

The Problem of Good in *Kutadgu Bilig*

İsmail Taş*

Abstract

Kutadgu Bilig by Yūsuf Khāss Hājib is one of the most important sources of Turkish moral and political philosophy. The problem of the good holds a decisive position both in moral and political philosophy. One can say that it is through the notion of good that such concepts as intelligence, knowledge, justice, and happiness acquire a holistic character. Therefore, one should analyze the nature and essence of the good before discussing the problem of the good in the *Kutadgu Bilig*. Yūsuf addresses this question through four figurative personages on the basis of the contemporary political and moral theories. In this context, one can mention as his cultural and intellectual sources the pre-Islamic Turkish, the Persian, the Greek as well as Islamic thought. Though he has made use of all these sources, Yūsuf seems to analyze the problem of the good in the frame of a teleological eudemonist ethics that can be considered within the tradition of Islamic philosophy which took a systematic nature under the influence of Greek thought. Thus, the thinker regards the highest good as the highest happiness, which he in turn describes as the ideal life in the Hereafter.

Keywords

Goodness, the highest good, happiness, Ay Toldı, Ögdülmiş, Odgurmış

Yūsuf Khāss Hājib and His *Kutadgu Bilig*: Being a Turkish political treatise written in the literary form of *mathnawī*, i.e. couplets, *Kutadgu Bilig*, literally meaning the knowledge of happiness, was composed by Yūsuf

* Prof. Dr., Necmettin Erbakan University, Faculty of Divinity – Konya / Turkey
hacili1965@hotmail.com

Khāss Hājib of Balasagun in the Qarākhānid era in the year 1069. The work consists of 6645 couplets. Not composed by the author, a preface, consisting of some prosaic words and seventy-seven couplets, provides information on the author and the work. The preface states that the work is unique in terms of articulating wisdom in the Turkish language in the period, in which many works of the same genre were written in Arabic and Persian¹. Three manuscripts of the work have come down to us, existing in Vienna, Cairo, and Farghana. These copies are written in the Arabic and Uighur scripts (Arat 1991: XXX-XLI).

Although the author started writing the *Kutadgu Bilig* in Balasagun, his hometown, he left for Kāshgar, the seat of the Eastern Qarākhānids, in the year 1068. Having worked on it for one year and a half, he completed the work in 1069, presenting it to the prince Tavgach Bughra Qarā Khān Abū 'Alī Hasan, son of the Qarākhānid ruler Sulaimān Arslān Khān. It is related that since the former liked the work very much, he conferred upon the author the honorific title *Khāss-hājib*, i.e. chamberlain (Dilāçar 1988: 23).

Yūsuf was most likely about fifty years of age when he presented the treatise to the Qarākhānid prince (364-369). Moreover, the words of the author himself suggest that his health was weak at that time. It is said that he did not live long afterwards. It is not clear whether he was buried in Kāshgar or in Balasagun, his hometown (Dilāçar 1988: 24).

The work, fashioned after the classic Islamic religious literature, starts with the gratification of God and the praise of the Prophet as well as his Four-Rightly Guided Caliphs, continuing with the praise of the ruler of the age. Having spoken of the title of the book and its meaning in general terms, Yūsuf proceeds to discuss such subjects as knowledge, language, and the good.

The author structured his work as dialogues which took place among four imaginary characters that represent four notions. In this regard, it is an allegorical work. In fact, Yūsuf explains in detail what these figures stand for by quoting from their own tongue. When speaking of the general structure of the book somewhere else, he explains the meaning of these allegories. (353-357). They are as follows:

Kün Togdı: the King: the right law (*Köni Törü*): Justice

Ay Toldı: The Vizier: Happiness

Ögdülmiş: Son of the Vizier: Intelligence (*Ukuş*)

Ođurmış: Brother of Ögdülmiş or one of his relatives: the Destiny².

Understanding the *Kutadgu Bilig*: Before proceeding to examine the main subject of this study, i.e., the question of good in the *Kutadgu Bilig*, I would like to draw attention to some points. One may think that it is needless to note that the treatment of such a subject requires a good grasp of the *Kutadgu Bilig*. However, such an understanding can only be possible through a detailed survey of its intellectual roots and sources as well as of the cultural matrix in which it was authored. In this regard, the *Kutadgu Bilig* is an ethical and political treatise that was composed in the Turkish language by Yūsuf Khāss Hājib in the eleventh century, standing as one of the earliest examples of Turkish Islamic literature. This approach by itself may designate some of the sources and references of the *Kutadgu Bilig*. In brief, one can easily say that the work has two dimensions: the dimension of Turkish thought and that of Islamic thought. As regards the former dimension, one can raise the following questions: With which periods of Turkish thought can the *Kutadgu Bilig* be associated? Hence, when does Turkish history begin? What is the scope of pre-Islamic Turkish thought? As to the latter dimension, one may ask the following questions: Islamic thought is a generic term that involves philosophy, theology, and Sufism. In this respect, Islamic thought has an intimate relationship with pre-Islamic Indian, Persian, and Greek thought. So, is it possible to associate the *Kutadgu Bilig* with these intellectual traditions? Secondly, of the *Kutadgu Bilig*'s pre-Islamic and Islamic references such as the Buddhist, the Indian, and the Persian, are they a continuation of the pre-Islamic structures or the influences taken through Islamic thought? These questions are essential to the discussion of the question of good in the *Kutadgu Bilig*.

The scope of this study, however, does not allow a detailed discussion of all these questions as an introduction to our main subject. Therefore, though the *Kutadgu Bilig* contains some elements that can be traced to various civilizations and cultures³, I tend to discuss the problem of the good as addressed in the *Kutadgu Bilig* within the context of Turkish thought with a special reference to Islamic tradition in its all comprehensiveness. This approach, of course, should have very serious reasons and I will point them out soon. However, I should add that this approach does not apply to all the subjects and elements existing in the *Kutadgu Bilig*. I would also like to note that my point of departure is not some particular elements in the *Kutadgu Bilig*, rather their general context within the whole system. In other words, in discussing the *Weltanschauung* of the *Kutadgu Bilig*, I shall first consider the work as a whole and then its near sources. I ought to say in advance that I will avoid making generalizations about its sources on the ground of some far-fetched similarities. For, if our

concern is to establish similarity, one can associate the *Kutadgu Bilig* with all the works of its genre. So, it is clear that one should remain within the reasonable limits of analytic thought. In short, one ought to take account of the whole and the genre of the work, no matter what specific problem it involves is addressed. In clearer terms, in what paradigm did the author employ the aforementioned cultural and intellectual sources and references? This point, I believe, is worth a particular consideration.

As we have already pointed out, the *Kutadgu Bilig* is a political and ethical treatise. In this regard, it belongs both to the environment of Turkish Islamic culture and to the realm of political and moral philosophy. Therefore, it would be useful to take a general look at the moral and political character of the environment and period in which it was composed. Apart from some pre-Islamic Turkish inscriptions and Uighur translations as well as the writings of Turkish thinkers and scholars such as Fārābī (d. 950), Ibn Turk (9th century), Ahmad Farghānī (d. 972), and Khwārazmī (d. 847), who produced their works within the domain of Islamic philosophy and science, the Arabic *Dīwānu Lughat al-Turk* by Mahmūd Kāshgarī (d. 1075), the *Kutadgu Bilig* by Yūsuf Khāss Hājib and the *‘Atabat al-Haqāiq* by Adīb Ahmad Yuknakī (12th century) are the earliest literary products in Turkish Islamic thought.

