

The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies



International Journal of Social Science
Volume 6 Issue 4, p. 729-741, April 2013

THE TENSION BETWEEN ORTHODOX "HIGH ISLAM" AND HETERODOX "FOLK ISLAM"

*ORTODOKS "YÜKSEK İSLAM" İLE HETERODOKS "HALK İSLAMI"
ARASINDAKİ GERİLİM*

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zeki UYANIK

*Ardahan Üniversitesi, İİBF, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü, Siyaset ve Sosyal
Bilimler Anabilim Dalı*

Abstract

This article aims to study on the relationship among three conceptual pairs, namely high Islam-folk Islam, orthodoxy-heterodoxy and social structure-communitas. These pairs of concepts have binary opposition in their inner relations (such as heterodoxy versus orthodoxy). It is argued here that heterodoxy, folk Islam and communitas can be evaluated together because of the existence of parallelism among them. Similarly, orthodoxy, high Islam and social structure can be grouped together, due to the existence of similarities among them. These concepts will be discussed on the context of Turkish social history and different interpretation of Islam observed among the Turks. What we mean by high Islam is an interpretation of Islam which emanates from *medreses/ulamas*, originates from *Qur'an* and *hadith* and orthodox in nature. In addition, it served as official ideology of many state in Islamic civilization. Other features of high Islam are: having systematized and institutionalized set of rules, stressing monotheistic side of Islam, based on written culture, having close relations with political authority and its urbanite nature. On the other hand, folk Islam refers to a heterodox interpretation and prevails in rural. It is also based on verbal culture and saint cult. Folk Islam distance itself from political authority and there is limited discrimination between sexes in it. This article, arguing that there is a kind of tension between orthodox high Islam and heterodox folk Islam, offer

application of Turner's concepts of *communitas* and social structure to these relations.

Key Words: High Islam, Folk Islam, Orthodoxy, Heterodoxy, *Communitas*, Social Structure

Öz

Bu çalışma, yüksek İslam-halk İslamı, ortodoksi-heterodoksi ve sosyal yapı-komünite olmak üzere üç kavramsal çiftin arasındaki ilişkiyi tartışmayı hedeflemektedir. Bu kavramsal çiftlerin her biri kendi içlerinde gerilim veya karşıtlık taşıyan kutuplardan oluşuyor (ortodoksiye karşı heterodoksi gibi). Bizim buradaki amacımız heterodoksi, komünite ve halk İslamı'nı aralarındaki paralellikler ve yakın ilişkiler çerçevesinde bir arada ele alıp, bu kavramsal kümenin karşısına ortodoksi, sosyal yapı ve yüksek İslam kavramlarını (aralarındaki paralellikleri de göz önüne alarak) yerleştirip kıyaslamalar yapmaktır. Sözünü ettiğimiz kavramları Türk toplumsal tarihi ve Türklerin arasında görülen farklı İslamiyet yorumları bağlamında ele almaya gayret ediyoruz. Yüksek İslam derken kastedilen merkezinde medrese ve ulemanın olduğu, kaynağını Kur'an ve hadisten alan, İslam medeniyeti tarihinde tarihteki birçok devlete resmi ideoloji de olmuş ortodoks bir İslam yorumundan bahsediyoruz. Şehirli olması, sistematik kurallara bağlı olması, İslam'ın monoteist (tektanrı) yanlarını vurgulaması, yazılı kültüre dayanması, kurumsallaşmış olması ve siyasal otorite ile yakın ilişkide olması ortodoks yüksek İslam'ın en önemli özellikleri olarak vurgulanmaktadır. Öte yandan halk İslamı, genelde kırsalda yaygınlık gösteren, heterodoks öğeler barındıran, sözlü kültüre dayalı, çoğulculuğu öne çıkaran, ibadetlerde cinsiyet ayrımı yapmayan, siyasal otoriteye mesafeli ve evliya kültürüne önem veren niteliklere sahiptir. Bu iki anlayış arasındaki gerilimli bir ilişki olduğunu savunan bu çalışma, Turner'ın yapı ve komünite kavramsallaştırmasını bu ikili gerilime uygulamayı önermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yüksek İslam, Halk İslamı, Ortodoksi, Heterodoksi, Komünite, Sosyal Yapı

