

A Review of Nevit Ergin's Complete Translations of Rumi's Quatrains
By Ibrahim Gamard (8/17)

The *Dîvân-i Kabîr* ("Great Collected Poetic Works") of Mawlânâ Jalâluddîn Rûmî includes over 44,000 verses and consists of three kinds of poems: ghazals, tarji'bands, and ruba'is. A Turkish Mevlevi scholar, named Abdûlbâki Gölpinarlı, translated all of the *Dîvân* from Persian to Turkish; it was published in eight volumes (1957-74). A Turkish physician, named Nevit O. Ergin (1928-2015), who lived in the United States for most of his life, spent twenty-five years translating Gölpinarlı's entire work from Turkish to English. Ergin's translations of (most of) the ghazals and tarji'bands were published in twenty-two volumes between 1995 and 2003. However, until recently, only two small volumes of selections from his ruba'i translations (simplified for popular appeal) have been available: "Crazy As We Are" (1992), and (with Will Johnson) "The Rubais of Rumi: Insane with Love" (2007).

Now, all of Ergin's ruba'i translations have finally been published in one large book: "The Rubais of Rumi: Mevlânâ Rubâiler," Konya, Turkey: Saray Medya Yayınları (ISBN: 978-605-83608-0-8), 2016, 495 pages. Each ruba'i is presented, four to a page, with Persian text, English translation, Turkish version (by Merâl Ekmekçioğlu), and three kinds of citations (Gölpinarlı's Turkish translation page number, Badî'uzzamân Forûzânfar's Persian edition poem number, and Şefik Can's Turkish translation poem number. The ruba'is are ordered in the traditional alphabetical order of the final letters of the verses, but not strictly, as many of them have been paired according to similarity of the first words in English.

A selection of 100 ruba'is from this book (with commentary by Ergin based, not on mystical love, but mystical "annihilation" or "absence") have been published separately as, "Unknown Rumi: Selected Rubais of Mevlana Jalaluddin Rumi and Commentary by Nevit O. Ergin," Los Angeles: Powerhouse publishing, 2015.

There are numerous errors in regard to the corresponding Forûzânfar edition numbers. The author corrected as many numbers as he could in his revised "Old Quatrains Concordance" and "New Quatrains Concordance" (http://dar-al-masnavi.org/quatrains_concord.html).

The Persian text of the ruba'is is derived from a digitally produced facsimile of a fourteenth century manuscript of the entire *Dîvân* in the Konya Museum in Turkey. This was produced by Nevit Ergin, based on 35 mm. photographs of every page of the manuscript, which he had made years before. Imperfections in the manuscript (such as faded letters and ink spillage that obscures letters) were digitally corrected (<http://sfumevlana.org/2008/04/replicas-of-the-original-divan-i-kebir>). The calligrapher was Hasan ibni `Uthmân al-Mawlawî, who completed this work in 1368 CE. This same manuscript was used by Gölpinarlı for his translation of the *Dîvân*.

Although, oddly, the name of the calligrapher is not mentioned in Ergin's complete ruba'is book, the author of this article determined that it was Hasan ibni `Uthmân, after making comparisons with a compact disk containing the 35 mm. photographs of the *Dîvân* manuscript that was given to the author by Dr. Ergin in 2003. In the *Dîvân* manuscript, the ruba'is are written horizontally (two quatrains of four hemistiches each to a line); these have been digitally rearranged into conventional form (the first two hemistiches above the final two).

The Persian text, therefore, has archaic letterings, with the result that some words are not easily deciphered. For example, some letters lack identifying dots; in other cases, additional dots are added, as in words ending with the letter “dâl,” which are written like the letter “Zâl”; the letters “gâf” and “kâf” are written as “kâf.” An example of the confusion that may result is the case of Quatrain F-276, which begins: “ân k-û ze...” (“The one who, because of...”). Here, Gölpınarlı misread the letter “kâf” as “gâf” and the letter “zâ” as “râ,” resulting in the interpretation, “angûr-é” (“The grape of...”). So he translated: “The grape of the vine-stock of your desire has matured” [Heves çocuğunun üzümü bitmiş (or more correctly: olgunlaşmış)]. This was rendered by Ergin as: “If the grape of your desire has been ripened...” (p. 62d). The translation by another Turkish scholar, Şefik Can, is similar: “The grape of your desires, of your wishes, has matured” [Senin heveslerinin, isteklerinin üzümü bitmiş]. A more accurate translation: “The one who, because of the sapling of yearning for you, rises at midnight” (FG-1076, p. 335).