The period in which these works were authored is the eleventh century, which witnessed the culmination of Muslim nations in the fields of religious and philosophical sciences. In this century, religious sciences such as theology, jurisprudence, and Sufism completed their process of formulation and institutionalization as a result of internal and external factors, and philosophy that tried between the eighth and tenth centuries to gain ground in the Islamic world largely through translations began to bear its original fruits. The development in the field of Islamic philosophy and thought holds true of ethics and politics in particular. In fact, what is of main interest to us here is the development in moral and political thought.

It is through ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Muqaffa’s (d. 758) translation of *Kalilah wa Dimnah* from the middle Persian referred to as Pahlavī into Arabic in the eighth century as well as his own writings that the tradition of writing political treatises entered into the literature of Islamic thought⁴. These works exercised a deep influence on the literary genre known as “*adab*” in the Islamic world. Under the influence of the Persian treatises translated by ibn al-Muqaffa, the Sasanid Kings of Iran appeared as exemplary rulers in many Islamic sources which introduced their court life and administrative conduct as a model to the Muslim rulers. But in the description of the

Muslim authors, the absolute monarchism of the Sasanid rulers was softened and rendered acceptable to Islamic political theory. Such Islamic principles as the general Islamic duty of commanding what is good and forbidding what is evil, belief in the afterlife as well as the insistence that all Muslims are equal as the members of a universal Islamic community played a determining role in the Islamic modification of the Sasanid political paradigm (Rosenthal 1996: 99-100). The authors of these works tend to describe justice and righteousness not as absolute ethical demands and values, but as something politically useful and necessary for the State and the rulers. The interest of the ruler and that of the State are one and the same in practice, though not in theory. These works present traditions and anecdotes in a general statement or a political aphorism that summarizes the main point of the following story. They are intended to give a lesson by means of allegories and illustrations (Rosenthal 1996: 100). By quoting aphorisms from ancient Turkish rulers, Yūsuf Khāss Hājib, too, employed the same method in the *Kutadgu Bilig*. An analysis of *Qābūs-nāmah*⁵ by Kaykāvus (composed in 1082) and *Siyāsat-nāmah*⁶ by Nizām al-Mulk (composed in 1092), both of which were written in the years very near the composition of the *Kutadgu Bilig*, would reveal important similarities in style and contents. For example, such topics as the importance of maintaining the wellbeing of people, the interdependence of the prosperity of a country and its people, the comparing of the king to the sun giving lights to all equally, the necessity of avoiding injustice and tyranny, the prolongation of the term of the kings who recognize the rights of their subjects, the interdependence of political authority, the army, finance and prosperity –these are all discussed in the *Qābūs-nāmah* almost in the same way as discussed in the *Kutadgu Bilig* (Rosenthal 1996: 115, Khāss Hājib 2008: 824-835, 2262, 2056-2059, 2130, 2133-2134, 2136, 1367, 1435). It is still more striking that all of these three works were produced under the Turkish dominion in a period in which the ‘Abbasid caliphate possessed merely a symbolic value in the face of the Saljuqi power.

With the rise and spread of the tradition of writing political and moral treatises, we find that moral and political philosophy, which the Muslims came to know through the translations and which received interest mostly from Muslim philosophers, obtained an important position in Islamic thought. Plato and Aristotle, though in a Neoplatonic garb, had a deep impact on the moral and political mindset of the Muslim Peripatetics, amongst whom Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā should be counted as pioneers. Teleologism is the general characteristic of the ethics that was enunciated first by Socrates, systematized by Plato and Aristotle and

elaborated by the Muslim Peripatetics. And the ultimate goal of this ethics is to attain felicity.

One can speak of eudaemonist, hedonist as well as pragmatist forms of the teleological ethics. Eudemonism identifies felicity as the ultimate goal and describes it attainable only in a virtuous life, while hedonism finds the individual happiness in pleasure, whereas pragmatism locates good in the wellbeing of society. But the concept of good is fundamental to all of these theories. Although these theories have had many followers in a philosophical sense, hedonism came to be known with Epicurus, who emphasized the notion of individual satisfaction, eudemonism with Aristotle, and pragmatism in the New Age with J. S. Mill. Of these theories, it is, however, eudemonism which affected Islamic thought in general and Muslim Peripatetics in particular. We pay a special attention to this theory for it is closely related to the main subject of this study. As we shall see when discussing the question of good in the *Kutadgu Bilig*, no matter whether we take the concept of *kut* as happiness or as the State or as the highest good, Yūsuf Khāss Hājib in the *Kutadgu Bilig* identifies happiness, being the highest good acquired by means of some virtues, as the foundation of its moral and political theory. In view of the meaning it denoted in Ancient and Medieval philosophy, happiness should be taken as a concept and a goal common both to moral and political philosophy.

To better understand such deliberately chosen allegorical figures as Kün-Togdı, Ay-Toldı, Ögdülmiş and Odgurmuş, upon which Yūsuf Khāss Hājib builds his ethical and political theory, one should first deal with the human being who is both the subject and object of ethics and politics according to this approach. The human being is a political animal by nature. Only beasts can survive without needing the borders of the defensive city (Ebenstein 1996: 14). This clarifies that man is defined as a social and political being, indicating his dependency on the other members of his species. The self-realization of man, therefore, depends on being social and political. While man reproduces himself in the family and satisfies his certain needs of coexistence in the village, he realizes himself fully in the State only. In other terms, man expresses his physical desires and biological impulses within the family; he satisfies his social sentiments like the want of community and fellowship within the village; he completes his moral nature and character, which particularly makes him a man, within the State. In this regard, Aristotle defines the State not only as a community but also as the most excellent community which aspires to the highest good (Ebenstein 1996: 32-33). This means that man can attain the high-

est good, namely, happiness in the State, which represents the most excellent human organization. This in turn signifies man's attainment of perfection and maturity. So, one should ask the question, "What is the highest good, i.e. what is happiness?"

Happiness as the Highest Good: Eudemonia: Happiness is the highest good. Anything other than happiness is good only accidentally, and not in itself (Aristotle 1998: 1097a 20-30, 10 97b 5). In other words, these kinds of things are good as far as they lead to the goal of happiness (Aristotle 1998: 1176a 29-35, 1176b 5), as held by almost all the teleological moralists. Happiness is the highest good and the most ultimate goal that is worth being sought in itself. Anything else is but an instrument to attain it. Since Aristotle this view has been adopted by the philosophers and influenced most of the Muslim philosophers (al-Fārābī 1980: 39, 40, Ibn Sīnā 1353 A.H.: 2-4). The philosophers define the notion of good as that which everything moves and aspires towards, and as that through which everything complements its existence, and that which is useful to everything's entelechy, while they define happiness, being the highest good, as the action of the soul in harmony with the intellect (Aristotle 1998: 1098a 10-15) or as the activity of the soul in congruity with virtue (Aristotle 1998: 1098b 25-35, 1099b 25-26, 1100b 9-11, Ibn Sīnā 1353 A.H.: 2-4, Aydın 1984: 433-51).