Introduction

Can Islam take different forms? If your answer for this question is "No" you will also probably deny the cultural diversity in Islam and universality of Islam. Instead of a single congruent form that is valid for all different times and societies, today we observe various appearances of Islam all over the world. In fact, when we look at closely we see that there are agreements among the Muslims on some basic principles of Islam concerning to realm of belief, like shadah (declaration of that there is no divinity but God, and Muhammad is the messenger of God), holiness of Qur'an (as words of the God sent to the Prophet Muhammad by the angel Gabriel). This agreement can be extended also to the domain of some religious practices such as hajj (pilgrimage) and adha (sacrifice). In

spite of the existence of many concurrence points among the Muslims concerning to domains both belief and worshipping, it is possible to observe variations and divergences related with implementation or practice of religion in different societies.

At this point, making a distinction between the concepts of "Islam/Islamic" and "Islamicate" may be helpful to understand to answer the question above. In Hodgsonian terminology while the former terms referring a religion (an idealized principles of faith), the latter term refers to "social and cultural complex, historically associated with Islam and the Muslims" (Hodgson, 1961:57-60). In that sense although the uniqueness and oneness of Islam can be asserted, we will witness the diversity among Muslims. Qur'an was sent in Arabic and at the beginning Islam emerged in Arab society but in the following centuries Islam was accepted in different parts of the world by many non-Arabic societies and these societies merged their pre-Islamic traditions with Islam. For this reason, Muslims show different peculiarities in African, Indian and Turkish societies.

In this article, we dwell upon the issues mentioned above and argue that despite the fact that Islam brings a number of universal principles, these principles are localized in different geographies. In this article, with the help of some pairs of concepts like "high Islam"- "folk Islam," "heterodox Islam"- "orthodox Islam," it is aimed to show that different appearances and interpretations of Islam are possible. In this context, different versions of Islam in Turkish society from a historical and sociological point of view are to be referred. Diversities of other Muslim societies will not be covered here. First of all, different appearances of Islam will be examined with respect to social and political organization of Turkish society. Then, Victor Turners' conceptualization of "social structure" and "communitas" will be employed in order to understand traditions of "orthodox "high Islam" and "heterodox folk Islam" in Turkish society. This article aims also to construct some parallelism between "communitas" and "heterodox folk Islamic" movements on the one hand; and "social structure" and "orthodox "high Islam" on the other hand by pointing out some overlapping parts of these two pairs of concepts.

High Islam and Folk Islam:

Beginning from the Prophet Muhammad's own period Islam became not only a set of principles of faith, but also the main reference point in determining the rules of political arena. Due to specific environmental factors (such as political and socio-economic conditions of Arab Peninsula, lack of a settled former empire tradition in Arab Peninsula) Islam had to form its own political institutions (Hodgson, 1961). During the first century of Islam, *ulama* developed a political theory of Islam by putting the *Caliphate* in the center (Watt, 1968). Their main references were *Qur'an* and *hadith*. *Ulama*, assuming that the *Qur'anic* principles and application of the Prophet should be binding factor both in religious and worldly affairs, made the main contribution in the

production of the “high Islam”. *Ulamas*, coming from both *Sunni* and *Shi'i* Muslims, programmed a *shari'ah* vision for private and public life and dominated Muslim public worship. They affected the area of public order and political authority and controlled the development of Muslim law (Hodgson, 1961:238-239). Many scholars studying on Islamic civilization take up this (*ulama*-centered) “high Islam” in an opposition to “folk Islam” which is explained below.¹ Until the end of the Ottoman period, “high Islam” (which is produced by the *medreses*) became a kind of official ideology of the many states in Islamicate civilization. Some of the scholars examine “high Islam” also under the titles of *Shar'iah* Islam / *Kitabi* (written) Islam or formal (*resmi*) Islam. In spite of the fact that there are some differences between these concepts, the common features of them can be stated as follow: being in tension with “folk Islam” (Akpınar, 1999: 85), having some kind of elite characteristics and being/ belonging to urban. In this article, the concept of “high Islam” will be preferred instead of three other conceptualization and the differences will be stated if it is vital.