As for the Turkish text, oddly, all of Gölpınarlı’s translations from Persian have been revised and replaced by the versions of Ergin’s collaborator, Merâl Ekmekçioğlu. The result is that Gölpınarlı’s scholarly labors, upon which Ergin was totally dependent, are not acknowledged. On Ergin’s acknowledgment page, he wrote: “I would like to dedicate this book to Merâl Ekmekçioğlu. Without her support and encouragement, this work would have never been completed. I also thank her for her persistence and guidance over the many years it took to edit the Turkish translation, word for word.” However, in Ergin’s book of one hundred selected ruba’is, no mention is made that the Turkish texts are Ekmekçioğlucioğlu’s revisions and not Gölpınarlı’s translations. Why such thorough editing was thought to be necessary is not explained. Perhaps there was a copyright issue with Gölpınarlı’s work. Or perhaps Ergin wanted someone to modernize the Turkish wording and vocabulary in order to make the translations more accessible. Another oddity is that her renderings often contain translations from Ergin’s English translations back into Turkish. In the case of Ergin’s English first renderings of Gölpınarlı’s translations of the ghazals and tarji’bands, it is evident that these were as faithful as he could make them, and he dutifully included translations of all of the footnotes of the ghazals and tarji’bands. However, later in life, Ergin was emboldened to make alterations and to insert his own peculiar mystical views as well as his anti-religious biases into revisions of his translations—as for example, in his more recent book (with Will Johnson), “The Forbidden Rumi: The Suppressed poems of Rumi on Love, Heresy, and Intoxication” (2006). This is also the case with his translations of Mawlana Rumi’s ruba’is, which he sometimes distorts (see examples below). And, in a few cases, he created his own verses and added them to the ruba’is. Amazingly, his collaborator has usually (but not always) translated these distortions in English back into Turkish. The result is that, without being able to read Persian, and with limited understanding of its wealth of idioms, poetic images and metaphors, religious and mystical terms and references, and so on, Nevit Ergin’s interpretations of the ruba’is are predominant in both English and Turkish.

As for the English text, Ergin does not mention that he originally translated all the ruba’is from Gölpınarlı’s translation (and, more recently, a smaller number from Şefik Can’s translations); instead, he wrote: “Although my English translations are based on two Turkish books...” Ergin’s knowledge of English is defective, resulting in odd word choices, phrasing,

and a variety of errors. (For example: p. 373d = F 1507: “Your apostasies [sic, instead of “apostles”] are in the circle...”). Ergin rarely distinguishes the divine Beloved (God) from the human beloved (Shams-i Tabrîzî), regarding whom he insists on capitalizing pronouns. (For example: p. 49b = F 96: “Tonight is the night of joy and drink: don’t You sleep!”). Ergin does acknowledge that there are problems with a double translation (that is, translated from Persian to Turkish and then from Turkish into English): “...I have consulted many Persian scholars to overcome the shortcomings of translating Mevlana from another language other than Persian (Farsi).” However, for those who can read the Persian texts, such shortcomings are everywhere to be seen. In fact, many of the errors and distortions are the result of not having the full collaboration of a native Persian-speaking scholar.

The manuscript of the *Dîvân-i Kabîr* used by Gölpinarlı for his translation was completed in 1368 CE. A contemporary Iranian scholar, Tôfîq Sobhânî, has published a modernized edition of this manuscript, which contains 1,866 ruba’is. Gölpinarlı’s translation contains 1,764 ruba’is (not including the famous non-Rumi ruba’i, “Come, come, whoever you are...”/ “Gel, gel, kim olursan ol...”, which he added without justification). Now this number is short of the manuscript total. This gap can be explained in accordance with what Ergin mentioned in his preface: a review of a copy of the original manuscript led to the discovery that Gölpinarlı missed “a little over 100 rubais” (on both sides of page 58 of the manuscript). To make up for this deficit, Ergin used translations from Persian to Turkish made by another Turkish Mevlevi scholar, Şefîk Can (“Hz. Mevlânâ’nin Rubaileri,” 1990, with 2,217 ruba’is, with Persian text included), translated them into English, and then had these additional Turkish translations revised and edited by his collaborator. Ergin did not state exactly how many of these additional ruba’is there were. But if an estimate of 102 is made, the result is $1,764 + 102 = 1,866$ ruba’is.