Hence, questions like "What is the virtue of the soul?", "How is this virtue to be attained?" etc., seem to relate to the concept of happiness, too. In fact, Plato, Aristotle, and the Greek tragedies describe *polis* as the place in which virtue is defined and practiced. In other words, this matrix is the human society and the city; it is in the human society and through citizenship that one becomes a good human being (Alasdair 2001: 2). Happiness as the highest good is a subject common to religion, metaphysics, psychology, ethics, and politics. Besides, should we properly understand the medieval as well as the ancient Greek-Hellenistic mind, we should be aware of the emphasis the medieval thinkers laid upon the comprehensive character of the revealed law in relation not only with the notion of happiness but also with the notion of dual happiness. The latter notion involves the happiness of both body and soul, which, though it temporarily dwells in the body, in fact, belongs to the otherworld (Rosenthal 1996: 27).

In this context, the ideal of the highest happiness is carried to a metaphysical and eschatological realm. This point of view leads men, in the final analysis, from the bodily pleasures that are temporal and imperfect to the pinnacle of spiritual perfection, preaching to seek satisfaction in spiritual

pleasures. The same views are by and large shared by the Muslim philosopher Fārābī (See al-Fārābī 1985; 1997, 1345 A.H., 1974; 1987; 1986; 1983)⁷. So, attaining the highest good or postponing everlasting happiness until the Hereafter by means of some religious and mystical elements, as symbolized by Ođgurmiş⁸, are not because the character “Ođgurmiş” is employed to refer to the Mystics, Buddhist or Muslim, rather because he is taken as an integral element of the eudemonist ethical theory. So, one should note in this context that the figures in the *Kutadgu Bilig* are integral parts of the author’s political and moral theory. In clearer terms, the notion of happiness and eternal happiness, which gained a metaphysical and eschatological meaning in the writings of Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā, found its expression with Yūsuf Khāss Hājib in the figures of Öđdülmiş and Ođgurmiş.

In this regard, we have some indispensable concepts, no matter whether we look at the work from a political or moral perspective. These are the concepts of the highest good and the *kut*, upon which Yūsuf Khāss Hājib builds his political and moral philosophy as well as the virtues necessary to attaining the good, such as intelligence, knowledge, understanding, righteousness, tolerance, justice, goodness, etc. Each of them is no doubt “good” in the moral and political theory of Yūsuf Khāss Hājib. But one should point out that they make sense in their relation with the concept of *kut*. In other words, they are not good *per se*. So, the *kut* should be good in itself according to the *Kutadgu Bilig*. We shall try to elucidate this point on the following pages, but now we will discuss what the author means by the term *kut*.

The *Kutadgu Bilig* is usually translated into modern Turkish as the knowledge of happiness. On the basis of recent linguistic studies about the word “*kut*”, some researchers, however, argue that this translation is wrong, for two-thirds of the *Kutadgu Bilig* is devoted to the discussion of ethical and political questions in the form of dialogues taking place between a king and his vizier. If we translate the *Kutadgu Bilig* as the knowledge of happiness, there appears a disparity between the title and contents of the work (Arslan 1987: 3). Therefore, the *Kutadgu Bilig* should be translated as the knowledge of attaining the State, instead of the knowledge of happiness or the knowledge that leads to happiness (Arslan 1987: 42). It is clear that the disagreement over the translation of the title of the work consists in the various interpretations of the term *kut*, which is one of the oldest words occurring in ancient Turkish inscriptions. For example, in the Göktürk inscriptions, it is employed in the sense of for-

tune, the State, and happiness in connection with the khans to intensify their preeminence⁹. Likewise, in his *Diwān*, Mahmūd Kāshgarī employed the word with its derivatives in the same sense (Kāshgarī 1995: I/301, 304, 230, 457, 508, II/121, 299).

Türker-Küyel, on the other hand, takes up a different approach as to the subject-matter of the *Kutadgu Bilig*. She warns us about the misleading character of the prosaic preface interpolated to the text. While the preface asserts that the title signifies justice, the *kut* (or *devlet kuşu*, i.e. the bird of fortune), intelligence, and contentment, Reşit Rahmeti Arat thinks that it denotes destiny¹⁰. However, Türker-Küyel thinks that it symbolizes the procession of the *kut* from the *Kut* and its return to It after passing through the Universe, society, and the human being, i.e. indicating the motion of imparting and receiving the *kut* (Türker-Küyel 1980: 220).

As pointed out by Mahmut Arslan, the earliest record of the Arabic word “*dawlat*” appearing in the Turkish language is the *Kutadgu Bilig*. From Yūsuf Khāss Hājib’s very rare employment of it, we understand that this word was not widespread in the vernacular Turkish in that age. We also find that this word is employed in the *Diwān* of Kāshgarī as synonymous with the *kut* (Kāshgarī 1995: I, 230). From this it follows that some Arabic words like *dawlat* were used first by the scholars and intellectuals of that period and then went into circulation among the masses. One should add that in the *Kutadgu Bilig* the terms *dawlat* and *kut* are employed interchangeably and synonymously (Arslan 1987: 44-45). To summarize, the concept of *kut*, be it in a moral or political context, relates to individual and social happiness. While the individual fortune signifies happiness in the lesser individual context, the State designates happiness at the larger social level. To express in political and moral terms, these two are the highest good. In other words, the *kut* means the highest good. Thus, we can interpret the *Kutadgu Bilig* as the knowledge of attaining the highest good.

In this context, one should note that in order to attain happiness, be it earthly and transient or otherworldly and eternal, one should possess certain virtues. Therefore, it would be useful to cite as example some of the moral virtues in order to elicit the relationship between the moral virtues and happiness/the *kut* in the *Kutadgu Bilig*. To further clarify the reason why we mention these virtues, we can remark: In the teleological moral and political philosophies, moral virtues are counted among the conditions of achieving the highest good. For instance, becoming knowledgeable, righteous, tolerant and just, etc. are good. But why are they so? They

are good because they lead to the highest good. In other words, the good is chosen due to attaining happiness, which is the highest good. Yet what is the highest good? It is, as defined by Fārābī, is the attainment of the everlasting happiness wanting no physical support. This is the ultimate end and entelechy of the human being (Fārābī 1997: 90). The most salient difference between Fārābī's and Yūsuf Khāss Hājib's conception of happiness lies in that the former takes this level of perfection as an intellectual state and formulates it in a philosophical language.

Some of the Virtues Discussed in the *Kutadgu Bilig* and the Relationship Between the *Kut* and Happiness

The Virtues of Intelligence and Knowledge: In the opinion of Yūsuf Khāss Hājib, knowledge, intelligence, and understanding are among the virtues that God made peculiar to the human being. He suggests that the source of goodness is intelligence and knowledge (148-154). While intelligence is a virtue set by God in the disposition of man, knowledge is a virtue which man should strive to obtain. So, while the *Kutadgu Bilig* describes intelligence as an inborn and innate part of human nature, it depicts knowledge as the result of learning and teaching (1679-1683). By learning and knowing man is distinguished from the beasts (1845). All difficult problems are solved by means of these two virtues (3168). Yūsuf places a particular emphasis upon intelligence, which is regarded as the means of attaining all good and knowledge. Intelligence is the source of all kinds of good (1841) and the beginning of virtue (1830). It is a torch as well as a sight that gives the vision of what is out of the reach of the physical eye. It is like the soul with respect to the dead body and is like speech with respect to the dumb. In this context, Yūsuf Khāss Hājib compares man to a dark night and intelligence to his torch (1861, 1840). One should be intelligent to choose what is good and be knowledgeable to fulfill his work (327). The responsible person is one who is possessed of intelligence and knowledge. No bad action originates from such people, whom Yūsuf Khāss Hājib describes, probably with reference to the literal sense of the Arabic word *'aql*, which terminologically means reason and intellect, as those whose feet are shackled, i.e. the self-controlling people (314).