It is a common argument in the discussions of sociology of religion that theoretical structure and belief systems of a religion may be mutated by cultural and social traditions of societies. In the case of Islam, what we mean by “folk Islam” is that formation of a new interpretation of the religion which preserves the basic principles of Islam, as well as containing some superstition and pre-Islamic elements. Contrary to urban characteristics of “high Islam,” “folk Islam” prevailed in the rural and mountainous areas, for example North African and rural of regions of Asia (Ocak, 2002: 55-60). Many Muslims living in rural areas arrange their life according to verbal Islamic traditions not according to the written (*kitabi*) traditions of “high Islam.” Rather than a monolithic understanding, plurality is the dominant character in this interpretation of Islam which is sometimes named as *tarikah* Islam (*tarikah İslami*) (Çamuroğlu, 2000: 72).

Some scholars argue that folk versions of the religions, including “folk Islam,” contain more or less heterodox characteristics (Akpınar, 1999: 80). Weber also argues that universal world religions have always highly intellectual demands which is not completely responded and perceived by the masses and for this reason these religions have the capacity to produce various versions of themselves. He also argues that these

¹ As one of those scholars Gellner (1992: 11) makes a distinction between high Islam and folk Islam. For him folk Islam “stresses magic more than learning, ecstasy more than rule-observance... its [folk Islam] most characteristic institution is the saint cult, where the saint is more often than not a living rather than a dead personage (and where sanctity is transmitted from father to son)... Saint cults are prominent in the tribal or semi-tribal countryside, and provide invaluable services in the semi anarchic rural conditions.” High Islam on the other hand, for Gellner, “is carried by urban scholars, recruited largely from the trading bourgeoisie (which often combines scholarship with trade), and reflects the natural tastes and values of urban middle classes” (1992:11). According to Gellner, high Islamic values “include order, rule-observance, sobriety, learning... This High Islam stresses the severely monotheistic and nomocratic nature of Islam.” He argues that in the modern times, “There has been an enormous shift in the balance *from* Folk Islam *to* High Islam. The social bases of Folk Islam have been in large part eroded, whilst those of High Islam were greatly strengthened. Urbanization, political centralization, incorporation in a wider market, labor migration, have all impelled populations in the direction of the formally (theologically) more ‘correct’ Islam [orthodox high Islam]” (Ibid: 15). Arguing that “rural Muslims may be ‘bad’ Muslims by the standards of urban scholarship,” Gellner also points out a kind of tension between folk Islam and high Islam.

universal religions did not later insist on their highly intellectual demands, which were presented at the beginning (Weber, 1998:160). Masses show resistance in giving up their traditional way of life and beliefs that is also another source of heterodoxy, which would be dealt with in detail below. For a great majority of folk population, it is also difficult to reach an abstract conceptualization of God and for this reason they need some mediator instruments in their religious lives like idols and pictures of Jesus or Hz. Ali; sacred places, animals and objects; saint/ *sheyhs /dedes* traditions (Gölpınarlı, 1969: 105). This point brings into mind David Hume's famous theory of oscillation which explains the "flux and re-fluxes" between polytheism and monotheism. He argues that (1889: 48):

It is remarkable that the principles of religion have a kind of flux and reflux in the human mind, and that men have a natural tendency to rise from idolatry to theism, and to sink again from theism into idolatry... The feeble apprehensions of men cannot be satisfied with conceiving their deity as a pure spirit and perfect intelligence; and yet their natural terrors keep them from imputing to him the least shadow of limitation and imperfection. They fluctuate between these opposite sentiments. The same infirmity still drags them downwards, from an omnipotent and spiritual deity, to a limited and corporeal one, and from a corporeal and limited deity to a statue or visible representation. The same endeavor at elevation still pushes them upwards, from the statue or material image to the invisible power; and from the invisible power to an infinitely perfect deity, the creator and sovereign of the universe.