Now, Ergin’s book has 1,868 entries (including 6 that are absent in Sobhânî’s and Forûzânfar’s editions). However, about 15 of the entries are the same quatrain translated (differently) twice, about 40 of the entries are duplicates, and 2 are triplicates; if 58 repeats are subtracted, the total number of unique ruba’is is 1,810. It is very odd that these duplications usually follow one another. (For example: p. 153d, 154a, 154b = F 852: “O water of life, whoever tastes Your Love’s wine...”). Now, 117 of the Forûzânfar-numbered ruba’is are not in the book, which is to be expected, since the Forûzânfar edition has 1983 ruba’is.

Below are examples of Ergin’s distorted translations. In citing these, there is no intent to imply that all of Ergin’s translations are poorly rendered; rather, many are adequately translated, as can be seen by comparing them to the original Persian. And, as with Ergin’s translations of the ghazals and tarjî’bands, a great deal can be learned from his translations of the ruba’is about Mevlana Rumi’s poetic imagery, devotion to the sufi master and to God, and numerous themes of mystical devotion.

(1) Ergin p. 217c [UR p. 3] (Gölpınarlı D 91-206 = F 768): “Know this very well: a lover cannot be a Muslim. In the religion of Love, there is no faith, no blasphemy.” Here, Ergin followed Gölpınarlı: “Know completely that the lover cannot be a Muslim; in the sect of love there is neither infidelity or faith” [İyice bil ki âşık, Müslüman olamaz; aşk mezhebinde küfürle iman yoktur; aşkta ne beden vardır, ne akıl...]. A more accurate translation: “Know truly about the mystic lover: he isn’t a [common] ‘Muslim’, for in the path of Love there isn’t ‘belief’ or ‘unbelief’.” (FG-1311, p. 406; footnote: “Lines one and two mean that the Muslim mystic lover isn’t a common believer since, for him, the presence of God’s Reality is so evident that concepts about belief or unbelief about God’s existence become irrelevant.”)

COMMENT: To translate, “cannot be” is too strong. The Persian text has “is not” [na-bow-ad]. For Rumi, his audience consisted entirely of Muslims, of which only a tiny minority were mystic lovers. Rumi’s use of the terms “religion of love,” or “creed of loverhood” is not intended to mean a religion or creed separate from Islam.

(2) Ergin p. 65 [UR p. 27] (Gölpınarlı T 28-3 = F-395): “There is a plain beyond Islam and heresy. Our Love stands in the middle of that plain. The sage will prostrate there because there is no room for either Moslem or unbeliever there.” This is similar to Gölpınarlı’s translation: “There is a plain beyond infidelity and being a Muslim; in the middle of that area, we have a passion. The knower who is there will (prostrate) his head in a row there, for there is no place there for unbelief or Muslim belief” [“Kâfirlikten de, Müslümanlıktan da dışarda bir ova var; o alanın ortasında bir sevdâmız var bizim... Ârif oraya vardı mı, başını yere kor; ne kâfirliğe yer vardır orada, ne Müslümanlığa yer”]. Here, Ekmekçiöğlü followed Ergin in the third line: “The knower prostrates there” [Ârif, orada secde eder]. A more accurate translation: “Beyond Islam and unbelief there is a ‘desert plain’. For us, there is a ‘yearning’ in the midst of that expanse. The knower (of God) who reaches that (plain) will prostrate (in prayer), (for) there is neither Islam nor unbelief, nor any ‘where’ (in) that place.” (FG-1314, p. 407)

COMMENT: Ergin’s translation went too far in depicting Love as “standing” in the middle between the opposites of Islam and heresy, both of which are rejected by the sage—who, it is implied, will choose Love and reject Islam and Muslims (along with heresy and infidels). The words “stands,” “because,” “Moslem,” and “unbeliever” are not in the Persian text. The better explanation is that the knower [‘ârif] (of God) rejects all mental concepts—whether religious or non-religious—but does not reject the practice of Islam, since he prostrates (Ekmekçiöğlü used the Islamic Arabic word for prostration: secde = sajda) in prayer where there is a yearning or a feeling of love [Sawdâyê] in the midst of that expanse (but not “because” there is no room...). Here, Ekmekçiöğlü rendered Ergin’s distorted English translation of the fourth line (“there is no room for either Moslem [Müslüman] or unbeliever [kâfir] there”) back into Turkish--altered from Gölpınarlı’s translation (“there is no place for unbelief [kâfirlik], no place for Muslim belief [Müslümanlık] there”—in other words, the mystic lover focuses on yearning and love for God, not on concepts about right or wrong beliefs.

