic, their *destan*s, and the epic creativity of the peoples of the east]. Ashkabad: İlim.

LAZARD, Gilbert.

1994 Le mètre épique baloutchi et les origines du motaqâreb. In *Arabic Prosody and its Applications in Muslim Poetry,* ed. Lars Johanson and Bo Utas, 81–90. Uppsala: Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul.

MEMMEDYAZOV, B.

1982 *Görogli 'eposinin döreyiši xakında* [On the rise of the Görogli epic]. Ashkabad: İlim.

1984 *Görogli 'eposinin po'etikasi xakında* [On the poetry of the Görogli epic]. Ashkabad: İlim.

Mühimme Defterleri
1580- Ottoman state reports from the provinces. In the Başbakanlık (Prime Minister's) Archives, Istanbul.

RA'IS-NIYĀ, Rahim
1988 *Kuroğli dar afsāna va tārix* [Kuroğli in legend and history]. Tabriz: Entešārāt-e Nimā. (1366)

REICHL, Karl
1992 *Turkic oral epic poetry.* New York: Garland Publishing.

ROSS, D. J. A.
1980 Old French. In *Traditions of heroic and epic poetry,* ed. A. T. Hatto and Robert Auty, 79–133. London: The Modern Humanities Research Association.

RYPKA, Jan
1968 The romantic epic. In *History of Iranian literature,* ed. Jan Rypka, 177–79. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

SĀDEQ Beg
1842 *Kuroğli-nāma.* MS, Bibliothèque Nationale Supplément Persan No. 994.

SAFĀ, Zabihollāh
1955 *Hamāsa-sarā'i dar Irān* [The art of the epic in Iran]. Tehran: Amir Kabir. (1333)

SPRACHMAN, Paul
1995 *Suppressed Persian. An anthology of forbidden literature.* Costa Mesa: Mazda Publishers.

SÜMER, Faruk
1987 Kör Oğlu, Kizir Oğlu Mustafa ve Demirci Oğlu ile ilgili vesikalar [Documents pertaining to Kör Oğlu, etc.]. *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları* 46: 9–46.

TAHMASIP, M. H.
1969 *Azarbaijan dastanları,* Vol. IV. Baku.

YILDIRIM, Dursun.
1983 Köroğlu destanının orta Asya rivayetleri [Central Asian versions of the Köroğlu tale]. In *Köroğlu Semineri Bildirileri,* 103–114. Ankara: Başbakanlık Basımevi.