At this point, we can focus on Turkish case concerning Islam and try to point out basic differences and contrasting points between "folk Islam" and "high Islam" in Turkish ground. After indicating the tension between heterodoxy and orthodoxy, we will relate heterodoxy with "folk Islam" and orthodoxy with "high Islam." Before doing that, following Yavuz, we will argue that "Turkish Islam" is an example of the "localization" or "vernacularization" of universal teachings of Islam through the works of the Sufi orders (Yavuz, 2004: 218). Yavuz identifies two intellectual roots of Turkish Islam, namely Ahmet Yesevi² as the main intellectual source of heterodox Islam and Mansur Maturidi as the source of orthodox Islam (Ibid: 218). Before converting to

² Yavuz, M.Hakan "Is There a Turkish Islam? The Emergence of Convergence and Consensus," *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, Vol. 24, No. 2, October 2004: "Ahmet Yesevi the founder of the Yeseviyye order, became very influential among Kazakh and Kirghiz tribes by reinterpreting Islam to accommodate nomadic lifestyles. He did not seek to negate old customs and traditions but rather used them to disseminate Islamic teaching. His teachings were collected by his followers in a book, known as the *Divan-i Hikmet*, one of the first literary Turkish works on Islam. This work heavily influenced the Anatolian Sufi poet Yunus Emre. Even though Yesevi knew Arabic and Persian, he wrote his work in the vernacular Turkic dialect to communicate with the people of the region. Many Central Asian Turks regard the teachings of Ahmet Yesevi as a part of their shared Turkic tradition. Yeseviyye became the intellectual origin of Kubreviyye, Nakşibendiyye and Bektasiyye in Anatolia. Thus, Yesevi's vernacularized understanding of Islam has been the dominant manifestation of Islam in the Turkic world."

Islam, the Turks were mainly pastoral nomads practicing Shamanism as their dominant faith. When the Turks converted to Islam, their religious leaders (shamans) in Shamanism became Sufi dervishes, known as “*baba*” and “*ata*” (Ocak, 2002: 28). The Turks interpreted Islam under the effects of their previous traditions and as a result new kind of syncretism emerged. When the Turkish nomads migrated to Anatolia, they served Islamization and transformation of Anatolia by means of *ghazi* organizations. Some of these *ghazis* became sedentary and eventually internalized a more orthodox version of Islam. On the other hand, an important section of the nomads maintained their nomadic way of life, and retained some aspects of their previous religious tradition (Shamanism). Eventually these nomadic Turks incorporated different beliefs under the framework of Islam, which corresponds today, Alevi interpretation of Turkish Islam (Yavuz, 2004: 219).

Now we turn to main differences and contrasting points between heterodox “folk Islam” and orthodox “high Islam” in Turkish ground. The first difference is that “high Islam” stresses the importance of external (*zahiri*) meaning of *Qur’an* and sometimes manipulates it in accordance with the needs of political authority. On the other hand “folk Islamic” groups argues that there is also an inner (*batini*) side of the *Qur’anic* verses. For the heterodox “folk Islam” *Qur’an* can be interpreted freely independent of its wording (*lafz*). They reject the “high Islam’s” dependence of static interpretation of *Qur’an*. For example, they argue that the praying (*namaz*) is not compulsory for all believers. For them, the aim and real meaning of praying (*namaz*) is getting closer to God and this aim can be accomplished by means of other ways not only by proper figures (Gölpınarlı, 1969:105).

The second can be seen in how these two trends take position against the concepts of fear of God (*Allah korkusu*) and love of God (*Allah sevgisi*). Although there have been restricted number of figure in orthodox “high Islam” mentioning about love of God (*aşk-ı ilahi*), the stressed and emphasized concept has always been “*Allah korkusu*” in this tradition. In addition, some other parallel concepts (in harmony with fear of God) like; the last judgment day (*mahşer günü*), hell (*cehennem*), devil (*şeytan*) were also emphasized. On the other hand, for the heterodox “folk Islam” love of God (*aşk-ı ilahi*) has been the superior and vital concept in order to reach to the God. Heterodox Islam refrains from freighting people by means of threatening verses of *Qur’an*. Instead, they try to show mercifulness of the God (Çamuroğlu, 2000: 87). In some cases members of “high Islam” uses punishing sides of *Qur’an* in order to legitimize their political authority. This understanding can be clearly seen in the words of Nizamül Mülk, a governor of Saljuqis, (2011:73): “The person, who does not have fear of God, also has no fear of me.” On the contrary, heterodox literature is full of sayings which despise the fear of God.