The author asserts that since they possess a significant power, the intelligent and learned people will hold control of the affairs at their time and find a way even to the heavens (208), thus heralding Bacon's famous maxim, "*Knowledge is power*" back in the eleventh century (251, 1841). In his opinion, knowledge is a pearl waiting to be extracted. Just as the pearl that

is not taken out of the sea yet is of no use, the knowledge that does not manifest itself is bereft of benefit altogether (212).

One can say more about the emphasis Yūsuf lays upon the intellectual virtues. But let it suffice to point to the significance of these virtues in general terms. Yet one should underline the point one more time that man can achieve the good and eternal happiness through the intellectual virtues (1712, 1715, 1707/1778). For happiness as a phenomenon ever changes and bewilders the people. Yet, since the objects of the intellect are intelligible, it has aversion to changing. So its task is to extract the unchanging from the changing. Thus, Yūsuf tries to situate the changing happiness in the vicinity of the intelligible domain, being permanent and unchanging, or at least to possess it as long as possible (1865, 1868). In brief, the author describes intelligence and knowledge as two of the most important means of attaining and maintaining happiness. They are means because the end is to become happy by means of them. In this context, one needs to keep in mind that we, as already pointed out, define the *kut* as the highest good in a political and moral sense.

The Virtue of Goodness: Clarification must be made about the *kut* and goodness. In our opinion, while the term *kut* denotes the highest good as an all-comprehensive virtue, the concept of goodness indicates a particular virtue. In this regard, the virtue of goodness also functions as a means of attaining the highest good. For Yūsuf Khāss Hājib views goodness as one of the virtues that help to maintain the *kut*/the State, and thus distinguishing between the virtue of goodness and the *kut* (551). This supports our view that the *kut* stands for the highest good.

To Yūsuf Khāss Hājib's mind, goodness is a difficult virtue; ordinary people can neither obtain nor actualize it. It is a distinguished thing. Therefore, the author describes it as climbing an uphill. (899, 903, 905). Yūsuf is convinced that goodness is the only thing whose morality we cannot doubt because a good thing is impossible to become bad (1640). He adds that good intention is the only thing whose goodness we cannot doubt. So, one should ask the question in this context: What is good according to the author, putting aside the genetic or biological aspects of goodness as a technical issue? For the source of goodness seems to be an open-ended problem in the mind of Yūsuf. His following remarks seem to be the most intriguing elements of this subject: "*If goodness enters into the soul of a person through mother's pure milk, he never turns away from the right path in his life.*" (881) In this context, one should bear in mind that Yūsuf believes that except the inborn intellectual virtue of man, all virtues are acquired

by man through studying and toiling. This seems to be the most general principle of Yūsuf concerning the question of virtues. So, this question should be understood in accordance with this principle. In other words, goodness, too, is a virtue that is acquired later, and not inborn. Thus, we ought to understand the aforementioned idea of Yūsuf as the following: All the necessary conditions should be carefully prepared to attain the virtue of goodness because it is hard to achieve. Once attained under the suitable conditions, this virtue becomes an unchangeable character “*that never gets corrupted until death corrupts it*”, as put by Yūsuf (882). This means that a virtue gets deeply rooted in one’s personality and becomes an essential part of his character.

After these parenthetical remarks, we can revisit the question above: What is the virtue of goodness according to Yūsuf? The answer we will hear from Yūsuf seems to be integral to the notion, symbolized by the figure of Ögdülmiş, that man is a social/political animal, needing other people to actualize his perfection, and probably more importantly, that what is meant by human society is the State which is built on the right law (*köni yasa*). Accordingly, goodness means being useful to the people and contributing to them gratuitously (856-858, 3269). Goodness is righteousness and truthfulness (5922). It means performing good actions that would keep one alive in life (5923). Furthermore, goodness is the only thing man will take with himself to the otherworld (5923); goodness is the name of immortality in a psychological as well as sociological sense (228-229, 237, 239, 243, 246). In short, goodness is humanity itself (1640).

The Virtue of Righteousness (*Könilik*): Righteousness is another virtue that secures the happiness of man. In other words, it helps him obtain the *kut* (865, 1285). Moreover, Yūsuf reduces all other virtues to righteousness, describing them as profit derived from the capital of righteousness (2756). The author counts righteousness as one of the three virtues that guide man onto the sun of the *kut*, stating that whoever unites them in himself becomes happy (1664). They are goodness (*edgülik*), modesty (*uvut*), and righteousness (*könilik*) (1659-1660). Righteousness, in short, is the touchstone of the trustworthiness of humanity (862, 865-866, 868). It is by righteousness that man obtains happiness both in this world and in the Hereafter (1290-1291, 1294, 2760).

The Virtue of Justice: The virtue of justice appears in the *Kutadgu Bilig* as a political virtue, rather than moral. Justice denotes applying the right law to all people equally. This virtue is an instrument of the realization of political organization, which is emphasized as one of the indispensable

conditions of an individual's perfection. It is the extension of kingship and the enemy of injustice (1435). It is probably by it that the happiness of unstable character (*yayık kut*) is maintained by the State power (91). In this regard, the King Kün-Togdu's justice is likened to the sun. Justice is described in the *Kutadgu Bilig* as the character of the king and is mentioned always along with the virtue of righteousness (7799-822).

The virtues that are discussed in the *Kutadgu Bilig* seem to be characterized by teleological and eudaemonist ethics. As we have pointed out earlier, we have mentioned these virtues only as examples. In doing so, we aimed at bringing out the relationship the virtues bear to the *kut*, i.e. happiness as the highest good. As seen, while all the virtues are good, they are not so by themselves. On the contrary, they are good insofar as they serve to reach the *kut*, over whose goodness there is no dispute. We need to discuss the conditions under which we shall obtain the good in itself, i.e. happiness. Though we have already pointed out that happiness can be achieved by means of virtues, we have not yet addressed how the human being can acquire them. Now we have come to the point in which we can discuss this issue in the context of Ögdülmiş and Odgurmış.

In the framework of happiness, we will discuss two main questions through these two figures. While the first is the city or the State where there appear such virtues as intelligence, knowledge, justice, etc., the other is asceticism or retreat that pits itself against the social life. As the former is represented by Ögdülmiş, the latter is symbolized by Odgurmış. To better understand the question in hand, we need to look into the distinctive features of these two figures.