(3) Ergin p. 124c (Gölpınarlı T 45-139 = F-225): “We are lovers of Love. But Muslims are different.”

Here, Ergin followed Gölpınarlı: “We are in love with Love; the Muslim is different” [Biz aşka âşıkız, Müslüman başkadır]. And Ekmekçioğlu followed Ergin: “We are lovers of Love; Muslims are different” [Biz aşkın aşıklarıyız. Müslümanlar başkadır]. A more accurate translation: “We are lovers of Love; but the [common] ‘Muslim’ is different. We are feeble ants, but Solomon is different.” (FG-1312, p. 406)

COMMENT: Here, the word “Muslim” is singular (Gölpınarlı: “Müslüman”); it means the common, ordinary, non-mystic lover of God. Ergin translated it as “Muslims,” and Ekmekçioğlu rendered this plural word back into Turkish (“Müslümanlar”). By translating it as, “Muslims are different,” Ergin created a false implication that Mawlana Rumi saw himself as different from “Muslims”. However, Muslims were his entire audience. A better interpretation is: “O Muslims, do not be an ordinary Muslim, but become different—a Muslim who is a mystic lover of Love.”

(4) Ergin p. 136c (Gölpınarlı T 47-161 = F-364): “He is such a Beloved that a rose and a thorn are the same for Him. In His religion, the Koran and the Bible are the same. Don’t try to impress Him. A lame donkey and a fleet of horses are the same for Him.” Here, Ergin departed from Gölpınarlı in the third line: “In his sect, the Book (of the Koran) and the (non-believer’s) belt are the same” [onun mezhebinde Mushaf’la zünnar aynı...] However, Ekmekçioğlu followed Gölpınarlı: “In his religion, the Koran and the (nonbeliever’s) belt are the same” [O’nun dininde Kur’an ve zünnar aynıdır]. A more accurate translation: “(There is) a comrade for whom a rose and a thorn are one; in his [religious] school of thought, the Book and a (non-Muslim’s) belt are one. Beware, don’t send anyone to him, (because) for him, a lame donkey and a swift horse are one.” (FG-36, p. 13; footnote: “This quatrain does not refer to a spiritual master, such as Shams-é Tabrîzî. Instead the verses express, beneath outward praise, Mawlânâ’s anger toward someone who perhaps devalued those who possessed true worth and over-valued those who did not.”) COMMENT: The word “Bible” (called “İnjîl,” Evanjil, in the Qur’ân), is not in the Persian text. The Book [mus-haf] is not paired with the Bible, but with the religious belt [zunnâr] worn by Christian monks and priests (a cincture). This quatrain is not praise of someone with mystical awareness who transcends the dichotomies of the ordinary mind; instead, it is criticism of someone who lacks discrimination, and who is ignorant about his religious school of thought [maz-hab]. Ergin distorted the meaning of the poem by capitalizing pronouns, which gives a (non-Islamic) implication of a Divine human being.

(5) Ergin p. 416a (Gölpınarlı Y 199-13 = F-1743): “You make me drunk in the place of worship. You let me stay at the Kaaba, but make me pray to idols.” Here Ekmekçioğlu rendered: “You make me drunk in the place of worship. You make me worship an idol at the Ka’ba [Sen ibadet yerinde beni sarhoş edersin. Kâbede puta tapırırsın beni]. A more accurate translation: “You are the one who keeps me drunk in my hermit cell. You keep me an idol-worshipper (even when I’m) sitting inside the Ka’ba.” (FG-1575, p. 475; footnotes: “‘You are keeping me an idol worshipper [bot-parast-am]’: This may mean, ‘I still think of you, O my ‘idol,’ Shams-é Tabrîzî, because you keep me in a state of spiritual love toward you.’”; “Inside the Ka’ba: This means, ‘even sitting inside the house of worship at Mecca that was purified of idols by the Prophet Muhammad, I would still remember my love for you, O master.’”