Another difference can be seen in the relationships with the state. In the Saljuqi period, “high Islam” in Anatolia could be identified with Sunni Islam and that is the case for an important portion of the Ottoman history. During the periods of the two mentioned states “high Islam” was an organic part of the state hierarchical system. In

most cases orthodox "high İslam" had common interest with the state. When we look at heterodox "folk İslam"-state relations we can principally state that generally there has not been an organic relations between heterodox Islamic groups and the state. During both Saljuqi and Ottoman period it can be argued that generally, heterodox "folk İslam" stayed at the periphery and showed resistance to the central authority (Akyol, 1999: 12-50). Bektashis of the Ottoman period is an exceptional case of heterodox groups in terms of their relationship with the state. Because, having organic relations with the Ottoman army this order had important effects on central government. *Babai* rebellion (took place in the 13th century against the Saljuqis) can be taken as an example of numerous confrontations of the central state and heterodox Islamic groups.

The fourth difference is related with the variation of settlement or life fields of residence. As we noted above orthodox İslam settled in urban areas and heterodox İslam, on the other hand, showing a pastoral character resided in the rural (Ülgener, 1981:64). Bektashis were again an exception in terms of this criterion among the heterodox groups. The other factor that distinguishes heterodox "folk İslam" from the orthodox "high İslam" is their positions against the property owning that is a reflection of the tension between the material world (*maddi nimetler*) and the spiritual values (*manevi değerler*). Heterodox *derwishes* assuming the general principles of "*Bir lokma bir hurka*" refrained the material world and property owning. The important point should be stated here is that this was not an absolute denial of the material world but having the ability of giving up the staff of life. In contrast to heterodox *derwishes*, members of orthodox "high İslam" did not deny/refrain the material world. *Ulamas* were among the wealthy segment of their societies (Zelyut, 1986: 16).

The other distinguishing peculiarity of heterodox folk İslam lies in the place of women in social life. Comparing to the orthodox İslam, in heterodox İslam women had more freedom both in social and religious life. Separation of men and women is a basic rule especially religious ceremonies as well as social life in orthodox İslam. On the other hand, the women had the chance to participate in religious ceremonies and taken more visible role in social life in the heterodox İslam. For example, in the Alevi-Bektashi communities men and women together participate to *ayini cem* (main religious rituals of these groups) and practice *semah* (ritual dance performed during *ayini cem*) together. Separation of men and women is an exceptional case in heterodox İslam.

After stating the major difference between orthodox "high İslam" and heterodox "folk İslam" we can discuss the concepts of orthodoxy and heterodoxy and the life of the heterodox *derwishes*. "Heterodoxie" has Greek origin and is opposite of "orthodoxie." A religion has a set of defined rules and regulations, which are binding for all the believers of it, disseminated through its main sources (these sources are *Qur'an* and the application of the Prophet in the case of İslam). That set of rules

imposes itself to the members of the religion. Heterodoxy challenges some of these principles and seeks to substitute new ones in their place; reinterpret them by opposing the dominant religious elite. Heterodoxy is a belief system, which publicly challenges and questions the basic assumptions, dogmas and authority of the mother-religion (Visuvanlingam, 2003). Contrary to the hierarchical, oppressive, stagnant, and structural features of the orthodoxy, heterodoxy can be described by its liberalistic (un-hierarchical), anti-oppressive, open, egalitarian and active characteristics.

It can be easily observed through the debates over the issue of orthodoxy-heterodoxy that these two concepts are generally defined in close connection with each other; but mostly this connection is characterized by contrariety or incongruity. The other major component of this discussion is that the contents of orthodoxy and heterodoxy were defined by referring to religion and authority. For example, McDonough, locating the two terms in opposite positions, argues that orthodoxy refers to “correct or sound belief according to an authoritative norm,” (on the other hand) heterodoxy refers to “belief in a doctrine differing from the norm” (2005:6909). Eisenstadt and Burnoff are among the scholars who discuss the issue on the basis of religion and authority. For Burnoff orthodoxy is “[a] collection of ideas, rites and symbols ruled by a more or less complete sacerdotal organization...” (1888:200). Similarly, Eisenstadt asserts that an orthodox religion can be defined “...as one which contains some form of organized church attempting to monopolize the religious (and, at times, political) sphere, and which emphasize the structuring of clear cognitive and symbolic boundaries of doctrine” (1984:6). It can easily be inferred from the quotations above that orthodoxy, in contrast to heterodoxy, contains authoritative tones implying the exclusion of any other idea that is incongruous with its principles. As for the relationship between the state and orthodoxy, it is argued that the alliance between them strengthen the theories of orthodoxy (Burnoff, 1888:225).