Ögdülmiş: Symbol of Civilization, Human Society, and the State: At first sight, one may view Ögdülmiş and Odgurmış as two figures that stand for opposite ideas in a dialectical manner. But this is not the case. On the contrary, the fact is that Yūsuf Khāss Hājb regards these two figures as integral to each other in setting out the universal problems related to the matter of *kut*/happiness. For the author conceived of political and moral philosophy against such heritage. One should bear this point in mind to fully understand the edifice of Yūsuf. We have touched on this point before. One can find Turkish, Indian as well as Iranian influences on the political theory of the *Kutadgu Bilig*, as pointed out by Halil İnalçık (1966: 259-271). Or, departing from the literal sense of the names Ögdülmiş¹¹ and Odgurmış¹² as well as from the life style they suggest, one can assert that the former indicates the Prophet Muhammad, literally meaning the praised one, while the latter signifies Buddha, meaning the

wakeful person¹³. It is possible and even natural to find pre-Islamic Turkish elements, political, moral and cultural, on the basis of the aphorisms and common terms occurring in the *Kutadgu Bilig* like *kut*, *Tengri*, *kam*, *otacı*, *efsuncu*, etc., and to talk of a Buddhist influence on the grounds of the way of life represented by Odgurmuş, and to speak of an Islamic influence on the basis of the Qur'anic verses and the Prophetic traditions cited and alluded to by Yūsuf. One can set forth separate theses on each of them. These are the cultural sources into which Yūsuf was born and in which he grew up. He himself expresses this truth by the wise words he draws from a variety of traditions. It is impossible to ignore the traces of pre-Islamic Turkish thought. But what impact do all these influences have on Yūsuf in addressing the problem of happiness? Are they essential or only auxiliary and supplementary to Yūsuf's *Weltanschauung*? For me, this is the most critical question with regard to the issue of happiness and good. I will discuss this problem on the basis of the figures of Ögdülmiş and Odgurmuş.

In fact, Kün-Togdu should be considered in association with the figure of Ögdülmiş, for the latter in a sense stands for the political mind essential to the State, which marks the perfection of the king and the people, symbolizing social organization and co-existence. In other words, Ögdülmiş represents sociality, the State, and political virtues in general, all of which guarantee the continuation of human existence.

In addition, Ögdülmiş thinks that no man can live in isolation from the people (3330). He is convinced that man is a social being and that humanity as a quality can be acquired by interacting with people. Seclusion that may be taken as impoverishment in some respect means depriving oneself of the human experience. The retreat of the ascetic to dedicate himself completely to the service of God is self-deception, rather than self-disclosure and pomposity. So, Ögdülmiş suggests that even secrecy makes a meaning in a social context (Cf. 3229-3235, 3915-3922). Manliness is to be content with little when one has wealth and affluence, and to give the excess to the poor. Otherwise, those who are possessed of nothing, by what can they discipline themselves? (3438-3445). If a servant confides exclusively in his religious services, this means that he has got nothing by which to please God (3249). It is through the pleasing of people that one gets the pleasure of God. Being useful to people is more important because God is not in need for the service of men (3249-3251). The congregational prayer on Friday, which Yūsuf calls "*pilgrimage of the poor*", and pilgrimage are the rites that require socialization with the Muslim communi-

ty (3239). The existence of religious commandments and rites required to be fulfilled in the congregation in villages and in cities proves that much of the religion can only be practiced in society (3214-3215, 3226-3227, 3243).

To Ögdülmiş's mind, goodness and happiness do not consist in individualism and egotism (3243) as practiced by the ascetic, in other words, not in individualistic hedonism, rather in socially usefulness. By expressing this idea of his through the tongue of Ögdülmiş, Yüsuf holds that the good man is one who forsakes his own interest and takes pains to contribute to the others (3247). If one is alive, he should be useful and do favor (1599, 1636). The author attaches so great an importance to the notion of being useful that he views the person who lives without providing use as a burden, saying that such a person should die as soon as he is born (3247, 3408). His following remarks on usefulness are quite noteworthy: "If a wild flower is useful, I am [ready to be] its slave. If a flower that is grown with a great care is harmful, I uproot it." (2573)

Being fully aware of the fact that defects and virtues come into being in society, Ögdülmiş states that man needs even his enemy to awake from the sleep of unawareness (3413, 3419). Thus, Ögdülmiş is convinced that it is through society that the good moral virtues are obtained. Interpersonal relations are the determinant of virtues. So, we cannot talk of virtue in isolation from the people. What make man happy in this world are the necessary virtues. In other words, man deserves being happy by means and to the extent of the virtues he has acquired. Thus, happiness, to the mind of Ögdülmiş, is a spiritual state resulting from the acquired virtues. In short, happiness is the result of the virtues that one can only acquire within a well-organized society.

But here one should note that these remarks about the notion of happiness do not fully comprehend the idea represented by the figure of Ögdülmiş. This is because all the protagonists of the *Kutadgu Bilig* time and again speak of the unsteadiness and transience of worldly happiness, which is parallel to the character of worldly life, and Yüsuf dedicates one of the heroes to the discussion happiness. Thus, does Yüsuf find this transient and earthly happiness sufficient? From the very beginning, man has always been yearning after everlasting happiness and the highest good, and at least, has idealized it. When speaking of true happiness especially in a philosophical sense, we face a more complex situation since all of us are experiencing so many things which abort and hinder our happiness. As regards this issue, thinking over the phenomenon of death alone must

suffice. Yūsuf too finds this happiness insufficient though he cares for it. I think that it is for this reason that Yūsuf included the figure of Ođgurmıř in his work. In other words, though he provided a partial solution the problem, Yūsuf faced the stumbling block of death and happiness in the search after the best, the absolute, and the everlasting. It must be again for this reason that the author tried to bridge the gap between death and happiness through the figure of Ođgurmıř.

Ođgurmıř as the Figure of Inquiry into Happiness: Ođgurmıř is an imaginary figure (3338) who finds the safety of his faith and individual interest in ascetic life (3338, 3359), and thus turns away from the world and withdraws into the mountains, cleaning his heart from worldly concerns (3148), breaking the backbone of the lower self as stated by Yūsuf (3636), and dedicating himself to the invocation of God (3349). He showers praise upon solitariness, so to say (3361-3364). Ođgurmıř has reasons for leaving urban life and taking up a solitary and ascetic life (3340-3347). Seeing all this, we can describe him as a real ascetic. However, some words of his suggest that he is not a thoroughgoing retreat who leads a solitary life in the mountains. There are some allusions that he has a disciple whom he sends to the town in case of need. So, he does not regard asceticism merely as seclusion. In addition, though he asserts that the world is a dungeon and not the right place to realize the end of happiness; life is there to die (3520-3530); the human body, too, is a foe which asks for the faith of its owner as ransom if it grows fat (3637-3640); though he depicts the world, the body, and Satan as three most fierce enemies of man (3589-3601); though he talks of the conflict of faith and the world and thus of the necessity of giving up the world (5311-5313, 5322, 5327); he however remarks that he joined Ögdülmiř and even asked him to stay in the city and serve society and the State when Ögdülmiř decided to lead an ascetic life (3305).

We observe that Ođgurmıř is not so happy with the title of ascetic (*zāhid*), agreeing with other Sufis in distinguishing between the outer and the inner and in clarifying that many impostors exploited religion with their appearance (5106-5113)¹⁴. For example, he says that the king should be very careful in selecting and appointing the jurists, the calıphs, and the viziers (5328-5333). Moreover, Ođgurmıř repeats the views of Ögdülmiř. For example, he pays attention to the public interest, saying that a person who is useful to the others is good and those who are capable of performing good things but fail to do so are responsible for this towards God (5165, 5723-5740). Hence, how should we understand these remarks?