COMMENT: In classical Persian poetry, the beloved is often compared to an “idol” who is loved by a mystic lover who is compared to an “idol-worshipper.” For example “Remember the time when I was like a (beautiful) idol (to you), (while) you were like an idolator.” (*Masnavi* 1: 2407)

(6) Ergin p. 207c [UR p. 193] (Gölpınarlı D 111-378 = F-716): “When Your Love makes me crazy, I will do things that even the devil will not do.” Here, Gölpınarlı translated: “The day your love makes me crazy, I will do such madnesses that even the demons (or) fairies cannot do those madnesses” [Aşkın beni deli divâne ettiği gün, öylesine delilikler edeceğim ki devler, periler bile o delilikleri edemez]. Here, Ekmekçioğlu repeated Gölpınarlı’s translation, except that she replaces the word “demons” [devler] with “satans” [şeytanlar]. A more accurate translation: “Any day that love for you causes me (to be) crazy, I act (with) a craziness that (even) a demon cannot cause.” (FG-1589, p. 493)

COMMENT: The Persian word for “crazy” [“dîvâne,” having the qualities of a devil, or ‘dîv’] has the same meaning as the Arabic word “majnûn,” possessed by a jinn, or genie. This is based on the idea that craziness is caused by being possessed by an evil spirit. Gölpınarlı also uses the Persian words “dev” (= “dîv”) and “peri” (= “fairy”), which are used to mean “jinn” in Persian literature. Ergin completely misunderstands the meaning of the verse.

(7) Ergin p. 146 [UR p. 113] (Gölpınarlı D 80-110 = F-503--not 533): “When someone who came from mud suddenly finds a beloved who also came from mud, he calms down and becomes happy. But the best is the one who comes from mud, finds the Divine Beloved and attains His Love.” Here, Ergin departed from Gölpınarlı: “The one given companionship with a beloved made from plain clay will meet her and find relief for (only) one day. The wonder is the person who has gone beyond clay; for such a person has a matchless close friend like you, who is a kingly person” [Balçıktan düzülüp koşulmuş bir sevgilisi olan, bir gün ona kavuşur bir karâra erer. Şaşılacak kişi, o kişidir ki balçıktan çıkmıştır; o kişiye, senin gibi eşsiz dostsuz kişinin bir de padişahlığı vardı]. However, Ekmekçioğlu followed Ergin in the second half: “However, the one who comes from the field of clay and finds a Beloved, Divine like you and gains love, that person is the happiest” [Ancak, balçıktan meydana gelen Senin gibi ilâhi bir Sevgiliye bulur ve aşkı elde ederse, o kişi en mutlu olandır]. A more accurate translation: “The one who has a beloved of water and clay has rest for (but) a day in union with (that beloved). Rare is the one who has gone beyond water and clay, for he has an extraordinary king like you.” (FG-585, p. 181)

COMMENT: The meaning of this quatrain is simple: The one who has a beloved made from matter has only brief rest and union, but the mystic who has gone beyond matter is rare and has an uncommon spiritual king like you (Shams). Gölpınarlı’s translation was close to the Persian text. In contrast, Ergin made up his own words (“becomes happy,” “finds the Divine Beloved,” “and attains His Love.”). Ekmekçioğlu did not follow Gölpınarlı and translated Ergin’s very different interpretation back into Turkish.

(8) Ergin p. 258d (Gölpınarlı Z 123-7 = F-946): “O Creator of the wailing and crying harps in human shape. Our souls became Your singers in every language, in every temple.” Gölpınarlı: “O

You who have made a harp in the shape of a human, all souls turned into Your singers from begging You” [Ey insan şeklinde bir çeng dizen; canların hepsi de sana yalvararak şarkıcın kesilmiş]. Ekmekçioğlu followed Ergin: “Our souls are your singers in every language and temple” [Ey insan şekline bürünerek feryat eden ve ağlayan çenglerin oldular Yaratanı. Bizim ruhlarımız, her lisanda ve her tapınakta Senin şarkıcın oldular]. A more accurate translation: “O (you who) have tuned the human form (like) a harp, all souls (are) your minstrels because of need.” (FG-402, p. 116)

COMMENT: Here, Ekmekçioğlu did not follow Gölpınarlı’s translation (based on his ability to read the original Persian), but followed Ergin’s willfully distorted interpretation.