How can we relate the conceptual pairs of heterodox-orthodox and folk Islam-high Islam? We cannot identify heterodox Islam with folk Islam. That is to say whole segments or domain of the folk Islam cannot be deemed as completely heterodox or Alevi. There are also Sunni elements (groups) containing features of folk Islam, which could be named as orthodox folk Islam. In addition, there are transitive relations between heterodox and orthodox groups for example Sunni Islam has heterodox figures like *Mevlana*, *Melamiye* (Aktay, 1999: 33-56). But we focused on the heterodox folk Islam since the tension was between that kind of Islam and the orthodox high Islam.

As we stated above, concerning the spread of Islam among the Turkish population of the Central Asia (from the 9th century through 12th century) it is argued that at the beginning an important number of the Turkish population accepted Islam via mystical (*tasavvufi*) channels (Köprülü, 2003). If this was the case it must be because of the fact that pre-Islamic traditions of Turks was in harmony with the mystical version of Islam. For M. Fuat Köprülü, one the most prominent and prestigious scholars of Turkish history, argues that the heterodox version of Islam was affective on

first Turkish Muslims rather than orthodox Islam; because, during this period a kind of nomadic rural culture was widespread among the Turks. For such a nomadic society it was easier to adopt heterodox Islam instead of the orthodox high Islam. Rather than the *ulemas* and *şeyhs* of the orthodox Islam, nomadic or semi-nomadic Turkish population followed leaders of the heterodox Islam (*babas*, *dedes* and *dervishes*) which were spreading syncretic ideas. Migration of Turkish population to the Anatolia started at the 11th century. While they were migrating they also brought their heterodox Islamic beliefs and life styles that were a mix of Shamanism and Islam. Heterodox *dervişs* were organized under the name of *Abdals*, *Kalenderis*, and *Haydaris*, etc. these groups had taken serious roles in the conquest of the Anatolia by Turks. Heterodox *dervishes* could not reside in the cities where the orthodox Sunni groups constituted the majority (Ocak, 2002: 40-47).

While orthodox groups were organized around *medreses*, heterodox group were situated mainly around *tekkes*. Compared to orthodox Sunnis, heterodox groups were lack of systematic worldviews. The heterodox dervishes got in touch with non-Muslim population of Anatolia and Balkans especially during the Ottoman period. They formed a kind of mediator mechanism (via their tolerant interpretation of religion) between local population and new comer Turks. Kemal Tahir, who is a prominent figure of Turkish literature and history of thought, in his famous novel *Devlet Ana*, describes relatively unstable and anarchic climate of pre-Ottoman period in Anatolia. For him, founders of Ottoman State (Ertuğrul Gazi, Osman Gazi), spiritual leaders of the era (such as Şeyh Edebalı) were sharing heterodox version of Islam. In *Devlet Ana*, Tahir represents heterodox *dervishes* as filthy persons, wearing wretched dressings, with long hairs, lacking property, sometimes carrying *saz*, drinking wine or *rakı* and performing *semah*. Although these arguments of Kemal Tahir were shared by important portion of Turkish historians, there are also intellectuals who depicts early Ottoman period as dominantly orthodox. For example, Tarık Buğra in his novel *Osmancık*, portrays completely orthodox picture of the same period.

Heterodoxy as Communitas and Orthodoxy as Social Structure:

Here we will offer an analogy that relates two pairs of concepts which mentioned in the title just above. In both set of concepts there is a tension between the opposite poles. Before discussing in detail the similarities between two conceptualizations we will summarize the basic arguments of Victor Turner. Turner, in his famous book *Ritual Process*, presents us a dualistic model of social life consisting mutually interdependent poles: "social structure" and "communitas." Social structure for Turner is a system of social relationship and status: "an arrangement of positions ... which involves the institutionalization and perdurance of groups and relationships"

(Morris, 1987:247). For Turner social structure is an aspect of society as a differential system of structural positions implying hierarchy and exploitation (Turner, 1969: 90). In Turner, social structure is described as static, classificationary, pragmatic and instrumental and for the individual it is a world that is "arid" and "mechanical." The patterned arrangement of roles, status, beliefs, norms and sanctions seems the prominent features of social structure.