Shall we take them as a contradiction in the thought of Yūsuf Khāss Hājib?

One of the principal notions upon which both of the heroes are agreed is that this world and its happiness are transient. A great part of the work is dedicated to the elaboration of this point. Starting in the eleventh century in Turkish poetry with Yūsuf Khāss Hajib, this attitude developed into a teleological and artistic tradition in the Sufi poetry of the following century, which was continued especially by Ahmad Yasawī (d. 1166)¹⁵. We find that Yūsuf takes death as a principal concept. The words Odgurmuş address to Ögdülmiş and Kün-Togdu, who praise and recommend urban life, shake the latter two very deeply. In a sense, he yearns for an immortal life and an everlasting happiness (3753-3765), but is fully aware at the same time of the fact that death destroys everything. In this context, all the heroes of the tale refer such an endless happiness to God, who holds life and death in His hand. So, Yūsuf views the phenomenon of death both as a fundamental element that devastates the changing and deceiving worldly happiness and as an instrument which brings about the highest good. Therefore, one should take Yūsuf's words above as two essential aspects corresponding to the moral existence of the human being, rather than contradictory.

To summarize what has been said so far, we can state that Yūsuf Khāss Hājib explains what the essence of happiness is and how it is acquired by means of four fictive characters, to each of whom he dedicates a separate section in the *Kutadgu Bilig*. Accordingly, the figure of Kün-Togdu is the king, who symbolizes the right law (*köni törü*) and is compared to the sun. Ay-Toldı is the vizier, who is likened to the moon and represents happiness. Ögdülmiş is the son of the vizier, standing for intelligence and understanding (*ukuş*). Lastly, Odgurmuş symbolizes destiny, as expressed by the *Kutadgu Bilig* itself. Considering the *Kutadgu Bilig* as a whole, we can say that these four figures complement each other, and are not contradicting. In other words, if we bring together the right law, the changing happiness, and the intelligence/understanding, we shall have a worldview that the changing happiness can be prolonged, though not forever, and the highest happiness that is unattainable in this world can be obtained in the Hereafter.

As we have noted time and again concerning Medieval political and moral philosophy, the *Kutadgu Bilig* followed in the footsteps of the Muslim philosophers in suggesting a twofold concept of happiness. The contrasting views as they appear in the dialogues between Ögdülmiş and

Odgurmuş seem to be contradictory at first sight, but they in fact represent two complementary conceptions of happiness that agree on the idea that the highest good and eternal happiness should be postponed until the Hereafter. So, one can be happy both in this world and in the Hereafter. But happiness represented by Ay-Toldı is ever changing and never lasting just as the moon to which it is compared. This character of happiness, combined with the transience of worldly life and the phenomenon of death, is pictured in a very striking manner. The period during which happiness is possessed is extended by means of certain measures, which in fact constitute the core of practical moral philosophy as exposed in the *Kutadgu Bilig*. Being the highest good, everlasting happiness is, however, postponed until the Hereafter unanimously by all of the four figures.

In fact, the following two quotations from the *Kutadgu Bilig* succinctly express all that we have said. It is interesting that the first quotation is from the preface by the anonymous author while the second is from the section that we can take as the epilogue: “I gave the book the title *Kutadgu Bilig* so that it grant happiness to the reader and lend him a helping hand. I have said my words and written the book. This book is like a hand that extends to grab both of the worlds. One becomes happy if one holds both of the worlds in hand through the State. (350-352)”. “I have provided some insight into how you shall act. By this instruction, you should set up two principles for your life. One of them is the path of religion while the other is that of the world. Never turn away from these main paths. If you want the world, here is its path. If you want the Hereafter, here is its path, too. Fulfill your duty of servitude; it is God who will give you the necessary strength. Pick up either of these paths, but never seek a third one... (6497-6500)”

If we assign a religious meaning to the text on the basis of these remarks, we can take it as an attempt of reconciliation between faith and the world. But all the philosophical systems that inquire about ceaseless happiness or the highest good have regarded death as a door opening into immortal life, and of course most of them have expressed this notion in religious terms. The same question persisted in Islamic philosophy, and the highest good or happiness as a philosophical question is either postponed until the Hereafter or taken as an intellectual activity experienced with the aid of the Active Intellect, as described by Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā.

In conclusion, Yūsuf Khāss Hājib clarifies that happiness can be obtained by means of the virtues acquired within human society. But this happiness is not long-lasting, rather a portion of the happiness regarded as the high-

est good. So, the author postpones the supreme and eternal happiness until the Hereafter and expresses it in Islamic terms just as the preceding Muslim philosophers, Fārābī and Ibn Sīnā have done. Therefore, the four figures in the *Kutadgu Bilig* should be taken as complementary elements, rather than contradictory. In this subject, Yūsuf Khāss Hājib followed suit with the teleological and eudaemonist worldview that prevailed in the Islamic world in his age.

Endnotes

- ¹ “There are many Arabic and Persian books; but this is the only book in our language that gathers together all wisdom.” (Khās Hājib 2008: couplet no. 73) (Since I will make frequent references to the *Kutadgu Bilig*, I will give only the numbers of couplets in brackets).
- ² Ođgurmıř is interpreted by the unknown author of the preface as contentment (71). Considering the whole work and especially the words of Ođgurmıř, this interpretation seems to be reasonable, for the notion of contentment comes to the foreground as an important aspect of Ođgurmıř’s worldview. I am, however, of the opinion that Ođgurmıř principally stands for the notion of destiny, and not contentment. This view is supported by both the general structure of the work and by the words of Yūsuf Khās Hājib himself, who clarifies that Ođgurmıř symbolizes the notion of destiny (357). So, this point seems to have escaped the attention of the author of the preface. Besides, this allegory has a significant position in ethics and is deliberately chosen by Yūsuf – a point which also seems to have escaped the attention of the writer of the preface. I will treat this issue in detail on the pages to come.
- ³ I should like to be content with mentioning two studies on this subject. One of them is the symposium paper titled “*Kutadgu Bilig ve Farabi*” by Mühahat Türker-Küyel, in which she investigates the *Kutadgu Bilig*’s possible relation to Mesopotamia in general and to the Sumerians in particular, explaining the notion of kut, that is, happiness in Neoplatonic terms. By the way, the relations established by the author between the *Kutadgu Bilig* and Mesopotamia in general and the Sumerians in particular present an inspiring and encouraging picture to the researchers of Turkish thought. Nevertheless, one should note that the connections and arguments seem to be pretty weak. I think that any attempt to trace the *Kutadgu Bilig* to older sources will add no extra value to the work. On the contrary, the *Kutadgu Bilig* by itself is important enough to derive its value from its own structure and contents, not from its sources and references. Therefore, any approach relying on far-fetched connections to the *Kutadgu Bilig* would prevent from grasping it and even detach it from its own worldview. But one should acknowledge that the relation Türker-Küyel sets up between the *Kutadgu Bilig* and Fārābī is important and to-the point. Nevertheless, the Neoplatonic interpretations envisaged on the basis of the notion of kut are difficult to trace to the *Kutadgu Bilig*. I think that the relation in question can be established on the grounds of the eudemonist-teleological ethics and more importantly on the notion of double happiness. (Consult, Türker-Küyel 1980:

219-230) The other study is *Kutadgu Bilig'deki Toplum ve Devlet Anlayışı* (The Conception of the State and Society in *Kutadgu Bilig*) by Mahmut Arslan. Being more voluminous than the former one, this study tries to trace the *Kutadgu Bilig* mostly to the pre-Islamic references, overlooking the Islamic influence almost totally and arguing that some of the Islamic elements are merely nominal. Furthermore, it is quite difficult to understand how the author tries to associate the *Kutadgu Bilig* with Buddhism on the grounds that no mention of Paradise and Hell occurs in the *Kutadgu Bilig* and Buddhism entertains no belief in the Hereafter. (Consult Sofuoğlu, “Kur’ân ve Hadîs Kültürünün *Kutadgu Bilig'deki İzleri* (Traces of the Culture of the Qur’ân and the Hadîth in the *Kutadgu Bilig*)” *Journal of Divinity School of Dokuz Eylül University*, V, 127-180.) On the other hand, it is possible to find Buddhist elements or influences in the *Kutadgu Bilig*. For example, one can seriously dispute whether the ascetic life of Odgurmuş, one of the most important protagonists of the work, represents Islamic Sufism or Buddhist mysticism. Likewise, one can discuss what an important and universal problem the question of death and the afterlife is in ethics and metaphysics and support these investigations with the Buddhist texts translated into Turkish in the Uighur period. So I think that such approaches, too, pose an obstacle to an accurate understanding of the *Kutadgu Bilig*. (Cf. Arslan, 1987) Thus, one needs to be more careful in suggesting any pre-Islamic sources for the *Kutadgu Bilig*. It is important to distinguish the *Kutadgu Bilig* from the collective and anonymous works and to keep in mind that it is the result of Yūsuf Khās Hājib’s individual thought and lore. Since the works of the first type are products of collective thought, they differ from the second type in character, formation, continuity, change, and sources. While the former reflects the collective subconsciousness, the latter represents the individual subconsciousness (Cf. Arslan, 1987).

- ⁴ Some of the treatises composed by Ibn al-Muqaffa have been translated into Turkish. See Ibn al-Muqaffa (2004), *İslam Siyaset Üslubu*, (Turkish translation by Vecdi Akyüz), İstanbul: Dergâh Publishing.
- ⁵ *Qābūsnāmah* was composed in 1082 by Kaykāvus, a prince of the Ziyārī dynasty who ruled over some part of south Khazar as vassals of the Seljuqids. By relying on his own political experiences, the author aimed at guiding his son (Rosenthal 1996: 115).
- ⁶ Nizām al-Mulk (1995), *Siyāsatnāmah*, (Turkish translation by Nurettin Bayburtlugil), İstanbul: Dergâh Publishing. It is important to find a similar treatment of the subject of women in the *Siyāsatnāmah* and the *Kutadgu Bilig* in the sense that Turkish culture was affected by Arab culture under the guise of Islam.
- ⁷ These works of Fārābī are important both from a political as well as a moral perspective.
- ⁸ For a systematic exposition of the philosophical and mystical usages of symbolism, consult Tahir Uluç, *İbn Arabî’de Sembolizm*, İnsan Publishing, İstanbul 2007.
- ⁹ For information on the runic works, consult Malov, S.E. (1951), *Pamyatniki Drevnetyurkskoy Pismennosti*, Moskva Leningrad: Akademii Nauk SSSR; Ergin, Muharrem (1994), *Orhun Abideleri*, İstanbul: Boğaziçi Publishing; Orkun, H.N. (1994),

Eski Türk Yazıtları (I-IV), Ankara: TTK; Tekin, Talat (1995), *Orhon Yazıtları*, İstanbul: Simurg Publishing.

- ¹⁰ In fact, Arat suggests this calling on the basis of the remarks of Yūsuf Khāss Hājib who clarifies that Ođgurmıř represents destiny. See endnote 2.
- ¹¹ The name Öđdülmiř is derived from the old Turkish root öđ, which means praising (Arat 1979: 353-54; Caferođlu 1993: 98).
- ¹² The name Ođgurmıř is derived from the old Turkish root ođgur, which means awakening (Arat 1979: 332; Caferođlu 1993: 93).
- ¹³ See Çađatay, XCVIII, 95-111. Of course, the claim that the Ođgurmıřian life style is of Buddhist origin is open to dispute. However, one should keep in mind that Indian tradition influenced Turkish thought. In addition, Turkish thought is not monolithic. On the contrary, it has been fed from a variety of cultures. For example, one can talk of different religious thoughts shaped by these different perceptions after the Turks became Muslims. But attention should be called to the fact that Sufism as an Islamic science had developed by the time the *Kutadgu Bilig* was composed. We know that the people of insight emphasized a Gnostic epistemology and an ascetic worldview that fully overlap with the meaning of Ođgurmıř. One should ask the question: The ascetic worldview recommended by Ođgurmıř, is it characterized by Buddhist mysticism or Islamic Sufism? In view of the general character of the *Kutadgu Bilig*, Ođgurmıř seems to stand closer to the Sufi worldview. Some remarks of Yūsuf support this view (4762, 4765-4772, 4778-4779, 4780-4809). In addition, the author makes a classification that gives the gist and essence of Sufism: "Leave the world before it leaves you. Leave this world and seek the otherworld and lead there an eternal life in peace. There is something better, if you can handle: Seek neither of them. Go and seek the Owner of both worlds. This world and the otherworld, neither of them has use. If you find the Producer, you get the product. If you find the Creator, you get the creature (4730-4739, 4740-4743)." These words of Yūsuf Khāss Hājib can be taken as the precursor of Yunus Emre's famous saying: "I need Thee, I need Thee!" But Buddhism had a deep impact on Sufism in general and on Turkish Sufism in particular. As we have just stated, Turkish thought does not have a monolithic character. Besides, there are some works that highlight the Buddhist worldview. For example, *Kuanshi Im Pular* (Ses İřiten İlah, Voice-Hearing Deity), a Chinese work translated into Turkish, includes some incidents that maintain that the Bodhisatva tradition in Buddhism overlaps with the miracles in Sufism (See, Tekin, 1993). We can mention tens of similar works that deal with the common cultural environment.
- ¹⁴ Cf. Al-Tūsī 1960: 19-20; al-Qushairī 1981: 95-96. Uluç 2009: 54.
- ¹⁵ Cf. Yesevī 1998; 2009.