(9) Ergin p. 402a (Gölpınarlı H 186-49 = F-1659): “O lover, the one who annihilates himself. You become someone in Absence. O aged ascetic, you have also turned into an idol worshipper. Don’t mind, O lover, if you have a hard time, as long as you drink plenty from the glass of Love.” Gölpınarlı: “O you whose pleasure has gone (vanished), but you (yourself) are filled with existence have been going (about) tasting (pleasure) for nothing, you are filled with existence and have become a little being... a common idol-worshipping man... a drunkard” [Ey zevki yok olup giden, varlığa bürünmüşsün, bir varcağız olmuşsun; a kocalmış zâhit, puta tapar bir adamcağız kesilmişsin. Elceğizin daraldıysa gam değil; çünkü kafatası testisinden yaygın bir sarhoşcağız olmuşsun-gitmiş. Ekmekçioğlu: “O you who have become nothing after having been existent, you have become something small in absence... a bit drunk from the glass of Love” [Ey varlıktan geçmiş yok olmuş kişi. Yoklukta biraz var olmuşsun... Değil mi ki aşk kadehinden bol bol içerek biraz sarhos olmuşsun]. A more accurate translation: “O one who has been enjoying pleasure for nothing: you have become a little being. And, O elderly ascetic, you have become a little idol-worshiper. There is no (cause for) worry, although you have become a little poor one, (since), with an open-topped (wine) jar, you have become a little drunkard.” (FG-61, p. 21; footnote: “A little being: Here the pejorative and reproachful diminutive is used (in all lines), that belittles someone who has pretensions of being a sufi, after having had a few spiritual experiences in sufi gatherings a little idol-worshipper [bot-parast-ak]: Ascetics are often criticized in Islamic sufi poetry as being proud of their austerities. Here, the hidden idolatry of ‘self-worship’ is alluded to.”)

COMMENT: Gölpınarlı understood and used the Persian diminutive suffix [-ak] according to the Turkish manner: “a little being” [bir var-cak], “a little idol-worshipping man,” [puta tapar bir adam-cak], “a little drunkard” [sarhoş-cuk]. Ergin did not understand that this quatrain criticizes a pretentious person in all four lines, so he thought it was addressed to an advanced mystic, “one who annihilates himself.” The words “lover” and “glass of Love” are not in the original Persian or in Gölpınarlı’s translation into Turkish, and have been added by Ergin. Ekmekçioğlu followed Ergin here and adds the words, “from the glass of Love” [aşk kadehinden].

(10) Ergin p. 356b (Gölpınarlı N 169-14 = F-1427): “O Beloved, a glass of Your troubles became oceans for the universe.” Gölpınarlı: “O my soul: a glass of your suffering is like an ocean of the world (to me” [Canım benim, derdinin bir kadehi, dünya denizidir sanki]

Canım benim, derdinin bir kadehi, dünya denizidir sanki]. A more accurate translation: “A cup of Your (wine) dregs (is) an ocean of the world.” (FG-1578, p. 490)

COMMENT: Gölpınarlı mistranslated, using the words, “your suffering” [derdinin = dard-e tû]; this is a misreading of “your dregs” [dord-e tû]. Ergin followed with “Your troubles,” and Ekmekçioğlu used the same words as Gölpınarlı [derdinin]. Ergin’s unintelligible phrase, “oceans for the universe” was a misreading for “an ocean of the world” [daryâ-ye jahân].

(11) Ergin p. 344a (Gölpınarlı M 151-105 = F-1308): “We freed our soul from the body and from the Essence. We have saved our Love from the dirty earth and the gloomy sky.” Gölpınarlı: “We have withdrawn our heart from the body; we have also removed (it) from matter; we are like a very turbid oil; we have gotten our love freed from (attachment to) the sky.” [Gönlümüzü cisimden de çektik, çıkardık, cevherden de; bus-bulanık yağız; felekten bile sevgimizi aldık]. Ekmekçioğlu: “We have withdrawn our heart from the body; we have also removed and extracted it from the essence” [Canımızı, bedenden de özden de çektik, çıkardık]. A more accurate translation: “We are (the ones) who have uprooted the heart from body and matter. We have uprooted attachment (both) to the heavens and (to this) dust-covered sphere” (FG-1342, p. 416; footnote: “Matter [jawhar]: lit., ‘jewel’. It also means ‘matter’, ‘substance’, ‘nature’; in other contexts it also means ‘essence’.”)