According to Turner, *communitas*, on the other hand, is "a relationship between concrete, historical, idiosyncratic individuals" (Turner, 1969:96). *Communitas* can generally be defined in opposition to structure: *Communitas* appears where structure does not. *Communitas* identifies with a mode of relationship, a group, a belief or ideology. In *The Ritual Process* Turner introduced the concept of *communitas* to denote this feeling of comradeship among the liminal personalities. In Turner's work, *communitas* in rituals refers to liminality, marginality, inferiority and equality (Ibid: 96). In *The Ritual Process*, Turner (1969: 96-97) conceived society as dialectic process between *communitas*, (the undifferentiated community of equal individuals) and structure (the differentiated and often hierarchical system of social positions). This dialectic process appears in the course of history in a cyclical way: "Maximization of *communitas* provokes maximization of structure, which in turn produces revolutionary strivings for renewed *communitas*" (Ibid: 130). Turner distinguished three types of *communitas* in society (Ibid: 130-140): (1) existential or spontaneous *communitas*, which is free from all structural demands and is fully spontaneous and immediate; (2) normative *communitas*, which is organized into a social system; and (3) ideological *communitas*, which refers to utopian models of societies based on existential *communitas* and is also situated within the structural realm. Turner contented that the *communitas* spirit, where individuals interact free from socio-culturally constructed divisions "presses always to universality and ever greater unity." Turner presents the distinction between as a series of binary oppositions (1969:106):

STRUCTURE		COMMUNITAS	
-State	-Inequality	-Transition	-Homogeneity
-Heterogeneity	-Property	-Equality	- Propertyless
-Complexity	-Pride	-Sacred	- Humility
-Classification	-Secular	-Simplicity	- Anonymity

In our opinion it would be helpful to employ Turner's conceptualization to understand the differentiation between orthodox and heterodox appearances of Islam and lives of the members of the mentioned categories. It is not argued here that there is a perfect overlapping. In other words, despite of the fact that Turner's approaches do not cover all dimensions of heterodoxy-orthodoxy binary, we still find explanatory statements and some illuminating points in it for our discussion. In the table below, we present a categorization about orthodox High Islam and heterodox folk Islam, which is similar to categorization of Turner concerning to social structure and *communitas*:

ORTHODOX HIGH ISLAM	HETETODOX FOLK ISLAM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -Friendly relations with the state • -Hierarchical in nature • -Domination of Shari'a, • -institutionalized • -Property owning • -Written culture • -Sanctions, duties, fear of God • -Discrimination between sexes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • -Tension with the state • -Un-hierarchical • -Normless, not institutionalized • -Propertyless • -Residence in rural • -Humility, simplicity, untidiness, shabby appearance • -Anonymous, verbal culture • -Love of God • -Limited discrimination between sexes

In Turner's conceptualization *communitas* refers to marginal segments of society hippies, gypsies, Shamans, priests, mystics (Morris, 1987: 256). On the other hand, structures for Turner are "the patterned arrangements of role sets, status sets, and status sequences consciously recognized and regularly operative in a given society and closely bound up with legal and practical norms and sanctions" (1978). Similarly, heterodox segments of Muslim societies show marginality and inferiority in their related social structure. Strongly patterned and arranged (arrangements of duties, relations, status sanctions) structure of orthodox Islam by legal norms resulted from *Qur'an* or "raison d'état" reminds us of the social structure of Turner. For Turner it (*communitas*) may be regarded by the guardians of structure as dangerous and may be hedged around with taboos, and associated with ideas of pollution. In that sense, it is generally agreed upon fact that the history of heterodoxy in Turkish-Islam can be read as the history of rebellion, challenge and critique of heterodox groups towards the

orthodox Sunni state authority. During both Saljuqhi and Ottoman period heterodox groups had been the sources of unstableness and regarded as threatening factors for the unity of the state.