References

- Alasdair, Mclntyre (2001). *Erdem Peşinde*. Çev. Muttalip Özcan. İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yay.
- Al-Fārābī, Abū Nasr Muhammad bin Muhammad Tarkhān (1345 A.H.). *Tahsīl al-Sa'ādah*. Hyderabad.
- _____, (1974). *Mutluluğu Kazanma, Farabi'nin Üç Eseri*. Çev. Hüseyin Atay. Ankara: Ankara Üniveritesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Yay.
- _____, (1980). *al-Siyāsah al-Madaniyyah*. Çev. M. Aydın, A. Şener ve Rahmi Ayas. İstanbul: KBY.
- _____, (1983). *al-Siyāsah al-Madaniyyah*. Ed. by Fawzī M. Najjār. Beirut: Dār al-Mashriq.
- _____, (1985). *Ārāu Ahli Madīnat al-Fādilah*. Ed. by A. N. Nādir. Beirut: Dār al-Mashriq.
- _____, (1986). *Fusūl Muntaza'ah*. Ed. by Fawzī M. Najjār. Beirut: Dār al-Mashriq.
- _____, (1987). *al-Tanbīh 'alā Sabīl al-Sa'ādah*. Ed. by Sakhbān Khalifāt. Amman: al-Jāmi 'ah al-Urdūniyyah.
- _____, (1997). *İdeal Devlet*. Çev. A. Arslan. Ankara: Vadi Publishing.
- Al-Qushairī, 'Abdulkarīm (1981). *Kuşeyrī Risalesi (al-Risālah al-Qushayriyyah)*. Çev. Süleyman Uludağ. İstanbul: Dergāh Yay.
- Al-Tūsī, Abū Nasr al-Sarrāj (1960). *Kitāb al-Luma' fī al-Tasawwuf*. Ed. by 'Abdulhalīm Mahmūd and Tāhā 'Abdulbāqī Surūr. Cairo: Dār al-Kutub al-Hadīthah.
- Arat, Reşit Rahmeti (1979). *Kutadgu Bilig*. İstanbul: Türk Kültürünü Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Yay.
- Aristotle (1998). *Nikomakhos'a Etik*. Çev. Saffet Babür. Ankara: Ayraç Yay.
- Arslan, Mahmut (1987). *Kutadgu Bilig'deki Toplum ve Devlet Anlayışı*. İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Yay.
- Aydın, M. (1984), "İbn Sina'nın Mutluluk Anlayışı". *İbn Sina Doğumunun Bininci Yılı Armağanı*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yay. 433-451.
- Caferoğlu, Ahmet (1993). *Eski Uygur Türkçesi Sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi.

- Çağatay, Saadet (1970). “Kutadgu Bilig’de Ögdülmiş”. *Türk Kültürü Dergisi* XCVIII: 95-111.
- Dilâçar, Agop (1988). *Kutadgu Bilig İncelemesi*. Ankara: TDKY.
- Ebenstein, Wiliam (1996). *Siyasi Felsefenin Büyük Düşünürleri*. Çev. İsmet Özel. İstanbul: Şule Yay.
- Ergin, Muharrem (1994). *Orhun Abideleri*. İstanbul: Boğaziçi Yay.
- Ibn al-Muqaffa (2004). *İslam Siyaset Üslubu*. Çev. Vecdi Akyüz. İstanbul: Dergâh Yay.
- Ibn Sînâ (1353 A.H.). *Risâlah fî al-Sa’âdah*. Hyderabad: Matba’atu Majlisi Dâirat al-Ma’ârif al-’Uthmâniyyah.
- İnalçık, Halil (1966). “Kutadgu Bilig’de Türk ve İran Siyaset Nazariye ve Gelenekleri”. *Reşit Rahmeti Arat İçin*. Ankara: TKAE Yay. 259-271.
- Kâshgarî, Mahmûd (1995). *Dîwânu Lughat al-Turk*. Çev. Besim Atalay. Ankara: TDK Yay.
- Khâs Hâjib, Yûsuf (2008). *Kutadgu Bilig*. Çev. Reşit Rahmeti Arat. İstanbul: Kabalıcı Yay.
- Malov, S.E. (1951). *Pamyatniki Drevnetyurkskoy Pismennosti*. Moskva Leningrad: Akademii Nauk SSSR.
- Nizâm al-Mulk (1995). *Siyâsatnâmah*. Çev. Nurettin Bayburtlugil. İstanbul: Dergâh Yay.
- Orkun, H.N. (1994). *Eski Türk Yazıtları (I-IV)*. Ankara: TTK Yay.
- Rosenthal, Erwin I. J. (1996). *Ortaçağda İslam Siyaset Düşüncesi*. Çev. Ali Çaksu. İstanbul: İz Yay.
- Sofuoğlu, M. Cemal (1989). “Kur’ân ve Hadîs Kültürünün Kutadgu Bilig’deki İzleri (Traces of the Culture of the Qur’ân and the Hadîth in the *Kutadgu Bilig*)”. *Journal of Divinity School of Dokuz Eylül University* V: 127-180.
- Tekin, Şinasi (1993). *Kuanşi İmpusar*. Ankara: TDKY.
- Tekin, Talat (1995). *Orhon Yazıtları*. İstanbul: Simurg Yay.
- Türker-Küyel, Mübahat (1980). “Kutadgu Bilig ve Farabi”. *Papers Presented in the International Symposium on Ibn Turk, Khwârazmî, Fârâbî, Bîrûnî and Ibn Sînâ*. Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi Yay. 219-230.
- Uluç, Tahir (2007). *İbn Arabî’de Sembolizm*. İstanbul: İnsan Yay.

_____, (2009). *Tasavvuf Geleneginde Hırka Giymek ve Giydirmek*. Konya: İdeal Yay.

Yesevî, Ahmet (1995). *Hikmetler*. Ed. by İbrahim Hakkulov. Çev. Erhan Sezai Toplu. İstanbul: MEB Yay.

Yesevî, Hoca Ahmed (2009). *Divan-ı Hikmet*. Ed. Hayati Bice. Ankara: TDV Yay.

Kutadgu Bilig’de İyilik Problemi

Refik Turan*

Öz

Kutadgu Bilig, ahlak ve siyaset felsefesi bakımından Türk düşüncesinin en önemli kaynaklarından birisidir. İyilik sorunu hem ahlak hem de siyaset felsefesinde belirleyici bir önem taşır. Akıl, bilgi, adalet, kut gibi kavramların bütün bir resim olarak ortaya çıkmasında iyilik düşüncesinin yapıcı bir rol oynadığını ifade etmek mümkündür. O halde *Kutadgu Bilig*’de iyilik sorununu tartışmak için ilk önce iyiliğin mahiyeti incelenmelidir. Yûsuf Hâs Hâcib *Kutadgu Bilig*’de bu sorunu dört temsilî şahıs üzerinden dönemin siyaset ve ahlak nazariyeleri temelinde ele alır. Bu bağlamda İslam-öncesi Türk, İran, Yunan ve İslam düşüncesi onun referansları olarak zikredilebilir. Yûsuf eserinde bütün bu kaynaklardan faydalanmakla birlikte, iyilik sorununu Yunan felsefesinin etkisiyle sistematik bir yapı kazanan İslam Felsefesi geleneği içinde değerlendirebileceğimiz gayeci mutluluk anlayışı içerisinde çözümlüyor görünmektedir. Dolayısıyla düşünür, en yüksek iyiliği en yüksek mutluluk olarak görmekte ve onu da ölümden sonra elde edilebilecek ideal hayat olarak betimlemektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

İyilik, en yüksek iyilik, kut, mutluluk, Ay Toldı, Ögdülmiş, Odgurmuş

* Prof. Dr., Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, İlahiyat Fakültesi – Konya / Türkiye
hacili1965@hotmail.com

« »

Аннотация

« »

Ключевые Слова