COMMENT: Ergin’s unintelligible phrase, “freed... from the body and from the essence” was a misreading of “body and matter” [jism-o jawhar]. Unfortunately, Ekmekçioğlu translated this error from English back to Turkish.

(12) Ergin p. 256c (Gölpınarlı R 176-73 = F-892): “Put your mind in your head, O heart; the Beloved is here.” Gölpınarlı: [Aklını başına al]. Ekmekçioğlu: [Aklını başına devşir, ey gönül; Sevgili burada] A more accurate translation: “Be attentive, O heart, for the Beloved pays attention.” (FG-1204, p. 373)

COMMENT: The unintelligible phrase, “put your mind in your head” was a literal translation of a Turkish idiom [aklını başını al/devşir=] that means, to come to one’s senses and be sober and alert.

(13) Ergin p. 213a (Gölpınarlı D 89-195 = F-461: I am glad that Your sorrow fits in my heart, because it can rest only in bright places.” Gölpınarlı: “I am joyous because Your sorrow fits into my heart; I am joyous because Your sorrow fits only in illuminated places” [Neş'eliyim, çünkü gamın, gönlüme sığıyor; neş'eliyim, çünkü gamın, ancak aydın yerlere sığar]. A more accurate translation: “I am happy that longing for You is held in my heart, because (such) longing for You may be contained (only) in an illumined place.” (FG-1605, p. 498)

COMMENT: Ergin did not know that in classical Persian devotional poetry the words “gham” (sorrow, grief, sadness, trouble) and “dard” (pain, ache, grief) are often idioms for “longing” and “yearning”--which can be experienced by the lover as pleasurable and sweet. Therefore, in this verse, “gham-e tû” (lit., “sorrow of yours”) means “longing for You (God).”

Abbreviations:

Gölpınarlı - Gölpınarlı

Ekmekçiöğlü - Ekmekçiöğlucioglu

UR - "Unknown Rumi: Selected Rubais"

FG - Farhadi-Gamard numbers, from "The Quatrains of Rumi," 2008

Duplicates: F-30, 47, 72, 97, 275, 282, 365, 411, 419, 474, 500, 537, 573, 769, 772, 783, 785, 799, 1005, 1085, 1166, 1288, 1330, 1754, 1804, 1848, 1855, 1861, 1945, 1946, 1947, 1948, 1954, 1955, 1959, 1961, 1963, 1977, 1980

Single Cases:

One case half of one ruba'i and half of another: F-1736/1730

One case of 8-versed poem: F-1450

Two different translations (of the same ruba'i): F-169, 435, 480, 585, 592, 622, 1428, 1536, 1766, 1813, 1898, 1914

Triplicates: F-407, 852

Absent (total = 170: quatrains in Forûzânfar, not in Sobhani): F-29, 174, 218, 242, 333, 453, 465, 483, 484, 591, 604, 623, 707, 727, 773, 813, 845, 873, 875, 876, 878, 879, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 895, 897, 899, 905, 906, 908, 909, 911, 913, 919, 920, 921, 923, 924, 928, 929, 930, 931, 933, 934, 942, 943, 953, 961, 962, 964, 965, 967, 969, 970, 973, 974, 975, 976, 979, 983, 986, 1007, 1008, 1009, 1013, 1023, 1029, 1030, 1036, 1038, 1041, 1102, 1134, 1139, 1174, 1179, 1184, 1200, 1205, 1221, 1238, 1239, 1246, 1259, 1270, 1282, 1297, 1302, 1304, 1307, 1313, 1317, 1325, 1331, 1338, 1346, 1349, 1350, 1351, 1356, 1359, 1370, 1371, 1377, 1386, 1387, 1388, 1400, 1401, 1403, 1405, 1407, 1411, 1414, 1424, 1429, 1432, 1434, 1436, 1439, 1440, 1443, 1446, 1448, 1455, 1456, 1457, 1463, 1471, 1472, 1475, 1476, 1479, 1480, 1481, 1482, 1488, 1489, 1490, 1492, 1495, 1502, 1510, 1521, 1538, 1672, 1683, 1701, 1719, 1760, 1777, 1780, 1820, 1836, 1839, 1860, 1880, 1902, 1924, 1938, 1950, 1974

Acknowledgements: I wish to thank Fırat Özdemir and Hülya Küçük for their kind assistance in making corrections to Turkish spellings and translations.