Conclusion:

As a conclusion, it can be argued that today we observe various appearances of Islam all over the world, instead of a single congruent form of it that is valid for all different times and societies. Turkish Islam is an example of the "localization" or "vernacularization" of universal teachings of Islam. In Turkish Islam, there have been two main interpretations: namely, orthodox and heterodox. The Turks interpreted Islam under the effects of their previous traditions (nomadic culture, Shamanism) and as a result new kind of syncretism emerged: heterodox Islam (such as Alevism). Sedentary segments of Turks eventually internalized a more orthodox version of Islam. We borrowed the conceptual pair of "high Islam/folk Islam" from Gellner and argued in this paper that while orthodox interpretation can be associated with high Islam, heterodox interpretation can be associated with folk Islam. There have always been tense relations between these two interpretations. We can summarize main characteristics of orthodox high Islam as follow: Friendly relations with the state, hierarchical in nature, domination of Shari'a, institutionalized, property owning, written culture, sanctions, duties, fear of God, and discrimination between sexes. On the other hand, heterodox folk Islam can be featured as: Tension with the state, un-hierarchical in nature, normless, not institutionalized, propertyless, residence in rural, humility, simplicity, untidiness, shabby appearance, anonymous, verbal culture, love of God, and limited discrimination between sexes. Lastly, it is argued in this paper that it would be helpful to employ Turner's conceptualization (i.e. social structure-communitas) to understand the differentiation between orthodox and heterodox appearances of Islam and lives of the members of the mentioned categories. As presented above, conceptualization of communitas refers to marginal segments of society, hippies, gypsies, Shamans, priests, mystics. On the other hand, structures refer patterned arrangements of role sets, status sets, hierarchical relations, regularity and close bound up with legal and practical norms and sanctions. For these reasons, marginal and anarchical natures of heterodox segments of Muslim societies remind us communitas. Strongly patterned and arranged (arrangements of duties, relations, status sanctions) structure of orthodox Islam by legal norms resulted from *Qur'an* or "raison d'état" reminds us of the social structure of Turner.

REFERENCES

- AKPINAR Turgut, *Türk Tarihinde İslamiyet, İletişim, İstanbul, 1999.*
- AKTAY Yasin, *Türk Dininin Sosyolojik İmkani, İletişim, İstanbul, 1999.*
- AKYOL Taha, *İran ve Osmanlı'da Mezhep ve Devlet, DK, İstanbul, 1999.*

- ÇAMUROĞLU Reha, *Tarih Heterodoksi ve Babailer, İletişim*, İstanbul, 2000.
- GELLNER Ernest, *Postmodernism, Reason and Religion*, Rourledge, New York, 1992.
- GÖLPINARLI, Abdülbaki, *100 Soruda Tasavvuf*, İstanbul, 1969.
- HODGSON M.G.S., *The Venture of Islam I*, The University of Chicago Press, London and Chichago, 1961.
- HUME David, **Natural History of Religion**, available at <http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/h/hume/david/h92n/>, 1889.
- KÖPRÜLÜ M. Fuat, **Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar**, Ankara, 2003.
- MORRIS Brain, *Anthropological Studies of Religion*, Cambridge U.P. 1987.
- NİZAMÜLMÜLK, **Siyasetname**, Dergah Yayınları, İstanbul, 2011.
- OCAK Ahmet Yaşar, *Türkler, Türkiye ve İslam*, İletişim, İstanbul, 2002.
- TURNER Victor, *The Ritual Process: The Structure and Anti-Structure*, Aldine, 1969.
- TURNER Victor, **Image and Pilgrimage in Christian Culture: Anthropological Perspectives**, New York: Columbia University, 1978.
- ÜLGENER Sabri, *Zihniyet ve Din*, İstanbul, 1981.
- WATT Montgomery, *Islamic Political Thought*, Edinburg, 1968.
- WEBER Max, **"Din Sosyolojisi,"** Edited by Yasin Aktay, *Din Sosyolojisi*, Vadi, 1998.
- VISUVALINGAM Sunthar, **Transgressive Sacrality in Hinduism and the World Religions**, available at <http://www.svabhinava.org/tshwr/tshwr-frame.html>, 2003.
- YAVUZ M.Hakan. "Is There a Turkish Islam? The Emergence of Convergence and Consensus," **Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs**, Vol. 24, No. 2, October, 2004.
- GÜZELYUT Rıza, **Osmanlı'da Karşıt Düşünce ve Idam Edilenler**, İstanbul, 1986.